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Welcoming Message from Koïchiro Matsuura. 
Director-General of UNESCO to the participant of the International Conference «Innovative Policies for Heritage Safeguarding and Cultural Tourism Development»

Koïchiro Matsuura, 
Director-General of UNESCO

I should like to congratulate the Minister of Culture and Mass Communication and the authorities of the Russian Federation and other participating countries for organizing this Conference, in cooperation with the UNESCO Office in Moscow, on a matter of such importance. Tourism has become the world’s largest generator of employment. As a complex phenomenon, it calls for a holistic approach, particularly because, in the context of globalization, tourism opens up new challenges for development – involving both risks and opportunities – in the areas of cultural and natural heritage, cultural identity and intercultural exchange.

It is UNESCO’s firm conviction that tourism is an effective tool for the promotion of cultural diversity, sustainable development and the struggle against poverty. It is now widely appreciated that development is inconceivable in economic terms alone and that there is a need to reaffirm the reciprocal links that govern the economic, social, ecological and cultural realms. This requires the identification and safeguarding of all forms and expressions of heritage – whether natural or cultural, tangible or intangible – and thus the creation of a climate favourable to its survival and full development. The preservation and application of traditional knowledge, especially at the interface between economic activities and local culture, and the sustainable conduct of cultural tourism are integral parts of these processes.

To tackle these challenges, UNESCO has developed over many years a set of normative instruments directed towards safeguarding cultural heritage. These instruments include the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) and the recently adopted Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005), all of which contribute to integrating a cultural perspective into the development paradigm and associated policies and programmes.

When a site is inscribed on the World Heritage List or when protected areas are designated as “Biosphere Reserves”, awareness grows concerning the importance of protecting and preserving heritage. It also stimulates interest in the site, promotes activities organized around the property and thereby increases the number of tourists who visit the location. World Heritage sites and Biosphere Reserves, therefore, serve as tools for developing links between sustainable tourism and conservation efforts. In addition, they help to promote the implementation of policies that contribute to environmental protection, reduce negative socio-economic impacts, and benefit local people economically and socially.

UNESCO is pleased to have helped in organizing this Conference, which will examine and highlight examples of tourism policies and projects contributing to responsible tourism development and the safeguarding of cultural diversity, including historical cities, natural reserves and museum development. The Conference’s thematic focus is particularly pertinent and timely considering the outstanding cultural heritage of the participating countries, their remarkably well-preserved landscapes and their commitment to tourism. The Moscow Kremlin Museum is a most appropriate place to host this Conference.

I wish you every success in your deliberations. I am confident that this important event will raise awareness that tourism is not only a factor of development but also a concrete engagement in intercultural dialogue and, therefore, a vehicle for living together in peace and mutual understanding.

K. Matsura

Proceedings of the International Conference
Dear Ladies and Gentlemen, participants and guests of the conference!

Judging by the range of represented participants both Russian and foreign expert societies showed a keen interest in the International Conference which theme is "Innovation policy in the sphere of cultural heritage preservation and development of cultural cognitive tourism".

As many other countries Russia has embarked on a path of establishing an information society. In May 2005 in Saint-Petersburg the Russian Ministry of Culture jointly with the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Information and Communications as well as with UNESCO conducted large international conference "UNESCO between two stages of the World Summit on information society". The conference had a wide response and resulted in recommendations which provided the basis for the Russian stand in the summit and approaches of UNESCO to establishment of an information society.

An information society is distinguished by such salient features as continuity of innovation process and innovation complexity which cover all spheres of social activity including culture and cultural cognitive tourism.

Development of culture in the era of globalization has its peculiarities and difficulties (including large scale offensive of mass culture) which rose in the way of almost all countries. Russia makes no exclusion. Under these conditions a creative personality closely connected to the cultural heritage turns into the main resource of world development. It becomes more and more frequent that people of culture from many countries are united by the common thinking that cultural and civilization variety of the word is a guarantee of its stable continuous development. Preservation of cultural pluralism and respect to other cultures is the most important prerequisite to cultural development. This problem will require not only our attention but also attention of future generations.

An intercultural dialogue and show of tolerance as well as high respect for cultural variety may be considered as key prerequisites to establishment of an information society under the conditions of spreading globalization. We have to perceive the problem of preserving cultural variety as a combination of new building blocks for the emerging world culture, which requires global ethics and values, rather than as a weighty responsibility.

Today it is very relevant to look at culture from the point of view of economy which may turn a number of cultural institutes into respectable players in the market of intellectual services in the field of social leisure.

I hope that discussion of problems connected with culture and nature preservation and utilization in Russia aimed at its economic, social and cultural growth will offer adequate ways for their solution. Now the time is ripe to switch to development of specific state and social support measures as well as to form the single interconnected system: cultural heritage – cultural cognitive tourism.

I have a firm belief that this conference will turn out to be fruitful and rich in brilliant reports and exciting discussions, that it will significantly expand our experience in the field of cultural preservation and utilization by society both in Russia and abroad.

From the depths of my heart I wish the conference to be a success and hope that its results will make a valuable contribution to modern international, regional and national culture as well as to information policy.

In the end I would like to express special gratitude to UNESCO, all members of the steering and program committees, masters of conference sessions and sections, reporters for their contribution to organization of this representative international forum.
Dear participants of the Conference!

Your distinguished work aimed at preserving and increasing cultural and natural heritage as well as its effective utilization in favor of intellectual enrichment of societies of the friendly states represented at this forum deserves deep respect and social recognition.

The Council of the Interparliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States fully supports UNESCO initiatives and applies all necessary efforts in its activities to facilitate preservation and development of the single cultural and economic area embracing territories of all these sovereign states.

We consider this conference as a unique opportunity to share experience in this vitally important to our countries sphere of spiritual life, cultural and production activities as well as to discuss our common problems and to strengthen cooperation among our nations.

We are convinced that the conference will highlight advanced experience of UNESCO and our Western partners, successful innovation projects and practices of the CIS states in the field of preservation and effective utilization of cultural sites and natural parks as well as in the field of introduction of new technologies in the corresponding human activities. It will facilitate the participants to find solution to many urgent national issues of cultural and natural heritage preservation.
Dear Mr. Chairman! Dear Ladies and Gentlemen!

I am very glad to welcome you on behalf of the State University – The Higher School of Economics which is one of the conference organizers.

Our task was to make up the program and form composition of the participants in such a way that irrespective of urgency of each issue the dialogue would always touch the following subjects:

- preservation of world heritage sites and national strategies;
- state responsibilities in the area of safeguarding national heritage and developing "cultural industry";
- strengthening of state control over cultural and natural heritage sites and modern approaches to managing them including wider involvement of private sector in culture.

An interdisciplinary dialogue is not something new for us. Everyone here hardly knows that the High School of Economics is a large socio-economic university which trains not only economists, but also philosophers, political scientists, managers, lawyers, journalists.

We strive for our educational activities to be closely integrated into scientific and analytical work. For a long time the High School of Economics has played the role of the main expert center in the interest of the Russian Ministry of Economic Development and Trade. On a regular basis it renders assistance to other ministries and governmental agencies in terms of developing ideas for upgrade of economic and social branches.

This year has seen substantial extension of our cooperation with the Ministry of Culture. We consider culture to be one of the spheres where social transformations should be implemented to ensure the further development. Unfortunately, mainly due to negative experience of 90s, the reforms in culture are frequently associated with its commercialization. We look at reforms from different point of view.

Development of culture can not be separated from adequate adjustment of economic institutes and mechanisms. The undoubtful fact that society must take care of preserving and developing its intellectual values presupposes adequate financing of culture by the state. One should hardly expect any progress in the system which in the recent ten years has been financed to the extent of only 15% of its demand and where monthly salary of 70% of employees does not exceed Rubles 4000.

At the same time mere increase in state expenditure will not solve all problems. One needs total reformation of mechanisms which identify priorities and ensure fruitfulness of the state cultural policy. As in other spheres the following principle should be also observed in culture – funds follow results.

A new social contract should be made between the society, state, culture itself and its employees. The society and state must recognize real value and priority of caring for its cultural and intellectual heritage including accessibility of cultural benefits for population.

The problem of culture can not be solved by allocating state funds only. Certain mechanisms of public-private partnership should be introduced. More than a half of cultural sites can be easily handed over to private managers. The legal base for that is already at hand – since 2006 the new “Concession Agreements Federal Act” comes into force. From the social point of view this form of cooperation between the state and business is more effective than random privatization.

The key issue lies in elaboration and specification of powers to be delegated to governmental authorities in the area of managing cultural and natural heritage sites as well as in separation of ownership rights, since unless the owner, his rights and responsibilities are determined one will be unable to solve specific administrative problems.
Non-state managers should be allowed into the sphere which traditionally has been considered as a budget one. This will create competition in the local cultural markets and increase general flow of funds invested in this sphere.

As you see, there is much space here for cooperation of culturologists and economists.

Growth of competition will unavoidably press for upgrade in management systems of state and municipal cultural organizations. Propagation of knowledge and the most successful experience of state and corporate management in culture will be of high importance. I have no doubts, that this conference will help to make a noticeable step in this direction as well as to better understand up-to-date problems of cultural heritage preservation and cultural cognitive tourism development along with bringing solutions which will make cultural policy truly innovative.

We appreciate everyone’s efforts in supporting the initiative to conduct this conference as well as active and valuable participation in process of its preparation. We are sure that the conference will allow to identify landmarks and specify priority areas and will yield fruit in the nearest future.

I wish you interesting and fruitful work.

Thank you for your attention.
Dear friends!

I am very glad to welcome the participants of UNESCO International Conference focused on innovation policy in the area of preserving cultural heritage and developing cultural cognitive tourism. The conference theme is of particular importance for Saint Petersburg, one of the largest world cultural centers.

The city on the Neva river is usually referred to as a museum, cultural and theatrical capital of Russia. The UNESCO World Heritage List includes the historical center of the northern capital as well as numerous palaces and parks located in its suburbs.

The Petersburg government pays significant attention to preservation of cultural heritage and development of cultural cognitive tourism. As far as Saint Petersburg is concerned we have adopted and are now implementing special programs for preservation of cultural heritage and development of tourism within the nearest future.

For the first time in the city history tourism is recognized as strategically vital direction in city development. Our goal is to preserve the unique image of Saint Petersburg for future generations, at the same time we apply every effort to establish a powerful city tourism infrastructure.

I would like to wish for the forum to be held in friendly atmosphere and its participants to enjoy fruitful discussions and new ideas!
Welcoming Speech  
of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

Grigory Ordzhonikidze,  
General Secretary  
of Commission of the Russian Federation  
for UNESCO

Dear colleagues!

On behalf of the Chairman of Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Victorovitch Lavrov, I wholeheartedly welcome the distinguished participants of the conference, called for to discuss a wide range of topics on the preservation of cultural heritage and development of cultural tourism.

For centuries remained unfailing the idea and desire to protect unique creations of the World Culture. The growth of threat of annihilation of natural and cultural values of our planet, becoming impetuous, made the people to become aware of an imperative need to preserve the national identity and cultural accomplishments.

As the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin observed in his address at joint session of presidium of the State Council and presidium of Council on culture and arts: «For our country cultural heritage is not only our wealth, but also a vast resource and therefore the problem of preservation of cultural heritage is becoming a national goal».

The notions of cultural tourism and preservation of a cultural heritage are mutually complementary and interdependent. Remains as the indisputable fact, that the competent use of cultural heritage, its preservation, is one of the crucial factors in the state development. Moreover, work on preservation of cultural heritage is of major emotional and educational importance, it also consolidates national self-awareness of people. In this connection cultural and educational tourism is called upon to give serious impulses to the development of business around objects of culture, to ensure there the development of hotel and transport infrastructure, arranging of high quality souvenir production, creating a significant number of additional workplaces even in the remote corners of our country.

Cultural tourism is one of the most dynamic phenomena of the modern world. Recently it has acquired enormous rates of growth and scales of influence on the level of development of the world community as a whole, and in many countries it has become one of the key branches of economics. Development of cultural tourism is one of the priorities of the 21-st century. According to the World tourist organization, in 10 years the number of tourists will be doubled and the number of people, travelling from one state to another, will be over 1 billion, and by 2020 – 2.6 billion. As to Russia, experts of WTO believe, that according to the size of international tourist exchange and tourists currency receipts it should enter among the first ten countries of the world.

It would be particularly desirable to emphasize, that in our age of globalization, interpenetration and intertwining of cultures, knowledge and ideas, it is essentially important to adjust and consolidate good-neighbourly relations with the countries and regions with whom we are bound by centuries-old history. It acquires especially great importance in connection with the emerging manifestations of intolerance, interreligious and intercultural animosity, terrorism and extremism. All civilized peoples and cultures should join their efforts in the struggle against this evil, which can be only overcome together, through frank dialogue. In this context cultural tourism acquires the greatest importance, as it promotes strengthening good-neighbourly relations, development of intercultural dialogue, better understanding of each other, strengthening the idea of peace in the minds of people – the basic principle in the activities of UNESCO.

In this respect the opening conference is becoming now in itself a very important appeal for peace, concord and cooperation.

I am sure, that by realizing consistently the principles of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, we can by joint efforts find effective decisions, to contribute to the preservation of natural and cultural values for the development of cultural and educational tourism under conditions of stability and progress.

Ladies and gentlemen! May I express my best wishes of successful and fruitful deliberations to all the participants of the conference.

Thank you for your attention.
Dear Ladies and Gentlemen!

Let me express gratitude to UNESCO, all organizers and participants of the international conference for your decision to conduct this representative international forum within the walls of the ancient Moscow Kremlin, thus highlighting once again its world value as a monument and center of modern world and Russian culture.

Tourism is a social event of the modern world in which all countries and almost all society are involved. Governments in most countries of the world recognize growth of cultural tourism prestige, its economic and social value in life of modern society. The place of tourism in world economy can be hardly overestimated – it consumes 11.4% of world investments and provides 10.9% of the world core income. The largest share of the mentioned figures comes to cultural museum tourism which is considered as the most important area of tourist activities.

The present XXI century features intensive development of cultural tourism where such sites have come to the fore as ancient monuments and undisturbed natural environment – natural landscapes. Thanks to development of cultural tourism and high activity of reserve museums the complex of historical, cultural and natural heritage gains the value of specific and important social and economic resource.

I am convinced, the results of coming discussions, the conference recommendations based on rich international experience will significantly contribute to the common cause of cultural and natural preservation and development which is closely connected with progress of modern human society!
Welcoming Speech

Herve Barre,
UNESCO Programme Specialist of
Culture and Development Section of
Division of Cultural Policies and
Intercultural Dialogue

Dear participants and guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen!

It is a pleasure and a great honor for me as Program specialist of the “Culture, tourism and development” program, to participate, along with my colleagues of the UNESCO Moscow Office, at this International Conference on “Innovative Policies for Heritage Safeguarding and Cultural Tourism Development”. Our meeting place, the Kremlin Museums, offers a splendid example of how a rich, well preserved cultural heritage can be made accessible to visitors from all over the world in a spirit of sharing cultural diversity and professionalism.

I should like to thank the Russian national authorities, the Mayor of the City of Moscow and the partners of this Conference, for their kind and qualitative hospitality, which is well in the line with your national traditions, as well as for proposing a theme of such contemporary relevance.

This Conference follows a series of regional capacity building workshops on innovative policies for cultural tourism development, which have been held in 2005 in Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia, with the support of UNESCO and the efficient competency of my colleague Ms Liubava Moreva. Having carefully read the reports of the three national seminars, I would like to congratulate the authorities of the three Caucasus countries and the participants of these meetings for the pertinence and richness of the debates, their analysis of the situation and important recommendations.

These debates determined that cultural tourism was a national priority and that the countries’ rich cultural resources needed to be better preserved and enhanced, through quality tourist circuits. The conclusions also referred to the infrastructure and professional staff, which must be improved to fully satisfy modern tourism standards. They also confirmed the need for a clear strategy, to provide the proper response to the question of how to develop a cultural tourism that does not destroy or damage the cultural and natural heritage on which it is based, but rather becomes a vehicle for improving the living conditions of local populations, both now and in the future.

Cultural diversity under threat.

The world today is faced with a paradox: on the one hand, cultural heritage whether tangible or intangible, has never been as threatened as it is today and, on the other hand, simultaneously, it has never been considered as useful and necessary and been the subject of so much interest at the local, national and international levels.

Mr Koïchiro Matsuura Director-General of UNESCO pointed to this crucial challenge facing our societies by saying, on the occasion of the World Day for Cultural Diversity that “Cultural diversity has become pivotal to the future of societies and requires renewed action”.

Therefore, the UNESCO Member States unanimously agreed that cultural diversity is a matter of major importance for humanity and acknowledged that cultural diversity is the manifold, cosmopolitan story of human progress, the identity of peoples and regional and local populations. It is for this reason why the UNESCO General Conference, adopted, last October, the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions”.

According to one of the Delegates to The General Conference of UNESCO , this new Convention will endeavor to ensure the survival of certain cultural expressions that might otherwise be weakened by the powerful forces of globalization.

Some years ago Mahatma Gandhi eloquently expressed the thought behind this Convention: “I do not want my house to be surrounded by walls or all sides of my windows to be barricaded. I want all the world’s cultures to be free to blow around my house but I don’t want to be carried away by any one of them.”
In order to exist, all peoples need to convey a testimony of their daily life, express their creative capacity and preserve the traces of their history. Heritage is the instrument of this two way process between past, present and future. Culture is one of the roots of development, including tourism, but it is also a means to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence. Cultural heritage is one of the keys to understanding others as it contributes to an uninterrupted dialogue between civilizations and cultures. This point was expressed by Mr V. Putin, President of the Russian Federation: "As for our country it [culture] is not only a treasure, but at the same time a great resource, no less important than oil and gas. Therefore, the goal of Heritage Safeguarding is a National Goal!"

**Preserved heritage, a precondition for competitive tourism.**

A qualitative and competitive tourism is linked to appropriate cultural heritage preservation and authentic living cultural expressions. UNESCO’s task with regard to cultural heritage is perfectly geared to the preoccupation of states and touristic companies who wish to make their tourism competitive on the international scene, because this competitiveness is dependent upon the authenticity, the good preservation and management of sites and living cultural heritage. This includes monuments, but also festivals, performing arts, museums, cultural events, handicraft, gastronomy.

Among the most important references for the safeguarding of heritage, are the UNESCO Convention of 1970, which highlights action against illicit trafficking of cultural property, the Convention of 1972 which established the UNESCO World Heritage List and introduced the concept of world heritage of universal value and of every country’s “duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the Cultural and natural heritage…” (Art 4), the Convention of 2003 on the safeguarding of the intangible heritage and the above mentioned, recently adopted, Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which allows countries to “…adopt measures aimed at protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions within its territory” (Art 6). Any cultural tourism strategy should be designed in the light of these documents, which can be said to represent the wisdom of the international community.

**Tourism as a tool for dialogue, peace and development.**

Well preserved cultural heritage, tangible and intangible, therefore appears to be a precondition for quality tourism, which implies the satisfaction of the tourists, of the host population and of the tourist companies. In UNESCO’s view, quality tourism is an activity that can advance the goals of preserving and promoting cultural diversity and the values of cultural heritage, foster intercultural dialogue and contribute to development and the Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations, among them poverty alleviation.

UNESCO’s activities in this field take the form of capacity building seminars and workshops with culture and tourism actors with a view to designing tourism strategies sensitive to culture, the building of experts’ and university networks in the framework of the UNESCO/UNITWIN program – I am glad to say here that the UNESCO Chair at the Russian International Academy of Tourism (RIAT) is an active member of this network – and operational projects associating research and action to identify “good practices” to be further discussed and disseminated.

I would like to mention specifically the “Sahara of Cultures and People” project, the development of cultural and eco-tourism in the mountainous regions of Central and South Asia, the “Youth Poverty Alleviation through Tourism and Heritage” project in the Caribbean, the Baltic cultural tourism strategy project, the “Culture, Tourism and Development in West Africa” project, and several cultural itinerary projects including: “The Slave Route”, “The Route of the INCA”, “Cultural Corridors in South East Europe”, “The Route of Jesus Christ in Palestine”, the “Golden Ring of Khorezm”, in the Aral Sea Basin. I would also like to refer to the World Heritage partnership initiative with tour operators and the “World Heritage in Young Hands” program of awareness raising among youth.

There is a clear common interest and basis for partnership between national and local cultural and tourism institutions, international institutions like UNESCO, and tourist industry companies. Beyond the goal of preserving cultural heritage, tourism also has an important role to play in national and local development, in fostering intercultural dialogue through a better knowledge of cultural identities, and in “education of people to live together” and to consider differences as a richness to be shared with others.

Tourism is an effective vehicle for creating the conditions for a real dialogue. Many tourism stakeholders are increasingly aware of the positive role they can play to promote understanding, through a more accurate presentation of different cultures in order to portray the true face of different civilizations and prevent people from being biased by prejudice, which begets fear and suspicion.

Tourism actors also have an important part to play in giving visibility to cultural diversity: they have the capacity to open that diversity up to discovery and thus offer real knowledge to tourists whose cultural perception would otherwise be purely fictive and image based. The role of tourism is to make this diversity broadly accessible to the public at large.

This gives its real meaning to cultural tourism and the very reason for the world wide endeavors for the preservation of cultural diversity, cultural heritage.
**Principles for a qualitative strategy.**

According to Barcelona based INTERARTS, 40% of cultural activity takes place while people are on holiday and, according to WTO, more than one third of all trips have a cultural element. In the last few years an increase in the demand for cultural experience has been registered. These facts illustrate the strong development potential for cultural tourism in the future.

Studies also show that most cultural tourists in Europe visit a place for the following reasons: 1. for learning purposes. 2. to know more about the local culture. 3. to experience the atmosphere of a place. 4. for entertainment purposes. Cultural tourism is a distinct sector within tourism, and one whose growth potential can be maximized if certain factors are met. These include: a strong cluster of well preserved and managed cultural attractions, be they monuments or festivals; good access; strong and efficient public-private partnership, especially between culture and tourism stakeholders; marketing, information and communication; a real and effective participation of the local population in the projects and a share in the generated income; strategic planning with restricted areas or buffer zones around the sites; quality guiding and presentation of sites; quality services and professionalism; quality labels for accommodation and infrastructures in general and quality souvenirs of authentic character.

There are many good examples of successful cultural tourism in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, the Republic of Moldova and Russia. It is clear that such a Conference as this one provides evidence of the existing political will in these countries to deepen analysis and research to improve the quality and competitiveness of tourism, for it to reach the level that the rich and diverse cultural heritage of these countries deserves.

We should understand that as culture, both at the levels of creation and demand, is constantly evolving, so is cultural tourism, which changes in terms of production and consumption with values, beliefs, and as social practice. The cultural tourist is not only interested in well-known sites, but also in everyday life, the social and political life of a country, meeting local people to understand their way of life, their distinctive way of building houses, including architecture, the places where the youth go to listen to music, which kind of music. It must be understood that today the tourist is a well informed person, who has access to modern means of communication, and who wants to associate knowledge and entertainment when discovering a destination. Culture should no longer have a reputation of being an interesting but sometimes “boring” experience.

**In conclusion.**

I would say that the question as to the kind of tourism that would sustain development, both economic and cultural, can be answered only through an interdisciplinary and global approach, and in partnership with the public and private sectors, intergovernmental organizations, academics, civil society and local populations.

We must be convinced that poorly designed tourism development, which has harmful consequences for the environment, the cultural heritage and society is not inevitable. Successful tourism policies for dialogue, cultural diversity and peace depend on the political will of the authorities as well as the behavior of travelers. Tourists must move from a passive attitude, looking at themselves as mere consumers of heritage, to a more responsible attitude of being custodians of the lifestyle and heritage of a territory, which does not belong only to the communities living there today, but also to the rest of humanity, present and future.

Finally, I would like to recall the words of the Director-General of UNESCO in his message on the occasion of the United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage (2002): “Today, the biggest challenge facing UNESCO is to make the public authorities, the private sector and civil society as a whole realize that the cultural heritage is not only an instrument of peace and reconciliation but also a factor of development” and I would add through tourism in particular. He concluded by encouraging each member of society to become actively involved in the conservation and enhancement of the heritage of humanity.

I wish you every success in your important Conference, hoping your deliberations prove fruitful and the follow up, useful and with concrete recommendations and actions.
Welcoming Speech

Dendev Badarch,
Acting Director of the
UNESCO Moscow Office

Dear participants of the Conference!
Ladies and gentlemen!

It is a special honour for me to welcome you at this significant conference, which has been made possible thanks to the joint efforts of the Ministry of Culture and Mass Communications of the Russian Federation and the UNESCO Moscow Office. It became possible to conduct the conference at the high level thanks to the support of the National Commissions for UNESCO of the cluster countries, the Secretariat of the Council of the Interparliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, and the Local Governments of Moscow and Saint Petersburg.

I would like to express special gratitude to the State University – Higher School of Economics and the State Historical and Cultural Museum-Preserve «Moscow Kremlin», for taking the major responsibility for organizing the conference, which is being held in one of the most unique cultural and historical centers – the Moscow Kremlin Museums.

On behalf of the UNESCO Moscow Office, I express gratitude to the staff members of the museums of the Moscow Kremlin, and in particular, to Ms. Elena Gagarina for their hospitality and cooperation in organizing the International Conference “Innovative Policies for Heritage Safeguarding and Cultural Tourism Development”.

Interest in cultural tourism, especially the world heritage sites, has been growing all over the world. According to various estimates, approximately 50 % of all tourists seek to visit sites that have to do with culture and heritage. Cultural tourism has become one of the basic elements of the tourist industry and a benefit to national economies.

In order for cultural tourism to be well-managed, a global and interdisciplinary approach on the part of all participating members is required.

Thus, UNESCO attempts to address the management issues in partnership with member-states, specialized UN agencies, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, tourist agencies, heads of museums and sites, groups of experts and tourist organizations.

The purpose of UNESCO is to assist in the formation of cultural policy and in specific projects in the sphere of sustainable tourism through research, training programs, and awareness-raising and capacity building events. UNESCO’s assistance includes promoting public awareness, establishing networks and pilot projects, aimed at educating decision-makers, and promoting culture as peace and development factors among the general public.

The process of globalization and cultural integration demands from us an understanding of not only national but international trends of developments, an exchange of spiritual experience and cultural innovations.

I believe the mutual experience of UNESCO, government and public figures, researchers, experts from the member-countries and others will allow us to strengthen our capacity for heritage safeguarding and cultural tourism development.
Issues of Preservation of the World Cultural Heritage and Cultural Tourism Development

Overview

Tourism is one of the World's largest industries with an estimated US$ 3 trillion in annual revenues. The industry is expanding at an average rate of four to five percent annually. Cultural and natural heritage tourism, grouped as ecotourism or specialty travel is the most rapidly growing industry sector. Tourism's growth has generated significant capital, changed regional economies and brought benefits as well as impacts to protected areas and local communities. World Heritage sites are prime attractors of tourists, and tourism is a major management concern at the majority of World Heritage sites. Governments perceive the value of the World Heritage listing as an economic development tool and tourism development continues at the sites. Based on international trends, the importance of tourism to site management and conservation will continue to grow. Because of their diversity, and the growing importance of tourism to site management, World Heritage sites provide ideal locations for research into heritage conservation and tourism management.

Tourism at World Heritage

Two streams of tourism-related activities take place within the WH system. One is the work of the WH Sustainable Tourism Programme, the other is the ongoing work of the WH Committee and the WH Regional Desk officers. For the World Heritage Committee and the Committee's two advisory bodies IUCN and ICOMOS tourism is a frequent concern. These advisory bodies provide recommendations to states parties on inappropriate tourism activities at sites affecting the sites WH values. WH Centre Programme officers receive information on site tourism issues and report to the WH Committee and the advisory bodies.

Tourism-related threats include, negative impacts from visitation, construction inappropriate with WH values and the lack of tourism management plans providing a base of information upon which the site administration and WH Programme offices can track changes over time. Additional site problems include lack of data and trained personnel to monitor tourism numbers, visitor preferences and visitor impacts, and a lack of business plans to determine how much financing to target from tourism. There is generally a limited interpretation and educational materials describing why a site is World Heritage. Difficulty in generating economic benefits to communities as an alternative income source to help mitigate threats to the site’s values is a key concern and problem.

The WH Tourism Programme

The over-riding importance of tourism to World Heritage, both as an opportunity and if poorly managed as a threat, was recognized by the World Heritage Committee when it authorized the Centre, in 2001, to develop a World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme. The mission of the Tourism Programme is to aid the WH Committee and site management using tourism as a positive force to retain WH site values and to help mitigate site threats.

In general, the Tourism Programme facilitates linkages between the key actors in the sustainable tourism and conservation chain and develops tools and methods for practical tourism applications. Here management policies and processes for broad tourism applications for World Heritage sites are being developed, including processes for determining visitor limits, World Heritage visitor interpretation, facilitating the involvement of the private sector, developing tourism related activities in communities, and exploring methods to aid sites with their operational costs. The Programme encourages the development of planning methodologies so that tourism development remains within the limits of acceptable change to those values upon which the sites were listed as World Heritage.

WH Tourism Programme activities aid the WH Centre's regional desk officers and the WH Committee. Here the Programme provides advice on tourism issues such as input to state of site conservation reporting, project design and project management. The Programme is engaged in training site managers and policy makers on sustainable tourism methods so as to provide managers and policy makers with vision of tourism that reflects WH site values. Training has been carried out in Sri Lanka, Benin, Vietnam, and is scheduled for Russian, China and South Asian in the near future. Training materials are being developed from the 2001 Tourism manual for site managers now translated in English, Spanish, Chinese and Vietnamese. Many of these activities such as es-
tablishing visitor monitoring programmes with the tourism industry will be reinforced by the activities suggested in the WHC-TNC project.

Since 2001 the WH Tourism Programme has initiated a number of tourism related projects. These have involved actions to build site staff capacity, train local people in skills to enter the tourism industry and build awareness in the local communities through conservation campaigns and to engage the tourism industry on these efforts. Based on the work carried out the last five years, much progress has been made on forging a viable process for tourism and conservation interventions at World Heritage sites. The lessons learned have provided a framework and processes for continuing Programme activities. These use the strengths of the UN, the recognized importance of World Heritage, combined with the abilities of an international NGO to carry out the implementation of basic training and community development activities. The framework with its seven activities seen as key elements guiding World Heritage sustainable tourism initiatives and policy are listed in Annex II.

A World Heritage Programme Tourism Framework:
The lessons learned and issues raised during the four years of the Tourism Programme's initiatives have provided points for reflection and a preliminary framework for continuing Programme activities. The following seven interdependent activities are suggested as key elements upon which to base and guide World Heritage sustainable tourism initiatives and policy:

1. **Building the capacity of World Heritage site management to deal with tourism.** Among the tools to include in this component are a site assessment process to determine how tourism interventions could be used to contribute to mitigating site threats, and the development of a tourism public use planning process providing a broad vision of how site tourism will be developed and managed.

2. **Training local community members in tourism related activities to participate in the industry and receive tourism's benefits.** Tourism generates a demand for a wide range of services, providing opportunities for community development. If these services are linked to the protected area, providing an alternative to high-impact land uses such as logging or mining, it is believed that tourism can help foster community support for conservation and site management. Activities here include providing training to local people to enter the tourism industry, for example, training local guides and other community members in micro enterprise development. Continuing training to raise skill and service standards is also needed.

3. **Aiding communities around the sites to market their products.** Marketing local community products is necessary if the products offer local people an alternative economic source to the extraction of protected area resources. Products and services such as an association of local guides, boat operators or local crafts, are rarely part of regional, country, and international marketing efforts. It is believed that the World Heritage Centre working with the tourism industry can play a role in providing international links and raising demand for these local products.

4. **Raising public awareness of World Heritage and building pride with local communities and visitors through conservation education.** Raising the awareness of the value of a site’s resources generates respect and a sense of pride among local populations and promotes a feeling that the site must be protected for more than economic reasons. Residents living in and around World Heritage sites generally have little knowledge of the sites’ global significance and the reason for its protected status. Carrying out conservation campaigns at sites can help to fill this deficiency.

5. **Using tourism generated funds to supplement unmet conservation and protection costs at the sites.** Generating funds from tourism and site visitation is a key protected area challenge. Supporting actions that increase site revenue from visitor fees, concessions, or donations generated by the tourism industry are all recommended actions for this activity. The World Heritage label may attract the tourism industry to become more involved at sites. This may permit tourism industry partnerships to develop creative mechanisms that deliver financial benefits to site conservation efforts.

6. **Spreading the lessons learned to other sites and protected areas.** Information and training systems to reach site managers and staff is a World Heritage Programme objective. Practical information targeted to site managers is a primary focus, although it is thought that this basic information will also be useful for those engaged at the policy level. The concept of using World Heritage sites as anchor sites for disseminating information and expertise to other protected areas is a key information distribution and training strategy.

7. **Building increased awareness of World Heritage and its activities and policies for tourism industry officials and their clients.** Raising industry awareness on the importance of safeguarding World Heritage to industry officials can help coordination with the tourism industry and help managers mitigate a number of tourism problems. Support from company officials can generate international support for conservation efforts, change the policies of the ground operators they work with and motivate visitors to make donations to conservation and respect management regulations. Presenting a realistic image of the site, describing management efforts and challenges, how to best visit the site so as to cause minimum impact, and providing information on how to contribute to the site’s protection are important elements to raising visitor awareness.
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Key issues and Lessons Learned

Four years of the Tourism Programme have generated a number of issues and lessons learned that will impact future Tourism programme initiatives. Several of these issues are presented to provoke feedback and further discussion from conference participants. This input will also be used to provide guidance for future World Heritage sustainable tourism activities.

Site management

The site assessment process at World Heritage sites is useful and can address a wide range of site pressures and threats.

Carrying out site assessments to determine tourism interventions that contribute to threat mitigation is a common conservation practice. Site assessment methods have now been used at a number of World Heritage sites. The primary focus of the assessments has been to identify localized threats that are negatively impacting the sites, for example, illegal hunting or illegal trafficking in artifacts. After threats are identified, initiatives such as guides training and micro enterprise development have then been initiated as alternatives to these unsustainable activities.

For World Heritage sites, tourism assessment processes may be expanded for a wider range of pressures than those generated from strictly a local community context. Because of the capacity of World Heritage to raise international attention and engage in dialog with a range of economic interests the assessment processes may also address impacts to sites generated from sources outside the community context. These threats could include threats from international and regional interests, for example international logging or trafficking interests whose actions or policies at the local scale impact the site's state of conservation. Because of its perceived neutral status, in many cases, the UN with the WH Convention can raise attention to these larger issues and facilitate dialog to positively influence negative policies and actions.

Administrative and institutional site pressures may also be included in World Heritage sites assessment processes. With additional information on the site's administrative and institutional situation World Heritage Programme officers are in a better position to support efforts to booster protected area needs related to strengthening site staff capacity. For example, if the assessment found that the site's administration needed tourism planning skills, the Centre could then seek support for strengthening the technical staff's tourism planning abilities.

Tourism public use plans would provide needed baseline data and a tourism vision that would provide guidance for tourism management and assist in tracking changes to the site.

Few World Heritage sites have tourism plans to provide baseline data and a global vision on how tourism will be developed and managed. World Heritage officers must frequently respond to reports of inappropriate tourism development but may have little information on site tourism management policies upon which to base decisions. Having tourism public use plans outlining agreed upon tourism policies particularly on infrastructure development issues would help the sites and guide World Heritage decision making.

In developing a plan for a World Heritage site, administration may wish to consider incorporating the site's World Heritage values into the broad policy framework. The information on why a site was or will be listed as World Heritage, its statement of significance related to the World Heritage criteria can provide useful input for the plan's broad tourism vision. Here the sites' World Heritage significance could be combined with national regulations and other related policies to form a more robust management instrument.

A particular example of this is the potential of World Heritage criteria for site designation providing insights for supporting policies guiding the visual, spatial and functional qualities of site infrastructure. Infrastructure design decisions could be adopted and justified by referencing the World Heritage criteria and the site's significance. For instance, if a site was listed for the site's aesthetic values, infrastructure development threatening this value would not be appropriate. The proposed development of a ten story hotel blocking a magnificent view of an archeological site may not be appropriate for a site listed for this criteria. If infrastructure guidelines are written to reflect the stated World Heritage values, in certain cases management could use the Convention in calling international attention to this hotel initiatives in conflict with site values.

World Heritage criteria may be referenced when developing the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS). Planners could reference World Heritage site criteria and values within the different agreed upon ROS zones. For example, if a World Heritage site is listed as having sacred significance to local people, site management planners could refer to these values to further justify decisions to manage the sacred areas of the site for experiences reflecting the areas sanctity managing the visitor experience to provide a tranquil and meditative environment. During the World Heritage nomination process a management plan presented in tandem with a tourism plan may help to strengthen the site's nomination dossier.

In addition, when developing these tourism public use plans would it not be also possible to incorporate tourism management policies that address the issues of intangible heritage? Could not plans be encouraged to link the protection and management policies of the site to activities reinforcing local cultural values? For example, a Mayan site in Meso America where a local population uses a site for religious purposes. It would be possible to include within the plan policies for the continuation and support of these practices referring back to the site's values and criteria so as to support these intangible cultural activities of local indigenous people. If such
a tourism plan was provided with the site nomination it may provide a useful management tool to maintain a number of these intangible cultural activities.

**Connecting to the tourism industry**

*Although the tourism industry has contributed grants for restoration and infrastructure such as visitor centers, and education activities, engaging the tourism industry to contribute to site protection and local community development has been more difficult.* The World Heritage Centre and partner NGO’s need creative approaches to engage the industry in support of local community tourism efforts.

The World Heritage Tourism Programme has successfully implemented actions related to training local people in skills to enter the tourism industry, including training local people as guides and in micro enterprise development. Connecting to the tourism industry to support community and site needs continues to present difficult challenges and needs continuing actions for its further development.

In the vertical structure of the large international tourism companies linking local tourism products and the tourism industry face a number of issues. Decisions on local services and products are usually made by ground operators working in the destination country. In some countries, these ground operators may be owned or partially owned, by the European or North American parent company, but may retain decision making power over what attractions are visited and services used. Parent companies may be approached at the highest levels to advocate for their involvement in supporting site conservation and local products, but this may not guarantee that local products will be integrated into the ground operator’s itinerary.

There can also be gaps between upper management and the company representatives managing the day-to-day operations limiting the use of local products and services. At all inclusive resorts, for example, the parent company’s country representatives may receive requests from the head office to use the services of local guides and entrepreneurs, however, country representatives may have little time to dedicate to developing these relationships and possible community add-on attractions. Country representatives are also frequently changed and this can lessen incentives to develop local business relationships.

In spite of obstacles, some tour operators may be willing to facilitate and offer local tours as add-on attractions for their clients, distribute information on the local products in their hotels, planes and resorts and provide in-kind services in the form of business training to local communities to booster the quality of their service. To begin to establish dialog and essential linkages for involving companies at the sites in these activities, systematic and well programmed site visits for executives could begin to develop the needed personal relationship with the site staff and the local communities.

Following site visits, several actions could occur. Ideas for local add-on attractions can be suggested and their marketing potential evaluated, interested tour operators could suggest new local products and training courses to aid local product development, and client surveys could include specific questions asking clients interest in the company’s support of local sites and communities and in aiding site projects. If there were positive survey responses, company officials could more easily advocate to their associate ground operators for the use of local product and service attractions. In addition, company officials in the central office could facilitate work policies allowing their country representatives the needed time to work with local community service providers to develop the necessary linkages to local products.

**To facilitate increased cooperation, exposure of private tourism sector involvement and support to sites and local communities needs systematic media promotion.**

World Heritage recognition can be an incentive for private sector tourism industry participation at sites. The tourism industry is increasing engaged in global corporate responsibility actions; partnering with World Heritage sites and participating in associated conservation efforts helps gain international recognition.

To maintain the continuing movement toward active involvement in conservation efforts media promotion is needed to highlight tourism industry initiatives. Private sector involvement in activities such as business training to local communities to booster the quality of their services can be spotlighted by the World Heritage and the UN information and media networks providing the promotion the industry will need to maintain and increase its positive involvement.

World Heritage participation at international tourism trade fairs are another piece to this effort. At these large international events, spotlighting a tour company’s activities in support of World Heritage will set the companies apart from their competitors.

**The cycle of having substantive local actions for the industry to support and the media to report on is the key to maintaining and expanding private sector site involvement and World Heritage tourism industry partnerships.**

The World Heritage label, possible media promotion of tour industry projects at sites and the trend in industry social responsibility are important elements motivating tourism industry involvement. For the continuing expansion of industry support, the ongoing development of conservation and local sustainable tourism projects is also needed. Private sector involvement in concrete activities, such as local guides training schemes provides a win-win situation both for conservation and the tourism industry, aiding the sites and providing the highly attractive activities that produce the media stories the industry is seeking.
Actions are needed to attract the involvement of specific target tourism market segments more geared to support conservation efforts at sites and economic development in the communities aiding conservation efforts.

Broadening the support of different tourism market segments is needed to help complement efforts to gain positive conservation results from tourism. World Heritage should be involved in attracting the types of tourists that maximize site conservation benefits and the use local products. These include the travel market segments whose clients use more local services, pay higher prices, make donations to the site to help meet site operational needs, and are attentive to impacts on site natural and cultural resources. The World Heritage Centre has recently formed a partnership with Earthwatch, an international group bringing paying visitors to areas to work directly with scientists at the sites. Earthwatch groups and the array of international volunteer and academic groups could form one part of this segmented market approach as they fit a visitor profile that can be motivated to directly benefit the site. Specialty markets, like Earthwatch and other volunteer groups, such as academic travel groups, who use local products and logistical services help “train” local service providers and can pave the way for more mainstream tourism markets to a site.

Government marketing efforts

New tourism products particularly at more remote sites may not have the short-term potential to generate significant tourism revenues and therefore are not usually included in government marketing efforts. Creative ways to provide market exposure for local products through official government channels may be possible.

Local community products that are linked to sites are rarely promoted through a country’s international and national tourist campaigns. World Heritage may be able to influence the entry of these products into international and national promotional campaigns. At some sites working with the industry and the governments on a regional marketing approach that links several sites may facilitate government involvement providing a greater chance of local products being included in the marketing packages developed and distributed nationally and internationally. One example of this approach would be if tourism products and attractions of the less visited sites could be marketed as add-on attractions linked to more heavily visited sites.

For many World Heritage sites and their satellite protected areas, a collective approach using a central information hub may aid marketing efforts. Shared lists of qualified guides at each site, a data bank of conservation activities for visitor participation, information on making donations, all could enhance site protection and stimulate local tourism-related economic development. It was suggested by a number of site managers that World Heritage help play a role in facilitating cooperation for the implementation of these sorts of collective promotional activities.

Site management – tourism industry coordination

Cooperation with the tourism industry is needed at some sites to keep tourism demand stable and the quality of local products high.

Many site administrations wish to develop a local tourism industry where numbers of tourists are limited but those tourists who enter the site pay favorable prices for local community services. This strategy requires that local community members develop sufficient skills so that service levels are high enough to enabling them to attract higher paying clients. This strategy also requires that both the numbers of tourists to the site and the number of concessions granted to the local community service providers are maintained at a constant level.

If site visitation were not limited this would provoke an increasing demand for local services. If the number of community members holding concessions were not limited, as visitation increased, communities would run the risk attracting outsiders to the communities. These outsiders, wishing to work in the industry, would flood the market thereby driving down local prices.

In addition, if the tourism industry saw the local services as profitable they may press site management to increase the level of visitation and the number of local concessions to fill the demand. Site management would probably resist an increase in visitation as they have limited staff to manage the growing numbers. Site management along with local NGO’s would also probably not have the resources to train more skilled local community people to enter the industry. The local community members who do not hold tourism concessions however, would in turn press management for the expansion of the number and size of the local concessions granted so they can participate in tourism activities, the result being the creation of enormous social pressures and resentment towards the protected area.

A factor in maintaining this strategy of fixed visitor site numbers and charging higher prices for community products and services is cooperation from the tourism industry. If the tourism industry were willing to cooperate with the site management to limit visitor numbers and to create a stable tourism situation this common scenario may be different. Questions remain on how feasible this cooperation may be. Perhaps, cooperation would be facilitated by having the tourism industry participating from the start in activities such as the development of the aforementioned tourism public use plans thereby becoming involved in decisions on visitor numbers, and the development of logical concession policies for the site to limit market flooding. In sites with existing problems of increasing visitation, perhaps it could involve developing add-on attractions to other neighboring sites to relieve tourism pressures at those highly visited sites. At this point in time, experience is needed to determine if site man-
agement, aided by UNESCO, could gain support from the industry to help create these kinds of stable environments in which management initiatives could be jointly initiated to gain maximum conservation benefits.

**Site administration and tourism industry links limit potential benefits. There is a need for a person at the site level to have responsibility in dealing with visitor management, community tourism development and to act as a liaison to the tourism industry.**

At some World Heritage sites tourism public use coordinators have been trained to carry out planning activities. Site directors are also unable to fill this role as they are occupied with other pressing management issues and they are not necessarily tourism experts. The strategy is to use the tourism public use coordinators not only for tourism planning but also to act as an intermediary with the tourism industry; this could involve contacting ground operators and introducing them to the local people and the products developed by the project.

How to fill this need of a person to represent the site interests with the tourism industry is a missing link in the sustainable tourism equation. At several sites, site managers suggested that World Heritage play a role in facilitating this cooperation with the ministries of tourism and the industry. Perhaps another sort-term suggestion is for the international NGO’s with a long-term presence at the site to provide the support to fill this need. These are only short-term solutions. Until Ministries institutionalize a senior position of a tourism public tourism coordinator to liaise with the tourism industry and appropriate ministries there will exist a gap, limiting site-industry conservation potential.

**Raising public awareness and building pride in the World Heritage sites**

*The symbols of site pride and identity, such as an endangered species, developed with World Heritage conservation education campaigns could serve as a symbol to link other sites promoting regional conservation.*

It is assumed that protected areas will be valued if they have a constituency believing and taking pride in the moral value of conserving the site. Site pride and identity by local people are considered essential ingredients in long term site protection.

At several World Heritage sites conservation education campaigns are being used successfully to develop this sense of site identity. In the campaigns an animal or a bird identified by the surrounding local population is used as a symbol upon which to base an entire social marketing campaign. The symbol could however, be a cultural attraction with a strong community identity. Puppet shows for local schools, songs, drawings are all produced with the species symbol as the main conservation focus. These highly effective programmes have produced good results in achieving awareness of the importance of the site.

As these campaigns take hold and species becomes identified with the site, it would be interesting to see if the “pride” and identity of a particular symbol could be expanded to cover a wider area and aid in the protection of satellite sites. Perhaps using the World Heritage network of sites, combined where possible, with other existing networks such as the Mundo Maya route in Mesoamerica a tourism route linking sites of outstanding Maya culture. In these cases it would be interesting to determine if World Heritage awareness and pride could stimulate a regional public and private commitment to cultural and natural heritage conservation.

Also it would be interesting to see if the “pride” and identity of a particular symbol could be expanded and incorporated into many of the local community's cultural practices, their intangible values, linking them into this campaign of social marketing. For example, could a traditional dance used to inaugurate the start of a village's fishing season be used in tandem with a conservation campaign to limit destructive dynamite fishing?

**Information distribution issues and lessons learned**

*Facilitating information distribution may be facilitated by using WH sites as anchor points.*

Information distribution is now a component of most conservation projects. Electronic transfer of information is a standard practice, with project information posted on websites. Another effective option for facilitating information distribution, if resources are available, may be to encourage the use of World Heritage sites as anchor points, or hubs, where collective knowledge and economic development possibilities are expanded outward creating links to neighboring World Heritage sites and other protected areas. There are practical reasons for this approach. Extending the knowledge gained in the project to other neighboring sites could provide an efficient and less costly means to carry out certain activities. Combined site monitoring training and activities could be extended into neighboring areas providing cost effective economies of scale. Site linking regional workshops organized by the World Heritage Centre and held at the anchor site could spark an interest in the experiences of the site and actions to know the lessons learned and acquire the skills developed at the anchor site.

**Using tourism generated funds to supplement site conservation and protection costs**

*Other creative approaches to use tourism to aid site financing may be available for World Heritage sites*

Site managers correctly report that there are a number of restrictions for getting tourism industry generated funds to aid on the ground site activities. Tourism industry stakeholders want to finance projects rather than operational costs. Tour operators want specific projects to show their clients, visitor fees in some countries have restrictions or return to the central government with little benefit to the site.

While donations tour operators and hotels are possible, for example, tour operators adding a charge to the price of each client’s tour purchase that goes to a particular site either directly or though World Heritage, there
may be other potential options to explore. One of these options may be the development of World Heritage
tours to support sites.

**Building an increased awareness with the tourism industry**

*Going beyond the usual guidelines for industry interaction with World Heritage sites is needed.*

Giving lists of sustainable guidelines and desired behaviours to industry officials is important but it now appears
that a deeper and more effective engagement is possible. Support from company officials so as to not to exceed the
limits of the site's management capacity in dealing with visitors, generating needed international support for conserva-
tion efforts, changing the policies of the ground operators, motivating visitors to make donations to conservation and
restoration may be possible as is an industry commitment to raising public awareness by teaching the importance
of safeguarding World Heritage to their clients. Going beyond the usual guidelines of do's and don'ts for industry
interaction with the site now appears promising and needs continuing development. It may be the ideal time where
UN support through the World heritage Centre can play a leading role in facilitating increased positive industry
engagement in site protection.

**Konstantin Pshenko**

«**Legislative Maintenance of Formation of the Common**
Tourist Space of Member National of the
Commonwealth of Independent States»

Dear Mr. Chairman, dear conference participants, let me express my appreciation to the conference organizers
for the opportunity to address you at this significant event. Tourism is an integral part of human life worldwide,
and is a major part of the world economy and culture. It facilitates a high level of employment, social well-being
and quality of life as well as a promotion of economic integration and cultural diversity in the world. After the
dissolution of the USSR and the emergence of new independent states, the tourist industry on the post-Soviet
territory has been regulated by national laws adopted in the CIS countries. As the Baltic countries were not
members of this alliance, they passed their tourist legislations in line with the European Union's requirements.
At the same time, those countries were working on establishing a legal base and common tourist area with the
CIS countries.

In 1993 the governments of the CIS countries entered into the tourism agreement according to which the
parties undertook certain commitments – to facilitate establishment of the common tourist area, adjustment of
normative legal documents on tourism, integration of the common international classification system on giving
tourist services into the integrated information system. In 1994 the Inter-state Parliamentary Assembly drafted
an advisory law, which was referred to in our documents as the Act on CIS States on Cooperation in the Field
of Tourism.

It is important to mention that that was the first document worked out by our Committee in conjunction
with the State Duma's Committee for Culture, Information, Tourism and Sport, and proves the importance of the
tourist industry problems for the parliaments of ten CIS countries. Tourism has taken its leading position in the
world economy, movement of people and ideas, free exchange of ideas and cultural values. The development
of tourism is of a similar importance to the immediate problems of cultural and historical heritage and, as I
have already stressed, plays an important role in cultural cooperation between the CIS countries. In this regard
it should be mentioned that the share of the CIS countries in the world tourist services market makes up 2%.
In the 90s the problems uncounted by many of the CIS countries causes in a decline of the demand for health
and cultural tourist services, closure of the network of tourist health facilities, and the sanatoriums and holiday
houses required major reconstruction and upgrade of service level.

It is worth of mentioning, that gradual successful development of mountaineering in the world resulted in
the regional integration. The today's global mountaineering market is formed with a more active participation
of inter-state organizations, alliances and trade and economic coalitions. This accompanies by the growth of
organizational structures of tourist industry from small-scale companies to transnational. The new phenomenon,
which is now being observed, is a rapid extension of inter-regional and inter-state trade with services caused by
intensification of integration processes. Irrespective of active development of tourism, its growing influence upon
world economy and international relations the legal regulation of international tourist ties still lags behind from
requirements of modern life. This can be explained, first of all, by active growth of international tourism, primarily
in connection with a number of visas issued for persons willing to visit foreign 28 Materials of the International
Conference countries, which is far ahead of establishing tourism as the subject of international legal regulation,
as well as by the fact that some governments are very slow in handling practical issues related to development
and promotion of international tourism. Secondly, by the fact that international tourism embraces not only the sphere of political relations but also many branches of economy, social aspects, culture, everyday life and traditions. Level of international tourism development differs from country to country, therefore, the national tourism management agencies have different powers and authority.

Third, by the fact that the CIS states have no common uniform national management authorities in charge of common tourist policy. In some countries these are purely state authorities, while in other countries these could be public organizations. Their competence, tasks and functions are different; therefore the level of governmental and parliamentary supervision of their activities is also different. This results in different national approaches to the solution of tasks and problems emerging in the path of international tourism. Tourist exchanges pre-suppose crossing of state borders, presence and movement of tourists on the territory of a foreign country where they are subject not only to international but also to national laws and administrative regulations.

Due to the listed reasons organizational problems in the field of international tourism are very complicated, so far they have not been completely solved. However, today they are considered at the international level and fall within responsibility area of states and governmental organizations. Thus, establishment of up-to-date normative and legal base has been determined as one of the priority tasks for the CIS states which is necessary to regulate tourist activities within the Commonwealth. The CIS Interstate Parliamentary Assembly plays certain, one may even say big role in the process of handling this problem. In general all our activities performed to this end can be defined by such notion as “model legislation”. Model legislation has proved its reasonability and productivity as it is an effective normative and legal unification instrument for legislation activities. As I have already said, we adopted over 40 laws in the sphere of culture and tourism. Basing on our model laws the CIS states adjust their own legislation by unifying or using them correspondingly; they can either accept the law as it is or only a part of it – which is the right of any sovereign state.

On the basis of our first model law 8 from 10 countries, members of the CIS Interstate Parliamentary Assembly, introduced their own national laws in the field of tourism: Ukraine – in 1995, Russia – in 1996, Georgia – in 1997, Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Tajikistan – in 1999, Moldova – in 2000, Kazakhstan – in 2001. Presently this work goes on, we have drafted a new model law on tourist activity, and Elena Drapeko is one of its draftspersons. This law has to overcome many obstacles. The Federation Council of Russia has already considered the model law drafted by us; we will undoubtedly proceed with this work. Thus, judging by analysis of a 14-year old the CIS states coexistence one may conclude that establishment of the common tourist area presupposes equal conditions of economic activities, similar legal bases, unified national administrative mechanisms as well as tourism development mechanisms.

Adjustment of national legislation and normative regulations, simplification and harmonization of customs procedures and other cross-border procedures, unification of tourist documents are of principal importance. Growth of tourist services is determined by investments in this industry, since the existing tourist facilities need upgrade, weak points should be eliminated and lacking links of a chain should be added. I hope that conference recommendations will facilitate to find solution to the problems which the Commonwealth of Independent States faces in the field of tourism.

Elena Drapeko

«State Duma’s Activities Aimed at Improving the Legislation in Sphere of Culture»

The powerful legal base has been created in the Russian Federation, which provides preservation, utilization, popularization and state protection of stationary historical and cultural monuments. In June 2002 the basic Federal law No. 73-FZ “On objects of cultural heritage (monuments of history and culture) of the peoples of the Russian Federation” came into force. According to the mentioned law, the cultural heritage sites belong to the special type of property. The law restricts citizens’ ownership rights towards cultural heritage sites; it specifies different ownership patterns for these sites and elaborates on utilization procedure of cultural heritage sites. It introduces the Uniform State Register of cultural heritage sites, obliges to conduct historical and cultural examination, sets up a number of requirements for preservation of historical settlements as well as other requirements aimed at keeping secure historical, cultural and environmental monuments. In addition to Federal Law No. 73-FZ various issues of safeguarding cultural heritage sites are regulated by 26 other laws. These laws cover a wide range of issues, which if combined, reveal a state protection system of cultural heritage sites.

The Russian Federation Constitution is a principal law, which states that everyone is obliged to preserve historical and cultural monuments as well as to enjoy access to cultural values. Certain provisions of the Russian
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The Federation Civil Code regulating property relations can also be applied to historical and cultural monuments, including the regulation based on which, a compulsory buy-out may be imposed on owners mismanaging cultural values.

The Russian Federation Land Code refers to lands of cultural heritage sites as having historical and cultural purpose and special legal status. For example, the lands belonging to World Heritage Sites, cultural heritage sites of particular value, archeological heritage sites as well as to historical and cultural reserves may not be privatized.

Protection of cultural heritage sites is ensured by regulations set in the following legal documents: the Russian Federation Urban Construction Code, State and Municipal Property Privatization Act, Law on State Registration of Estate in Land and Estate Business, the Russian Federation Administrative Offence Code, the Russian Federation Criminal Code, Law on Licensing Procedure in the Russian Federation of Certain Activities, Russian Federation Local Administration Act, Russian Federation Principal Culture Act, as well as in other legal acts adopted in recent years and regulating issues of budget formation and tax policy.

The mentioned legal documents elaborate on issues of property in state and municipal ownership as well as on powers of the Russian Federation, its constituents and local administration authorities in the field of preserving, utilizing, popularizing and protecting historical and cultural monuments. They define the privatization procedure of cultural heritage sites, the procedure of transferring ownership for these sites or their free use by religious organizations specifies registration procedure of ownership for cultural monuments as well as other issues which emerge in process of providing state protection and preserving cultural heritage sites.

I have a firm belief that all countries represented at the conference have a keen interest in the State Duma’s experience in the field of regulation of the relations between cultural and tourist sectors.

Vladimir Gridushko

«Cultural Policy and Legislation on Preservation of a Cultural Heritage and Cultural Tourism Development in Belarus»

The system of Belarusian legislation for preservation of historical and cultural heritage has been formed as a result of activities performed in this sphere by specialists of various qualifications within decades. It is based on world experience in the field of preserving antiquities which is reflected in the corresponding national legal acts, international normative and regulative documents with long history of development being actually as old as two centuries and a half.

The first Belarusian legal document of this kind was a decree issued by the Council of People’s Commissars of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic July 5, 1926 according to which a number of artistic, architectural, domestic and natural sites were nationalized, while district, regional, city and village soviets were made responsible for protection of cultural monuments. This act legalized the first Belorussian list of 87 monuments located in Minsk, Slutsk, Polotsk, Orshansk, Mogilyov, Kalinin, Bobruisk and Vitebsk districts of Eastern Belorussia.

On the whole, Belorussian legislation for protection of heritage has developed in accordance with the common legal policy pursued by the USSR.

After World War II the Belorussian Republic has ratified three The Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, The Convention concerning the protection of the world’s cultural and natural heritage, The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage was adopted by the authoritative international organization at the turn of the past millennium.

The significant event was adoption in 1969 of the first Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Cultural Monuments Protection Act. In 1978 the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Cultural and Historical Monuments Protection and Utilization Act was adopted which was based on the corresponding USSR legal act of 1976.

Legalization of activities aimed at protection of heritage entailed systematization of historical sites records which resulted in the fact that in 1988 the government of Belorussia approved the State list of historical and cultural monuments of republican value. Work was launched on drafting lists of monuments of local value which fell within competence of regional and Minsk city executive committees.

In 80s of the last century Belorussian Soviet Encyclopedia named after Petrus Brovka Publishing House published 8-volume Book of Belorussian Historical and Cultural Monuments which still remains the only complete and fully published work of the kind in the Soviet Union.

However, the procedure of historical and cultural monuments protection required serious changes as the legislation in this area was declarative primarily due to its poor execution by local authorities.
In November 1992 the fundamental Law of the Belorussian Republic on Protection of historical and cultural heritage was adopted in accordance with which protection of historical and cultural heritage is defined as a system of organizational, legal and economic measures aimed at preventing any damage to historical and cultural values. The list of practical activities in this area includes the following:

- scientific and research work connected with detection, study, classification, publication and popularization of the most distinctive material objects as well as of nonmaterial products of human creativity;
- registration of heritage sites, giving them status of historical and cultural values, management of the State list of Belorussian Republic historical and cultural values and update of database of Belorussian historical and cultural heritage which falls under the category of information resources of national scale;
- drafting of legal acts which regulate the procedure of preparing and approving scientific and design documentation, performance of production activities, preservation and utilization of values, supervision over implementation of laws for protection of historical and cultural heritage.

The Republic of Belarus Ministry of Culture was designated as the state body exercising heritage protection within which the directorate was formed in charge of historico-cultural heritage protection and restoration. Groups of specialists responsible for these issues were appointed in local district and regional administrations.

The Belorussian Republican Scientific and Methodological Council on Historic-Cultural Heritage under the Republic of Belarus Ministry of Culture provides scientific and methodological protection of historico-cultural heritage. Design research and restoration activities are preformed by eight specialized republican organizations and enterprises.

Besides, the Law forbids any activity which may result in worsening the condition of immovable material values or in their disappearance, it either restricts or forbids any activity threatening existence or technical condition of values. To perform any works within the protected area of immovable material values one has to get written permission of the Ministry of Culture. The key ownership rights for values are defined in the Republic of Belarus Civil Code as well as in the corresponding articles of Law “On protection of historico-cultural heritage” (1992).

Historico-cultural heritage protection and preservation activities are financed from the state budget, by owners and users of values as well as by funds collected as penalties from heritage protection law breakers. Persons who were found guilty of deliberate destruction or damage of monuments (values) are held administratively or criminally liable.

Currently the House of Representatives of the Belorussian National Assembly is ready to consider at the second reading bill “On amendments and supplements to the Belarus Republic Law “On protection of historico-cultural heritage (new wording)” which takes into account ten-years experience of the Belorussian state in the field of protecting ancestries, recent amendments to the national legislation as well as relevant international rule-making experience.

The drafted bill's important feature is distribution of competence among state administration bodies of different levels, specification of roles played by public organizations in the area of heritage protection, improvement of terminology covering specific activities performed in relation to various historical sites.

Legal regulation of ownership for historico-cultural heritage is also of high importance. Certain provisions of the bill have been brought into compliance with UNESCO conventions ratified by the Belarus Republic.

Another advantage of the bill to be considered consists in the fact that it is more specific in defining the bodies authorized to keep records of heritage sites. The right to determine state policy in the field of historico-cultural heritage protection is entrusted to the President of the Belarus Republic. The policy is to be implemented by the Cabinet of Ministers of the Belarus Republic.

Basing on the competence levels this work has been layed upon the Ministry of Culture of the Belarus Republic, which besides is a state body authorized to provide protection of historico-cultural heritage, as well as upon local executive and administrative bodies.

Our intention not to confine ourselves to articles of the law is also of high value. Certain articles of the bill set a task to draft within a six-month period from the moment of adopting it a number of regulative documents focused on regulation of specific areas of activity in the field of historico-cultural heritage preservation.

Thus we expect to complete the legislation by relevant comments which will be clear and understandable by everyone involved in process of protecting ancestries. It is worth of mentioning that some provisions of laws in the field of culture, museums, museum and library funds of the Belarus Republic are also pointed towards preservation of national heritage.

Even now the historico-cultural heritage protection system of Belorussia is not limited to the corresponding laws alone. The Cabinet of Ministers of the Belarus Republic has defined a list of most significant material immobile historico-cultural values which includes historical centers of some cities as well. This government decision enabled concentration of public funds on particular sites thus reducing duration of restoration works.

By adopting a number of resolutions in the field of heritage protection the Cabinet of Ministers of the Belarus Republic has established procedure of financing activities in the field of material historico-cultural values preservation and restoration as well as defined the scale of government participation in this process. The Cabinet has developed and approved national estimate standards, methods and recommendations for performance of
restoration works. Certain instructions have been issued elaborating on composition, sequence, development, coordination and approval of research and design documentation for performance of works on heritage sites. A research supervisor guide and other materials have been prepared necessary for establishment of the most rational state administration system in the area of restoration activities.

In the recent several years on a regular basis, at least biannually, the Ministry has considered various heritage connected issues and made decisions after visiting if necessary the regions of the country.

The resolution “On protection of archeological sites during earth and construction works” adopted on a high governmental level also plays an important role in preservation of antiquities including those put on the List of state historico-cultural heritage of the Belarus Republic. This document necessitates performance of initial archeological examination of area where the construction is to be held.

One should mention, that architectural and constructional legislation includes regulatory norms providing protection of historico-cultural heritage. The Belarus Republic Law “On architectural, municipal engineering and construction activities in the Republic of Belarus” obliges to preserve ancient monuments in process of planning and conducting works both inside and outside towns. Moreover, the Law defines the area of historico-cultural values location as special state regulation zones.

Basing on that the work is going on in Belorussia for regeneration of historical centers in inhabited localities as well as for development of small townships. The development activities are carried out in accordance with research and design projects. The experience accumulated in process of preparing and conducting national holidays Dazhink, Day of Literature and Press, regional festivals and competitions indicates the effect of heritage sites revival, high value of their historical image and adaptation to modern life standards due to the fact that these events attract today material and financial resources of everyone interested in performance of town restoration works.

In this regard high consideration should be given to moral, patriotic and aesthetic education of population. We work hard on increasing public knowledge about the past and forming active position of a modern person. This is achieved through introduction of various tourism forms, through press, radio- and TV-broadcasts, education provided in schools, universities, etc. This is one of the important directions in the activity of our Ministry of Culture.

Positive experience of the mentioned effect was achieved during chamber music festivals “Zaslav’ye”, “Muzy Nesvizha”, “Mirsky Zamok”, organ music festival in Sofiysky Cathedral of Polotsk, theatrical festival “Belaya Vezha”, novogrudskiy theatrical performances, spear-runnings, musical holidays at Oginsky Homestead in Zales’ye as well as other activities organized at the historical places and on unique heritage sites.

Belorussian cinematographers also pay considerable attention to social sphere. This is one of the most effective forms of ideological population-oriented activities, since documentaries have always been and so far remain of high interest for public.

Patriotic education is facilitated by the films devoted to history of Belarus, cultural and architectural sites, our towns: Polotsk, Grodno, Mogilyov, Brest, Mir, Nesvizh, Pinsk, etc. This year a film about Turov will come out. Today one can organize a video tour of Belarus using our film products.

Allocation of historico-cultural values over the territory of Belarus is very advantageous especially in terms of organizing tourist trips focused on the subject in question.

Thus, on the one hand, a possibility emerges for more active and effective usage of historical sites in tourist activities, and on the other hand, to increase effectiveness of historico-cultural heritage preservation activities by attracting additional funds allocated for the purposes of tourist sites.

Involvement of historico-cultural heritage sites in active life is considered as the most effective condition of their preservation. Therefore, these sites make up a part of Republican tourism program approved by the President of the Belarus Republic.

At the end I have to dwell on tax remissions related to heritage sites. Research, design and production activities performed at the historical sites are exempted from value added tax which constitutes in Belarus 18% of completed work volume.

Territories occupied by historico-cultural values are exempted from land tax. Those heritage sites included in the list of monuments approved by the government and the President of the Belarus Republic are not subjected to estate tax. Thus, the state uses legal methods to encourage activities aimed at preservation of historico-cultural heritage.

To provide honorable representation of the country in the world society the Republic of Belarus sets a priority task which should be accomplished as a part of policy pursued in the field of historico-cultural heritage preservation: restoration of historical originality, artistic and documentary properties of historico-cultural values vital for spiritual, intellectual and economic development of the society basing on the Constitution of the Belarus Republic, national legal base and international standards.
James Kennedy

«Activities of the British Council for Cultural Cooperation Development»

Dear ladies and gentlemen, speaking about such an important theme as a theme of our conference first of all I would like to mention a number of crucial issues which attract much attention in Great Britain.

Firstly, I would like to dwell on the legal framework established in the field of cultural heritage preservation. Secondly, I would like to tell about the work of my organization, the British Council, here in Russia, how we cooperate with our Russian partners in terms of project development aimed at protection of cultural heritage.

It should be mentioned that in Great Britain we have the ministry of culture which is actually called the Department of Culture, Mass Communication and Sport. This agency was established only in 1993. My personal point of view lies in the fact that culture is something that Britons and other countries possess as their own wealth. Therefore, in 1997 the decision was made to establish the Ministry of Culture. Our Ministry of Culture is responsible for generation of policy for the whole country. In 2001 a political document was published which is called “Historical medium is strength of our future”. I believe the title of the document tells for itself how seriously we are concerned about our culture. I agree that from historical point of view it is very important, however, we must apply all possible efforts to ensure successful and favorable development of our nation in future.

Key issues of this policy are as follows. Firstly, we have to implement educational components of our cultural heritage; secondly, we have to provide maximum possible involvement of our people to have access to our cultural heritage. Speaking so we bear in mind not only our people, citizens, but also millions of others visiting our country.

The third aspect of our policy is protection, safeguarding and preservation of our cultural heritage. Here we speak not only about research activities and specific measures which should be taken to preserve this or that site, but also about political issues. To what extent should we restore the ancient buildings? Or should we leave them better in a form of ruins. These issues are subject to very intensive debates in our country.

The fourth aspect of our policy is as follows. We must take an economic advantage of our historical territory both form the point of view of tourism and innovative approaches to development of cultural heritage sites. Different other agencies operate within our Ministry, the largest is “English Heritage Agency”. “The English Heritage” has its analogues agencies or branches in Wales and Scotland, we organize annual meetings aimed at preservation of our cultural heritage constructions. Besides, there is a special lottery fund, a part of lottery earnings goes for preservation of cultural heritage. The Ministry is assisted by many private companies which operate in the field of culture.

Additionally, there are state and private partnerships which were mentioned today by Mr. Prentis. This is the third sector in a line, after our state and private sectors, which also plays an important role in preservation of cultural heritage and tourism development. This sector is neither not-for-profit, nor nongovernmental, nor non-state sector. In Great Britain we have a National Trust as well as many other agencies cooperating with it. Our National Trust is actually one of the largest in the world nonprofit organizations.

The National Trust was set up in 1885, 110 years ago, and numbers 3.4 million members. E.g., I am a member to this Trust myself. The Trust turnover makes up about 300 million pounds annually, i.e. 400 450 million Euro annually. The National Trust is responsible for preservation of historical buildings and landscapes through its membership fees, volunteers and different private enterprises. Britons are really concerned about the coastline which encircles our islands, many kilometers of the coastline are in fact preserved by the National Trust. There is a number of structures occupied with preservation of cultural heritage and organization of tourism.

The following is of high importance to us. We want to ensure that all these structures representing public and private as well as non-governmental sectors tightly cooperate with each other in the directions which were mentioned by previous speakers on behalf of UNESCO. I can say that all my British colleagues fully support those directions described in UNESCO presentation. Apart from that, I would like to mention the work of the British Council here, in Russia. The British Council in Russia is an independent structure which was created to establish cultural and educational relations between Britain and other countries.

Here in Russia we function as a cultural department of the British Embassy, we have 15 branches, 15 representative offices all over Russia, in Moscow, Saint Peterburg and 13 smaller offices in such cities as Rostov-on-Don, Sochi, Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk and even Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. We use these centers to organize different educational and cultural programs, two of which I would like to emphasize here.

First of all we launched a joint project in cooperation with 12 museums located in different Russian towns, our goal is to establish relations between these museums and their colleges in Great Britain so as to generate model sample practice. In particular we speak here about art galleries, how to use various exhibitions for educational and cultural purposes. Museum managers have come back from their two-week training trip to Great Britain organized within this project. Judging by results of the trip we hope that smaller projects will be...
arranged this time directly between Russian and British museums. We consider this work to be very important, namely assistance in establishing such international ties. Undoubtedly, British museums and Moscow museums of the Kremlin, the Hermitage and the Tretyakov Gallery are very powerful, however, our intention is that regional museums also get an opportunity to establish direct partnership with their foreign colleagues.

The second part of the project consists in the following. We are going to interact with the Association of Russian museums in process of developing the special training educational program. A couple of months ago one of British experts conducted a seminar on administration of museum activities. He conducted the same seminars in a very clear manner of other museum centers.

Finally, I would like to say that the British Council is always open for you, we will be very glad to establish new contacts. We would like to expand our cooperation in the sphere of cultural heritage. I believe we can share a lot of experience accumulated in Great Britain. I do not think that we are the only ones who can give correct answers to how such activities should be organized, however, we have operated in this field for a long time and it would be a pleasure for us to share this experience with our partners from Russia and other countries of the world.

Gagik Gurdyan

«The Legislative Basis of Preservation of a Cultural Heritage in Armenia: Necessity of Perfection»

The report’s goal is to reveal and describe the main stages of forming experience in the field of organizing administrative and legal protection of Armenian historico-architectural monuments basing on principles of assessment, presentation and usage of cultural heritage.

Basing on renewed public values acquired after getting national independence protection of Armenian cultural heritage is organized according to the new Law of the Armenian Republic “On protection and utilization of immobile historical and cultural monuments and historical environment” of November 11, 1998. The Law establishes relations between all subjects of this sphere: state, municipal, scientific, public and private organizations, and takes into account all possible forms of ownership. New legal regulations as well as social and economic conditions determine major problems and tasks of conserving, restoring monuments and reconstructing architectural facilities.

Today under the conditions of sharp decrease in government subsidies it is of vital importance to provide that all interested social layers are widely involved in process of monument protection with delegation of certain rights for their examination, reconstruction and functional usage.

Due to active involvement of monuments and their historical environment in public life, their functional rehabilitation, adaptation and usage in new social economic conditions especially in spiritual sphere as well as due to development of cultural tourism we have to constantly develop and extend existing methods of conservation and restoration of monuments and architectural environment.

Nowadays necessity arises to pay particular attention not only to methodical combination of key provisions of international conventions but also to review regulatory and legal base of cultural heritage preservation as the cultural tourism develops. Tourism requires protected territories, while the protected territories require income and advertisement which will be granted by tourism. However, to avoid serious negative consequences the protected territories and tourist facilities should be properly managed.

Nigar Ahundova

«The Issues of Correlation of the International Legal acts with the National Legislation in the field of Cultural Heritage Preservation»

As cultural policy rapidly advances to the East in the shape of an independent science and field of knowledge, conquering more and more countries of Eastern Europe and Asia, researchers and political scientists get the opportunity to conduct a comparative analysis on the socio-cultural situation in different regions of the world. It should be noted that most of the countries fairly emphasise the problem of the heritage preservation as one of the most important priorities of contemporary cultural policy. The notion of “cultural heritage” itself has nowadays
greatly changed, got enriched and absorbed not only traditional views but also diverse manifestations of the every day’s life. The introduction of the terms tangible and intangible heritage into the working vocabulary of UNESCO is a consequence of this vision.

Taking into account the principal discussion topic of our conference, the connection of cultural heritage with tourism and, particularly the subject of this meeting, we consider it necessary to dwell on the issue of correlation of the international legal acts with the national legislations in this field. It should be mentioned that Azerbaijan actively takes part in the adaptation of international legal documents, what can be seen from the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Convention</th>
<th>Year concluded</th>
<th>Date when Azerbaijan joined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage</td>
<td>16 November 1972</td>
<td>6 December 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Cultural Convention</td>
<td>19 December 1954</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>30 September 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European convention on joint cinema production</td>
<td>2 October 1992</td>
<td>28 October 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At present the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of UNESCO goes through its last phases of ratification and the issue of possibility and expediency of joining to the Convention on the Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expressions is examined.

It should be noted that the national legislation on the whole covers all the main trends of the cultural heritage preservation which is reflected in the following laws:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laws</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Culture Law</td>
<td>6 February 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 On the preservation of historical and cultural monuments</td>
<td>10 April 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 On the library work</td>
<td>29 December 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 On the tourism</td>
<td>4 June 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 On the national archival fund</td>
<td>22 June 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 On the museums</td>
<td>24 March 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 On the legal protection of examples of Azeri folklore</td>
<td>16 May 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 On the carpets</td>
<td>7 December 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time there exist certain reasons why international legal acts are not always adequately realised in the frames of the national legal field. It is related to juridical, as well as to administrative economic and manpower resources. In order to provide qualitative improvement and advancement in this field, it is necessary, in accordance with UNESCO recommendations, to conduct a revision of national legal acts, introduce corresponding changes into the existing laws and, in case of their absence, to elaborate new ones. It is also important to stir up the participation of experts from cluster bureau countries in the preparation and elaboration of international acts, to lead activities on a regular basis with the purpose of developing of the local manpower potential, as well as the attraction of various strata of society to the realisation of ideas and plans integrated in these documents.
In June 2002 the framework federal law was adopted "On cultural heritage sites (historical and cultural monuments) of peoples of the Russian Federation" (hereafter referred to as Law No. 73-FZ). Frequently journalists used to ask me, what is the principle difference of the new law from the previous RSFSR law "On protection and utilization of historical and cultural monuments" which had existed since 1978. Shortly, the main difference consists in the fact that the new law for the first time defines historical and cultural monuments as a special form of property and sets certain limitations connected with their content and usage. Besides, such notion has been introduced as "a subject of cultural heritage site protection", the historico-cultural examination has been introduced which must precede any activity involving cultural monuments, monument protection requirements have become a part of the law thus saving security agencies from making security agreements with each separate owner or user. This law enumerates cultural heritage sites which can not be withdrawn from state ownership – exclusively valuable cultural heritage sites, world heritage sites, archeological heritage sites, historico-cultural reserves, it also sets the procedure of submitting documents to put Russian cultural heritage sites on the list of world heritage.

Anyway, this is not the only law which represents legislation providing protection and preservation of cultural heritage sites.

Certain provisions ensuring preservation of cultural heritage sites are contained in other legal acts, the most important of them are as follows: the RF Land Code (according to it all plots of land where cultural heritage sites are situated belong to the land of historic-cultural purpose having special legal status, land with monuments not subject to privatization are restricted in terms of civil circulation), Federal Law "On privatization of public and municipal property" (set privatization procedure of historical and cultural monuments including obligatory security commitments), Federal Law "On state registration of estate ownership rights and estate transactions" (provides transition of obligations and commitments together with the specific cultural heritage site irrespective of the owner, these commitments must be registered when legalizing any transaction), the RF Municipal Construction Code (it excluded monuments and sites from those under effect of municipal construction regulations; it states that anything connected with monuments must be regulated by the corresponding legislation on monuments).

Recently legal acts have been adopted which clearly separate powers of federal and regional authorities in the field of cultural heritage protection and define these powers in accordance with a category which the monument belongs to.

According to these legal acts the Russian Federation constituents can not participate in protection and restoration of monuments of federal value even if they are able to do it. Similarly the Russian Federation constituents can not own monuments of federal value. The Russian Federation can participate in process of financing monuments of regional value through various target programs, however, it has no right to own the sites of this category. (I will not dwell on powers delegated to local administrations in respect to monuments of municipal value since currently these sites do not exist).

If one takes into consideration the number of federal executive bodies empowered to ensure preservation of all monuments of federal value including archeological monuments, as well as insufficient financing of federal monuments, one may understand that the most valuable layer of historical and cultural monuments is left to the mercy of fate.

Having realized the current situation the State Duma Committee on Culture addressed the Russian Federation Government with a request to amend the existing legislation. The similar appeals were directed by the IV congress of historical and cultural sites protection bodies which took place in Twer this September. These requests were considered by the Russian Government and resulted in recent adoption at the first reading of bill “On amendments to the Russian Federation legal acts based on improved delimitation of authorities”. The bill allows constituents of the Russian Federation to finance monuments of federal importance, to own monuments irrespective of their importance category if they are necessary to exercise authorities of the Russian Federation constituent. Furthermore, it allows to transfer authorities from federal cultural heritage sites protection bodies to the Russian Federation constituents upon concluding the corresponding agreement. Provided these provisions remain a part of the final version of the law preservation of federal monuments under the current economic conditions will be granted.

However, some problems regarding specific historical and cultural monuments still remain unsolved as the framework law provides in these cases inadequate or insufficient regulation.

Primarily these are the problems connected with access of civilians to cultural heritage sites, definition of security documentation, procedure of physical damage compensation inflicted to cultural heritage sites which envisage compensation not only for partial damage but also for complete destruction of a cultural heritage site.
Culture Committee deputies sent the bill, which provides for implementation of the said right legalized in article 44 of the Russian Federation Constitution as well as amends a number of articles in Federal Law No. 73-FZ, to attention of the State Duma, all constituents of the Russian Federation as well as the RF Government and President. The Government's reaction was negative, however, the President's Administration expressed its support to the bill provided all remarks are taken into consideration. In December the bill is planned to be considered by the State Duma again.

One must specify which body of the three refered to in the Law is the federal body responsible for protection of cultural heritage sites. A legal definition should be given to cultural heritage site territory as well as to cultural heritage site of special value in terms of real estate as currently the existing cultural heritage sites of special value are institutions of culture. One must adjust the procedure of managing the Uniform State Register of cultural heritage sites as the current Register is in fact not uniform due to existing delimitation of authorities, but there are 89 registers of territories and one register of federal monuments. The procedure of issuing cultural heritage site passport must also be developed. Today the Ministry of Culture and Mass Communication is drafting the corresponding bill. The bill concept has already been sent to the Government.

The problem of historical and cultural sites privatization is really urgent.

Currently privatization process is suspended by Law No. 73-FZ till adoption of the federal law on distribution of cultural heritage sites owned by the state (sites will be specified as Federation property, property of Federation constituents, municipal property). However, the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade believes that this law has no right to exist as ownership was once distributed in 1991 by Russian Federation Supreme Council Resolution No. 3020-1. Disputes between the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Economic Development are still going on, the problem remains unsolved. However, we were informed that the bill canceling the moratorium on monument privatization was drafted and would be put forward for the State Duma consideration in the nearest future.

One can not but mention the negative consequences existing today due to absence of relevant legal acts which must be adopted by the Russian Federation Government in execution of Law No. 73-FZ. The crucial weak point is that certain provision on the Uniform State Register and state historico-cultural examination have not yet been developed. As these documents are still unavailable one is unable to define such notions as cultural heritage site protection body and territory. As a result one is unable to make up security obligations which are the integral part of a cultural heritage site purchase agreement. If the moratorium on privatization of monuments is cancelled before adoption of the said legal acts the fate of privatized monuments will be quite tragic.

The acting privatization laws envisage fulfillment of bid conditions as a result of which a purchaser should be defined within a period of a year. However, it is crystal clear that qualified repair and restoration works on a cultural heritage site can not be carried out within a year. This means that adequate amendments should be introduced during the period when bid conditions remain in force. So far such amendments have not been introduced.

In October this year the bill was put forward for consideration of the State Duma envisaging application of the Cultural heritage site assessment standard in process of calculating the size of damage inflicted to the site (amendments to Law No. 73-FZ are currently being introduced). The bill has been sent to attention of all Russian Federation constituents as well as the RF Government. Soon its first reading will take place.

The issue of Estate assessment standard is also touched upon in the bill on amendments to Federal Law "On assessment activities in the Russian Federation". This bill suggests that the Estate assessment standard including the cases of historical and cultural monuments should be approved by the body authorized by the Government rather than by the Government of the Russian Federation itself. I assume that this body will be the RF Ministry of Economic Development and Trade. I have no guarantees that in process of cultural site assessment standard development its historico-cultural value will be properly taken into account. The bill was adopted at the first reading and the Committee on Culture will prepare its amendments.

The RF Ministry of Culture and Mass Communication has drafted bill "On amendments to federal law "On the Russian Federation museum fund and museums of the Russian Federation" which introduces the legal notion of national reserve museums. The Russian Federation Government has drafted the bill to be soon considered by the State Duma on amendments to the RF Administrative Offence Code which will toughen penalties for unauthorized excavation and trade in archeological evidence.

I have to add that the legal base constantly changes, our Committee on Culture carefully follows all bills touching upon cultural monuments as special property form as well as comes forward with new bills.

I appreciate your attention.
The Russian tourist branch quickly develops in last years, following world tendencies. The world advice on tourism predicts dynamical growth of the Russian tourism the nearest years. There are, certainly, bases for optimism. But we more all are disturbed with negative tendencies of modern tourism in Russia:

- In conditions of the growing market tourism did not become while branch of the economy involving in the country currency resources and makes an insignificant share in a profitable part of the budget of the country;
- Creation of new workplaces inside of the country due to development of tourism considerably lags behind analogues abroad;
- Development of the Russian tourism still is poorly reflected in dynamics of growth of small business in sphere of an agriculture, trade, hotel service and other services connected with hospitality;
- Services of the Russian tourist business are dear enough to the majority of the population of the country.

If to understand the term “development” in the expanded and advancing sense conversation on development of the Russian tourism should be complex is not only economic growth, but also increase of competitiveness, modernization of infrastructures, development of new resources (information, social, humanitarian) and the human capital.

Complexity of the Russian situation consists that tourism dynamically develops in a society, which itself is in a stage of active transformation (fast development of cultural, social, economic, political processes). At the same time there are attributes of that we cost on a threshold of a new stage of the tourist activity formed on transition to global “postindustrial” (“information”, etc.) to a society.

If still yesterday we spoke about tourism as about new, quickly developing in industrially developed countries today tourist activity becomes the sector of economy which is in the lead under the contribution to the world economy, surpassing on a turn of capitals any of spheres of industrial production. Tourism integrates into itself others, earlier not connected economic subsystems (ecology, formation, an agriculture, etc.).

Tourism can (and should) to become a key direction for development of many Russian regions possessing cultural, historical, natural, a mental potential if the strategy integrating interests of different subjects will be developed in each such territory.

1. A role of the state in development of tourism

That Russia was included into a postindustrial society as competitive tourist power, complete strategy of development of tourism is necessary. Now we lag behind the developed countries on many qualitative and to quantity indicators. Our tourist branch is in a stage of development of “industrial”, mass tourism while in the world tendencies on formation of “postindustrial” tourism are already traced.

This process in the different countries and regions is in different phases, but the direction was defined clearly enough. The basic tendencies connected with деиндустриализацией, privatization, гуманитаризацией and информатизацией of sphere of tourism, are naturally entered in the tendency of transition of the world community to the “postindustrial” period. Does not remain away from these tendencies and Russia. At this transitive stage the state regulation protecting interests of domestic manufacturers of tourist products, domestic culture, domestic consumers of tourist services should play the major role.

Forms of influence of the state on development of tourism:

- Allocation of sphere of tourist activity as main direction of economic and cultural policy, transformation of corresponding state structures for the decision of this problem;
- Legal support of acceptance of laws, state standards and other statutory acts adjusting tourist activity; revision of restrictions on freedom of movings of citizens, including foreign;
- Development and acceptance of a package of the state target programs directed on development of tourism and connected with it of branches (the program of development of entrance tourism, the program of development internal, programs on creation of system of training and retraining of experts, the investment program on development of a tourist infrastructure, etc.);
- Protection of interests of domestic consumers and manufacturers of the goods and the services connected with tourism;
- Creation of a favorable investment climate for development of tourism and the branches interfaced to it;
- Regulation of exit tourism and stimulation entrance and internal; introduction of visa-free visiting of the country and limiting simplification of visa formalities, depreciation of visa services;
- Increase of a level of safety of the tourists, the strengthened protection of the law and order in the tourist centers;
- Care of quality of the ecological environment;
- Protectionism in relation to the enterprises connected with tourist industry (tax privileges, tax “vacation”, etc.).
Granting to the enterprises, connected with tourist industry, the state grants, grants, premiums, the state credits, guarantees and grants;

Carrying out of national competitions in the field of the innovations connected with development of tourism; promotion of successful practical experience in sphere of tourism, the cultural industries, educational technologies.

Direction of target state investments on support and development of a tourist infrastructure, on preservation and development of a cultural heritage-historical, on modernization of educational system;

State financing of scientific and marketing researches in sphere of tourism and the branches connected with it; the organization of monitoring of the markets, studying of global and local tendencies in development of tourism, research of consumers, perfection of the state statistics; maintenance of availability of results of researches for the Russian manufacturers of tourist services (thus researches of all complex of resources are necessary for social and economic development of territories on the basis of the tourism, including not only studying of an existing infrastructure of hospitality, but also a condition natural and historical and cultural heritages, for a demography, a standard of living of the population, ecology, the industry, an agriculture, transport, power and etc.).

Information support and propagation of tourism (the edition of tourist directories, cards, guidebooks, posters, representation printed and electronic editions, etc.);

Promotion Russian tourist services on foreign markets, support of participation of the domestic tourist companies in the international exhibitions, fairs, festivals, competitions; development of a network of representations of the domestic tourist organizations abroad;

Support of the public initiatives connected with carrying out in the country of the international competitions, festivals, the congresses;

Stimulation of development of tourism in regions (introduction of the tourist rent for the territories removed from the center, grants, tax privileges;

Support of creation Russian the Internet-representations, forming attractive image of the country;

Development of a complex of the state adjusting measures on prevention (or to decrease) negative influence of growing tourist streams as noncontrollable mass tourism can represent serious danger to ecology and culture, economy and an internal political situation.

Thus, for development of tourism corresponding the state interests the active state policy is necessary. Tourism can become that key direction which will deduce Russia on competitive positions in economic, to a policy and culture. Regulation of development of tourism should occur to participation private, state, and public structures (so, for example, in the European Union in tourism are engaged about 10 various commissions).

The state structures, whether it be controls or the enterprises created by them and the organizations, today should act as potential partners social-cultural initiatives and projects.

2. Tourism in regional aspect

Till now development of tourism in the Russian Federation basically has been connected with promotion of such large tourist centers, as Moscow, St.-Petersburg, cities of “ the Gold ring “. The majority of the Russian regions will stand aside of mass tourist streams by virtue of some the reasons and, first of all, because of deficiency of the information, backwardness of an infrastructure, lack of qualified personnel.

At the same time many factors specify that all over the world interest to “remote places” grows: “Capital” tourism in many countries has come nearer to limiting volumes of the development;

Process of globalization levels a level and style of a life in all large cities that raises competitiveness of “remote places” where in many respects the historical environment was kept, national colour, exotic;

The provincial territories less industrialized and consequently more safe from the point of view of ecology, can become attractive both for internal, and for entrance tourism;

Development of transport, information technologies and mobile communication does regions more accessible to tourism;

For many regions tourism is good chance to improve socially an economic situation;

Free from stereotypes of the “industrial” tourism, many provincial regions are shown by samples of more rational use of resources, the innovative organization and management of a tourist infrastructure, to original interpretation of a historical and cultural heritage.

In creation of optimum conditions for development of tourism in “remote places” are interested not only the tourist organizations. Various kinds of economic activities are involved in sphere of influence of tourism. Occurs retraining and specialization of an agriculture, trade, consumer services, system of public transport and a high system, banks, leisure spheres, cultural activity, hotels. Popularity of region abroad grows, the commodity market of local production extends, tax revenues in the budget of region increase, business activity in territory grows, quality of a life improves. The population is actively involved in sphere of services, hotel business, creative activity; workplaces are created, there are new kinds of activity in territory.

Russia, owning all necessary resources for successful development of internal tourism cannot stand away from these processes. Our country possesses not only high potential for creation of the tourist industry meeting modern requirements, but also unique opportunities for powerful jerk in a direction of development of tourism. Potential opportunities of Russia allow to accept under condition of creation of the developed tourist infrastructure up to
40 million foreign tourists a year. To involve this huge potential it is granted to us by virtue of historical, cultural and spiritual development, to make its constant property not only Russians, but also an organic component of the world tourist market, to give to development of tourism character serious бюджетообразующей to branch.

Since 2002 Russia for the first time began to participate the uniform national stand at the international tourist exhibitions.

The majority of the countries, actively engaged with tourism to the national tourist administrations significant resources purposefully allocate. The given circumstance allows to build work in view of national features and interests.

For the decision of these important problems in November, 2004 the Federal Agency for Tourism, being the authorized federal enforcement authority which is carrying out functions on carrying out of a state policy to нормативно-legal regulation, rendering of the state services and to management of the state property in sphere of tourism has been formed.

Position of Federal agency on tourism on perfection of нормативно-legal base of tourist activity will find due attention at all levels executive and legislature and to be carried out in close interaction with all interested organizations.

Attraction of interests of the most different level and opportunities is clear, that, including and private directions, are not possible for creation of a favorable investment climate, without corresponding support from regional authorities, without precise coordination of all interested structures.

Only at corresponding support on places, work with mayors of cities that is included into number of problems of agency, it is possible by the consolidated efforts to generate a condition for a favorable investment climate in sphere of tourism.

The tourist market is appreciably formed spontaneously. Not looking that priority directions of state regulation of tourist activity are certain by the Federal law " About bases of tourist activity in the Russian Federation " (№ 132-ФЗ from November, 24th, 1996), they remain while without target state support, and tourism did not become while economic branch.

According to the Governmental order of the Russian Federation from April, 19th 2005. № 239 " About the statement of Regulations about development, the statement and realizations of departmental target programs " now Agency are developed two target programs: " the Tourist centers of Russia " and " Development of a туристско-recreational complex of southern areas of the Russian Federation " for the period 2006-2008.

The purposes and problems of programs:

- Creation of the modern tourist product corresponding requirements of the world market;
- Creation of the basic tourist centers, allowing to unite around of them opportunities of federal and regional authorities on development of tourism and the decision of social and economic problems of territories as a whole;
- Increase in a stream of tourists in these centers in 2,5 times;
- To create 12 basic tourist centers of federal value;
- To fulfil measures and mechanisms of the state support of development of tourism;
- To create in territories of realization of complex projects conditions attractive to investors.

Promotion of a tourist product on the internal and international markets includes:

- Creation of information centres on tourism for a supply with information of tourists, acquaintance to tourist routes, the organization of excursions, accommodations in hotels, attraction of tourist firms on promotion of tourist services, etc.
- The organization and distribution image part of the advertising including informing of potential tourists about tourist appeal of historical cities, about sights, history, stay and an infrastructure, release of advertising-information production in Russian and English languages (including on electronic carriers), creation and service the Internet-sites.
- Preparation of experts on tourism, training of employees of information centres.
- The problem of complex reconstruction of the environment of historical cities for the purposes of creation of the centers of tourism can be considered as model for development of a state policy of creation of conditions of steady development of territories. Creation of conditions for steady development of territories one of the primary goals of the Town-planning Code of the Russian Federation accepted in 2004 and tourism in its context can be considered as the effective tool of creation of such conditions.

Program actions provide first of all realization of large tourist projects which are particularly directed on the decision of the problems connected with development of the tourist industry.

Within the limits of preparation of two departmental programs of development of internal tourism to Russia, 35 subjects of the Russian Federation have presented over 70 objects of a tourist complex for their support from the federal budget and over 70 investment projects financed of inappropriate sources, for participation in program actions. We shall hope, that acceptance of these programs, and then their realization will be the initial contribution of the state to real support of development of internal tourism and improvement of quality of given tourist services in Russia.
Dear Elena Grigor'evna, dear ladies and gentlemen! I will try to touch upon issues put on agenda of this conference from the point of view of tourist industry, tourist business and as a partner of cultural institutions and administrations of specially protected reservations.

Let me consider the situation in terms of entry tourism as its principle difference in the market of domestic tourism lies in absence of visa component. The Russian share in the world tourist flow makes up less than 1%. Even official statistics proves that number of tourist visits to Russia has been declining in recent years. According to Moscow and Saint Petersburg tourist operators organized flow of incoming tourists through tourist companies have reduced by 20% this year alone. 20% reduction in visitors is observed for tours which until recently have enjoyed the highest popularity along with such tourist routes as Moscow – Saint Petersburg, Moscow – Golden Ring.

According to estimates of the Bank of Russia the balance of payments deficit in “tours” item will soon reach the mark of USD 10 billion. This figure may be a bit exaggerated, however, it comes to billions of Dollars rather than millions.

What is the cause of the current situation? For the first time on my knowledge we have inquired from 115 tourist operators specialized on entry tourism and located in 27 regions of the country about the reasons. The inquiry enabled us to make up a priority list of reasons which prevent successful development of entry tourism including cultural cognitive and eco-tourism. The list consists of about 30 reasons.

The most common and main reason lies in the fact that Russia is loosing competition at the world tourist market in terms of price-quality relationship of its tourist products, price in particular. Thus, according to Rosstat within recent 5 years the cost of domestic and entry tourist package have been rising in average by 20%, while the cost of exit package from Russia, e.g. to Turkey and Egypt, by 5-10%.

Nowadays the exit tour cost growth rate is also increasing due to the fuel factor, however, the growth rate of entry tours to Russia will proceed to climb even faster. This is a common problem.

It causes more specific problems. The first issue is deficit of tourist class hotels. We are in Moscow where about 6-7 thousand hotel accommodations try to meet the demands of organized entry flow of tourists: Moscow, Russia, Intourist, Kosmos, Izmaylovo, Ukraine. Intourist – does not exist any more, Moscow – the same, Ukraine – was sold, at least for good price, but it will be turned into business class hotel, Russia will soon stop its operation, thus we will loose another 2000 accommodations. The question is clear – where will tourists live?

The second question is why tourist class hotels, the lack of which is so evident, have not been constructed in Moscow in this period? The point is that the cost of land and so called kick-back make construction of tourist class hotels principally impossible. Here we speak about payback time not of 7 years as it is the usual case, but of minimum 10-12 years. Those tourist class hotels which are being built irrespective of current situation, e.g. Novotel or Holiday-Inn, immediately enter the price range of 4 and 4+.

The next problem is absence of nonprofit advertising, financed from not any other but the national budget as it is the case in all civilized countries. I am referring here to the sum of about 120-160 million to be spent on advertising tourist capabilities of the country. Approximately this is an analogues advertising budget of Romania. It is impossible to compete today at the world market without support of intensive advertising funded by the state rather than by business. This problem is of high importance especially in those regions which lack popularity.

One of the most weak points in development of our business, cultural cognitive tourism inclusive, is a problem of transportation. To by a bus here will cost you by 70 thousand more than you can buy it, say, in Lithuania or Belarus. Payback period becomes very long, not to mention the case of cruise ships, which have never been produced in Russia, however, the VAT and customs duties for them make up 23%, i.e. purchase of these ships turns to be extremely expensive as well as the cost of importing them. I leave untouched light aircraft for the needs of eco-tourism or small vessels, etc.

Now as far as visas are concerned: e.g., a visa from Russia to Israel will cost US Dollars 17 for each tourist, from Israel to Russia the cost will vary from US Dollars 7 to 700 depending on urgency of issuing it. Meanwhile, Czechia introduces no-visa entrance for Israel and flow of Israeli tourists third of whom are our former fellow citizens turn their backs to Russia because people count their money, it is the market. The similar examples can be given in big numbers.

Now about cultural resources. Absence or deficit of natural places of interest, cultural sites, sites of cultural or natural heritage, which can be demonstrated is not a constraining factor for development of tourism in Russia. There some problems in separate parts of the country, but quoting someone’s statement at the All-Russian Tourist Forum "Russia has no places unfavorable for development of tourism, but different attitude to
this business". Of course, there are some problems in practice. But there are examples of success as well. Say, Moscow, Saint Petersburg, we have remarkable experience of Yasnaya Polyana, Pushkinogor’ye, all of them are well-known to you.

I would like to express my gratitude to management and museums of the Moscow Kremlin, commandants office and Hermitage which for the first time in two years have managed to stop growth of prices. One should mention that to enter our world class museums one has to pay more today than it is the case in Europe and the USA. Entrance fees are higher only in Tavria and Vatican.

Speaking about the world competition we have reached the ceiling price. And the fact that the Hermitage and Moscow museums of the Kremlin have not increased their prices in recent two years, and commandants office has managed to settle all problems connected with entrance and passage, results in shorter lines and is of high importance. But another very simple at first glance issue of a parking area? This problem is already 15 years old, where is this political will at the highest Moscow level? Is this question clear?

Then there is a problem of poor coordination between tourist business structures and cultural institutions. There is a variety of these problems and I will not go into details, the most important that both sides suffer from lack of funds, therefore, today we face primarily the problem that everyone tries to grab the biggest piece of the pie, as a result both sides loose. This stands for both cultural institutions and religious constructions, e.g. monasteries have their own problems.

Eco-tourism which will be discussed here is Klondike, no doubts about that. Some of our tours have become very popular, e.g. sportfishing on Kola Peninsula costs foreigners more than Dollars 3 thousand. But again we have to handle the transport problem, in most cases our eco-tours require helicopter flights one hour of which costs about Dollars 2 thousand. The same problem may be referred to small vessels or sport-utility vehicles, it is impossible to develop eco-tourism if these transport means are unavailable, impossible from technical point of view. There is a number of other more complicated problems. I will give a very simple example, gamekeepers. The major problem is connected with a lack of personnel, once an investor enters the market, say, the Volga river estuary, he is first of all engaged in gamekeeper pirating, since there is only a dozen of normal gamekeepers, not drunkards, over the whole area, I do not even mention the number of those who are able to speak foreign languages, while the number of sites is about 70.

So, I do not want to tire you by the similar examples, therefore, I would like to shift to issues of principal character. The main problem lies in the fact that all mentioned problems fall under the area of responsibility of the state. E.g. domestic transportation fees which make many visitors surprised, or visas, customs duties, etc. It is clear as day that these problems can be solved neither by you, nor by us, nor by tourist business on the whole.

However, if we speak about interaction with cultural and natural heritage sites, to be more precise with those people who are responsible for them, in my view it is very important to understand that in terms of tourism these are neither museums, nor transport, nor restaurants which compete at the world market, but tourist packages. This is a product, program which competitors cast in bronze, thus making it look like a must to go for it. Once this complex product is created basing on OSCE cooperation between all components wonders take place, including those in the field of financial and administrative results.

So far we have not created this product, what we have are endless contradictions, which side must provide guides, which badges, etc., meanwhile all efforts get drowned. The last specific example of the tourist product I would like to give is that one which perfectly embraces cultural cognitive, natural and ecological components. The so called Great Sayan Ring. The elderly man, the adventurer in good sense of this word, organized this tour which starts in Krasnoyarsk, passes through Khakasia, Abakan and Sayan Mountains. Tourists travel in Mercedes bus led by the advance group, there they can enjoy everything: Shushenskoye village, shamans, splendid excursion of cave art, overnight stop at the base, a snow leopard in Sayan Mountains, etc. Tour price of Dollars 1200 includes ground trips only. When he started his business there was no accommodation at all. He built yurta camps which cost several tens of thousand Dollars, it was not very difficult but somebody had to do it. He created this tour, this year about 500 foreigners have visited it, among them Italians, Englishmen, Germans. At the very beginning we tried to warn that this idea was impossible to implement. How one can promote Sayan Mountains at the world market if people have never heard about them. They even do not know such town as Krasnoyarsk, apart from those who involved in steelmaking. He did everything alone what must have been actually done by administrations of the Krasnoyarsk Territory, Khakasia and Tuva which in fact did not crook a finger for the benefit of tourism development. He is the only man who annually organizes the Day of Spirit of Fire in the suburbs of Krasnoyarsk attracting there tourists and making losses to the extent of tens of thousand Dollars. Irrespective of it he applies all possible efforts to promote this tour which can not be achieved without creating such products.

I want everyone to understand that planning of cultural cognitive and eco-tourism projects as well as intention to earn money by running this business presupposes creation of a product, development of attractive routes. One has to establish base tour routes, until then we have only separate sites. Will people visit them, how many of them will come, how much will they pay, how can these sites be connected among each other? These questions are very complicated.
In my speech I told you about our problems, instead I could have told about our work in the field of customs duties, how we cooperate with the Federal Agency on Tourism where we consider issues of entry tourism, how we interact with the State Duma Committee on Economic Policy, Entrepreneurship and Tourism as well as with other agencies.

Managers of the largest tourist companies are always open for cooperation, our union is always at your disposal even in the field of promoting specific sites, making methodological decisions and solving legal problems. Certainly we count on the fact that the most important issue connected with ownership change of cultural and natural heritage sites will not repeat the experience of voucher privatization thus making it possible to implement projects which lie on the surface in the interest of society. E.g. the national chain of mansion hotels, there is Paradores in Spain, other European projects thanks to which the castles are preserved for mankind. What we should do is adjust these projects to our conditions, no brain surgery, the only thing we need is political will. Paradores was introduced under the auspices of the Spanish King, i.e. if political will is in place everything will be fine, otherwise no progress can be expected.

_Dmitriy Mazein_

«The Prospects of RF Participation in Conventions on Cultural Heritage Preservation»

Presently Russian Federation does not participate in several international conventions, which concern protection of cultural heritage. Brief summary of these conventions and the prospective of Russian participation are given in this report.

SECOND PROTOCOL TO THE HAGUE CONVENTION OF 1954 FOR THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY IN THE EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT.

The Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 is an important legal instrument. It provided for the better protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict.

The Protocol developed further provisions on the safeguarding of cultural property: Preparatory measures taken in time of peace for the safeguarding of cultural property against the foreseeable effects of an armed conflict shall include, as appropriate, the preparation of inventories, the planning of emergency measures for protection against fire or structural collapse, the preparation for the removal of movable cultural property or the provision for adequate in situ protection of such property, and the designation of competent authorities responsible for the safeguarding of cultural property.

The Protocol developed further provisions on the respect of cultural property:

A waiver on the basis of imperative military necessity, may only be invoked to direct an act of hostility against cultural property when and for as long as that cultural property has, by its function, been made into a military objective; and there is no feasible alternative available to obtain a similar military advantage to that offered by directing an act of hostility against that objective. In case of an attack an effective advance warning shall be given whenever circumstances permit;

a waiver on the basis of imperative military necessity, may only be invoked to use cultural property for purposes which are likely to expose it to destruction or damage when and for as long as no choice is possible between such use of the cultural property and another feasible method for obtaining a similar military advantage.

The Protocol demands from the State-Parties to prohibit and prevent in relation to the occupied territory any illicit export, other removal or transfer of ownership of cultural property, any archaeological excavation, save where this is strictly required to safeguard, record or preserve cultural property, and any alteration to, or change of use of, cultural property which is intended to conceal or destroy cultural, historical or scientific evidence.

The Protocol also introduces a new category of protection – "enhanced protection". To enjoy it, the cultural object must meet following three conditions:

- it is of the greatest importance for humanity;
- it is protected by adequate domestic legal and administrative measures recognising its exceptional cultural and historic value and ensuring the highest level of protection;
- it is not used for military purposes or to shield military sites and a declaration has been made by the Party which has control over the cultural property, confirming that it will not be so used.
The Protocol reaffirms **the immunity** of cultural property under enhanced protection by refraining from making such property the object of attack or from any use of the property or its immediate surroundings in support of military action.

The Protocol establishes **sanctions** for offences against cultural property.

Any person commits an offence within the meaning of The Protocol if that person intentionally and in violation of the Convention or The Protocol commits any of the following acts:

- making cultural property under enhanced protection the object of attack;
- using cultural property under enhanced protection or its immediate surroundings in support of military action;
- extensive destruction or appropriation of cultural property protected under the Convention and The Protocol;
- making cultural property protected under the Convention and The Protocol the object of attack;
- theft, pillage or misappropriation of, or acts of vandalism directed against cultural property protected under the Convention.

The Protocol increases the material scope of protection in armed conflicts that are **non-international** in character, which represent the majority of contemporary conflicts (Chart 5);

The Protocol establishes a **specific institutional body** to monitor the Protocol's implementation – The **Committee** for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (Chapter 6) and The **Fund** for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

There is no evidence that this Protocol is being actively applied. To make it effective, it is first important to increase the number of parties to it. The high number of State Parties may be expected to add very much to the efficacy of the instrument. In the light of this, I think the participation of the Russian Federation is highly desirable. The participation of Russia in this instrument would be a great step to promotion of international protection of the cultural heritage in wartime.

**THE UNESCO CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE UNDERWATER CULTURAL HERITAGE**

November 2001

The Convention aims to ensure the protection of underwater cultural heritage and extends on underwater cultural heritage in internal waters, archipelago waters, territorial sea, in the contiguous zone, in the exclusive economic zone, on the continental shelf and in the open sea.


It requires from States Parties:

- to co-operate in the protection of underwater cultural heritage;
- to preserve underwater cultural heritage for the benefit of humanity;
- to take all appropriate measures that are necessary to protect underwater cultural heritage, using for this purpose the best practicable means at their disposal and in accordance with their capabilities;
- to preserve of underwater cultural heritage **in situ**;
- to deposit, conserve and manage in a manner that ensures long-term preservation of recovered underwater cultural heritage.
- to prevent commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage;
- to prevent the entry into their territory, the dealing in, or the possession of, underwater cultural heritage illicitly exported and/or recovered;
- to prohibit the use of their territory, including their maritime ports, as well as artificial islands, installations and structures under their exclusive jurisdiction or control, in support of any activity directed at underwater cultural heritage which is not in conformity with the Convention;
- to take all practicable measures to ensure that their nationals and vessels flying their flag do not engage in any activity directed at underwater cultural heritage in a manner not in conformity with the Convention;
- to impose sanctions for violations of measures it has taken to implement this Convention.
- to take measures providing for the seizure of underwater cultural heritage in its territory that has been recovered in a manner not in conformity with this Convention;
- to co-operate and assist each other in the protection and management of underwater cultural heritage, including collaborating in the investigation, excavation, documentation, conservation, study and presentation of such heritage;
- to take all practicable measures to raise public awareness regarding the value and significance of underwater cultural heritage and the importance of protecting it;
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• to co-operate in the provision of training in underwater archaeology, in techniques for the conservation of underwater cultural heritage and, on agreed terms, in the transfer of technology relating to underwater cultural heritage.

Under the Convention, States Parties shall establish **competent authorities** or reinforce the existing ones where appropriate, with the aim of providing for the establishment, maintenance and updating of an inventory of underwater cultural heritage, the effective protection, conservation, presentation and management of underwater cultural heritage, as well as research and education (Article 22).

The Annex to the Convention contains detailed **Rules concerning activities directed at underwater cultural heritage**.

The reasons of voting against adoption of The Convention and non-ratification of it by Russian Federation are not clearly stated. The participation of Russia in this Convention would be a significant step toward establishing regime of international protection of the underwater cultural heritage.

**UNIDROIT CONVENTION ON STOLEN OR ILLEGALLY EXPORTED CULTURAL OBJECTS**
(Rome, 24 June 1995)

The convention provides private law solution for the problem of illegally removed cultural property. It was adopted to fill some gaps of the UNESCO Convention of 1970.

The Convention applies to claims of an international character for the **restitution of stolen cultural objects** and for the return of cultural objects removed from the territory of a Contracting State contrary to its law regulating the export of cultural objects.

As for the **restitution of cultural objects**, The Convention provides, that possessor of a cultural object which has been stolen shall return it.

Any claim for restitution shall be brought within a period of **three years** from the time when the claimant knew the location of the cultural object and the identity of its possessor, and in any case within a period of **fifty years** from the time of the theft.

Claim for restitution of a cultural object forming an integral part of an identified monument or archaeological site, or belonging to a public collection (which belongs to a Contracting State, a regional or local authority of a Contracting State or to a religious institution in a Contracting State; or to an institution that is established for an essentially cultural, educational or scientific purpose in a Contracting State and is recognised in that State as serving the public interest), a sacred or communally important cultural object belonging to and used by a tribal or indigenous community in a Contracting State as part of that community’s traditional or ritual use – **shall not be subject to time limitations** other than a period of three years from the time when the claimant knew the location of the cultural object and the identity of its possessor.

A Contracting State may request the court or other competent authority of another Contracting State to order the **return** of a cultural object illegally exported from the territory of the requesting State. Any request for return shall be brought within a period of **three years** from the time when the requesting State knew the location of the cultural object and the identity of its possessor, and in any case within a period of **fifty years** from the date of the export or from the date on which the object should have been returned.

The Convention provides, that possessor of a stolen or illegally exported cultural object, required to return it shall be entitled to payment of fair and reasonable **compensation** provided that the possessor neither knew nor ought reasonably to have known that the object was stolen or illegally exported, and can prove that it exercised due diligence when acquiring the object.

The reasons of non-ratification of the Convention by the Russian Federation are not clearly stated. The participation of Russia in this Convention would be a significant step toward establishing private law regime for restitution and return of illegally transferred cultural objects.

**EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE (REVISED)**
(La Valetta, 1992)

The Convention is based on the concept of common responsibility and solidarity in the protection of European archaeological objects and sites. The aim of the Convention is to protect the archaeological heritage as a source of the European collective memory and as an instrument for historical and scientific study.

The Convention demands from State-Parties:
- **to apply procedures for the authorisation and supervision of excavation and other archaeological activities to prevent any illicit excavation or removal of elements of the archaeological heritage, to ensure that archaeological excavations and prospecting are undertaken in a scientific manner and to ensure that excavations and other potentially destructive techniques are carried out only by**
qualified, specially authorised persons;

- to implement measures for the physical protection of the archaeological heritage;
- to seek to reconcile and combine the respective requirements of archaeology and development plans;
- to ensure that archaeologists, town and regional planners systematically consult one another;
- to ensure that environmental impact assessments and the resulting decisions involve full consideration of archaeological sites and their settings;
- to make provision, when elements of the archaeological heritage have been found during development work, for their conservation in situ when feasible;
- to ensure that the opening of archaeological sites to the public, especially any structural arrangements necessary for the reception of large numbers of visitors, does not adversely affect the archaeological and scientific character of such sites and their surroundings;
- to arrange for public financial support for archaeological research from national, regional and local authorities in accordance with their respective competence;
- to increase the material resources for rescue archaeology;
- to make or bring up to date surveys, inventories and maps of archaeological sites in the areas within its jurisdiction;
- to take all practical measures to ensure the drafting, following archaeological operations, of a publishable scientific summary record before the necessary comprehensive publication of specialised studies;
- to facilitate the national and international exchange of elements of the archaeological heritage for professional scientific purposes while taking appropriate steps to ensure that such circulation in no way prejudices the cultural and scientific value of those elements;
- to promote the pooling of information on archaeological research and excavations in progress and to contribute to the organisation of international research programmes;
- Promotion of public awareness;
- to conduct educational actions with a view to rousing and developing an awareness in public opinion of the value of the archaeological heritage for understanding the past and of the threats to this heritage;
- to promote public access to important elements of its archaeological heritage, especially sites, and encourage the display to the public of suitable selections of archaeological objects;
- to arrange for the relevant public authorities and for scientific institutions to pool information on any illicit excavations identified;
- to inform the competent authorities in the State of origin which is a Party to the Convention of any offer suspected of coming either from illicit excavations or unlawfully from official excavations, and to provide the necessary details thereof;
- to take such steps as are necessary to ensure that museums and similar institutions whose acquisition policy is under State control do not acquire elements of the archaeological heritage suspected of coming from uncontrolled finds or illicit excavations or unlawfully from official excavations;
- to afford mutual technical and scientific assistance through the pooling of experience and exchanges of experts in matters concerning the archaeological heritage;
- to encourage, under the relevant national legislation or international agreements binding them, exchanges of specialists in the preservation of the archaeological heritage, including those responsible for further training.

The reasons of non-ratification of the revised Convention by the Russian Federation are not clearly stated. Russia remains a party to the previous variant of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (1969). This fact may create some difficulties to deal with countries, which are the parties to the revised Convention. The ratification by the Russian Federation of the revised Convention would take this problem away, and would be a significant step toward protection of archaeological sites and objects.

EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON OFFENCES RELATING TO CULTURAL PROPERTY
Delphi, 23.VI.1985

The Convention is based on the concept of common responsibility and solidarity in the protection of European cultural heritage, and aims to protect cultural property against criminal activities. To achieve this objective the Parties should undertake to enhance public awareness of the need for protection, to co-operate in the prevention of offences against cultural property, to acknowledge the seriousness of such offences and to provide for adequate sanctions or measures with a view to co-operating in the prevention of offences relating to cultural property and in the discovery of cultural property removed.

The Convention demands from State-Parties:
- to take appropriate measures to enhance public awareness of the need to protect cultural property;
• to co-operating in the prevention of offences relating to cultural property and the discovery of cultural property removed subsequent to such offences;
• to inform each other about violations, made against a provisions of the Convention;
• to co-operate with a view to the restitution of cultural property found on their territory, which has been removed from the territory of another Party subsequent to an offence relating to cultural property committed in the territory of a Party (restitution of the property in question is however subject to the conditions laid down in the law of the requested Party). The requested Party may not refuse to return the cultural property on the grounds that it has seized, confiscated or otherwise acquired rights to the property in question as the result of a fiscal or customs offence committed in respect of that property. Where there is a request for extradition, the return of the cultural property take place even if extradition, having been agreed to, cannot be carried out owing to the death or escape of the person claimed or to other reasons of fact;
• to execute in the manner provided for by its law any letters rogatory relating to proceedings addressed to it by the competent authorities of a Party that is competent for the purpose of procuring evidence or transmitting articles to be produced in evidence, records or documents;
• to execute in the manner provided for by its law any letters rogatory relating to proceedings addressed to it by the competent authorities of a Party that is competent for the purpose of seizure and restitution of cultural property which has been removed to the territory of the requested Party subsequent to an offence relating to cultural property;
• to execute any letters rogatory relating to the enforcement of judgements delivered by the competent authorities of the requesting Party in respect of an offence relating to cultural property for the purpose of seizure and restitution of cultural property found on the territory of the requested Party to the person designated by the judgement or that person’s successors in title.
• to take the necessary measures in order to establish its competence to prosecute any offence relating to cultural property:
  committed on its territory, including its internal and territorial waters, or in its airspace;
  committed on board a ship or an aircraft registered in it;
  committed outside its territory by one of its nationals;
  committed outside its territory by a person having his/her habitual residence on its territory;
  committed outside its territory when the cultural property against which that offence was directed belongs to the said Party or one of its nationals;
  committed outside its territory when it was directed against cultural property originally found within its territory.

Appendix III of the Convention contains the list of violations against the cultural property:
• thefts of cultural property;
• appropriating cultural property with violence or menace;
• receiving of cultural property where the original offence is listed in this paragraph and regardless of the place where the latter was committed;
• acts which consist of illegally appropriating the cultural property of another person, whether such acts be classed by national law as misappropriation, fraud, breach of trust or otherwise;
• handling cultural property obtained as the result of an offence against property other than theft;
• the acquisition in a grossly negligent manner of cultural property obtained as the result of theft or of an offence against property other than theft;
• destruction or damaging of cultural property of another person;
• any understanding followed by overt acts, between two or more persons, with a view to committing any of the offences referred to in paragraph 1 of the appendix;
• alienation of cultural property which is inalienable according to the law of a Party and acquisition of alienated cultural property, if the person who acquires it acts knowing that the property is inalienable;
• alienation of cultural property in violation of the legal provisions of a Party which make alienation of such property conditional on prior authorisation by the competent authorities and acquisition of such property, if the person who acquires it acts knowing that the property is alienated in violation of the referred legal provisions;
• violation of the legal provisions of a Party according to which the person who alienates or acquires cultural property is held to notify the competent authorities of such alienation or acquisition;
• violation of the legal provisions of a Party according to which the person who fortiitously discovers archaeological property is held to declare such property to the competent authorities, concealment, alienation, or acquisition of such property, if the person who acquires it acts knowing that the property was obtained in violation of the referred legal provisions;
• violation of the legal provisions of a Party according to which archaeological excavations may only be carried out with the authorisation of the competent authorities;
• concealment or alienation of archaeological property discovered as a result of excavations carried out in violation of the legal provisions, or acquisition of archaeological property, if the person who acquires it acts knowing that the property was obtained as a result of such excavations;
• violation of the legal provisions of a Party, or of an excavation licence issued by the competent authorities, according to which the person who discovers archaeological property as a result of duly authorised excavations is held to declare such property to the competent authorities, concealment or alienation of such property or acquisition of such property, if the person who acquires it acts knowing that the property was obtained in violation of the legal provisions;
• violation of the legal provisions of a Party according to which the use of metal detectors in archaeological contexts is either prohibited or subject to conditions.
• actual or attempted exportation of cultural property the exportation of which is prohibited by the law of a Party;
• exportation or attempted exportation, without authorisation of the competent authorities, of cultural property the exportation of which is made conditional on such an authorisation by the law of a Party;
• violation of the legal provisions of a Party, which make modifications to a protected monument of architecture, a protected movable monument, a protected monumental ensemble or a protected site, conditional on prior authorisation by the competent authorities, or according to which the owner or the possessor of a protected monument of architecture, a protected movable monument, a protected monumental ensemble or a protected site, is held to preserve it in adequate condition or to give notice of defects which endanger its preservation.

This Convention is the best example of public law instrument to combat offences relating to cultural property. The list of offences, contained in Annex III could be used by national legislation as a model of criminal and administrative provisions. The adoption of this Convention by Russian Federation, if it enters in force, will help to establish an international order to combat offences, relating to cultural objects.

Conclusions:
The participation of the Russian Federation in above-mentioned Conventions will extend their territorial scope and let the Russian Federation to strengthen international protection of national cultural heritage.

Maria Aleksandrova

«Problems and Prospects of Legislative Maintenance of Cultural Heritage Preservation in Museums of Russia»

Adequate legal maintenance of museum activities is a guarantee of its successful functioning. Legal maintenance of museum activities emerges in different forms. There are problems of legal assistance of exhibitions (export and import of museum collections, insurance etc.), legal aspects of supplement of museum funds (including relationship with authors and their heirs), labor law aspects etc. But successful legal work in this field is impossible without normal functioning of the legislation system. as a whole. Only on federal level there exist more than 200 legal acts concerning this matter. Unfortunately the system of norms connected with preservation of cultural heritage needs coordination. That is the main problem for legal implementation.

Modern Russian legislation on culture applies a great number of different lexical constructions. For example: "cultural values", "cultural heritage", "historical and cultural heritage", " monuments of history and culture", " valuable objects", "cultural objects", "values" etc. For example, the text of Museum Funds and Museums in Russian Federation Act has very adequate conceptual structure. This act includes such terms as "cultural values", "museum object" and some others. "Museum object" is considered to be a cultural treasure, value, quality or other special features of which make a necessity of its preserving, researching and public presentation. The museum Act has no definition for the term "cultural value". It contains a reference to the Export and Import of cultural values Act. However, this Act has no universal definition of the term "cultural values" because of its specialized nature. Thus, unfortunately terms "cultural values" and "museum object" according to Museum Act seem to be amorphous and vague.

This article shows only few examples of collision between provisions of Russian museum legislation. Concrete legal problems of museum activities are varied. There are problems of private museums establishing and functioning, juridical aspects of nonbudget activities of museums, lack of legal regulation of patronage of arts etc. But all these concrete problems of museum legislation can not be solved without paying attention to improving the whole conception of museum and cultural legislation in Russia.
Dear friends, respected representatives of participating countries, listeners of today's audience!

I am glad that I participate in the Conference under the aegis and with the support of the UNESCO Moscow Office, especially because the subject of one of the working sections is devoted to our national values inscribed on the World Heritage List, as well as their preservation and the tasks of Periodical Report composition. This is one of the urgent issues because we all should submit the Section II of Periodic Report in composition of Europe-North America region by the end of this year.

After the moment when the General Conference of UNESCO adopted the Convention on Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 180 countries in the world have ratified it and today 812 cultural properties have been inscribed on the World Heritage List. If we take into account that 188 countries are participants of the UNESCO, we can definitely state that the fulfillment of the Convention has a universal character. Almost all countries in the world participate in the fulfillment of one of the successful Conventions in the world.

Taking my today's chance I would like first of all to congratulate our colleagues from Moldova, Byelorussia and Russia with inscription of their properties on the List this year, and particularly with Struve Geodetic Arc one of the best examples of transfrontier heritage, one of the results of new and modern approach to the heritage.

77% of cultural, 19% of natural and only 3% of mixed monuments are inscribed on the World Heritage List. Probably the same as all countries we answer the question about the main motive for the registration in the World Heritage List with no hesitation, saying that it is "honor and dignity". On September, 15 1993 joining the Convention Armenia made a proposal of nomination and in 1996 Hagpat monastic complex, one of the unique examples of Armenian cult architecture was inscribed on the List. In 2000 this nomination was expanded with the inclusion of one more significant architectural cult structure – Sanahin Monastery. Year of 2000 was particularly fruitful – two new groups of monuments were inscribed on the List: Geghard monasterial complex and Upper Azat Valley, Cathedral and Churches of Echmiatsin and the Archaeological of Zvartnots. Today all these 3 objects are a visiting card of Armenia for everybody, who is interested in meeting it.

In July 1997 under clause 11 of the Convention Armenia presented the Tentative List of the cultural and natural monuments located at its territory and which could be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The following was suggested in this Tentative List for further registration during 5-10 years:

- Dwin and archeological area;
- Ereruk Basilica and archeological area;
- Monasterial complexes Tatev and Tatev Anapat as well as cultural landscape of Vorotan river valley.

Trying to analyze already nominated and submitted for nomination to the World Heritage List properties of Armenian heritage, we notice that all of them are examples of religious cult architecture, that is quite clear for one thousand seven hundred years Christian Armenia. The traditional view of Armenia on its heritage was similar for ages. It seems to me that this fact should be thought especially at the national level: we must submit for the World Heritage List examples of typical variety of our heritage: besides Cathedral and monuments of traditional church building, which are the base of our historical heritage, we should present to the world examples of Armenian medieval bridge and coaching inns, fortress engineering and defensive constructions, sites of ancient settlements, preserved sectors of historical cities, examples of country and cave settlements as well as monumental sculptures. Today the frames of cultural heritage significantly changed and enlarged: new concepts require the actualization of Tentative lists. Anyway it is obligatory for Armenia. The Format of nomination of suggested objects to the World Heritage List has been recently changed: series presentation of monuments, landscapes and whole areas. In the same way reviewing and enriching the Tentative list of Armenia as well as showing the conceptual evolution of the latest decades in the sphere of heritage, we will begin the stage of world presentation of new and relatively little known aspects of Armenian cultural heritage. On the other hand these are the requirements of decisions of Durban session as well as Recommendations of the Special Session of experts on “Concept of Outstanding Universal Value”, which was held in April of 2005 in Kazan.

State Parties of the Convention should review the Tentative lists at least once per 10 years, and particularly consider them as a component for the fulfillment of the Convention as well as the useful documents for plans of
terrain designing. Let me say that up to now the Tentative list was only the result of decisions of administrative bodies, at the same time the participation of local community and public consultations are not less important and useful. The estimation of local opportunities is unusually important in order to avoid an undesirable contradiction between expectations and reality. Being a State Party of the Convention we made a proposal without taking into the consideration who would ensure control, care and security of the objects at the local level, as well as if their technical capabilities, competence and knowledge are applicable. So, how should we consider the reviewing of Tentative lists:

How can we make a choice?

How can we combine our desires and new view and priorities of the UNESCO concerning the heritage, could the typology become a principle for composition of the Tentative lists, not excluding, of course, the elements of uniqueness?

Who does coordinate the process of composition of the Tentative list, and who does make a final decision?

In connection with this issue it is especially interesting to listen to the representatives of those countries, which have recently reviewed their lists, particularly our Byelorussian, Moldavian and Russian colleagues, who according to the latest updates of World Heritage Center web-site have already reviewed their lists.

Analyzing all 3 nominations of Armenia inscribed on the World Heritage List from the point of view of categories and criteria, we can see that all they are architectural ensembles and criteria are repeated.

The World Heritage Committee pursuant to Budapest Declaration 2002 pursue the global policy relative to the World Heritage List: the Tentative list should be impressive and trustable. We need to do the following for this purpose:

- Give the priority of Tentative list preparation;
- Protect effectively the preservation of the objects included into the List;
- Support the development and strengthening of the possibilities of State Parties;
- Attract the attention and sense of community to the World Heritage.

The important examination for protection of World Heritage objects is the composition of Periodic Reports that is the requirement of Article 29 of the Convention. They are especially important from the point of view of improving of long-term protection. The composition of the Periodical Reports has the following goals:

- The estimation of fulfillment of the World Heritage Convention made by this country;
- The estimation of tutorial activity to the objects inscribed on the World Heritage List;
- General information, which could be used for registering protection condition and changes;
- The mechanism of experience and information exchange between State Parties for sake of regional cooperation in order to fulfill the Convention and effectively protect world heritage objects.

In 2005-2006 all State Parties of the Convention in Europe and North America as well as Armenia should submit Periodic Reports for the first time, which will be considered in two steps:

The 1st step corresponds to the Section I of the Report and is relative to the legislative and administrative regulations adopted by all countries as well as other activity of Convention fulfillment and details of gained experience.

The 2nd step corresponds to the Section II of the Report and is relative to the preservation condition of world heritage objects, located on the territory of a given country. This Section should be enlarged for each object.

Because the Armenian properties of the World Heritage List are only cultural (we do not have natural monuments of the World Heritage yet), it is obvious that authorized body on cultural heritage preservation of Ministry of Culture and Youth is responsible for this Report.

The Section I of the report was composed last year only by efforts of the Agency for Historical and Cultural Monuments Protection. The same body is writing the Section II of the Report today.

For sure we understand that the 1st step of the organizational work on the Periodic Reports is the collection of information and analysis of the data. Filling the Questionnaire of the Section I the task is quasi more clear because it is relative to the common responsibilities. Though when we talk about the Section II of the Report the participation of local authorities and site managers becomes inevitable.

I have read an article recently about how France is trying to effectively organize the work on the composition of the Periodic Reports. Of course we understand that in this case we talk about the country, which has 28 objects of World Heritage. In June of this year in France three interested ministries – Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Environment, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs founded new interdepartmental institution “Committee on the French Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List”. This Committee officially charged the French section of the ICOMOS with the composition of the Periodic Report, because the ICOMOS initially consulted the UNESCO in this sphere. This experience is possible for using by the ICOMOS/Armenia. The composition of the Periodic Report is not only the bureaucratic issue. This is an opportunity both at the local and national levels to understand which the necessary dynamic for the improvement of control of using world heritage objects should be:

- How should we handle an object of the World Heritage;
- Should we found a special control body or assign somebody as a director of World Heritage objects;
- How can we monitor the quality of preservation and control.
Finally, the personnel at the object needs a special training. In this line the question of supplying the personnel with required literature remains unsolved. The question of full translation of “Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention” into Armenian language is extremely important. The oneness of a World Heritage object should be kept with the improvement of conditions ensuring their authenticity and integrity. How on earth can we gain possession of these all without familiarization with required documents, formats, guidelines and international experience?

Our experience of the preparation of Periodic Reports testifies to the necessity of a curtain responsible institution, which will carry out constant work with site managers and local authorities, giving comments about the World Heritage objects and their significance, emphasizing again the importance of personnel training and local population vigilance. On the other hand additionally to the law on protection of cultural heritage they should adopt appropriate by-laws on the preservation of World Heritage objects.

Our practice of preservation and management of World Heritage properties cannot be considered as successful today. That is why it is important to get acquainted with the experience of the countries of our group. With this goal we suggest and appreciate the exchange of experience and relationship between the same category objects of the World Heritage.

Thank you for your attention.

Larisa Petrovskaya

«Museum-Reserve «Solovki». Issues of Activities for the World Heritage Site»

Solovetsky islands – is a unique complex of the historical and cultural heritage objects, which includes:

• Hundreds of ancient archeological objects (5000 B.C. – 1000 A.D.) – 48 complexes, 889 solitary objects have passed through governmental registration, new objects, which increase and specify ancient heritage of Solovky, were founded and explored during latest years. As these memorials were well studied it makes possible reconstruction of the most ancient for northern Europe models of the territory exploration.

• Remarkable complex of memorials of the historical Solovetsky monastery (1429-1920) includes besides monuments of primary architectural ensemble, its surroundings, cells and deserts, complex of hydro technical and engineering buildings, memorials of the economic and trade activities and other things.

• The GULAG history memorial complex (Solovetsky camps of special function 1923-1939), which includes historical places, apartment houses, landscape complexes, economical and industrial units.

• Monuments and memorial places connected with history of the Northern Navy Training Detachment (1939-1957) and established the Cadet School of the USSR Navy (1942-1945), which was one of the World War II legendary pages, symbol of heroism and patriotism of Russian nation.

• Russian Science History memorial complexes of 19-20 cc. – the Saint Petersburg University Biological Station, places for activities of Solovetsky regional association, established by Solovetsky camps’ prisoners, who were implementing unique researches in conditions of prison, algal and other research ranges of the Polar Institute of Oceanography and Fish Industry, research range of the Institute for Oceanology of the Russian Academy of Science in Beluzhiy Cape and others.

• Specially valuable objects, natural and cultural landscapes of Solovetsky islands Archipelago and adjacent defined areas of water.

Monuments of Solovetsky islands are included into Statute Book of Russian Federation cultural heritage specially valuable objects (affiliated to the Solovetsky State Museum-Reserve). Monuments connected with historical activity of the Solovetsky monastery are inscribed on the World Heritage List of UNESCO.

From our point of view Solovetsky cultural and natural heritage is a unified unique complex, which has preserved natural values of great importance, as well as cultural landscapes, created by human activities during several thousand years. Interconnection of these occurrences performs Solovky as an object of outstanding universal value, and poses a problem of the object nomination expansion for “compound” as it was offered in the initial nomination of 1992.

Activity of Solovetsky State Historical and Architectural, Natural Museum-Reserve

Practical activity on heritage objects management is performed by the Solovetsky State Historical and Architectural, Natural Museum-Reserve. The museum was founded in 1967, in 1974 it was reorganized into the integrated historical and architectural, natural Museum-Reserve.

Overwhelming majority of historical and cultural monuments of Solovetsky islands are operatively managed by the Museum-Reserve. In accordance with Provision “On specially valuable objects of historical heritage” monu-
ments, which belong to the museum, are exclusively federal property. 16 objects included in the Solovetsky historical and cultural complex have different property forms (municipal, private).

In 1992 Cultural and Historical Ensemble of Solovetsky Islands was inscribed on the World Heritage List of UNESCO; in 1995 the Solovetsky Museum-Reserve together with all its monuments was put into the State Statute Book of Especially Valuable Objects of the Russian Federation Peoples’ Heritage.

In 2004 the National Security Council has taken a decision to include the Museum-Reserve into the List of objects, which are extremely important for national security.

Financing of the Museum-Reserve is realized from the expenses of the federal budget funds of the Ministry of Culture (the Federal Agency for Culture and Cinematography). Besides these funds, the Museum also uses federal budget funds of the special purpose program “Culture of Russia”, funds of the address investment programs for reconstruction of the engineering infrastructure, charitable funds.

In 2001-2003 full-scale antirecessionary activities were conducted. Nowadays Solovetsky Museum-Reserve enters into the list of the most dynamically upcoming museums of Russia.

By this day Solovetsky Museum-Reserve is a town-planning establishment for Solovetsky settlement: about one third of all capable population is employed at the Museum.

The Museum carries out active researches in the sphere of archipelago monuments and natural heritage study with participation of specialists from leading science centers of Russia, Archangelsk region and foreign countries. Solovetsky archeological expedition is a standing unit of the Museum (primeval and medieval archeology).

The Museum makes excursion tours for all visitors of Solovetsky islands, with exception of Solovetsky monastery pilgrims. The Museum maintains and creates expositions, develops and equips with modern facilities excursion routs for leading museum complexes – architectural monastery ensemble, Botanical gardens, Zayatsky Island, develops objects of Museum hospitality – Hospitality Center, Educational Center.

The policy of the Museum is to participate in the local development. The Museum is the first-rate taxpayer into the local budget, it renders cultural services to the local population, and it plays the leading role in the strategic planning of the territory development.

The Program of Solovky preservation and development was made in 2005 on the initiative of Solovetsky Museum-Reserve. This Program was approved by the decision of the Solovetsky Region Municipal Council and coordinated with Solovetsky Museum-Reserve and Solovetsky monastery.

Protection of heritage objects.

The Museum is the state customer of the reclamation works in Solovky. To the present time, thanks to the state support of the Federal Agency for Culture and Cinematography, Solovetsky Museum-Reserve has formed the integrated developing program of maintenance, study, restoration, repair, territory accomplishment and monuments safety provision. The Program for monuments’ technical condition monitoring was developed during the current year.

Services on the current maintenance of monuments, museum objects and territories were established and work successfully with in the structure of the museum.

To provide heritage objects safeguarding a special Security Service was established in the Museum-Reserve, which provided 24hour protection of museum complexes. Professional and social units of the Ministry of Emergency Cases of the RF can be recruited for summer time on the contract basis in order to increase safety of visitors, museum objects and routs. Museum Security Service is equipped with radio facilities with 24hour Control Office, transport vehicles – ground based and water for delivery of the personnel to distant territories.

The Federal Fire Rescue Unit with up to 50 people of personnel will be established in Solovky in 2006, with further modern fire fighting facilities and equipment. Rescue service on waters will be organized within the composition of new unit.

Correction of the plan for Solovetsky archipelago monuments’ protection areas, which was developed in 1973, is being carried out this year.

In 2004 to provide protection of historical territories and monuments the Museum-Reserve got for free use holdings of total area 14 hectares within the limits of the protected zones in Solovetsky settlement territory with heritage objects. Museum provides maintenance and accomplishment of these territories.

Among all activities implemented by the Museum-Reserve to preserve heritage objects, we should also mention the construction of the ecological path in Large Zayatsky island, witch is a kind of the wooden planking of 1 km extension with several sight places, located above the curb. It can provide organization of the tourists flow, preservation of the archeological heritage objects – mazes, burial grounds and so on, save vulnerable tundra natural growth on the way of the most popular rout.

There are other large economic subjects on the territory of archipelago, which include heritage objects into their scope of activity. Solovetsky municipal district, which was reorganized into village settlement in 2006. There are 14 building-monuments with housing, which is in the municipal property. All buildings are in unsatisfactory condition. About 1000 people live in Solovky permanently. In summer time population of the settlement increases by several times due to guests, tourists, pilgrims, other visitors. Anthopogenic impact on forests, monuments opened for visitors,
tourist routs rises sharply. Such impacts are destructive for coastal zone, areas covered by tundra vegetation, primeval archeology objects. Type of the region (settlement) budget is of subsidy.

The Solovetsky Stauropegial Friary of Our Savior and Transfiguration resumed its activity in Solovky in 1990, at present there are up to 40 permanent tenants part of which lives in town churches of the mainland. The Friary receives up to 6 thousand of pilgrims annually. About 50 buildings and small architectural forms included into the composition of Solovetsky historical cultural complex – both inside of the prime architectural ensemble and on the territory of archipelago – hermitages and deserts, were donated to the monastery use in accordance with different decisions of federal and regional authorities. Solovetsky cloister is one of the largest historical and contemporary Orthodox centers in Russia.

The Solovetsky Forestry. Forests take 90% of all archipelago territory; they referred to forests of the first group and are federal property. Forests are excluded from economical use, only clearing cutting can be made by private persons on special "cutting tickets" with subsequent firewood selling for the local population – up to 1000 cubic metres annually. "Solovetsky forestry" federal administration performs operative management of forests. Personnel amount is 16 people, material and technical basis – unsatisfactory.

There are also functioning life support enterprises in Solovky - power station, hospital, school, transport and communication departments, private business in the sphere of hospitality-hotels, transportation, services for tourists. These organizations implement their activities at the territory subject to preservation and maintenance – areas of monuments security, secured forest territories.

II. Primary problems of protection and development of Solovky.

1. Absence of effective state security system and security and maintenance operative management of Solovetsky historical cultural and natural complex, which is federal property (monuments, forests) and the object of the National and World Heritage.

Up to the present time Solovky does not have protective legal status as an entire object of historical cultural and natural heritage. The state protection of Solovky is based on the outdated bureaucratic methods.

Monuments of history and culture. It is possible to ascertain for today that a system of activities on monitoring, current maintenance, accomplishment, restoration and current repair of historical and cultural monuments, as well as monitoring of natural objects and archipelago environment was formed and developed on the basis of the Solovetsky State Historical-Architectural Museum-Reserve. But for all that there is no state authority structure for monuments protection. In accordance with existing legislation any museum does not have such functions.

Natural complexes and cultural landscapes. Existing state of protection and maintenance of another part of Solovetsky complex – natural heritage, cultural landscapes on the territory of the state forest resources is not provided properly, but also makes serious difficulties for Solovetsky Museum-Reserve to provide effective protection of immovable historical and cultural monuments, located at forest territories.

This fact is connected, first of all, with existing bureaucratic approach to Solovetsky complex protection. There are following monuments of federal significance on the territory of forest recourses: historical roads, lake and canal systems (21 local hydraulic systems including navigable waterways and potable water systems were investigated as the result of researches), separately situated monument ensembles (hermitages, deserts), separate heritage objects, as well as numerous unique archeological monuments, historical sites and so on.

In accordance with the existing legislation on protection of cultural heritage – the RF Land Code – plots of land under historical and cultural monuments should be given for free use to that establishment which manages these monuments. But all requests of the Museum to convey land plots of the forest recourse with monuments to the museum possess are blocked up. At the same time the Solovetsky forestry, exercising its rights, systematically gives permissions to tourist groups to visit forest territories with specially protected heritage objects, without notification of the Museum-Reserve. With all this going on the forestry does not control and even unable to control such visits. Special concern gives systematic issuance of such permissions for visiting of Zayatsky islands, where situated the largest in Western Europe archeological memorial complex, the oldest in Solovsky wooden St. Andrew the-First-Called Church, nesting-places of rare birds, islands covered with extremely fragile tundra vegetation. This practice threatens historical and cultural heritages, causes conflicts of tourists and local inhabitants with museum security on that objects, and destroys work on access organization for visitors of secured heritage objects.

Absence of the control on forest territories and archipelago natural heritage threatens its safety. Specialists-biologists annually notice negative occurrences, connected with natural heritage integrity.

For instance, cases of poaching (as well as sea ducks fowling (eider-ducks mostly)) were noticed near sites of drift weed suppliers on Small Muksalma, Eremeevky in 2005. There is active seal hunting on Home luodo (near Rebald).

Amount of wild and uncontrolled dogs and their being in the forest continue to increase, this leads to mass destruction of the nesting birds and broods (first of all Gallinacean – hazel grouse, wood grouse, willow grouse and ducks). Besides, there is almost no prohibition of visiting archipelago small sea islands even during nesting time from May 15 up to July 15. Visitors just trample down nests of sea birds.
Amount of “wild” tourists, as well as water tourists continue to increase. In other words, disturbance factor and anthropogenic load on the territory noticeably increase (objective estimation of this load is possible as special research on the pedestrians activity and auto transport units on primary roads was conducted in nineties). New tourist parking sites appear on the whole, as at the sea coast as well as in the middle of islands.

Ploughing up of sea meadows near Tolstik Cape and intensive economic activity in Isakovo and Savvatievo have caused a loss of several nesting couples of big curlew (Red Book of Arkhangelsky region).

The grown up tent camp near Drinking brook (close to the runway) and the developing of sea meadows near Tolstik Cape have possibly lead to disappearance of one more species in Solovky – yellowhammers, as there are situated not numerous in Solovky habitats of yellowhammer.

The path from Beluzhiy Cape to Sekirnaya road have passed right under the longstanding (nest age is up to 100 years) nest of erne. There are a lot of similar examples. There is absolutely barbarian (uncontrolled) net fishing in sea and lakes that leads to mass death of birds in nets (eider-ducks, ducks and guillemots).

The Museum does not control forest lands under such monuments as historical archipelago roads, navigational canals and passing through them tourist routs, that is why it is impossible to conduct financing of restoration and equipping of these objects with modern services and utilities.

Nevertheless, only the Museum receives annual directions from supervision authorities to conduct repair of roads, the state of which deteriorates catastrophically year by year because the roads are exploited by all island organizations and tourist firms.

The same catastrophic situation takes place with navigable and drinking water lake-canal systems, which are the monuments of 16-19 centuries, total extension – more than 10 kilometers, demanding conduction of anti-damage works. The Museum incurs all financial expenses on accomplishment of routs (10 routes on the forest territory), these routes do not belong to the Museum legally and in this connection it doesn't have any right to control their exploitation by tourist organizations.

At the same time tourist flow growth causes increase of uncontrolled visiting of archipelago forests, camp installations, camp fires, debarkation of tourists from sea to shore line, et cetera.

Multitudinous tourist firms actively use bureaucratic approach to Solovetsky complex security organization; they organize independent visits to historical sights and monuments situated in the forests of archipelago Beluzhiy Cape.

One can predict that under existing bureaucratic approach to Solovetsky complex security management the abovementioned negative tendencies will become more intensive. Situation will be aggravated in connection with tourism growth, expansion of economic activity on the territory.

2. Undetermined state of relationship church and public in the sphere of Solovky monuments use.

At the present time interaction and cooperation between Solovetsky Museum-Reserve and Solovetsky monastery is in the stage of active progress: there are joint cultural actions, they create joint exhibitions and expositions, they realize joint projects on repair and accomplishment of chapels, temples which are jointly used. According to the official agreement there is a well-ordered excursion servicing of tourists and pilgrims: museum serves tourists, monastery serves pilgrims, and excursion groups of museum receive access to objects which were handed over to monastery, pilgrim groups – to museum objects.

During latest years the Museum has assigned a great number of monuments-buildings to monastery use. Solovetsky monastery has in its use practically all preserved historical hermitage complexes on archipelago islands, and more than a half of central architectural ensemble buildings. Temples of the prime ensemble are in joint use (controlled by monastery). To the present time monastery and Museum have jointly developed and coordinated the list of monuments for their assignment to monastery and museum. They worked out joint plan on preservation of Solovetsky historical cultural and natural complex as entire object of cultural and natural heritage (handing over of archipelago forests to Solovetsky Museum-Reserve for use, creation of federal historical cultural reserve within the confines of archipelago in accordance with existing legislation.)

At the same time there is a number of critical problems in the sphere of monuments assignment to monastery with their further use and state preservation:

- It requires approval of the List of monuments for final (long-term) assignment of these objects to above-mentioned organizations in accordance with established procedure by higher governmental authorities on federal level;
- Coordination of this procedure and development of corresponding documentation by interested departments (the Federal Agency for Culture and Cinematography, Ministry of State Property). At the present time existing forms of agreements are not mutually coordinated with these ministries (property agreements are not coordinated with the Agency and don't contain necessary legal safeguards for further access to that monuments (and monument territories) of specialists for scientific purposes as well as museum visitors for excursion purposes. Agreement form itself does not provide for the transferable object status as specially valuable heritage object.

3. Absence of the unified program of Solovky protection and development.

Absence of the coordinated unified program of Solovky protection and development on municipal, regional...
and federal levels – is not a new problem for Solovky, taking into account originality and complexity of an object, which has multi subject and multi level control.

The Solovetsky Museum-Reserve jointly with the Solovetsky monastery and the Solovetsky Regional Municipality have developed and coordinated the Program of Solovky preservation and development, which requires further coordination and approval on regional and federal levels.

4. Unsatisfactory condition of the archipelago engineering infrastructure.

At the present time all primary objects of engineering infrastructure and network of Solovky (roads, water and drains purification, water supply, sewer system, recycling of wastes, electrical supply) are in unsatisfactory emergency state or just don't exist at all.

Engineering infrastructure objects are under the jurisdiction of local government with corresponding possibilities of their repair, maintenance and exploitation

They are the following:

- Diesel power station with module boiler-house and oil storage;
- Water supply point with water pump station and manifold water supply (incomplete construction, no water conditioning, water head in nets and correspondingly, in fire plugs is unsatisfactory).
- Sewer system purifying facilities (incomplete construction, sewer waters flow in several places right to sea with in the settlement , drain is situated close to the central monument ensemble;
- Roads (emergency situation);
- Electricity supply (unsatisfactory condition);
- Disposal tip (unsatisfactory condition, there is no recycling of rubbish, scrap iron, glass wastes, plastic and so on).

All these infrastructure objects are life support systems not only for small settlement population, but for the whole complex of heritage objects (roads – fire passages, manifold water supply – fire water supply, purification of drains and disposal tip – ecological disturbance).

Neither local nor regional authorities have in their disposal enough money for modernization, reconstruction and building of engineering structure in Solovky, which is necessary for maintenance of heritage objects and development of hospitality sphere

III Propositions on solution of primary problems of Solovky protection and development.

1. Creation of effective state protection system and security operational management, maintenance of Solovetsky historical, cultural and natural complex, which is the federal property (monuments, forests) and the object of the national and world heritage.

In order to create effective legal and institutional basis for state protection of Solovetsky island cultural and natural heritage, it is necessary to recognize Solovetsky islands as “entire historical cultural and natural complex which demands a specific maintenance mode” according to Federal Law on objects of cultural heritage (Articles 57 and 58) and the RF Government Regulation:

- To establish historical and cultural reserve “Solovetsky islands” of federal importance with in the confines of Solovetsky archipelago with surrounding five mile defined area of sea including archipelago forest territories and lands, assigned to the Museum-Reserve at the present time;
- To charge reorganized the Federal State Cultural Institution “Solovetsky state historical-architectural and natural Museum-Reserve” with operational management of historical, cultural and natural reserve;
- To lodge the Head of Solovetsky State Museum-Reserve with powers of operational representative of the state institution for monument protection (right of operational control and interruption of works, carried on with violation of regulations)

2. Settlement of Church-State relations concerning Solovky heritage use.

- To agree on the level of Federal Agency for Culture and Cinematography and Moscow Patriarchate the List of monuments which are of federal property assigned to the Solovetsky monastery for free and joint use together with Solovetsky Museum-Reserve;
- To conclude an agreement between the Ministry of Culture of the RF and the Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church on cooperation in protection and use of the assigned monuments; on the basis of the agreement to conclude an appropriate agreement between Museum and Monastery;
- To develop a package of documents on assignment, joint use of heritage objects, which would correspond to existing legislation and provide measures on protection of the heritage transferred for use.

3. Adoption of the Program of Solovky protection and development, establishment of Program Coordinate Council in order to introduce new perspective complex program approaches to problem of Solovky preservation and development, provision of interdepartmental coordination and public participation in preservation and development of Solovky.

- To coordinate and confirm by the RF Government decision the Program of Solovky preservation and development, worked up in 2005 jointly with Solovetsky Museum-Reserve, Solovetsky monastery, Solovetsky Region Municipality as a program basis for planning of activities on preservation and development of
Solovky, implemented by leading subjects (federal authorities, the Moscow Patriarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Administration of Arkhangelsky Region, local government);
- To establish the Program Coordinate Council as a public state supervisory authority for implementation of the Program of Solovky protection and development;
- On the basis of the program to provide coordinated planning and realization of priority activities in the following directions:
  - Restoration, protection and conservation of historical and cultural monuments, cultural and natural landscapes, accomplishment of Solovky excursion routs as historical, cultural and natural reserve of Federal matter.
  - Creation of engineering infrastructure in Solovky
  - Protection of Solovky as historical, cultural and natural reserve of federal importance;
  - Creation of effective system of security, protection and conservation of natural and cultural landscapes, other objects of natural heritage;
  - Modernization and development of infrastructure for tourism and pilgrimage in Solovky.

4. Development of works on restoration, current maintenance and repair of historical and cultural monuments, cultural and natural landscapes, restoration of temple historical interiors, which are in joint use, accomplishment of excursion routs in Solovky as historical and cultural reserve of federal importance.

Vera Dementjeva, Boris Kirikov

«Saint Petersburg – Problems of Management of Cultural Heritage»

Over the last two years a number of important documents were prepared and adopted in order to improve the legal basis for protection of cultural heritage in St. Petersburg. Cultural heritage preservation events are now included in all city planning documentation.


The Program defines the main objectives, criteria and work directions in this sphere. The Strategy must become a Charter for a joint effort of the city community, including authorities, business circles and various groups of public to preserve the heritage, which constitutes cultural, spiritual, and economic capital of tremendous value.

The Strategy reflects the growing role of cultural heritage in the era of globalization, discusses the universal importance of St. Petersburg as a unique large city, which retained the genuine environment of its historic downtown and suburbs. The heritage is seen as the most important factor in sustainable development of the city, and the document defines the priority of “protection for someone” as opposed to the traditional “protection from someone.” The document defines priorities in lowering risks of monument dilapidation and formulates solutions to help stop their destruction.

Sections of the strategy discuss the protection objects and their composition, restoration and conservation methods for monuments in contemporary conditions, and the problem of harmonizing modern architecture with the historic context. Specifically, the Strategy discusses the value of open city spaces, “the public living room of St. Petersburg.” The Strategy reexamines topics of cultural tourism, social and educational importance of the heritage, and international cooperation. For the first time ever the document analyzes forms and objectives of managing the heritage, including legal, organizational and administrative measures, financial and economic support, ownership issues, scientific and technical events.

On April 28, 2004 the Government of St. Petersburg adopted “Temporary Regulations for Construction on Land Plots Establishing Standards for Heights.” These Regulations introduce strict requirements for vertical measurements of new and reconstructed buildings in historical districts. The Regulations is the first document defining the historical look of the city and, first and foremost, its skyline.

In the past year work on defining borders of territories and compilation of historical and cultural heritage list has been completed. Concurrently, the new project of cultural heritage zones was completed as well. The zones include heritage protection areas in historic downtown and the suburbs, regulated construction and business zones, and natural landscaping protection zones. In December 2005 the law “On the General Plan of St. Petersburg and Cultural Heritage Protection Zones in St. Petersburg” was adopted. This is the first law of its kind in the Russian Federation as it defines cultural heritage protection as one whole with the urban construction and investment development plans.
Legal regulations have been defined for the territories within the zones, which will be included in the system of rules and requirements for use of land and construction development. The legal regulations will assure preservation of cultural heritage objects in the historic environment and its adaptation to modern conditions.

In the early 2006 the regional law “On Protection of Cultural Heritage Objects in St. Petersburg” will take effect, after being approved by the Government of St. Petersburg on December 21, 2005.

Anatoliy Dogotaru

«Preservation of Historical Center of Kishinev City: Problems and Prospects»

The first documentary citation about Chisinau refers to 1436. Most probable it was a settlement with a few farms, on the bank of the Byc river. At those times a few other inhabited settlements were attested neighboring with Chisinau, such as: Visterniceni – in 1436; Buiucani – 1457; Schinoasa – 1502; Rascani – 1517; Hrusca – 1548, all of them gradually swallowed by Chisinau.

Medieval Moldovan cities had the property of enlarging or becoming smaller depending on the circumstances, without any fortress' walls, in case of an intruders' attack, people hided themselves not inside the city but the opposite, outside, in the forests, leaving everything they had. Such a destiny had Chisinau for many times during 1690, 1739, 1788, 1941, when the city was simply burned down.

As a city, Chisinau was attested during 1661 – 1665, and closer to the last quarter of the XVIIth century – beginning of the XVIIIth, becomes an important country's commercial center. At the end of the XVIIth century the first two-storied houses appear. In the beginning of the XIX century the basic elements of defining Chisinau as a city have appeared. Living houses in Chisinau were built of wood and clay, over a basement made of stone, which served as a bailment. The walls were usually painted with chalk and were refreshed every year, what created an impression of stone houses. The roof was covered with straw, and wealthy people covered their houses with shingles. But military buildings and with social character were built of stone. The first building of stone in Chisinau was the church of Saint Nicholas, built in 1645, which exists until now, with a few modern changes. Mass stone building starts with the end of the XVIIIth century. In this period in Chisinau were attested 9 churches.

In 1817, by the geodesian Ozmidov, was composed the first map of Chisinau and the first planning project of the "Upper town", which was different from the medieval spontaneous "Down town" with it's straight streets. Later, during the year 1834, the first general development plan was approved.

Especially these two parts of Chisinau: "Upper town" and "Down town" nowadays constitute the central historical nucleus of Chisinau. In this part of the town there are registered 740 historical and architectural monuments, of a local and national importance. Unfortunately, starting with the XXth century, according to the new town's building plan, it was proposed to demolish the medieval part of the town, placing large boulevards and modern many-storied buildings. Partly this was done. This way have made their appearance: the former Youth boulevard with a few quarters with modern buildings, the Albisoara street parallel to the Byc river and others. In consequence from the medieval city only a few islands have remained.

For the last 15 years of Republic of Moldova's independence, a lot of architectural mistakes were admitted, building the historical center of the town without considering its historical aspect. During the last years the center of the town became especially interesting for the investors. As this region is considered nowadays the most prestigious, you can already notice there, individual cottages and many-storied elitist living houses. In the end there are many buildings that do not belong to the common conception of historical center. Mass building of the last years brought to the unauthorized demolition of many historical and architectural monuments. You can blame for that is the increasing economic interest to the specified region, as well the specialists, which, awaiting expensive orders, in order to realize themselves, are satisfying the beneficiary's needs, forgetting about different legal demands, building regulations, but most important – about the duty to keep the cultural inheritance of our country for our successors, even if this is not considered by everybody as a "such an important" inheritance.

This general practice can still be stopped, but this question has to be approached with a specific originality. With this purpose, the Governmental regulation from September 2004 has suspended new building inside the historical zone of the town, until the approval of the zonal building plan for this part of the town.

The Chisinau's guests from different countries, usual tourists and specialists, are charmed by our low scaled, green streets and calm.

Although lately the center of the town encounters another great problem – persistent traffic jams. Because of its geographical position, the most of transport in the center is transit transport and passes the historical center only to reach one region of the town from another one.
The existing Chisinau's general plan, approved in 1989, was based on state planning and on the fact that each of the 5 sectors had its own administration, own social and cultural existence and green zones, and there was no use for a simple citizen of coming to the center of the town. This general plan is very outdated. Presently, when the most of economical elements were destroyed, Chisinau needs a new General Building Plan, to be strictly followed.

With the support of the UN Development Program in Moldova, within the Project “Mesmerizing Moldova” it was elaborated, and consequently approved by the Municipal Council, the conception of the municipal general plan. A contest for elaborating the general plan of the town was announced, which was won by the National Projecting Institute “Urbanproiect”. In present this plan is in the first elaborating stage, and we all hope that the plan will establish strict rules, that will save Chisinau from the unconscious and irresponsible lost of individuality.

Each year, for a few years in succession, there were allocated 250 thousands of lei, and equivalent to 20 thousands of US Dollars for restoration of the monuments. And though the legislation of the Republic of Moldova stipulates responsibility for conservation and maintenance the monuments, the economical crisis during the 90's and the lack of resources for restoration have brought to the lose of many monuments.

This year, the Government of the Republic of Moldova has allocated 10 millions of lei (about 1 million US Dollars) for monuments’ restoration. Also there were restored the most of monuments dedicated to people lost during the 2nd World War. Works of restoration started around many churches and monasteries, like the Capriana, Frumoasa, Curchi monasteries, and others. Although the year 2005 can be considered as a turning point in preserving the monuments, within the historical part of Chisinau there still exist a lot of problems, even if it was included as a state preserved territory in the list of Moldova’s monuments according to the Parliament regulation № 153 from 22nd of June 1993.

The problems of preserving the cultural inheritance of Chisinau more and more interest different public organizations.

The Union of Architectures from Moldova elaborated in 2003 the reconstruction project of a quarter in the central historical part, with preserving and restoring all the existent monuments, also preserving the building border and the building scale, as an example of problem solving in the entire historical part of the city.

In 2004 the public organization “Urban Development Institute” has realized the project “The cultural Inheritance of the Chisinau Municipality. State of the art and trends of events”. Also in 2004, the Association of Moldova’s Ethnologists has realized the electronic map of the central historical part of the town, with 300 monuments and historical agenda to each of them.

Nikolay Kanaev

«Russia and UNESCO - Together on a Way of Preservation of the World Cultural Heritage»

To preserve the world cultural and historical heritage is one of the basic objectives of the UNESCO. In accordance with the decisions taken by the states-members this direction which is of interest to all the countries of the world remains to be of priority in the organization activities. The UNESCO has created all mighty system of preservation of the world heritage, deserved a great authority in this field. Numerous international conferences, meetings of non-governmental experts and ministers of culture, scientific research, international law acts and other law documents regularly draw attention of the government circles, cultural and scientific public.

According to the decisions of 33 –d session of the UNESCO General Assembly which took place in October, 2005 in Paris the work is being and will be carried out in the following main directions:

realization of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted in 1972.

Considering 2005 the World Heritage List consists of 778 properties. Among them there are 611 cultural objects, 154 natural objects and 23 mixed objects in 134 states. We are speaking about the provision, development and realization of the new means of processing documental data concerning the objects of the World Heritage, more strict control over the protection of the World Heritage properties and about the development of new strategic objectives. Special attention is taken to fair representation in the World Heritage List.

In the Russian list there are 23 objects: Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow; Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments; Historical Monuments of Navgorod and Surroundings and some others. The UNESCO has got applications for consideration of another 13 Russian objects. But I do believe that there are much more cultural and historical monuments in Russia worth to be part of the World Heritage List. I am glad that in Great Britain there are 26 monuments included in the List, in France – 27, in Germany – 29, in China – 30. There mustn’t be less in Russia. I am speaking about it as a historian and a person who has been traveling through the length and breadth of Russia from Kronstadt and Karelia to Kamchatka and the Kuril islands, from
the Komi Republic to the North Caucasus and Altai. This is a question of historical justice and the efficiency of our future work.

Enormous attention is taken to extension of the protection of the World Heritage objects and particularly of the objects which are under threat of destruction, to search and protection of non-material cultural heritage, to realization of 1954 and 1970 Conventions which declared prohibition and prevention of illegal export, import and delegation of the property right on the cultural valuables, to realization of 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. Altogether the UNESCO has adopted 17 Conventions, 15 Recommendations and 3 Declarations which are directly or indirectly connected with the protection of the World Cultural Heritage.

Taking into account the fast development of the cultural-educational tourism in the late years which involves hundreds of millions of people all over the world, the UNESCO has developed a number of directives to preserve collections of monuments of material and non-material ancient culture, ethnographical museums, moving cultural valuables and other objects, improvement of efficiency of tour-guide work. A lot of work in this direction is being carried out by the UNESCO department “Cultural tourism for the benefit of peace and development” created on the basis of the Russian International Academy for Tourism which closely cooperates with the Department of Cultural Politics of the UNESCO Secretariat and the Institute of Higher Tourist Education and Scientific Research of the Sorbonne University (Paris).

The new stage in the preservation of the world cultural heritage has become the adoption by 33-d Session of the General Assembly of Convention on the Protection of the Variety of Cultural Content and Forms of Arts Expression. This is crucially important under the present conditions of the real negative influence of globalization on national cultures. Russia has supported this Convention.

Preservation of the Russian and the world cultural heritage is one of the key directions of cooperation between Russia and the UNESCO during 50 years of participation of our country in this Organization. In his speech at the 33-d Session of the UNESCO General Conference the President of the Russian Federation evaluated this work in the following words: "We highly appreciate the efforts of the UNESCO to preserve invaluable cultural and historical heritage of our civilization"... Our experts participated in all important government forums and meetings of non-governmental experts, in development and realization of all international-law acts and law documents, suggested a lot of initiatives.

In 1997 the National Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO established the Russian National World Heritage Committee. In 2001 Russia became a member of the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO. The UNESCO programs provide Russia with the latest techniques and a consulting assistance in the field of restoration of the cultural historic monuments. Its law documents have had an important impact on adoption of new laws in Russia concerning the cultural heritage. Different aspects of the Convention adoption is under regular consideration at the conferences and seminars on the basis of the Ministry of Culture territory districts, at the meetings of the Russian Committee of the International Museum Council. The UNESCO has greatly assisted in the restoration of the Bolshoi Theatre, Saint Petersburg's Hermitage, The Russian State Library, the realization of the Russia's Memory Project.

The problems of conservation of Russia's cultural heritage remain very urgent although, and draw more attention to them.

According to the State Duma Committee for Culture about 90,000 objects of cultural heritage, monuments of history and culture are under the government protection and more than 140,000 objects of cultural heritage have been recently discovered. Only 30% of them is in a good state, 20% is in a satisfactory state and the rest, namely 50% of them is in an unsatisfactory state. In Duma sessions on 6 December, 2004 it was reported that at present Russia is losing a monument daily.

In 2002 the Federal Law “On Objects of Cultural Heritage, Monuments of Cultural History of Peoples of the Russian Federation was adopted. It has laid contemporary legal foundations for protection and conservation of the cultural heritage objects, but a lot needs to be done yet. In this aspect the cooperation with the UNESCO may be one of the conditions of the improvement of work efficiency concerning the preservation of the rich cultural heritage of Russia and the world cultural heritage as well.

Maria Solovjeova
«Restoration Activity in Interests of Development of Cultural Tourism»

The eighties of the past century has been hard luck for our country. As a result of an unprecedentedly quick upon the world's standards, rush and even crumbled transition to the new social and political formation the system of values, norms and perception of the world formed during the Soviet Union time suffered enormous shocks. Let's have courage to state that the overall tenor of the Russian life was changed.
Certainly so, one of the main results of the reforms of 90-ies - it's a newly obtained independence of cultural activity in its creative and organizational manifestations.

In the conditions of an undreamt-of freedom during years of reforms the position of the culture cardinaly changed in the hierarchy of values as well as its forms and volumes of its consumption by the population - finally the overall paradigm of the cultural development.

Today, in the 21st century, cultural connections and humanitarian contacts undertake a special meaning. New challenges of the time, globalization problems and problems of the cultural expansion lay to the issues of cultural exchange decided significance and topicality.

Authority of the state are defined not only by its political and economic weight, military power, but also by the cultural, spiritual and intelligent potential which characterizes the country in the world community.

Up-to-date cultural connections are characterized by great diversity, wide geography, run in different forms and directions. Process of democratization and borders transparency consider greater meaning to the cultural exchange that joins the nations, independently from social, religious and political affiliation.

Besides that, a lot of questions of the cultural cooperation are actively discussed today by authoritative international organizations. New intergovernmental bodies sprang up for the good of the commonwealth, where a great attention is paid to the problems of dialog of cultures.

Traditionally, in Russia the key role in the building of spiritual connections is just applied to princes of culture. After the collapse of the authoritarian system, State came out of being monolith any longer. Fractions of the political and economic character between different branches of the state power, between the public institutes and social groups became evident.

That is why today the problems of protection of cultural heritage, existent traditions, support of innovation projects as well as correlation of international and national factors within the frames of cultures coexistence – are more actively discussed by those who is not indifferent to the ways of world community development. It is a unique chance for Russia to synchronize its development, possibility to estimate and compare everything what is going on in the realm of culture in different countries.

Cultural heritage – it is a spiritual, cultural, economic and social capital of irreplaceable value. Heritage is feeding modern science, education, culture. On a par with natural resources, it is the main basis for the national self-respect and foundation of firm authority of Russia in the world.

The postindustrial civilization has perceived the highest potential of culture heritage, the necessity of its protection and effective use. The losses of spiritual values are irreplaceable and irreversible. They cannot be compensated neither by the development of the present society nor creation of new monuments of culture, even if they are considerable ones.

The most important task of our State is conservation of our cultural heritage, sedulous and thoughtful use of which in many ways is similar to environmental protection. Efficient combination of such factors as maximum practicable conservation of an unchanged view of the cultural monument, organization of the public access to it, implementation of the socially or commercially significant use of it without detriment to pieces of art or historical background is necessary for that. In order to handover the heritage of the past to the future generations it is necessary to redound to delicate handling with it.

As far as cultural heritage is always testimony of the past and to-day there are no almost territories on which man hasn’t exerted his influence, so the policy pursued in this area should start from the protection of cultural landscapes. Planning in the given area should be focused on preservation of all the most valuable. To protect archeological monuments they should be added to state registries. One may even go for prohibitive measures in order to avoid violation of their integrity. The main rule in point of fact is elementary: testimony of the past shouldn't be ruined.

Ancient buildings, which have architectural value, also have to be maintained in the primitive shape, not only like sights but also like places for residence or for implementation of working activities. In some European countries it is not the State but the owners who take care of the buildings listed in the registries of architectural monuments. The last ones are given subsidies, compensations or exemption from taxes, in order to provide them possibility to maintain the building and everything what encircles it. Besides that owners promise not to sell some of the interior items, which have artistic value.

One of the priorities of the cultural policy is conservation of monuments of history and culture.

At present the available data on status of the main part of monuments in our country allows estimating the existing situation as a critical one. Results of monitoring made in 2002-2003 in 59 subjects of Russian Federation witness that almost 50% of objects are in unsatisfactory condition and about 10% - in wreck condition.

It is known that one of the conditions required for maintaining of monuments of architecture, monumental and easel painting, items of decorative and applied arts and others is their restoration. Maintenance of the cultural heritage objects develops ancient crafts and the types of applied arts, which in other case would just die out. While there are castles and homesteads, there always will be need in those who can gold-plate, fresco, work with gyps, stone and wood, lay out gardens and parks, weave Gobelin tapestry and trellis, restore books and marble sculptures.
As a result of the change of social and political order in Russia, a conflict of new owners, renters, and investors who consider monuments of history and culture only from the point of their commercial use as objects of real estate has emerged and is constantly escalating. Often investors, with the purpose of cost cutting, engage unskilled labor for the work accomplishment. As a result, the restoration is implemented with rude violations of methods and technological standards.

The state control over the preservation of objects of the cultural heritage is ineffective due to the absence of mechanisms for its realization. Up to now, an institute of historical and cultural expertise hasn't been formed yet, there is no system of determination of the protected item as of the object of cultural heritage as well as a whole number of normative documents.

The state system of Russian restoration organizations existed in early 90-ies and consisted of two biggest enterprises: all-Union incorporation “Soyuzrestavratsia” of USSR Ministry of culture and union “Rosrestavratsia” of the Ministry of Culture of the RSFSR is almost ruined. The State Commission for certification of restorers, architects and engineers-restorers was liquidated late 2004.

All the listed above led to many irretrievable losses of cultural heritage of nations of the Russian Federation.

In the capacity of the most important activities dedicated to extrication of the restoration branch from the critical status one may define the following:

- Preparation of state and departmental documents, norms and rules which provide observance of up-to-date scientific-methodical, law and organizational requirements during works on preservation of the objects of cultural heritage;
- Accomplishment of monitoring over status of monuments;
- Composition of the state registry of objects of cultural heritage, conditioning of monuments and determination of the items of protection;
- Creation of the restorers training state system;
- Reinstatement of activity of restorers certification state board;
- Accomplishment of experimental preservation and restoration works using new technologies and methods;
- Organization and holding of regular exhibitions, conferences, international symposia on problems of preservation of historic-cultural heritage.

Above-listed tasks in the area of preservation of the monuments of the past are common for many other countries. In developed countries, special institutes empowered to implement science-methodical and project-informative support of the administrative policy in the sphere of preservation of cultural heritage objects have been created. For example, off-departmental organization “English heritage” in the Great Britain, central institute of restoration in Italy and others.

Participation in the work on preservation of the cultural heritage can also become one of the excellent ways to provide population employment, especially in the country-side, where there are a lot of castles and homesteads.

Restored buildings, for example, can become educational and lecture centers, places for holding of festivals and stage plays, if it doesn’t take toll of the overall object.

It is no mandatory to carry out restoration, modernization and organization of public access to the monument at the same time. Preservation of historical heritage – is a long duration process which requires a complex approach and presentation of different directions of cultural connections.

Within the framework of the cultural policy development, tourism takes an important position and plays a bigger economic and social role.

Saint Petersburg hasn’t become an exception. City has powerful potential for development of tourism which has to become a significant branch of its economy. Tourism provides wide access to the cultural heritage, contributes to the popularization of monuments of history, consolidates high authority of our State abroad, can increase quality of life of citizens. Foremost it is bonanza business which brings huge tax revenues to the budget of Russian Federation. Target-oriented earmarking of a part of these funds provides considerable resources for maintenance and preservation of the cultural heritage.

Among world megalopolises Saint Petersburg is a unique one by number of monuments, which saved in its main features grandiose historical center. The image of the city is not created only by the masterpieces of architecture, but also by holistic space-architectural environment. High grade of preservation and authenticity of historical territories gave occasion to inscribe historical center of Saint Petersburg and related groups of monuments on the World Heritage List of UNESCO.

In conjunction with that it is necessary to remember, that sightseeing by the tourists shouldn’t exceed allowable norms defined subject to their features and level of protection.

At present development of the model of cultural tourism is especially important. It will be different from the regular types of mass tourism, in order to avoid excessive pressure on the objects of cultural heritage. This model, based on the use of advantages of the historical past for tourism development, should be focused on renovation of the forgotten traditions, creation of new centers of tourists’ interest, organization of special types of
way-bills. It is necessary that the problems of protection of heritage and tourists' attraction are interchangeable. Integrated planning, right selection of main sights and places of new buildings' construction, beautiful up-to-date architecture as well as limitation of the overabundant flow of guests as the primary measures on protection and restoration have the most important meaning in the area of cultural tourism development in Russia.

Veronika Zueva

«Peculiarities of Education for the Sphere of Cultural Tourism»

Entering the XXI century and the third millennium revealed new features of human existence and human consciousness. Changes in economic formations and spiritual landmarks have placed humanity in conflict with the environment, with nature and with itself. In the age of industrial civilization overall computerization, standardization of ideas and habits, and general homogenization collide with the spiritual and creative human nature.

At the same time, tourism, as the most powerful impulse of the intercultural exchange, can provide new forms and methods for discovering reality through active and creative use of the cultural heritage in the framework of the UNESCO program “Cultural Tourism For Peace And Development”.

Covering many fields of human activities – from economic planning and management up to recreology and art animation – tourism has brought culture to the foreground as the basic element. Its objects – museums, architecture, estates, theaters, unique landscapes, are not only objects for display but they also play specific role in intercultural communication, and in making a distinction between urban and rural landscapes, and in developing tourism programs and projects. Tourism sets special demands on the professional activities of the tourist organizations and the specialists of the tourist industry.

To rationally use the richness of culture in his/her work, a tourism professional should be universally educated and ready to solve a variety of creative and economic tasks.

Successful development of the cultural tourism depends on the ability to use in synthesis all forms of art in accordance with their laws. And here it is impossible to get by without some form of social and aesthetic direction.

A stage director, like specialist in the sphere of culture, brings not only the ability to work with the author's material, but also builds his/her own concept of a show, a mass performance or a film. One of the main humanitarian tasks of the stage direction today is “a new analysis of the human existence”. For tourism this has fundamental importance because the credo of the cultural tourism is “the personal discovery of the historic sites and monuments”, which places special requirements on the development of cultural and educational tourism programs all over the world. First of all, it requires professional education and training.

A specialist in the sphere of cultural tourism has to be educated at the junction of business and art, first and foremost in the dramatic art, because theater represents a synthesis of arts. What professions are these: playwright (idea, design and script of the program or tour), stage director (development, management and implementation of the artistic concept, program or tour), actor (animation in its widest sense), critic (ability to analyze and synthesize in the sphere of culture and tourism). Each of these creative professions shadows the main functions of tourism: dramatic composition – planning, production and stage direction – management, acting – promotion, and criticism – control.

The essential requirement is that a tourism professional be very well prepared in the social sphere because his/her work is aimed at formation of a special aesthetic environment around one or another cultural object. What matters here is not only a consideration of the composition of the local population, the social policy in the given country and region, city or settlement, and the role and importance of the cultural heritage of the given area for the development of tourism. The most important quality here will be the ability to adapt to all social circumstances so to be able to stage the most beneficial and potentially successful scenario for the interaction of all interested parties from the top management to the local governments and different organizations in the specific conditions.

Passing to the social modeling, the working process should be structured as follows: understanding of the environment (analysis) – introspection of the environment (evaluation, self-analysis) – construction of the environment (design of the specific plan from the idea to the result).

This approach is based on the culturally creative type of educational system as elaborated by the Gertzen's Pedagogical University (St-Petersburg) where the goal and objective of the modern education is to become a tool of humanization of the human consciousness and activity. "In this regard education is perceived as a sphere of humanitarian anthropogenic activity, as a socio-cultural phenomenon where a human grows as a biopsychospiritual being, a personality able to adequately orient his or herself in the modern world, to understand, evaluate
and act in it, who is able to structure his/her own life, habitat and communication environment, and who can create culture from his or her own active presence and creativeness”.

Who are those people able to join the rank of the cultural tourism professionals? First of all, they are teachers and professors of arts, theater workers and government officials called to develop tourism in their countries and regions. These people, when they have completed advanced training in the tourism colleges, will represent that unique human resource needed today in the sphere of cultural tourism.

Andrey Jurchenko

«Prospects of Use of Foreign Experience in Preparation of Experts on Cultural Tourism in Domestic Tourist Education»

It goes without saying the priority of the UNESCO activity has always been and still is education. Although starting from the 90s of the XXth century protection of the World Heritage and development of cultural tourism has become one of the most important directions of the UNESCO activity. Tourism industry as one of the most dynamically developed economic spheres should contribute much in preserving cultural and natural heritage as “Cultural heritage opens great possibilities in preserving cultural and natural heritage” said Mr. K. Matsuura.

The challenge of protecting cultural and natural heritage of the humanity has become a highlight. Our cultural heritage is being ruined or demolished because of the international tourism development, industrialization and other temporary factors.

However, cultural heritage as tourism object is under the supervision of the international intergovernmental organizations such as UNESCO, WTO and ICOMOS.

Nowadays the challenge of protecting cultural and natural heritage is quite beyond the national interests and has become world-wide major goal. However, in the case there’s a contradiction between the demand of the developing sphere of cultural tourism in highly-qualified specialists who are able to anticipate the value of historical and cultural objects, to coordinate the cooperation of the public and state establishments in economic and social provision of their development on one hand and lack of theoretical basis and methodical provision of professional training on the other hand.

One can’t but agree that tourism will do less harm to the monuments of cultural and natural heritage in those historical destinations where the state and the municipal authorities achieve the most effective tourism management and visiting the tourist objects is strictly under their control.

To overcome the above mentioned problem both in Europe and in Russia it’s of great importance for tourism educational institutions to provide such professional training as to improve their knowledge on the world’s heritage and awareness of its role in the development of cultural tourism.

Taking into consideration European experience in the field of professional tourism training, one can notice that tourism schools of the European Union where highly – qualified professionals in tourism are trained pay much attention to establishing and maintaining close cooperation between the educational institutions and establishments working with the objects of national heritage.

To contribute to the preserving of heritage, cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue and to the development of the destinations and the struggle against poverty the professionals who can form policy in cultural tourism and train future tourism managers should adopt the content of the curriculum. Actually, the diverse nature of tourism requires complete awareness of different aspects comprising the course as well as it requires extra professional knowledge, expertise and skills.

At present in western tourism schools a course of cultural tourism includes the following aspects:

- The protection and safeguarding of cultural (tangible/intangible)heritage, cultural diversity and cultural landscapes (eco-tourism);
- Local development and local heritage (rural tourism, social or responsible tourism);
- The promotion and enhancement of (tangible/intangible) heritage;
- Heritage management.

The spheres of activity for the professionals are either large tourist areas (destinations) intended for mass tourism or smaller in size areas (eco-sub-areas) intended in perspective to expand in the European market meeting the European standards. Consequently, the so-called European aspect is apparent – tourism activity acquires international character and the mobility of tourism jobs is increasing.

The state establishments of the EU on their part encourage tourist organizations in managing and monitoring the environment in Europe.
Studying and analyzing practical experience in training professionals for tourism in Europe makes it possible to conclude that the contents of professional training are of the key priority. Professional skills are paid much attention to along with the awareness that a new generation of the tourism managers should take into account the importance of the tourist industry in the united efforts for the sake of preserving cultural and natural heritage as the factor of sustainable development of the whole society.

Elena Solovova

«Intercultural Communication and Its Role Cultural-Cognitive Tourism Development»

In the development of our modern world one can trace several comprehensive controversies that jointly predetermine the tendencies of global evolution of our multicultural and complex world. One of the crucial developmental problems of the mankind is marked by the coexistence of two tendencies that are presented in the form of binary opposition and that reflect the present day state of minds, innovations in economy, social and cultural development, etc. One tendency is that of globalization, aimed at achieving maximal unification in all the spheres of our life. The other one is the ever-growing need to preserve and perpetuate uniqueness of national cultures and their cultural heritage, general strive for personal and national identity and "otherness".

One can't agree more that our world is so exciting not because it is big, but thanks to its inimitable variety, where there are lots of wonders and things to enjoy and to contemplate about. If people in different countries look alike, dress alike, speak the same language, observe and follow the same rituals, our world will turn into a homogeneous mass and will lose its harmony, as it is common knowledge, that homogeneous can never be harmonious. In this case we can also lose any good reason for interpersonal and intercultural exchanges that has made the most profound basis for our inner development and mutual enrichment.

Among many possible ways of compromising and choosing the right solution for the existing dilemma we can mention the systemic development of cross-cultural communication as a means of life-long education and human development and maturing.

We can admit that this term has many possible interpretations and is explained in different ways even by scholars and educators who are responsible for training specialists in cross-cultural communication in classical and teacher-training universities. It seems right to start with what this notion is not. It is neither mere language fluency nor accuracy, no matter how many spoken languages a person can boast. It is not synonymous to the amount of knowledge about different countries and cultures or the ability to translate or interpret texts within language for general or specific purposes areas and topics. This notion has much to do with the readiness of an individual for the dialogue of cultures, his/her ability and aptitude for this complex process.

This process is impossible unless the person has such qualities as

- inquisitiveness, desire for life-long learning, critical thinking and reflection on prior knowledge and its continuous restructuring;
- tolerance, readiness to accept the motto "enjoy the diversity" and simultaneous right to express individuality and uniqueness;
- ability to compare and contrast countries and cultures, identifying our commonalities and differences;
- ability to present one's own culture and its input in the world culture with dignity and pride, but without cultural snobbism;
- ability to position oneself as a citizen of the country, Europe and the wider world with references to cultural diversity based on one's social/ professional/ political/ gender/age identity;
- readiness to combat cultural vandalism and oppose the intentions of certain forces to manipulate our mind, values and conscience.

It is obvious, that a person who has been brought up in that educational paradigm will want to communicate with other people, crave to learn more about his own and other cultures, influence other people and support their need for cultural tourism. Such people are ideal clients for the industry of tourism, cultural, educational, socially responsible and other types included.

They are not the easiest clients, because they know a lot and expect much, they are demanding clients of the tourism industry. They won't be content with trivial travel package. But thanks to such clients the industry is safe from stagnation.

We can develop different tourist itineraries for them, experiment with different types of accommodation, widen the spectrum of thematic home and foreign excursions, negotiate alternative forms of museum service, provide adequate professional training for guides and other staff members of the tourist companies, etc. But
tourism can also be envisaged as a means of developing cross-cultural skills and competence in its own, but under certain conditions, partially mentioned above.

Ludmila Dudova

«Preservation of Language and Cultural Variety as Element of a Cultural Policy»

Preservation of cultural and lingual diversity always takes one of the leading positions in UNESCO activity and was priority in Russia state policy. Globalization processes escalated the problem, set for State, public, professional and other organizations and communities at national and international levels a task of immediate solution of the problems of preservation of the cultural originality and identity of nations and ethnic groups, cultural and lingual diversity of the world. One may reasonably state, that preservation of cultural-lingual palette of the world is a law-governed consequence of mankind protest against depersonalization and unification, rage to save individuality and identity of each culture existing in the world. Cultural-lingual diversity is neither more nor less then other side of globalization.

So far as today anxieties of the world community are validated regarding the preservation of the cultural and lingual diversity in the world and in Russia, as an essential part of the world's cultural community, part considerable and ponderable. Unfortunately, numbers, which evenly reflect the situation in the world, speak for themselves. Participants of «American society for advancement of science» conference hold in Seattle (USA) state, that half out of 6800 conversational languages will die away by 2050. Europeans underline that today lingua-franca language which one upon a time was Pan-European is being displaced by Anglo-American language. In accordance with the data from “World's writing languages. Languages of Russian Federation” socio-lingual encyclopaedia two out of 31 inspected languages – uygski and orochski – have been acknowledged as lost ones, many of the languages are simmer with extinction.

Problem of infringement and abridgment of lingual rights is not less important. Right of preservation of ethnic, religious and lingual identity is fixed in many UNESCO documents and in Russian legislation. Special emphasis for the observation of these rights is made in “Cultural freedom in the modern multiform world” report on human being development in 2004 (Brussels, June 15, 2004). World’s community concernment is expressed in the report regarding the preservation of the cultural and lingual diversity in the world. Authors of the document, referring to data, received in Maryland University (USA), note that 900 millions – 7\% part of the planet suffer from religious, ethnical, race discrimination. In countries of Africa to the South of Sahara desert there are about 2500 languages, but the possibility to use home language to get education and in the contacts with the officials is limited. In more then 30 countries of this region the language of the daily communication is not official and only 13% of children are taught in their home language. There is a very problematic situation with the observation of the lingual rights of Russian-speaking population in Baltic countries and some other countries of CIS. Mrs. Phukuda Parr, one of the authors of the report on human being development said the following regarding the inadmissibility of such a juncture from the point of view of the International law: “State can be blind with respect to religion but can not stay mute with respect to lingual problems.” Following the idea of Mrs. Parr, it should be added: “And stand bi idly to the problems of preservation of cultural values, for “only culture protects historical dignity of nation” (N. Rerikh).

Necessity of historical dignity protection of any even thin nation, is conditioned the rage of the international community to develop legal space for this sort of protection. UNESCO, European Union, OSCE approved a number of documents, dedicated to the preservation of cultural and lingual diversity of the planet. Let’s mention only some of these documents: Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), International Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious or Linguistic Minorities (1992), European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1992), etc. During the discussion of the issues associated with the preservation of the cultural and lingual diversity, state and nations address to the documents which specialists in the area of jurisprudence name “mild laws”. In most cases in order to solve defined problems Hague recommendations concerning the rights of national minorities for the education (October, 1996) and Recommendations, passed in Oslo, concerning the rights of national minorities in the area of languages (February, 1998) are used. Recommendations on the problems of use of minoritary languages in mass media were developed in October 2003.

In the Russian Federation enough attention is paid to the problems of law support of preservation of cultural and lingual diversity. Special topicality law support of this area of the state policy got in 90-ies of XX century, after dissolution of USSR. The Soviet Union where legislation on culture and preservation of the monuments of
history and culture outrun on the average the world level, went into past. On huge not only geographical but also cultural space, speaking on dozens of languages, new sovereign in bulk multi national and multilanguage states showed up. Almost in all the new state formations on the overall post-Soviet territory problems of preservation of cultural and lingual rights of national minorities including Russian speaking one were sharply arisen. With very few exceptions (Byelorussia, Kirghizia) in all the former Soviet Republics Russian language statuses changed and in some countries cases of lingual extremism were met (Baltic countries, Ukraine, Moldova).

Complicated cultural and lingual situation formed in Russian Federation. Early 90-ies Russia turned to be un-prepared to carry out into life cultural and lingual policy under the new conditions. Russian language used by about 285 millions of people for speaking in the world today and taught by about 180 millions happened to be out of law on the huge territory of the post-Soviet space. All that required immediate solution of the problems associated with not only multilanguage (about one hundred of languages live in Russia), multinational culture of Russian Federation, but also with preservation of the title nation language – the Russian language. Position of the Russian language in the world was defined long time ago and was conditioned by the outstanding achievements in the area of culture, science and technology. This “geopolitical space of the Russian language” by the accurate remark of V.M. Solntsev and V.Yu. Mikhal'chenko was defined “primarily by its spiritual and cultural space. If in the geopolitical space the Russian language noticeably relinquishes by the level of abundance to English, it doesn't relinquish perhaps to any other language in cultural and spiritual space”. Loss of position foremost by the Russian language would mean considerable impoverishment of palette of the overall international community because the “world-wide sensitiveness” of Russian culture is known as well is it is not under the doubts that XX century “has been marked by the strongest influence of Russian culture on almost all the culture of the Globe.”

Perception of this high cultural and spiritual mission of Russian language is from one side an acknowledge-ment of the right for existence of the other languages and of the fact on lingual diversity itself as only one possible variant of lingual pluralism expression, from other side, it is fixed in the legislation of Russian Federation. In Constitution of RF clause 26, p.2 is said: “Everyone has the right to use his home language, right for free selection of the language for communication, training, education and creative work.” The main law of Russia prohibits propaganda of “social, national, religious and lingual superiority” (clause 29, p.2), guarantees the right for the education (clause 43), for the participation in the cultural life and use of cultural institutes, as well as rests the responsibility upon the individual for the preservation of historical and cultural heritage (clause 44.). Clause 68 is dedicated to the lingual right of the nations of Russia. Specification of the principles of the lingual policy with the consideration of norm of the lingual law is described in the Law “About languages of RF nations” and in the respective laws of republics – subjects of Russian Federation.

Preservation of languages and original cultures on the territory of Russian Federation, especially languages of sub-ethnical groups is supported by number of laws: Law “About national-cultural autonomy”, Law “About general principles of organization of communities of the autochthonic thin nations of the North, Siberia and The Far East of Russian Federation”, Law “Framework conception on protection of national minorities”, etc.

After the adaptation in 2005 of the Law “About the status of the Russian language as the state language of the Russian Federation” the legal field of the language of the title nation of Russia – the Russian language – has been defined. Declaration adopted by the participants of International Congress “The Russian language in the commonwealth of CIS nations” (March 5, 2004) conducd the consolidation of the Russian language position in the international lingual community.

Work on preservation of the cultural heritage and lingual diversity is complicated and very hard but is much needed. The world is beautiful by its multi colors and multi voices. If at least one color disappears in it, the whole world will become dim, and if one language subsides, then the thought will get thin as great philosopher of XX century M. Heidegger said that “language is a house of spirit, space – hose of thought.”
Igor Zorin

«Problems of Preservation of Objects of Cultural Heritage and Development of Cultural-Cognitive Tourism in Russia»

As for Russia is concerned there are the same incentive motives as in global tourism are characteristic as interethnic and inter-regional dialogue through cultural tourism channels in many respects; at the same time there is quite clear specificity takes place that imposes a print of an originality onto forms and methods of the organization of a tourist affair as far as the training experts for this sphere including forming the appropriate pedagogical conditions.

Traditions of cultural tourism with reference to interethnic and inter-regional dialogue act as something stiffened, constant, but in dynamics- a ratio of steady and variable characteristics.

To a steady one the Russian national mentality in its modern hypostasis is attributed including feature of the patriotic generality formed during the Great World War and in post-war years. That and kind neighbour’s attachments and interethnic respectfulness and confessional mutual tolerance and desire to learn new in order to confirm deliberately our own and ourselves.

Stability of the own traditions is observed which is not washed away, not weakened but on the contrary, the more consolidated the more widely a range tourist recognition of others is. It allows to build quite reliable strategy of formation of the appropriate pedagogical conditions at a professional training for sphere of cultural tourism with a regional tendency.

We’ll have to agree that internally it is impossible to force a person to turn into a traveler obliging him to be a tourist. It is possible to create artificially a situation of travel by compulsion and imposing for example having betrayed somebody to exile, having expelled out from the country. But that is a kind of compelled travel whereas the aspiration to travel on a call of soul is an organic property of a human nature. Someone has it advanced more but someone - has less; the main thing is that it is given initially. And the matter is in creating opportunities to help to realize fuller this immanent property of civilized public creatures. First of all to cultivate a tourist in ourselves means traveling devoting not only dreaming but also active tourism, thus cultivating and enriching the nature needs incorporated into us by the long evolution of a person.

At the beginning of XXI century tourism has become the norm of human life. There is a cultural tourism on advantage. The industry and the infrastructure of tourism therefore exist because they are claimed with primordial requirement of a person to travel. And that appears the more distinct on rise, the more strongly grows and develops in mass an irresistible desire of people to travel and that finds the full satisfaction.

A person plants wheat, mills flour and bakes bread in order to satisfy his hunger, and that isn’t at all for the reasons that the needs of bread arises for maintenance of a farmer’s, a miller’s and a baker’s trades. In the same way, the sphere of tourist service and professionals working in it exist for the sake of satisfaction of inexhaustible needs to travel and only by this value provide themselves, but not the reverse. Tourism for a tourist is the aim in itself as well as for those who takes care of traveling in their tourist aspirations. Insoluble scholastic dispute: «What is primarily - an egg or a hen?» in this case has the unequivocal answer. A tourist is primary and tourism is primary. Tourism is the aim itself. It is something self-valuable and self-sufficient to what especially such kind of travel as the amateur tourism which is almost not demanding foreign maintenance expressly testifies.

The opposite view and approach would result an undermining of the industry of tourism itself because it is impossible to put a cart ahead of a horse. It is not the tourist and tourism for the sake of prosperity of tourist service sphere (that will fail) but its prosperity is due to tourist and tourism service as the original.

In the basis of cultural tourism is the need of spiritual development and spiritual assignment of the world culture through its visiting and direct comprehending and emotional experience of different cultures in various places when personally seen becomes property forever as well as belonging of idea and feelings of a tourist broadening his horizons of mentality. That is just primarily but not the maintenance.

Cultural assignment the world by a tourist is distinguished for example, from assignment of mineral wealth in the way that the world remains firm and unspent on the same place. You see no one from tourists in general, anybody can even if he wanted to carry away for example the Kremlin or Mihajlovske of Pushkin or Khmelita by Griboedov or estate museum of Teneshova.
It's been arranged for centuries: except for a loss from natural disasters or tragical cataclysms of the human history that resources of cultural tourism which can be given in to renewal, restorations and saving cares by a person and the mankind are non-vanishing in the same way as the person's desire to seize spiritually by means of tourism and are so不变和不可替代的永远资源 of culture. Therefore is the secondary and the most significant competent resource exploitation of cultural tourism in a combination to economic and social benefits for those who forms, promotes and sells a tourist product in the market. All the tourists' charges for them are potentially inexhaustible incomes.

Thus our amendment is reduced to the following. Unconditionally tourism is the aim in itself as far as it represents satisfaction of deep, ineradicable inquiries of a human nature. But such the aim itself when efforts on its achievement entail occurrence and rise of the certain infrastructure (delivery, accommodation, catering and others), urge on the development of service technologies (quickly improved automated booking tickets and hotel accommodation) that stimulates additional revival of some non-tourist sectors of economic activity (effect of animation), encourages the scope of professional work on providing all the necessary to tourists and tourism by (the number of the experts occupied in tourist business is known in France has exceeded the number of professionals in medicine), increases investments into various levels especially local budgets that allows economically interested putting more funds into increase of attractiveness and comfortable reach in the territory of objects of tourist visiting.

First of all by the means of cultural tourism being the aim in itself and developing up to popular and mass in this status some important problems including social have become solved: the national revival, cultural growth, appreciable increasing life standards and quality of population in those regions and countries which are focused onto internal and entrance tourism. For example, the share of tourism in the internal gross product in Greece does not fall below 48-49%. In the richest by stocks of petroleum and its profit Mexico tourism gives 33% of the internal gross product. In the cold Scandinavian countries incomes of tourism make from 18 up to 22%. And in modern Russia tourism gives less than 1% of the internal gross product.

The culture is a fundamental basis of development, preservation and strengthening of independence, sovereignty and originality of peoples. The purpose of development of culture consists in maintenance of well-being and satisfaction of needs of a society and each person. It means that each person and each people has the right to receive the information, to acquire knowledge and to transfer the experience.

Similarity of ways of historical culture and tourism evolution has predetermined a generality of new methods of the approach to their further development: within last forty years in most countries of the world there is a process of democratization of culture and tourism. The culture and tourism make an integral part of human life. The consciousness and knowledge of world around and the development of a person and achievement of objects in view all that is impossible without getting of cultural character knowledge at home, at work and while traveling.

UNESCO and WTO belongs the leading part in coordination and standardization of cultural and tourist activity all over the world. The sphere of their activity also includes data gathering, transfer and distribution of saved knowledge and experience.

Within the framework of the World Conference on politics in culture (1972) the recommendation concerning cultural tourism was accepted. Principles of cooperation in the field of culture and tourism have found their reflection in the declarations accepted in Manila and Mexico.

It is important to emphasize that these declarations specify the character of qualitative aspects of development. The comprehensive planning is considered as the tool of constant process of democratization of culture and tourism. Importance of preservation of a cultural and natural heritage in conditions of the further development of a civilization is emphasized as well.

The cultural heritage of people consist of works of artists, architects, musicians, writers, scientific researchers, masters of folk art is the set of values making sense of person's existence. It covers both material and non-material works expressing creativity of people, their language, customs, beliefs etc.

The new in the above-stated definition is the non-material property including folklore, crafts, technical and other traditional trades, entertainments, national festivals, ceremonies, religious rituals, and also traditional sports competitions etc. Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) marked only its material or physical aspects. WTO recommended the states members of the organization to join this Convention and to be guided both its principles and the principles of the Cultural Tourism Charter accepted at the international tourism seminar in 1976 under the initiative of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). Considering that the decision of the questions connected to wildlife management and a cultural heritage demands significant financial resources the opinion of the appropriate organizations concerning the one who should be responsible for this direction of activity frequently do not coincide. In this situation it would be expedient to put a question of classification which basic criterion should be regulations about expenses that the consumer should pay under the maintenance.

On the basis of this principle it is possible to offer the following classification: property, basically used by tourists (festivals, representations, monuments, the areas predominarily visited by tourists, etc.);
**property of the mixed using** (less significant historical monuments and museums, theatres, the places visited by tourists, reserves etc.);

**property, basically used by local population** (objects of a religious cult and civil constructions, cinemas, libraries and so forth)

Cultural aspects of influence of tourism is that influence which tourism makes on material and spiritual fields of the person’s activity and first of all on his system of values, knowledge and public behaviour.

In areas where active and various welfare activity and where the tourism has a traditional character is observed and where the number of tourists concedes to the number of local population and where their cultural level is approximately identical it is not practically seen a special cultural influence of tourism. At the same time in some industrially developed areas the growth of tourism can cause considerable changes in social structure and also in an environment and local cultural life.

This phenomenon has put the bases of studying a problem of the social interaction caused by contacts between cultures. The character of mutual relation between tourists and local population is substantially determined by that both groups are the carriers of various cultures. The contact between them causes a cultural shock which is also aggravated with the circumstance that it occurs at the moment when tourists are having a rest but the local people are working. Besides the similar contacts have temporary character and occur usually within the mutual relation between a buyer and a seller. The last remark is especially fair in a context of so-called isolated tourism which is one of the basic forms of organized tourism in the areas far away from main suppliers of tourists.

Leading part of WTO and UNESCO at the international level in the field of tourism and culture was above emphasized. And the attention to the coordinating role of these organizations directed on assistance to cooperation, technology transferring, experience and management methods and also on development of standards in the field of tourism and cultures was paid. Other international organizations both inter-governmental and non-governmental are directly or indirectly interested in that tourism could bring in the contribution to preservation of monuments of culture and public values could render certain help WTO and UNESCO in their activity.

The questions connected to protection of natural and cultural property and also its using in tourist purposes the numerous organizations at local, regional and national levels are engaged in our country.

Granting the organizations which competence includes questions of culture and tourism to the status, appropriate powers and budgetary funds is the first condition of successful realization of their activity. It enables them to carry on negotiations on the basis of equal rights with other interested organizations and provides them necessary legal rights and financial assets for achievement the aims and solving everyday problems. The major aspect of these organizations activity is development of a policy in the field of culture and tourism that is a essential condition of solution of the tasks set by society in these areas. Besides it is necessary to give support to activity of national, regional and local social agencies in the field of culture and tourism (tourist associations, societies of culture, association of nature and art friends etc.).

For the sake of maintenance of effective character of similar cooperation it is necessary that cultural and tourist organizations to inform each other of the basic directions of their work. Thus for the appropriate organization which competence includes questions connected with operation and the maintenance of historical monuments it is necessary to consider process of movement of people, i.e. to take into account the social characteristics of tourists and also the contents of tourist programmes.

---

**Faik Gurbatov**

«Innovative Technologies for Preservation and Management of Historical Cities in Context of Development of Cultural Tourism in Azerbaijan»

The Credit Agreement on implementation of the project “Cultural Heritage Support” was signed on 31st May 1999 between Government of Azerbaijan and International Development Association.

The aim of the project is restoration and conservation works of 5 monuments indicated below, which support the cultural heritage of Azerbaijan:

- 1st floor of Palace and Divankhana of the Palace of Shirvanshakhs
- Palace of Shekikhans
- Mausoleum of Momine-khatun in Nakhchivan
- Mausoleum of Gudi-khatun and 2 minarets in Garabaglar settlement
The task of the project is to promote and support the culture of Azerbaijan through the enhancement on self-actualization and social relations in transition period and this will make its contribution to stability and favorable investment climate.

Holding the tender on contest base gave an opportunity to save the credit means. Gained savings of 1.3 millions USD from credit means let to distribute this means among poor class of population. Regarding this the World Bank and the Government of Azerbaijan prepared the Schedule/Plan of the Development of Monuments and the Development Program of Society.

The course of the program concerns social, economic and cultural aspects of social life of the people, living in surroundings of monuments.

Baku • To establish the Information Cultural Center in Ichery Sheher (Old City)
• To hold “Ichery Sheher Festival”
• Some improvement works in Ichery Sheher
• Sheki
• To establish the Association of Craftsmen in Sheki
• To develop the international market for the production of craftsmen; to attract the specialist to promote the sale of local goods in international market; to provide the technical assistance to craftsmen
• To develop the local tourism in Sheki; to create The Association of Family Holidays, to hold the educational trainings for members of Association of commercial and legal sciences and etc.
• Nakhchivan
• To develop the strategy of assistance to the local people interested in developing tourism activities in Nakhichevan.
• To hold the training for tour-operators within 3 month (17.05 – 31.07 2004)

Robert Minasyan

“Problems of Development of Cultural-Cognitive Tourism in the Republic of Armenia”

The Republic of Armenia is one of those few countries, where material cultural monuments of different ages are represented. In the territory of Armenia the settings from Paleolithic period, cave cities, megalithic structures and tracks of ancient observatories are situated. One can also find here the wealthiest heritage of the State of Urartu and the Hellenistic period as well as various monuments of state and religious architecture of Middle Ages beginning with the period of adoption of Christianity as state religion in 301.

The Republic of Armenia, a part of Armenian plateau, being one of the cradles of civilization, can serve as a ground for formulation and solution of important problems of cultural and cognitive tourism. Tourism development is a primary tendency of RA government policy, which presupposes the implementation of joint measures in the sphere.

The Republic of Armenia affords a great opportunity for development of tourism in different directions, one of which is scientific tourism, which includes participation in archaeological excavations in Armenia.

Based on previous experience, a great interest exists among tourists of Armenia not only for passive examination of architectural and historical monuments, but also for participation in studying, description, archaeological excavation and, in separate cases, in reconstruction of monuments.

By giving tourists of Armenia opportunity to take part in the process of study and reconstruction of monuments, we involve people of different nationalities from different countries in a joint process of protection and conservation of cultural heritage of world significance, which is of no small importance for their realization of community of human cultures and thus appearance of a new thought.

The consistent implementation of such a state policy in tourism sphere can promote the involvement of general public in the development of cultural and cognitive tourism. Such approach cannot be one-sided. The examination of monuments of material culture from ancient to present times on the territory of the RA will gradually promote creation of joint projects in the sphere of scientific and cognitive tourism at inter-governmental levels. In this way treaties can be concluded with appropriate institutions (the National Academy of Science of the RA and the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Russian International Academy for Tourism and the Armenian Institute for Tourism) about conduct of joint excavations, expeditions, scientific conferences under the aegis of UNESCO, etc. It will assist in creation of a new Armenian tour-product in the sphere of cultural and cognitive tourism, which in its turn will lead to the creation of a united tourist space on the territory of CIS.
The study of civilization roots on the pattern of cultural and historical heritage of Armenia can become a stimulus for involvement of large tourist streams in the study of other nations’ cultures. This will conductive to realization of a new thought of a united world, which is so important for living in our not simple 21st century.

1. Minasyan Robert, candidate of pedagogical sciences, professor of RIAT
2. Rector of the Armenian Institute for Tourism
3. Tel.: 520-530, fax: 583-229
4. The management of historical cities in the context of cultural tourism development

Aleksandr Kudryavtsev

«Trust Management in the System of Reviving of Historic Towns»

The historic town is a settlement which arose in some history period separated from the present time and which has retained valuable monuments of its history and culture and is included in the list of the historic inhabited places of the Russian Federation, where there are 478 such urban settlements. Among them are the megapolises of Moscow and St.-Petersburg, 11 largest cities with the population of more than one million inhabitants, 82 large cities (from 150 thousand inhabitants), 252 small towns (up to 50 thousand inhabitants) and 51 city type settlements.

Thus, the problem touches interests of more than 40% of cities and towns and about half of the population of Russia.

The architectural-planning structure of historic small and medium towns, of their historic zones is genetically destined for functioning under the conditions of private property and market economy. Practically in each town a complex of public spaces, buildings and structures which become necessary for the normal life while reforms are taking place have been retained: shopping rows, Gostiny Dvors (arcades), cathedral squares and fairgrounds, residential buildings of different types, including houses of common people with shops, craftsmen’s workshops, houses with service buildings, yards and gardens. Imagine returning historical structures in the center of Moscow and we could have absolutely another picture today.

Even not long ago there was an idea in town planning about the necessity of liquidation of the historic development and its replacement by a modern one. The mankind rejects the belief in such modernism and the theory of destroying the old for the sake of creating the new seems to be rejected, but however it has not resulted in decisive prevention of destructing the historic environment. Special complexity of problems of preserving and using historic building as a national property demands that the society and all structures of management develop special approaches to their solution.

The country leaders understand it. According to the Decree of the Russian Federation Government of March 01, 2001 the Federal target program «Preservation and Development of Architecture of Historic Towns» has been worked out. In November 2001 the Government approved it. The decision of the Government concerning development of the Federal target program, whose actions are directed towards the preservation, revival and further development of outstanding Russian towns and cities, their historical centers is a major step for our whole economy and culture.

In the provision of resources for the Program at all stages of its implementation the participation of the Federal budget in certain portions and off-budget means of Subjects of the Federation, regional investment funds, budget and off-budget means of towns and also means of private investors (individual persons, organizations, enterprises) is envisaged; as well as hypothecary crediting; credits of the World Bank, the International Currency Fund, the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development and other international financial sources.

At the beginning of realization of the Federal program competitions were held among historic towns and cities for stimulating budgetary support of high-priority actions and such competitions were rather useful. In the towns of Uglich, Aleksandrov, Maloyaroslavets, Rostov the Great, other small historic towns the documentation has been worked out and reconstruction of buildings and improvement of historic territories is being realized. Significant results have been achieved in the historic center of St. Petersburg before its 300th anniversary. However, federal programs have not provided a qualitative improvement of the situation. 720 million rubles for 478 (?) is at the best for repairing one house. I have seen that in historic Troitsk a grant of 2 million rubles has made it possible to repair only one hotel – a monument and has not provided a stimulus for the improvement of quality in the town environment, particularly the main town street.

It is obvious, that the state should contribute to the development of non-state forms of protecting the heritage – hence proposals to privatize monuments, with all encumbrances, etc. The public wary attitude towards this way is known, but it is inevitable. However already more than a hundred years the world has used “the third way” – asset management of objects of protection, including manors and landscapes which uses economic development of the heritage only in the interests of the heritage.
Looking for approaches to the solution of the restoration problem and also of subsequent practical employment of monuments the initiative National Center of Trusteeship of the Heritage has been established by a group of “anxious” citizens for studying foreign experience of the system trust management of heritage objects – so-called the National Trust. Representatives of the Russian Academy of Architecture and Building Sciences, the All-Russia Society for Protection of Monuments of History and Culture (ARSPMHC), the Academy of Restoration, the Research Institute of Cultural Heritage have held a number of consultations including managers of banks.

The project envisages participation of state, commercial structures and individual citizens in attracting means for the restoration of monuments of architecture (contributions and donations), and also their participation in the process of using and managing objects of heritage entrusted to a public organization specially created for this purpose. The structure of the organization assumes the existence of a board of trustees including authoritative experts, public figures and politicians, and also the existence of ramified system of regional branches. In our opinion, this form of managing monuments is “transparent” for the society and makes it possible to redistribute incomes received from using “expensive” monuments in the capital by means of the centralized fund for the benefit of provincial objects whose commercial use is considerably smaller.

The first National Trust of the Heritage was the English one created in 1895, now they exist in more than 60 countries, including post-socialist countries. They are incorporated in an international organization. A board of trustees manages the movable and immovable property, given by the state to corporations and private persons, deposits and membership dues. Its analogue in the USSR was the ARSPMHC (All Russia Society for Protection of Monuments of History and Culture) with mass membership, its own property and manufacturing. The analogue of the mechanism of the National Trust of the Heritage activity is the activities of the Moscow Chief Directorate for Protection of Monuments (nowadays Moskomnaslediye).

The sources of forming the financial base of the Trust usually are: receipts from the state budget, donations of individual citizens, membership dues from individual members, corporate payments, grants from different funds and other sources, receipts from using managed objects, receipts from the organization of tourist activities on the territory of managed objects, etc.

The model of trust management of objects of heritage with regard to its characteristic features in the social life of the society is a phenomenon of market economy and the answer to the question what is necessary to undertake in search of an effective system of preserving and managing the national heritage objects. The trust management of the heritage is an obligation by virtue of which the state passes the heritage objects to a trustee manager (to the National Trust), which undertakes to carry out management of objects of the heritage with the aim of its preservation. The profit got as a result of the highly professional management remains entirely inside the Trust, is directed to the maintenance and management of the given object, and also to the maintenance of other heritage objects.

The trust management means a professional work of a managing director consisting in his fulfilling a complex of legally significant and actual actions with objects of the heritage, directed on earning possible profit which can be used only for the restoration and maintenance of objects of the heritage entrusted to the asset management. The largest national trusts protecting the heritage are English, Japanese and the USA trusts.

Among innovations in the sphere of preserving the heritage of various world countries the program “the Main Street” of the National Trust for the Preservation of Historic Heritage (the USA) deserves in our opinion a special attention, with it we managed to get acquainted during the 11th International Conference of the National Trusts which took place last month in Washington D.C. where the headquarters of the above mentioned trust were situated.

How did the idea of this program appear?

In the middle of the 1970s in the USA serious concern for constantly worsening condition of historic parts of towns was displayed. At that time they were obviously threatened with disintegration as a result of physical degradation or replacement by newly built structures dissonant with the environment. Having realized the acuteness of the arising situation and importance of the problem which has got national importance, the National Trust has started the pilot project “the Main Street” with the purpose of finding out causes leading to the decline of the historic town centers and the analysis of ways of struggling against it.

As a result of its realization the national program with the same name has been prepared, aimed for mass preservation of historic and art values of the country towns. But not in the form of objects of the past turned into museums and in the form of the live heritage integrated organically and economically effectively into the present-day life. Now, after a quarter of a century, it is possible to say with assurance, that this program has turned out to be successful: the USA and their citizens have managed to retain the historic heritage of their towns as their priority national value, to protect it really from aggressive commercialization and other risk factors.

What the program “the Main Street” really is?

The program “the Main Street” is a complex of stage-by-stage independent actions aimed at the revival of traditional historic town parts, mainly shopping ones. This program can be carried out equally successfully both in large, and in small towns, under any economic conditions and in any regions of the country. The program is based on the following basic principles:
Designing: improvement of the appearance of urban areas by means of restoring buildings and structures, constructing new ones in close coordination with the established development, improvement of the territory and employment of various systems of the management of the improvement.

The organization / cooperation and partnership: achievement of a consensus and creation of an atmosphere of cooperation between various state and public groups and private persons, as well as revealing sources of financing activities connected with the revival of town blocks.

Progress /advertising: advertising of shopping areas by carrying out various actions with the aim of attracting buyers, potential investors, new companies, inhabitants and visitors.

Economic re-structuring: strengthening of economic base of the region and creation of new opportunities by means of the comprehensive analysis and development of new forms of the life in the historic center.

Results of the program

For 25 years of successful work the total volume of investments in historic districts, according to the program “the Main Street” has been equal to 18.3 billion dollars, 244,543 new workplaces have been created and 60,577 large and small companies have been founded. Each dollar invested by the commune for carrying out the program “the Main Street” corresponds on the average to 35.17 dollars of new investments that makes this program one of the most successful projects of strategic development of the economy in America.

Today the program “the Main Street” is realized successfully in more than 1800 large and small towns throughout the United States and serves as a model for similar programs in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and Venezuela. Many towns in Brazil, Czech, India, Lithuania and the Ukraine are also going to adopt this experience. During special excursions within the limits of the conference mentioned above we, a group of its participants from the National Center of Trusteeship of the Heritage, managed to make sure personally of the practical value of the American experience with whose details it is possible to get acquainted on the site of our Center (www.ntrust.ru).

The causes of the program’s success come to the following: the objective interest of the society, support of the state, professionalism of its immediate participants and democratism, as well as the preparation by the trust of special actions connected with its realization.

Conclusions

It is doubtless for us, that historic towns of Russia today face approximately the same problems as the USA towns did in the 1970s. It is also doubtless that our country needs greatly a constructive national program of preservation of the historic and cultural heritage of Russian towns. Such a program should be based on a combination of national traditions and positive modern experience, in particular, the program “the Main Street” of the National Trust for the Preservation of the Historic Heritage of the USA.

It is obvious, that this program is based on the summation of restoration/reconstruction, development of the town territories, i.e. town-planning, the skilful employment, based on the originality of the fund of the real estate, and the formation of a community, i.e. a self-governing element of a civil society. I am sure, that only such a complex approach will provide steady development of historic towns.

Vissarion Alyavdin

«Prospects of Development of Public-Private Partnership in Sphere of Revival of Cultural Heritage»

Nowadays the private-state partnership term has become wide-spread in the various economic fields. Basically, this term means a joint financing of infrastructure projects implementing by the state and private sectors in their common teamwork.

The private-state partnership in field culture has been traditionally charitable. Because of it the meaning of the PSP in the cultural sphere now is narrowly understood as just the form of patronage or sponsorship. We consider it is possible to broaden our understanding of this term in the sphere of immovable cultural heritage as economic mechanism and significant long-term investment potential.

The private-state partnership in the sphere of cultural-historical heritage preservation and usage is supposed to be understood as contractual mechanism (agreement) between the state and public/private sectors which is aimed to put the heritage sites into valuable cultural and economic circulation, as well as effectively to maintain them using related services.

The complete impossibility to make valuable decisions only with assistance and efforts of state organizations dealing with cultural heritage preservation forces us to search new management decisions in the field.

So, one of perspective lines is supposed to be an implementation of the PSP which is aimed to rebirth and involve historical heritage sites into cultural and economic circulation of full value. But moreover, the state-private partnership is supposed to become not only cooperation or teamwork for joint financing projects, but also
for any other assistance or direct help, when state bodies for heritage protection cannot carry out their duties immediately due to their limited funds and professional resources.

Culture requires investments as well as industry does, however, not “virtual investments” as it is usual to say nowadays but absolutely real financial services and private investments into an implementation of perspective and rewarded projects. The historical immovable monuments and the ground areas around them are potentially attractive to investors. However, a lot of different factors influence on the condition of historical site. For example, the historical country estates located not far away from urban centers or near infrastructurally advantaged areas are certainly preferable, and vice versa.

All investment projects in field of immovable heritage should meet some necessary conditions. On the one hand it is observance of state purposes concerning preservation and use of historical-cultural heritage, public access to it and budgetary charges. On the other hand it is the observance of private sector interests implementing the rewarded projects for profit increasing.

The Basic problem for project implementation is a lack of area analysis. Any best project without preliminary competent analysis of environment will be failed. There are many examples of location of city garbage, operating cemeteries and so on close to cultural sites, i.e. very far from tourist routs. Due to absence of access roads and infrastructure these objects have been not provided by personal and professional resources and that is why they are not able to function normally.

In other words, attractive historic site in itself is not the only factor of successful project implementation. It is supposed to have the whole set of legal, technical, economic terms and conditions, as well as combinations of them, which should be very special in every concrete case.

That is certainly big problem zones which are supposed to be decided in close cooperation between state and private bodies.

Marietta Gasparyan

«Innovative Approaches to Problems of Preservation and Use of Historical Buildings of Yerevan»

Armenia is one of the most ancient countries of the world. The rich cultural heritage of this country dates back to the Paleolithic Era, while the monuments of history and culture are spread all over the historical Armenian territory and include menhirs, vishaps, settlement remnants, station caves, fortresses, palace complexes, khachkars, monasteries, churches, bridges, et cetera. Highways and blind paths lead to them, they crown tops of mountains and tower over valleys and lakes. They stand on the verge of the plateaus abruptly ending with steeps or are concealed amongst rocks and green gardens. The modern tourism routes disclose the beauty and diversity of the national architecture, which is the invaluable property of the Armenian people and part of the treasury of the global culture.

The language of the Armenian architecture is unique. It is always in harmony with the surrounding landscapes. It has the strikingly rational lapidary quality, on the one hand, and the wondrous picturesque quality of artistic forms and the filigree ornamentation motifs, on the other hand.

Lastly, there is the patina of the ages that remained on the stones as an eternal rarity.

Yerevan is the capital of Armenia that breathes with the ancient history dating back to the foundation of the Urartu stronghold of Erebuni on the top of the Arinberd Mountain in 782 B.C. However, any tourist who would walk down the town streets will certainly notice the juvenile outlook of the modern town of Yerevan, modern though aged 2787. Indeed, the outlook of the town is little reflective of the many centuries of its history, let alone the Paleolithic archaeological culture layers.

There are the objective and historically justified reasons for this. In a nutshell, suffice to quote the English traveler and scientist Lynch who visited East Armenia at the end of the 19th century and said, “Yerevan is situated on the northern fringe of the Middle Araxes valley, the valley remarkable for its important geographical situation and the magnificent architecture of the nature towering above it, as well as the honourable place it occupies in legends and in history as a venue of great catastrophes in the destiny of Mankind. A natural stoppage on the way from the East to the West, it provides easy access into the heart of Asia Minor for those who travel from the shores of the Caspian Sea. It was by this way that the peoples of the Caspian and the Trans-Caspian regions were moving to the coasts of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean; since the tradition links this country to the Biblical Eden, the bloody wars that it witnessed evoked in one talented writer a quite appropriate recollection of tarnation and the flaming sword”.

Yes, of course, while the fortunate situation of the town on the transit trade routes served for prosperity and for commercial activity never abating in even the political depression periods, it was precisely this that made
the region an apple of discord and a constant warring venue, which often led to complete destruction of the town.

The seismic zone in which Yerevan is located played its dramatic role as well. The geographical review of the Erivan Province dated 1892 stated, 'A powerful earthquake occurred in Erivan and the neighbourhood in 1679: monasteries, churches and other buildings were demolished and 8,000 people died'.

It is the result of the above that the architectural building-up of the 18th to the early 20th centuries dominated in the outlook of the town established at the beginning of the 20th century. That is true of the Mediaeval objects inclusive of churches that had either been restored or re-built in their former locations after the earthquake.

Therefore, the notion of the historic image of Yerevan is predominantly representative of the architecture of precisely that period, which forms the history-hued and colourful fragments of the town environment every appealing to tourists.

Apart from the purely aesthetic qualities and the general cultural associations, the presence of this group of history and culture monuments in the street outlook is specially importance in terms of reproduction of the historical-memorial factor, since every building embodies a very specific history: it contains documented information and carries in it a certain memorial value telling of the developments of the three historic formations of the two centuries past – the history of the Russian Empire, that of the Republic of Armenia (1918-1920, 1921) and the period of existence of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Lastly, and in view of the cognitive tourism tasks, as well as in connection with the fact that the tourism routes’ grid that covers the whole of Armenia’s territory only include Yerevan in a rather narrow context, the monuments of history and culture of the 18th to the early 20th centuries represent an objective resource that stays underemployed in the context.

The year 2005 signifies the formation of innovative processes in the preservation and use of the historical architectural part of Yerevan. Those processes are connected with the new social world outlook developing as well as the realistic activity undertaken in this field.

The previous situation is a point of reference.

If, as the UNESCO General Conference admitted at its XV Session in Paris in 1968, city planning and re-construction is one of the major threats to monuments of culture, Yerevan only sets a vivid example. In the case of Yerevan also, that was the Soviet ideology based on the orthodox tendency for destruction of the confessional edifices that was pursued from the 20s until the 50s last century.

Paradoxical though it might seem, destruction of the historical buildings is also connected to the inadequate attitude, namely, the intuitive indifference towards the historical-cultural, artistic and aesthetic qualities of the edifices built during the 18th to the early 20th centuries as seen against the background of the unique background of the Ancient and Mediaeval heritage of Armenia. That is, this is the unjustified degradation of the present value categories and purposeful relaxation of the state reservation guarantees. As a result, there’s devaluation of the historical factor in the outlook of the town and loss of many valuable monuments of history and culture.

The new century saw intensification of construction work in the historical part of Yerevan, which increased the threats posed to the 18-20 centuries’ architectural legacy. There’s not only the threat of physical demolition but also that of moral and aesthetic devastation of the architectural priorities of the historic-importance buildings, since the objects falling into this category visually lose their aesthetic parameters outside a properly arranged city-planning environment for all their undisputed artistic advantage. This applies, at least, to the loss of the immanent ambience and the gross discrepancy between the old buildings and the new high-rises. The latter only leave in between them isolated fractions or even smaller fragments of the chamber building-up.

As regards the question of spiritual innovations, it is about the society that has awakened from apathy and realized that the loss of the historical core of the town would entail the liquidation of the irreplaceable national values and traditions, and of that humanistic ambience in which every building provides an immediate contact with history. The vox populi has sounded in public actions and meetings, in rallies, exhibitions and marches for several months; this is the voice of the social and young-member organizations, of the academic circle representatives, of the intelligentsia, the press, the radio and the television.

This spontaneous movement has had a serious influence on the positive shifts in the problem’s handling and brought nigh practical implementation of the aforementioned tasks.

The objective assessment of the situation indicates the undisputed difficulty of implementing the task of keeping the historical factor in the infrastructure and in the constant motion of the whole city-building in Yerevan. The point is, the past reconstruction work caused the prevalence over the modern town fabric of the sporadic allocation of fragments and individual historical buildings. This makes it impossible to establish an integral reservation zone in the historical part of the town so as to include all the valuable edifices in one area. Therefore, the more rational solution is to embed the individual fragments into the functioning organism of the town.

The decision of the municipal authorities to organize a reserve was a helpful step taken to preserve the historical part of the town and establish a well-organized historical architectural zone. The quarter located in the perimeter made by the Abovyan, P Bouzsand, E Kogbatzi and Aram streets in the Main Avenue area and comprising 19200 hectares (320 m x 60 m) was allocated for this purpose in 2005.
That, given the present-day condition, this is the only part of the town with preserved immanent historical buildings is the main parameter justifying the choice made in its favour.

As for intensive functionality, it is promoted by the commanding location in the central district of Yerevan and in the most animated pedestrian area next to the Republic Square, the main square of the town to which the P.Bouzand street approaches from the North-West.

The quarter refurbishment purposes are to ensure the functional and aesthetic optimization of the historical area, to fix the reserve with controlled building-up and to make it an active element of the town's everyday life.

The pool of historical buildings mainly represents the original samples dating to the 19th and the early 20th centuries with the interwoven inner yards and gardens, all making one suite of the quarter, with a common national spirit, with the specific accents, rhythm, scale and harmony creating spontaneously a whole and irreplaceable architectural-emotional district. At the same time, the time-dependent variety of forms and styles is very visual and helps trace the progress of the architecture of the whole epoch. The colourful brickwork of the building walls dating to the first half of the 19th century or the tuff rust of the later buildings, the laconic or ornate facades, the delicate wooden or iron balconies and the ever-dominant portals and arches of the passageways leading inside create the distinctive architectural outlook of the residential district of Yerevan where every building contributes a hue of its own to the architectural background and the expositional expression of the street.

Given the desire to retain the wholeness of the visual impact of the historical environment, three old buildings are being reserved apart from the ten objects that were included in the State List of Immovable Monuments of History and Culture. This will make it possible to retain the large-scale combination of components. It was taken into consideration also that usually any building of the 19th or the early 20th century is seldom deprived of certain valuable features even if not having architectural representativeness in general and, in particular, functionally. The cosy inner yards, the vaulted basements, the airy rooms and the wide and open galleries form a fertile soil for the new interpretation of the forms and the fuller use on the broad enough range of functional solutions.

For the city-planning considerations, the reserve zone included 15 historic buildings dismantled and moved over from other streets. This move was justified by several factors:

First, the task of setting up an aesthetically organized architectural environment is carried out in this way. The question is that of filling the blanks between the edifices on the red line, which were not filled in due time and were occupied by the unpresentable and historically unjustifiable buildings eventually.

Second, this solves the problem of hooking up the valuable monuments of history and culture dismantled and lost formerly.

Third, it is possible to re-create the aesthetic architectural environment by moving over the older buildings dating back to the 19th and the early 20th centuries, which had been left standing alone amidst the modern and dense building districts.

The ideal goal of this architectural project to restore the immanent environment combines with the modernization of the territory because of the increasingly strong social-priority functional infrastructure and the need to promote the facilities of commerce and public recreation, including comfy cafes and restaurants with tables in gardens and open-air galleries. These are so popular in all the southern towns. This also includes exhibitions and selling museums and artistic galleries, which popularize the traditional applied arts, and small elite hotels, and so forth.

The inner space of the block is bound by the pedestrian area under a glass roof, with water surfaces, fountains, with the interwoven greened atriums of the houses.

The architectural interpretation of the project employs either contrast or harmonic combination of the old and new forms – of the open-work wooden arched galleries with the glass surfaces, and of the green and open lots of the old stately homes with the modern small forms and fountains.

The vaulted stonework basements are unique elements of the old houses that developed in underground car-parks of two levels expanded horizontally to under the street pavements.

The implementation of the project will solve the main problem standing in way of setting up a tourism route, namely, that of arranging exposition expression and intensive functionality of the reserve.

The thematic context intended to promote the enlightenment tourism incorporates the historical buildings proper, the content potential of which is made of the priority criteria characteristic of monuments of culture and history: general cultural associations, the artistic architectural category and the historical-memorial category. In this perspective are covered the issues of the history of Armenia, of wine production, of medicine, schools, theatre, of the lives and deeds of the politicians, military leaders, the mayor, the members of the City Council, artists, writers, industrialists and doctors who lived in that street. The street names recall Tsar Nicholas I, the governor of the Armenian Province, the governor of the Erivan Province, the dictator of the Republic of Armenia, the revolutionaries, et cetera.

So, the innovative approaches to the problems of preservation and use of the historical architectural part of Yerevan are characterised in our days by the new governmental policy shaping up the eventual developing of the enlightenment tourism.
Fedor Lavrov

«Management of Historical City and Development Cultural Tourism by Example of Vladimir»

Vladimir, one of the ancient cities of Russia, was founded in 990 by Kiev prince Vladimir Svyatoslavovitch. Vladimir is a renowned tourist destination – the first great principality and the first capital of north-eastern Russia. Vladimir is a city of the world-famous Golden Ring of Russia.

An important place in the city’s tourist infrastructure belongs to the State Historical and Architectural Vladimir-Suzdal Museum-Reserve, which is listed among the most valuable objects of the cultural heritage of the Russian Federation. The state Museum-Reserve comprises 56 landmarks, 36 museum expositions and two exhibition halls. The most prominent masterpieces of white-stone architecture are inscribed on the World Heritage List in line with the decision of the XVI-th Session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee. They are the pride and glory of the Russian architecture. They include the XII-th century monuments in Vladimir - the Golden Gate, the Collegiate Church of St. Demetrius and the Cathedral of the Assumption of the Virgin.

The historical center of Vladimir is a brilliant example of the ancient Russian city. The most prominent landmarks that date back to XII - XXth centuries and illustrate the main stages in the development of the Russian architecture are also located in the city center.

At present the region has over 3600 architectural and cultural landmarks. Many of them are in dire need of restoration, and some require urgent rescue measures. However, over 100 mln rubles are to be allocated this year for restoration, project design, and preservation of monuments and sites in Vladimir region. Last year the state aid amounted up to about 70 mln rubles.

One of the 18 top priority tasks set by the city's administration for the year 2005 is the promotion of tourism by means of developing a highly competitive tourism industry, particularly in the historical center of the city, which will be able to cater for the needs of both domestic and foreign tourists.

The strategy of the city’s development in 2005-2015 has been developed and approved. The long-term development plan, formulated by the City Council deputies, representatives of a broad range of social groups, businessmen, is aimed at bringing high cultural standards, improvement of living standards accompanied by the innovative development in all the aspects of social sphere. The preparation of the overall concept of the city’s layout is in progress. In August 2005 the “Revival of the Historical Center of Vladimir” project (scheduled for 2005-2010) was approved. The project documentation specifically mentions the need for urgent measures to improve the historical center that has retained its initial layout and uniqueness.

The preservation of the historical architectural monuments of Vladimir is of great significance in terms of the preservation of the Russian historical heritage as a whole, as it plays an honorable role in creating a prestigious image of the nation.

However it should be noted, that possessing the World Heritage properties erected by our ancestors the city does not use the tourist business recourses and service industry in their full capacity.

The Program of providing the state aid to the development of tourism launched on the territory of the region proved the efficacy of investments into this sphere (the growth of volume of tourist services amounted up to 265 rubles vs every invested ruble), however, it failed to remove obstacles that impede tourism development.

There is a number of such problems and their solution requires setting up tourist facilities (including compiling itineraries, and day-trip programs) and bringing their attracting potential for tourists up to European standards.

This task necessitates a large-scale reconstruction and preservation of historical, architectural and cultural monuments.

Another task is to improve the accommodation facilities and service level (all of the city’s hotels can jointly accommodate less than 1,5 thousand visitors at a time, the hotels are rated three stars at most). There’s a necessity for building a network of parking lots for tourists and improvement of facilities for entertainment and leisure.

Promotion and management constitute most important but least developed segments of the tourism industry. Broad implementation of modern methods of management in Vladimir must be directed to making the city more attractive for both tourists and investors. The following measures must be taken to attain this goal.

- Launching of projects of large-scale restoration and reconstruction of the historical look of the living quarters, which in its turn will facilitate fitting modern tourist facilities into historical environment, setting up facilities for provision of cultural programs for tourism and satisfy the demands of the tourism industry.
- Development of small hotel businesses (setting up pensions, family-run hotels and inns).
- Development of small enterprises of private ownership within the historical center of the city (foodstuffs, trade, crafts).
- Development of the facilities belonging to the service industry sphere.
- Compiling itineraries for day-trips, cognitive, cultural, music programs with a visit to the historical center, as well as small and medium-size towns in Vladimir region.
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- Improvement of the environment, reducing the risk of environmental pollution.

The successful implementation of the aforementioned projects must be based on modern means of management, rationalized use of the regional potential, appropriate investment policy. Unless this large-scale comprehensive project is launched Vladimir will face the danger of losing up to 30% of its landmarks within the next 7-10 years.

By the estimates of the Russian Association of Travel Agencies Vladimir region occupies the 3rd place in inbound tourist flow statistics (after Moscow and St. Petersburg). Over one million domestic and foreign tourists visit the city and its region annually (2004 - 1,176,000 tourists, forecast for the year 2005 - 1,364 tourist). Since 1997 there’s been a steady increase in the inbound tourist flow, the average figure for the annual growth rate is 15%.

In 2005 there was adopted the government program of revival of the historical kernel of Vladimir for 2005-2010 stipulates the following sources of financing.

- State budget – 608,000,000 rubles
- Budget of the territory of the Russian Federation – 308,900,000 rubles
- Local budget – 322,800,000 rubles
- Sources outside the budget – 2530,000,000 rubles

This fact enables us to maintain that cognitive-historical tourism development in our city will enter an entirely new phase. Tourism in Vladimir can bring substantial income, moreover, it has to be this way.

Fazil Mamedov

«Some Aspects of Formation of New Tourist Image of Baku»

Baku, the capital of the Country of Flames – Azerbaijan – has attracted the attention of many people from the old times. Not only the town’s being the biggest industrial and cultural center of the Caucasus aroused the interest in it but also by its ancient history. According to the presumptions of the famous historian of culture, writer and traveler Thor Heyerdahl, the Absheron Peninsula was one of the cradles of the global civilization.

In this connection, we find it not uninteresting to look at the history of the town in the light of its role in the formation of the religious outlook of not only the local population but also that of the neighboring provinces of the region and their regard of it as the holy piece of three religions – New Jerusalem of a kind.

Let us attempt a more detailed outlook upon the history of the town, the time of establishment of which is lost in the mist of the ages, in precisely this context.

The advantageous geographical situation, the benign climate and several other factors made people settle in this place in the extreme antiquity.

However, not only that but also the rarest combination of such natural factors as mud volcanoes, abundant oil fountains and self-igniting gas springs gushing not only onshore but even offshore aroused interest in this place.

The fame of the “eternal and inextinguishable flames” of Baku therefore spread as far as the parts of the world very remote from here. Quite naturally, the rise of Zoroastrianism, one of the most ancient religions in the world, made Absheron the most worshipped sacred place of this spiritual teaching. Given birth to on the coasts of the Caspian Sea in IV B.C. Zoroastrianism was expanded and reached the farthest from here regions of the Eurasian Continent including Hindustan. Essentially, this religion was the first monotheistic one and forerun such global religions as Judaism, Christianity and Islam, some researchers maintain.

Acceptance of this land by fire-worshippers as one of their biggest sacred places is reflected on the toponym of Baku, which was called Atesh and Baguan in those places. Some scientists including the prominent student of the history of Baku S Ashurbeyli translate this name as ‘The Place of the God of Fire’ (ref. S. Ashurbeyli, The History of the Town of Baku in the Middle Ages, Baku, 1992; pages 45-46). This, in our view, is a very figurative indication of the place of Baku in the hierarchy of the centers of Zoroastrianism. Interestingly enough, it is very rare that toponyms reflect the name of the Almighty; in fact, we can remember no other town name calling the name of the God apart from Allahabad in India and Goteborg in Sweden.

However, the memory of those distant times in which Baku was one of the most respected centers of Zoroastrianism brought us not only the old name of the town but also the only fire-worshipping temple surviving in Azerbaijan – it is the Ateshgyakh Temple now located in a Bakuvi outskirt. In the opinion of Professor D. Ahundov, a prominent researcher of the history of the Azerbaijan architecture, the temple was built at the decline of Zoroastrianism and because the natural gas flame fountains in the more ancient Bakuvi holy places had gone off (D Ahundov, The Ancient and Early Mediaeval Architecture of Azerbaijan, Baku, 1986, page 95).
To this testifies, among other things, the ruins of a Zoroastrist temple in the Icheri Sheher, the Old City of Baku, discovered in the course of archaeological excavation. So do the planning features of the central hall of the Juma Mosque situated in the Icheri Sheher.

After the Arabs had conquered Azerbaijan and imposed Islam as the official religion here, the Ateshgyakh Temple was destroyed eventually – but only to be restored by the Indian pilgrims in XVII as reports one of the inscriptions that the builders left on the temple.

It seems as interesting to us that S. Ashurbeyli also mentioned that, 'The worshipping of fire in Surakhany (the place where the Ateshgyakh Temple is located) was resumed after XV because of the progressing economic and cultural relations with India' (S Ashurbeyli, ibidem, page 327).

Incidentally, this one of the seldom occasions in which a pre-Islamic architecture monument was restored to practically its primeval shape in a Muslim country – this is also a proof of the religious tolerance of the local population. This is especially remarkable as all the other scared places of the fire-worshippers that once existed not only here but also in the neighbor countries were either destroyed or re-built to serve the later confessions. This is true of the already-mentioned Juma Mosque in the Icheri Sheher, the central part of which is presumed to be a Zoroastrist sanctuary in the time anon (A. Bretanitzky, The Architecture of Azerbaijan in XII-XV and its Place in the Architecture of the Near East, Moscow, 1966, pages 156-158).

The echoes of Zoroastrism live in not only old buildings and toponyms but also are impressed in the conscience of the people who live here, because some traditional rites and the celebration of the Novruz – the astronomic New Year – and the rite against the evil eye breathe with the spirit of the fire-worshipping creed. Also notably, the most sacred places include the ‘pir’, which means ‘the fireplace’ (as translated from Greek also, by the way – pyros).

The emergence of Christianity in the Caucasus was marked with a long, complex and sometimes painful process of the struggle between the new religion and the more ancient dogmas. The struggle did not leave out the Caucasian Albania, which included Baku at the turn of the millenniums. Baku was referred to as Albanopolis then. Here, the most ardent propagators of the new religion were such Christian adepts as the Apostle St Gregory the Enlightener, St Faddey and his disciple St Eliseus, and St Bartholomew (F Mamedova, The Political History and Historical Geography of the Caucasian Albania, Baku, 1986, pages 217-230). The surviving legends tell of St Bartholomew, one of the best associates and disciples of Jesus Christ, was executed to the orders of Astiag, the brother of the Albanian King Polymius, by the walls of the Maiden's Tower in the now Icheri Sheher. That was the sorry result of the intrigues and plots of his opponents and of those who had envied him, and this punishment is a proof that the adoption of the new religion was not a smooth process – by far.

Enver Pasha-zade mentioned in his book The Mosques and Churches of the Old Baku that 'Bartholomew is the son of Tolomay. Is mentioned – always after Philipp – when the apostles are enumerated in all the three synoptic Gospels. This name is not found in the fourth Gospel, for that, there is a certain Nathanael in it who hears about Jesus Christ from Philipp, expresses his doubts as to the possibility of the Messiah's having come from Nazareth but is persuaded then in the prophetic clairvoyance of Jesus Christ. Christ refers to him as 'an Israeli who has no slyness in him'. This is the one and the same person. Later, the hagiographic legends tell of the joint sermon of Christianity in Syria and Asia Minor by Bartholomew and Phillip. Eventually, Bartholomew preached in India and Azerbaijan. He was crucified in the town of Baku: (E Pasha-zade, The Mosques and Churches of the Old Baku, Baku, 1997, page 160).

The author continues, 'The second chapel, the stone one, was built in the stronghold, in the so-called Dark Rows near the Maiden's Tower where the first Orthodox Christian Church of Baku called the Old Church used to stand. Built in 1815, the Old Church is cramped, damp, had the poor acoustics and proved uncomfortable, and became dilapidated eventually. It was completely desolate in the 70s the XIX century. The question of re-building the Old Church into a mosque or a Roman-Catholic church was discussed as far back as in 1858, but the Ekzarkh of Georgia the Metropolitan Isidor opposed that idea. In 1892, the semi-tumbledown church was pulled down and replaced by a stone chapel in the "Russian" style by the design of the architect I. Erdel the same year. The chapel cost 2000 roubles to be built and on top of it was hoisted a looking-glass cross. The chapel was called after Bartholomew to honour one of the disciples of Jesus Christ (E Pasha-zade, The Decree, the Collection of Works, page 192).

It is worth mentioning that this chapel was completely destroyed in the 30s the XX century as the Soviet Power was busy putting into non-existence the 'vestiges of the religious past'; the chapel was destroyed alongside the other religious buildings in Baku belonging to the other confessions. However, the recent archaeological excavation along the A. Zeynalli Street in the Icheri Sheher (between the Marketplace and the Maiden's Tower) led to the discovery of the chapel's foundation's remnants.

Concerning the history of the spread of Christianity in Azerbaijan in general and in Baku and the surrounding area, in particular, we should perhaps remember the fact that this religion or, to be precise, its Nestorian branch never disappeared altogether with the advent of Islam, as some presumed earlier. Rather, and evidently, it had persisted until the XIV century, that is, for as long as it took it to survive to coincide with the accession of the Sefevi Dynasty and the imposition of the Shahia Islam here. It would be interesting in this connection to
turn to the mention of Baku in the works of the Mediaeval Arab traveler Abd ar-Rashid al-Bakuvi, who wrote that “There are many settlements nearby the town and each settlement has a stronghold with solid walls. All the people who live in those settlements are Christians, while the townspeople are followers of the persuasion of the Imam ash-Shafi – may the Allah be pleased with them forever!” (Abd ar-Rashid al-Bakuvi, Kitab talhis al-asar va aja ib al-Malik al-Kahhar. Translation, foreword, remarks and appendices by Z M Bunyadov, published by Z M Bunyadov, Moscow, 1972, pages 89-90). Incidentally, there are the remnants of a Nestorian temple later re-built as a mosque in the village of Buzovna nearby Baku.

The VII century and the beginning of the VIII century were marked in Azerbaijan by the replacement of the older creeds by Islam, similarly to many neighbouring countries and regions of the Near East. Remarkably, Azerbaijan did not only prove a fertile soil for the new religion that the Arabs had brought from day one, but also served as a shelter for the daughters of Musa, one of the most respectable members of the dynasty of Mohammed the Prophet and - the daughters of the Seventh Imam – Musa - and Kazym – Hekuma-Khanum and Ragima-Khanum when they fled from intriguing back home. Besides, they were sisters of the Imam Rza whom the Shiahs specially respected. Local women hold still their tombs sacred. Besides, they draw numerous pilgrims from the other Muslim countries.

By the way, Bibi-Heybat, the cult memorial built over the grave of Hekuma-Khanum in the suburb of Baku, was pulled down in the 30s the XX century, too, during the notorious struggle against “the religious past”. Now, however, a new and yet more grandiose edifice stands in the same place thanks to the initiative and personal assistance of the president of the Azerbaijan Republic, Heydar Aliyev.

As regards the Icheri Sheher, the citadel of Baku, the religious buildings within its walls had features of their own though being part of the Shirvan-Absheron architecture school. For instance, they were different in that they had no architecturally organized spaces in front of the mosques and no inner court-yards, the latter being the result of the density in the stronghold, the very area of which was limited, besides. Moreover, several citadel mosques that used to be ingrained in the rows of ordinary buildings did not even have enough premises to organize all the rites to the Shariate commandments. An example of this is the so-called Beylar Mosque; its murdeshirkhana, the traditional place where dead bodies are washed ritually, is located in the neighbouring quarter and not on the premises for want of space around the building.

The limited space in the citadel had a rather important influence on the external looks of the mosques as well as their establishment structure. For instance, even the already-mentioned Juma Mosque, the biggest of them all in the citadel, by the way, was not bigger than 150-200 m^2. Apparently, the early mosques were but little different from the ordinary dwelling houses except for the presence of the mihrab, the praying niche. One can make such a conclusion upon the analysis of the many so-called quarter mosques that survived to our days, including the Lezghi Mosque, the Ibrahim Mosque and the Mohammed Mosque, the earliest mosque of them all not only in Baku but also in the whole of the Caucasus, and dating back to 1078-1079 (A Bretanitzky, ibidem, pages 89-90). It is noteworthy that, evidently, it was built over the ruins of a yet older cult service centre.

The early Bakuvi mosques were one-chamber buildings as a rule; sometimes, however, the inner chambers were divided in two by the central support arch. Their vaults were the stone ogives – due to the lack of building timber. The only light came from small window-openings decorated with the shebeke the stone grates.

It was only in the XIV-XV centuries that the praying halls of the Bakuvi mosques begin to bear not too big stone cupolas. That was very useful for proper arrangement of their inner spaces.

This principle of image-forming was characteristic of many mosques built in the villages surrounding Baku in the time anon. like the in-Baku analogues; they only had stone vaults to begin with and had cupolas later on.

The minarets of the Bakuvi mosques should be mentioned specially; the characteristic and unique manner started with the minaret of the Mohammed Mosque, called the Sinik-Gala (the “Broken Rock”) popularly, and developed up to the beginning of the XX century. That peculiar feature's presence in a number of other topologically related buildings of Shirvan made it possible to put forth the hypothesis of the existence of a very original Shirvan-Absheron artistic architecture school in the Middle Ages (A Bretanitzky, ibidem, pages 477-480). Its architectural associations and impacts were quite wide-spread and even reached the towns on the River Volga (F Mamedov, The Architectural Associations of Mediaeval Azerbaijan's Architecture Schools, Baku, 1988, pages 33-60).

The second half of the XIX century and the early XX century were a very important period in the history of the town because that was the time of transition from the feudalism to the capitalism. While the transition was not particularly painful in many other provinces of Azerbaijan as well as of the whole of the Caucasus and the relationships remained largely patriarchal there, the boisterous use of crude oil in Baku made sure that the transition was very energetic. The actively developing industries, the stronger economic and cultural relations with other countries and the emergence of new industrialists and of the proletariat class made sure that Baku turned from a backstage provincial town of the Russian Empire into one of the most important cities of it in a very short period of time. Suffice to remember, the population of Baku was tripled and exceeded 500 thousand from 1897 till 1913. For comparison, the populations of Moscow and St Petersburg rose by 68% and 71% in the same period (The Economic and Social Development of Baku, the Compendium, Baku, 1982, pages 28).
Such a quite robust economic growth of the town had not only demographic but also composition impacts on the population. The ethnic and confessional parameters of the population of Baku represented a rather motley picture between the XIX and the XX centuries, as can be deduced from the mere fact that the new and expanding areas of the town had not only mosques (Hajji Jabrail, Hajji Gasim, Hajji Javad, Hajji Zarbeli and the big synod mosque Teze Pir) but also the Bahá'í's Medrese in the Chadorovaya Street (the M A Aliyev Street now), the Synagogue and the Roman-Catholic Church in the Kaspisykaya Street (the R Behbudov Street now), the Lutheran Church in the Telefonnaya Street (the 28th of May Street now) and several Gregorian and Orthodox churches including the Alexander Nevsky Orthodox Church, the biggest one in the Caucasus.

However, the chapel as well as the aforementioned Bibi-Heybat cult memorial and the St Bartholomew Chapel, as well as the Gregorian church in the Bondarnaya Street (the Sh Badalbeyli Street now) and the Roman-Catholic church were pulled down in the course of the “struggle against the reactionary religious legacy” in the very first few years of the rule of the Soviet Power in Baku.

The existing spiritual links that had tied many generations of the Azeri people were disrupted with the advent of the Bolsheviks to Baku in 1920 and the institution of the Soviet Power. The notorious struggle against the religion and the official separation of the Church from the State did not only impose a ban on building mosques and other cult premises, but also made certain that quite a few cult buildings were pulled down and many more still were shut down.

It was not until Azerbaijan gained national independence that the tendency of bringing the people back to their spiritual roots began to manifest itself. It did not take long before construction activities and restoration of many monuments of religious architecture were resumed in the towns and villages of Azerbaijan. Not only individual mosques but also proper architectural complexes including also medrese (religious schools), libraries and other facilities are being built. The “Irshad” Islamic Studies Centre, a unique institution in the whole Caucasus, has been built in Baku. Also, the new Synagogue is built and it is planned to erect a Roman-Catholic church.

The appeal of Baku as a sacred place for three religions will make it possible to show many visitors a completely new aspect of the city and draw attention not only to the site rich in numerous historical monuments but also demonstrate it as a worshipping center for the adepts of the different confessions.

Olga Pirogova

«Management of Historical Cities»

Verkhoturie is one of the oldest towns in the Middle Urals. In 1988 the Executive Committee of Soviet of People’s Deputies in Sverdlovsk region approved the list of 14 historical towns. But just 10 towns were happened to be in the list of historical towns approved in 1990 by the Resolution of Collegium of the Ministry of Culture of the RSFSR and the Presidium of the Central Council of the All-Russia Society for Protection of Monuments of History and Culture (ARSPMHC). These are Ekaterinburg, Alapaevsk, Verkhoturie, Iribit, Kamensk-Uralskij, Kamishlov, Krasnoufimsk, Nijnij Tagil, Talitsa, Turinsk. The status of historical towns was not approved for such towns as V. Salda, N. Salda, Polevskoi and Neviyansk. The situation in the tourist excursion activity has been radically changing since mid 90-s. This is connected not only with the tourist discovery of the region, but also with the purposeful policy of the regional government, concerned with historical and cultural sights’ preservation and reconstruction. A great amount of work has been done in Verkhoturie, Neviyansk, Kamensk-Uralskij and other historical towns.

Road building is also crucial for the development of tourism in the region. For example, the building of the road to the north of the region allowed Verkhoturie to be visited by tourists.

Nowadays such historical towns and cities as Ekaterinburg, Neviyansk, Verkhoturie became tourist centers. Less popular are N. Tagil, Alapaevsk, Kamensk-Uralskij. It’s also worth mentioning that Alapaevsk is an “auxiliary” place to visit during excursions to the museum-reserve in N. Sinyachikha. The main place of interest in Kamensk-Uralskij is not some historical sights but the aqua park. The rest historical towns are hardly included in the sphere of cultural tourism.

The state of matters in such famous Ural region’s town as Verkhoturie is characteristic of the problems of cultural tourism development in historical towns. The problems of cultural tourism development in this town are mutual for many historical towns of Russia. They are:

- lack of satisfactory tourism infrastructure in the region, that corresponds modern criteria (hotels, catering, leisure, transportation, etc.);
- lack of any tourist complex in the town structure;
- lack of special program for cultural tourism development in the town.
Besides these problems there exist such difficulties as: inconvenient geographical position (distant from the region center, absence of the “Ring route” tour, lack of time for visiting sights). The tourism infrastructure is not developed in the town (the hotel is not ready to accommodate tourists, there are maintenance problems, high room rates, catering can’t provide high level service, absence of leisure and transportation). The administration and businessmen don’t possess enough finance to invest in tourism. There is no stability in tourist flow, no regional tourist program.

Tourist regional program is worth mentioning. At first the efforts of the municipal administration in turning Ekaterinburg into tourist centre can not be productive without tourism development in the region. Secondly “Silver Ural Ring” program developed in 2004 is actually an attempt to solve problems of resort complex firms through tourism business. That’s why this program as it is today can not influence the tourism development. But regional program is important and it is necessary to develop it paying attention to all subjects of tourism business.

The rational strategy of tourist – excursion complex development for the improvement of cultural tourism in historical towns must be bound with a town and its citizens and must suppose the creation of the developed system of both short – time guided and long – time tourist service of various tourist contingents.

In conclusion it’s vital to notice, that there is still no understanding in society of the fact that tourism is not just sights and historic places but service. It is the service that must bring financial comings, which so many historical towns are interested in. Tourism is a kind of business and it should develop according to the business laws. The development of investment projects, attraction of finance for these business projects but not asking for budgeting is the leading trend in cultural tourism development in historical towns and in the whole tourism business as well.
ROLE OF MUSEUMS IN PRESERVATION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE
AND DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL TOURISM

Inga Karaja

«General Approach to Museum Activities Development»

With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the former soviet republics encountered fundamental changes relating to independent state status and new economic relations. Transitional process is slow and sometimes painful, especially in the field of cultural heritage.

Discussions on plenary and section sessions of the international conference once again confirmed the problems that are common to all post soviet countries, such as insufficient government subsidies for preserving cultural heritage and lack of experience in large number of institutions related to cultural heritage, particularly in the museums.

Speeches made by top museum managers and experts V.A Gusev (General Director of the Russian National Museum), V.I. Tolstoy (Director of the National Memorial and Nature Reserve Museum of L.N. Tolstoy "Iasnaia Poliana"), T.D. Panova and A.V. Dremailova (managers of departments of National Historic and Cultural Museum Reserve "Moscow Kremlin"), J.K Tchistov (Director of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography of Peter the Great) and others have once again demonstrated that museums are unable to function effectively because of inefficient management and administration systems, absence of public relations and educational programs aimed at increasing knowledge of local communities and their involvement in museum activities, low level of knowledge of fund-raising strategies, inadequate experience in managing and presenting collections, need of developing information technologies in museums and lack of interaction among museums (national and international) and other institutes.

During the section session urgent issues, common to all participating countries, were addressed. Coming from the idea of the conference basic problems in the museum field were defined:

I. In the last two decades the so-called post soviet countries have experienced large-scale transformations in state systems, economy and administration. Society’s political beliefs and social priorities have changed. In such environment the role of the culture as a whole cannot remain unchanged, as well as the role of museums, not only in terms of preserving historical and cultural heritage, but also in terms of developing socio-cultural and economic life of countries.

II. It is necessary to reevaluate the attitude in society and in the government towards culture (towards museums), from perception of culture (museums) as objects of spending budgetary funds to understanding of cultural heritage (museums) as a resource of social and economic development of territories and as an active participant in this activity.

III. Certainly the main task for museums at all times remains preservation, acquisition and wide presentation of historical and cultural heritage, only this strengthens significantly the role of the culture (museums) as a humanitarian resource. Museums can and should be:

- catalysts in developing territories
- active participants in the process of developing territories along with authorities and businesses
- serve as moral and public guarantors that transformations on the territory carry socially oriented character
- serve as the basis for educational processes on the territory
- should develop and implement cultural and cognitive tourism on the territory

Taking into consideration the above mentioned and acknowledging the critical role which museums play in education, preservation and development of cultural heritage, originality and cultural cognitive tourism, participants of the conference presented the following proposals for specific action plans:

- To achieve differentiated individualistic approach to museum activities from the side of the government, considering the specifics, sites, possession of resources and potential.
- To assert the effectiveness of complex system approach to interaction of museums with all active participants of the process of territorial development, regardless of their subordination to departments or administrations.
- Most importantly create the legislative base for carrying out complex socio-cultural and economic activities of museums in the interests of population- the consumer of maximum amount of quality services.
Elena Gagarina

«The Moscow Kremlin and Cultural Tourism»

Nowadays, in the Russian Federation there are more than 2000 museums. 114 of them are museums-preserves and museums-estates. They possess 11% museum funds in Russia and 24% visitors of all museum institutions. Museums-preserves play important role in preservation of national heritage of the people of the Russian Federation. They secure complex protection and effective use of cultural and natural heritage of both national and international value. Museums-preserves, among which the Moscow Kremlin State Historical and Cultural Museum-Preserve occupies a particular position, are particularly important for forming an attractive image of Russia abroad. The Moscow Kremlin is a monument of culture of world-wide importance, a center of political and spiritual life of the state, a symbol of Russia.

An act of international recognition of exceptional historical and artistic value of the Kremlin architectural masterpieces was including of the Moscow Kremlin into the List of particularly valuable objects of the Russian Federation in 1990 and UNESCO World Heritage List.

The world fame and significance of the museum, the richness of its collections marks it out in Moscow cultural life. The Museum is kind of a visiting card of Moscow and Russia. Being a world-wide known brand, Moscow Kremlin Museums have many contacts with world museums and cultural institutions. It gives a bright opportunity of exchanging interesting projects (displays, conferences, scientific editions etc.) as well as sharing experience in organization of particular programs with colleagues.

Either a Russian or a foreign tourist visiting Moscow today, considers a tour of the Moscow Kremlin a necessary point of his journey. Lately, in our museum there has been noticed sizable growth of professional tourism, i.e. pilgrimage. The sections of congress tourism and business trips, individual and family tourism have also increased. 30% of tourism stream belongs to the children's section. Every year more than 1,5 million people get acquainted with the museum complex as the Moscow Kremlin is one of the most frequently visited museums of the world. It makes the museum particularly responsible for both monuments' condition and preservation and organization of reception of tourists and professionalism of the staff. The unique historical and cultural complex with exceptional museum collections allows satisfying interests of variable audiences. At the moment, we offer over 50 types of excursion and cultural programs on tourism market.

The impression and image of a museum depends on the level of organization of tourists' reception. Creation of modern infrastructure and conditions for normal museum service is an urgent problem we are to solve. Recently, a lot has been made to improve this field of the museum activity. The analysis of visiting of the museum complex gives evidence to the point of maximum admission quantity of museum monuments, particularly in tourist season “peaks”.

It is quite clear at the moment that all the potentialities for widening of the museum activity in the Kremlin territory in the vicinity of the highest administrative bodies have been exhausted. The widening of the museum activity through including of new objects outside the Moscow Kremlin territory and forming modern infrastructure is to allow reorganizing the museum. The nowadays museum of “one visit”; the majority of visitors of which are foreign tourists and Russian citizens from local regions, would become a modern museum complex, the one to be visited often by the whole family on a family weekend, a holiday, etc.

Vladimir Gusev

«The Russian Museum: Virtual Branch»

The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch is a project of creation of cultural, educational and information centers in the educational and cultural establishments using modern computer technologies in their activities. The project is part of the Russia programme aimed at a long-term collaboration with the art museums of Russian cities.

Aims and tasks of the programme include: using the possibilities, experience and academic, methodical, administrative, creative and production potential of the Russian Museum as a major center of national art to create a single cultural and information network covering the whole country. Overcoming the breakdown in relations between the museums of the country's two largest cities and the towns and provinces and dispelling myths confining Russian art life and the national artistic process to two capitals – Moscow and St Petersburg. Assistance in consolidation of the system of inter-regional and intra-regional academic, creative and professional links between national museums, striking a new system of partnership between the Russian Museum and national
museums of art in new social and economic climate.

Cultivation of modern means of communication and advanced technologies will enable to expand the application of the museum programmes – academic and educational – to disseminate the knowledge on the history of Russian culture and art among all sections of the population.

The project has been launched and carried out in partnership with the Sistema Finance Investments Corporation. The president of the corporation, Vladimir Yevtushenkov is the president of the Board of Guardians of the State Russian Museum Development Foundation.

The general sponsor of The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch programme is Mobile TeleSystems. (The agreement on collaboration was signed in Moscow on March 24, 2004). The aims of the virtual branches of the Russian Museum are to provide the Internet access to the masterpieces of the Russian Museum collections to all citizens of Russian towns, to initiate all socially active groups of population and the young audience, in particular to the treasures of the national art.

All the cities hosting the art exhibitions from the Russian Museum collections will open its virtual branches. The opening of such branches accompanied the exhibitions in Nizhny Novgorod, Saratov, Samara, Petrozavodsk, Kaliningrad, Murmansk, Perm, Yekaterinburg. Nevertheless, the geography of the virtual part of the programme is much bigger than its exhibition component. The first virtual branch of the Russian Museum was created in the town of Sosnovy Bor, the Leningrad region in spring 2003 and in the town of Lisy Nos in December of the same year. The opening of twenty-seven virtual branches in the towns of the Leningrad region is planned in future. In 2004 the museum opened its virtual branches in the Alexander Herzen Russian Pedagogical University in St Petersburg, in the palace of culture of the town of Kirishi, in the Mikhail Lomonosov State University in Moscow and in the Tver regional picture gallery in summer 2005, in the Russian Museum grammar school – in autumn 2005, in the Yekaterinburg university and the first branch outside Russia opened in the town of Kohtla-Jarve, Estonia.

The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch centers have been created in 17 cities of Russia in 2003-05.

Founded over a hundred years ago the State Russian Museum is now home to the largest national art collection (about four hundred thousand works of art covering all forms and genres embracing a thousand years period of its history). The museum has published a great number of albums and catalogues including those accompanying the Russian Museum exhibitions, popular science films on the history of the museum palaces and collections.

More than 20 years ago the SRM began to introduce computer technologies in the museum activity. From the middle of the 1990s a work on creation of multimedia programs for temporary exhibitions and thematic programs on the history of the palaces and collections of the museum has been in full progress. In 1998 on the occasion of the 100-anniversary of the State Russian Museum the first information zone was launched in the Mikhailovsky Palace of the museum. The programs on history of the palace, as well as the electronic guidebook of the Russian Museum exhibitions have been installed in the information touch screen kiosks. At present there are two information zones in the St Michael's Castle and in the Marble Palace offering multimedia programs on history and restoration of palaces, programs on temporary exhibitions and collections of the Russian Museum. The information zone with an electronic archeological exposition is planned to open in the Stroganov Palace in the nearest future. The idea of creation of The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch centers is a result of accumulation of computer programs, and also a large number of video films and printed materials.

A number of programs is based on three dimensional computer modeling that enabled to create three-dimensional models of the museum rooms, to reconstruct the original palace interiors as well as to join the “tour of the space of a painting”.

The Russian Center for museum pedagogics and children's creativity was created in the Russian Museum in 1990. The center has developed methodical material for teaching children and schoolchildren the language of fine art. The video films and CDs released by the Center for museum pedagogics introduce numerous forms, genres, styles, trends and schools of fine art.

Academic, methodical, video and multimedia material developed by the museum within a long period of time and its experience of creation of the museum computer zones suggested an idea of cultural and educational centers on the basis of education and cultural establishments, known as The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch.

The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch is a centre framed on the basis of academic, educational and methodological investigations of the leading museum experts. The centre cultivates modern computer technologies.

PURPOSES:
• effective familiarization of the visitors of the Virtual Branches with treasures of the Russian culture
• broadening and deepening of knowledge on the history of Russian art, collections and activities of the Russian Museum by means of a free access to electronic-digital and printed materials
• creation of a single cultural and information space throughout the country

TASKS:
1. Public access to diverse resources of Russian fine art and culture and practice of museum work.
2. Creation and active circulation of materials on the masterpieces of art and permanent expositions of the Russian Museum on various media. Efficient information on new exhibitions and major events in academic

Proceedings of the International Conference
3. Introduction of multimedia programs and Internet technologies in teaching and educational process on humanitarian and art-aesthetic cycles disciplines in the educational establishments of the regions where The Virtual Branches are located.

4. Support of cultural-educational programmes, cultural and social projects of the museum. Promotion of actions contributing to their implementation.

5. Encouragement of collaboration between the connoisseurs of art, educational and cultural establishments and the museum pedagogical and educational departments.

6. Counseling on the issues of fine arts and application of modern technologies in art education.

7. Creation of the virtual branches network.

8. Integration of museums and universities into a single cultural and information space.

The academic and educational zone presents long-term investigations of the museum academic section (more than 200 items): publications (albums, catalogues, methodical manuals), multimedia programmes on CDs and DVDs, video films featuring museum collection and Russian art history. The visitors can get acquainted with the Russian Museum website and other Internet-resources devoted to the cultural heritage of Russia.

This zone provides space where classes for children and adults are held, some of them being based on the methodology of the Russian Centre for Museum Pedagogics and Children’s Creativity. Formed in 1990, the Centre for Museum Pedagogics deals with the development of training techniques used when teaching the language of fine arts to children and schoolchildren within the framework of the Hello, Museum! programme. The programme is accompanied by manuals, video films, slides and CDs.

The academic sector of the Russian Museum has developed interactive CD programs featuring the museum exhibitions. These programs provide retrospective surveys of the most important events and exhibitions of the State Russian Museum and offer the visitors of the center a virtual tour of a temporary exhibition and enable to arrange classes on such themes as “Three Centuries of Russian Art”, “Painting, Graphic Art, Sculpture in the Russian Art of the 1860s”, “Impressionism in Russia”, “Russian Futurism”, “Russian Portraiture of the 20th Century”, “A Portrait of the City and its Citizens”, “Jesus Christ in Fine Art”, “Religious St. Petersburg”, as well as to study creative oeuvre of such Russian artists as I.Aivazovsky, B.Kustodiev, K.Malevich, N.Goncharova. The center also offers “The History of a Masterpiece” cycle of programs, an interactive program featuring the open storages of Russian sculpture.

The multimedia cinema introduces its visitors to the programmes created with the use of the latest breakthroughs in the information technologies and the virtual reality technologies, the three-dimensional computer simulation. Here the programs on the history of the museum collection and palaces, multimedia films on the history of creation and restoration of the Russian Museum palaces, Ludwig Museum in the Russian Museum, the Glance from the Russian Museum series of programmes about the cultural bonds between St Petersburg and cities-members of the project and histories of collections of the local museums of art are demonstrated.

The multimedia cinema demonstrates The Virtual World of the Russian Museum project which:

- enables to take virtual tours of the four palaces of the Russian Museum complex to see their unique interiors and to get acquainted with the exposition of the museum
- presents an opportunity of creation of an interactive exposition – a showroom existing in virtual reality
- demonstrates the process of historical reconstruction of the museum interiors
- offers virtual tours of paintings – passing from one picture into another, including specially designed 3D space based on the subjects of both pictures. Virtual tour of a painting allows one to become a direct “participant of the events”, contributes to the development of creative imagination, and is created for children.

The local net that will unite the participants of The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch project (museums, universities, and schools) is in the process of creation. The net will enable: to watch the events taking place in the Russian Museum (exhibition opening ceremonies, etc.) on-line; to circulate news; to gain access to the new multimedia programmes specially developed by the Russian Museum; to carry out distance learning projects.

Within the framework of the project of creation of a local network of the Virtual branches a number of Internet – bridges have been carried out: with the Saratov university of social economics, the Perm State university named after A. Gorky, the Moscow State university named after M. Lomonosov. Such bridges offer an opportunity to watch the events taking place in the Russian Museum on-line.

In May 2005 The Virtual Russian Museum: development of the project analytical-project seminar was held within the framework of the project. The seminar is organized by the Russian Museum and the Museum of the Future Independent Noncommercial Organization of Culture with the support of the Sistema Finance Investments Corporation and the Mobile TeleSystems. The seminar was devoted to preparation of museum and educational establishments for management and development of innovational structure of – The Russian Museum:
The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch centers function on the basis of educational and cultural establishments. Since 2003 the virtual branches of the Russian Museum have been visited by nearly a hundred thousand users.

The programs offered by the centers opened at the universities (Nizhny Novgorod, Saratov, Perm, Alexander Herzen Pedagogical University in Saint Petersburg, the Moscow State Lomonosov University) have been included in the educational process. On the basis of the centers classes on the «World art culture» and other courses of human sciences are held.

The centers created in the museums (Samara, Petrozavodsk, Kaliningrad, Murmansk, Perm), are intended for both individual visitors, and for groups from schools, kindergartens, colleges and universities.

In the Leningrad region several branches were opened on the basis of the centers of information technologies of the extended education establishments. In these centers lectures on history of fine art and architecture, competitions for schoolchildren, methodical seminars for schoolteachers and teachers of preschool education are held.

The staff of the virtual branches not only actively use the material offered by the Russian Museum but develop their own programs of lectures and classes bearing in mind the peculiarities of their audience.

In 2006 the museum plans to open its centres in the following national educational and cultural establishments:

- the Saint Petersburg State University
- the National Art Museum of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), (Yakutsk)
- the North Caucasian State University
- the Kirovsk Regional Art Museum named after V.M. and A.M. Vasnetsov
- the Volsk Historical Museum of local law
- the Udmurts Republican Museum of Fine Arts (Izhevsk)

In September 2005 in collaboration with the Moscow office of the UNESCO the presentation of the museum project was held within the framework of the Museum Management: Museums in the 21 Century seminar for curators of the art museums of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Byelorussia, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Russia. The delegates were acquainted with the multimedia programs and educational resources, used by the virtual branches in their activities. The seminar suggested new perspectives in collaboration and ways of development of the project on the territory of the CIS.

The Russian Museum has already ended negotiations on the opening of the virtual branch of the Russian Museum with the National Art Museum of Byelorussia.

In June 2005 a roundtable was held on the issues of collaboration in the sphere of culture between the twin-cities Antwerp and St Petersburg accompanied by the presentation of The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch project.

As a result of the roundtable a protocol was signed reflecting the interest in mutual collaboration in the future development of The Russian Museum: the Virtual Branch project in 2006-12 to promote the museum and its collections in Antwerp, regular rotation of collections and exhibition projects, creation of joint projects devoted to historical and cultural ties between St Petersburg and Antwerp including those within the framework of The Russian Ways in Europe – Ways of Partnership and Cultural Collaboration programme.

Maka Dvalishvili

«Cultural Industries – the Case of the Museum Sources and Traditional Georgian Crafts»

The cultural industries has been an integral part of the cultural history of different nations; among the treasures and traditions left behind by ancient civilizations that are currently on displays at the different museums as well as are kept in the traditions of folk-art, reflect the brilliant craftsmanship and creativity of yesteryear; during the centuries this production has been a source not only of cultural pride but also of economic livelihood, exchange of ideas, creation, creativity.

In the meantime the cultural industries can be observed as the source for economic benefits for cultural institutions, and first of all for the individual creative producers, artists, etc., the creative industries as a means to turn the cultural heritage into the economically benefited product. “Recognizing the fundamental right of
social groups and societies, to create, disseminate and distribute their cultural goods and services, including their traditional cultural expressions, to have access thereto and to benefit there for their own development; emphasizing the vital role of the creative act, which nurtures and renovates cultural expressions and hence the vital role of artists and other creators, whose work needs to be, endowed with appropriate intellectual property rights. (CLT/CPD/2004/CONF.201/1 Paris, June 2004).

It is encouraged that the cultural heritage to be a factor of economic growth and employment through the product development, business training, promotional and marketing activities; the source that combines the fields of promotion at international markets, encouraging exports and cultural tourism.

Staring from 1997 Georgian Arts and Culture Center in cooperation with international organizations and local museums is implementing “The Georgian Crafts and Museum reproductions development program”, within the program the Georgian crafts and museum reproductions lines have been developed, the production have been presented at the international fairs and the traveling exhibitions, more than 300 individual artisans have been generating the income, renovating the small and medium crafts based enterprises, etc.

In May 2005 with the assistance of the UNESCO Moscow office and OSI, Budapest, under the program Cultural Dialogue “Europe- Caucasus – Asia” the roundtable meeting of the Cultural Industries Development of the cluster counties have been conducted.

The experience gained during the implementation of the GACC program showed out the sustainability of the innovative idea of the development of the Cultural Industries based on the museum sources and traditional crafts and its goals of the Heritage Safeguarding and Cultural Tourism Development. At the meantime the program seeks for its further development and fostering of the involved components.

Tatiana Panova, Alexander Dremajlov

«Computer Historical Reconstruction of Moscow Kremlin»

FILM

The 3D historical reconstruction is dedicated to the history of creation of the unique Moscow Kremlin complex in the 12th to the 20th century.

The film includes historical reconstructions of the architectural complex of five periods:
1. The wooden Kremlin of the 12th-14th centuries
2. The white-stone Kremlin of the 14th-15th centuries.
3. The brick Kremlin of the 16th century
5. The brick Kremlin of modern look.

The relief and location of ancient buildings represented in the computer film is based on archeological excavations and fundamental scientific research. Archive data and sources were used for creation of ancient buildings’ outlook. In case of the lack or absence of historical materials, there were used historical analogues. The film’s plot includes passages through towers and streets of the ancient town, reconstructed on contemporaries’ reminiscents.

Research assistants, selecting archive materials, collected a database of 3000 images, i.e. maps, plans, sections, gravures, water-colours, photos etc. On the database there was created the 3D historical reconstruction of the Moscow Kremlin architectural complex.

The Moscow Kremlin (brief information)

The Moscow Kremlin is a symbol of Russian statehood, one of the world largest architectural ensembles and richest treasure houses of historical relics, monuments of culture and history. It is located on the Borovitsky (Grove) Hill. At the turn of the 11th -12th century there appeared a Slavic settlement and a new town was founded. By the end of the 15th century, the Kremlin became residence of the state and spiritual power in the country. In the 18th and 19th centuries, when the capital was transferred to Saint-Petersburg, Moscow still possessed the status of the first city. In 1918 it became the capital again, and the Kremlin turned to be the place of location of the highest power bodies. Nowadays, the Moscow Kremlin houses the Residence of the President of the Russian Federation.

The Moscow Kremlin town architectural ensemble have formed for centuries. By the end of the 17th century, the Kremlin was a real town with developed planning, complex system of squares, streets and side-ways, “upper” and “embankment” gardens.

In the 18th-19th centuries, the Kremlin was rebuilt. A lot of medieval architectural complexes were replaced by monumental palaces and office blocks. They changed the Kremlin’s outlook, however, it saved its individuality
and national peculiarity.

The Moscow Kremlin territory includes architectural monuments of the 14th-20th centuries, gardens and parks. They form the ensembles of Cathedral, Ivan, Senate, Palace and Trinity Squares as well as Saviour, Borovitsky and Palace streets.

In 1990-s, the Moscow Kremlin architectural complex, its treasure house, Red Square and the Alexander Gardens were included into the List of particularly valuable objects of Russia and the UNESCO World Cultural Heritage List. The museums, located in the Kremlin territory were transformed into the State Historical and Cultural Museum-Preserve “The Moscow Kremlin”.

The unique Moscow Kremlin museum complex includes the Armoury Chamber, the Assumption, Archangel’s and Annunciation Cathedral, the Church of Laying Our Lady’s Holy Robe, the Patriarch’s Palace and the Twelve Apostles’ Church, the Ivan the Great Bell-Tower complex, collection of artillery weapons and bells.

Creators

The film of the 3-D historical reconstruction of the Moscow Kremlin architectural complex was created by the Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany, in collaboration with Moscow Kremlin Museums, Russia.

The creation of the computer film was initiated by the Art and Exhibition Hall of the Federative Republic of Germany. Moscow Kremlin Museums and Art and Exhibition Hall of the Federative Republic of Germany organized a display in Bonne “Moscow Kremlin through the 850-year history”. The display was accompanied by the computer film of the 3D reconstruction of the Moscow Kremlin architectural complex.

Art and Exhibition Hall of the Federative Republic of Germany, in general, houses exhibitions from museums of famous architectural complexes, e.g. Vatican, Venetian museums, Moscow Kremlin Museums. The gallery’s staff do their best to introduce images of ancient architectural complexes into displays for a visitor viewing museum items or paintings could be deep in the historical and architectural atmosphere of the most ancient places of the civilization. For ten years, the Art and Exhibition Hall of the Federative Republic of Germany forms exhibition concepts including virtual 3D reconstructions of historical architectural complexes. In an exhibition hall there is a screen, projector and computer. The hall can seat 100 spectators. Every hour runs the “virtual film”. A consultant comments the film and answers spectators’ questions.

The Technical University of Darmstadt, architectural faculty, department of CAD reconstruction

3-D historical reconstruction of ancient walls, towers and separate buildings of the Moscow Kremlin was executed by students of the architectural faculty of the technical University of Darmstadt under the supervision of Prof. Manfred Koob. The students modeled the modern Kremlin buildings as well as the ones that have not survived till our days. Future architects work with historical materials. Prof. Koob uses the situation as an educational process. To create a 3-D model of an ancient building not survived the students study materials from archives and museums, analogies of construction and architectural details of buildings survived till our days. The students are high qualified in CAD programming, form separate buildings’ “boxes” and later décor elements.

The Russian Humanitarian University

The 3-D historical reconstruction of the Moscow Kremlin architectural complex is an educational project. The technical University of Darmstadt invited students of the Russian Humanitarian University to participate in the project. Either Russian and German students studied the Moscow Kremlin architectural complex, worked with specialists, got acquainted with historical and archive documents. The task of the Russian students was to collect information on the project.

Moscow Kremlin Museums made scientific contribution to the project. Museum research assistants gave data of the latest archeological research as well as a lot of graphic materials on history of development of the Moscow Kremlin fortifications and buildings in the Kremlin territory.

Use

Computer film “Der Moskauer Kreml. 850 Jahre Baugeschichte im Computer” (“The Moscow Kremlin. The 850-year history of the architectural complex in computer”), the German language, 24 min, DVD, 2004, is demonstrated at the exhibition “The Moscow Kremlin through the 850-year history”.

Moscow Kremlin Museums use the computer film in educational programs, dedicated to the history of development of the Moscow Kremlin complex as illustrative material.
We live in a very interesting and complicated time and these definitions applied to the field of culture as well. Regarding museums, we ought to differentiate between the role of the central museums in the big cities (the Hermitage, the Russian Museum and the Tretyakov Gallery) and that of the provincial museums and preserves, such as the Yasnaya Polyana, Solovky, Pushkinogorye and the Kulikovo Field.

The importance of museums to the life and progress of the provinces should never be underestimated. The experience of the recent decades shows that a museum is often a town-promoting or structuring object in a rural settlement or a municipal locality. A museum has to solve the daily problems of the local community and this task is carried out successfully more often than not. Apart from their main role, museums become active economic operators forced to handle the social problems of the local communities; they act as the leading employers in their localities. Museums are active in the fields of enlightenment and education, in restoration of the traditional applied arts and crafts, souvenir manufactures, agriculture, environmental affairs and tourism... A museum today is a catalyst of development and an active participant of the social and economic changes in the locality rather than just a target for state investments. All this accumulated experience of the reserve museums is ignored in the course of the current reforms. It is necessary to re-consider the government's and the public attitude to culture, depart from its vision as an object of application of the state budget resources and to appreciate culture as a subject of the socio-economic of territories.

The Yasnaya Polyana memorial estate has been developing actively over the few years past; the range of activity as well as its territorial boundaries have been expanded. The museum established a network of branches in Tula Province, namely, in Tula, Nikolaevskoye-Vyazemskoye, Krapivna and Pirogovo.

The Yasnaya Polyana is experienced in implementing major partner projects already. For example, the historical re-construction of the Kozlova Zaseka railway station 2.5 km away from the memorial estate and the launch of the comfortable Moscow-Yasnaya Polyana tourist train were organised together with the Moscow-Kursk Railway Authority in 2001.

In the middle of last year, the Yasnaya Polyana Memorial Estate, the Shekinoazot Chemical Factory and the Tula Province Administration signed the Yasnaya Polyana Agreement representing an open public movement based on the idea of practical and business-like amalgamation of all the creative and socially-conscious forces in the community for steady development of the province with the reliance on the humanitarian resources. The joint operations have been started in the territory already.

The main goals of the Yasnaya Polyana Agreement are to rehabilitate the living environment, improve the standards of living comprehensively, promote environmental awareness and related lifestyles and improve the investment appeal of Central Russia and of its separate provinces, big and small ones.

The partnership between the State, the culture and the business is a way to solve the problem of resurrection of the historical towns of Russia. We decided to take to this way in our work to restore Krapivny, the former chief town of the local district, the history of which is closely connected to Leo Tolstoy and his path.

We find such partnership alliances as this very promising. This model for activity of the memorial and reserve museums should not be destroyed; quite on the contrary, the experience ought to be studied and distributed.
cover the elementary public utility fees, whilst logistics improvement and solution of many other vital problems are quite out of the question.

There are other factors impeding development and downplaying viability of the museums in the country apart from the logistics and funding problem, such as sub-standard museum management, the outdated exposition, accounting and storage system, poor knowledge of museum marketing and fund-raising strategies, shortage of enlightenment programmes, the catastrophic decline in attendance, the under-developed process of teaching the professional human resources, the shortage of the advanced information technologies at the museums and the inefficiency of the legislative basis.

The spectrum of problems is far from being small and it is obvious that the museum business of the country is in need of complete re-organisation, instant and radical reforms and generation of flexible management mechanisms so as to help bring the museums of Georgia closer to the present-day international standards.

The Ministry of Culture, Preservation of Monuments and Sports of Georgia is largely responsible for the museum reform's implementation; the Ministry has been working on the museum re-organisation programme for the second year now but, naturally, cannot solve on its own such difficult problems as the national museums are facing. The museum community should realise that it is not only the government that has to meet financial demands or solve their vital problems. Quite naturally, the Ministry, a governmental body, retains its co-ordinating function since it is to initiate a well-developed heritage protection strategy and integrate it into the public life. According to the laws, this will play an important role not only in pursuing the innovative cultural policy but also in forming the public opinion about the museums. We should re-consider our attitude to museums as keepers of the culture values. Rather, communication with the public and getting closer to the public spiritual needs and vital interests should be the main missions of museums.

The intensive integration of museums into the modern society is one of the main goals of the museum reforms. The museum will rid itself of the outdated elitist concept of the last century but will develop a new and accessible method of museum material appreciation, unorthodox programmes for children and adults and for visitors of all categories, all in the course of the search for the ways of interaction between museums and the society. The said novelties certainly require institution of specialist museum bodies and adoption of a differentiated approach to everything.

Naturally, the museum reform will reflect the resource locations and the potential of each museum. As regards the state-owned ones, it is planned to draw initiatives from representatives of the leading museums (the National Museum of Georgia, the Zugdidi and Kutaisi Museum) and to ensure high activity of the relevant non-governmental organisations, especially of the Museum Association of Georgia, and of the civil sector. These can address and handle such issues the very presentation of which might arouse scepticism in the officialdom circles.

The Ministry of Culture, Preservation of Monuments and Sports works intensively on re-establishing the museums as the legal entities subject to the public law. This will help set higher standards of quality for the independent museums and streamline interaction with the state bodies and other institutions, including the legislative ones, which is very importance what with the currently chaotic privatisation that might put reserve museums or architectural museums in the sight of the business.

It appears as though it would be impossible to find and implement new institutional and economic mechanisms to preserve the cultural heritage or the cognitive tourism unless there is close co-operation between the state and the private sectors.

In view of the above, the museums certainly must not only advise the government about their affairs and draw its support, but also shape up public opinion an energise the enlightenment work (discussions, debates, press-conferences, target actions and involvment of mass media to cover or raise museum business problems) – so as to attract investments.

The range of problem is not changing yet, in wait for decisive steps taken. The museum and collection boards and managers ought to implement radical reforms in close interaction with various state bodies, museum organisations and the civil society. This process should be across the whole range of co-operation, from investment-raising to enlightenment programmes; this means that museum institutes should be set up for no tangible results are achievable without them.
There is a specific local organisation form for management of the cultural and natural heritage in one set in Russia that has been efficient since the 60s. This form is that of the reserve museums established in lieu of museums. The reserve museums serve to protect and use various kinds of cultural heritage inclusive of the cultural sites and sights, immovable monuments of history and culture and their ensembles, museum collections and the natural heritage objects being the historical parks, forests, water resources, et cetera. The existing reserve museums have wide function ranges going beyond the boundaries that the effective laws set for the classic museums limiting them to studying, preserving and exhibiting publicly their collections. The main distinctive feature of the reserve museums is that they have the practice, established over time, of preserving and using certain territories for their purposes. Those sites include the famous Yasnaya Polyana estate of Leo Tolstoy, the Mikhaylovskoye of A S Pushkin, the Spasskoye-Lutovinovo of I S Turgenev, the Tarkhany of M Y Lermontov, the Veshenskaya Cossack village that has associations with the name of M A Sholokhov and many others. These are not only the Russian heritage but also make a part of the global culture. The reserve museums retain or revive the traditional economic activities and do a whole range of specific jobs not characteristics of museums of the orthodox order.

The activities of these cultural facilities are wholly in accord with the modern world-wide tendencies for a comprehensive and business-like approach to the cause of preserving and using the heritage declared in the UNESCO documents.

Of the 144 reserves and memorial museums, 26 (or 18%) are the federal subjects. This includes the branches of the reserve and memorial museums. For example, the Tyumen Provincial Local Lore Museum has the Andreyevskoye Lake Archaeological Reservation Museum exercising the rights of a branch, while the State Reserve Museum of Smolensk has the memorial estates of M I Glinka and A T Tvardovsky as its branches. The reserve and memorial museums are found in 52 provinces of Russia, which accounts for 58.4% of their total number. The regional leaders – in terms of the number of reserve museums – are Moscow Province (13 facilities), Leningrad Province (9 facilities) and Yaroslavl Province (8 facilities). 15 or 58% of the 26 federal reserve museums are included in the Compendium of the Russian Federation Peoples’ Heritage of Special Value. The federal reserve museums command 129599 hectares, which is just less than 30% of the total acreage of all the reserve museums. Further 9 reserve museums and museums of Russia hold the items that are in the World Heritage List of UNESCO.

18 federal reserve museums (69%) have to date been past their strategic planning stage covering the periods until 2009-2012, which has been achieved with the support of the Federal Agency for Culture and Cinematography. While the Complex Development Programmes were being elaborated for those reserve museums, their current condition was checked, missions developed, the main development guidelines identified and the priorities (the “growth points”) streamlined; in addition, they were put through culturological audit. The set of actions designed to solve the reserve museums’ problems helped identify the financial, organisational and staffing resources required for the museums’ development.

Development of the museum infrastructure and introduction of modern communication technologies to the museum practice are the innovative components of the reserve museums’ progress. The reserve museums are becoming proper participants of the market for intellectual services and compete for the society’s spare time efficiently. Therefore, practically all of them made provisions in their Complex Development Programmes for their contribution to development of the cultural enlightenment tourism infrastructure, as well as development of various museum programmes expanding the range of services on offer to the society.

At the same time, the following kinds of governmental support are the basic conditions for development of the reserve museums of Russia.

The reserve museums have practically fallen out of the legal field because the legislation of the Russian Federation does not hold tools of regulating protection of the compound cultural and natural heritage objects. The issues related to organisation and operation of reserve museums remained unregulated and, more importantly, there are no prescribed means of appropriate preserved territory regime maintenance.

This poses threats to the existence and progress of these cultural facilities. It is necessary to elaborate and enact legal and regulatory acts urgently. Amending the Law on the Specially Protected Natural Territories and the Law on the Cultural Heritage Objects (Monuments of History and Culture) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation would perhaps be the actions bringing the fastest and most tangible results. Eventually, a new and specialised law concerning the specially protected historical and cultural territories would have to be composed.
The development potential of the museum system dealing with the cognitive tourism is extensive enough, as can be seen from the fact that the reserve museums had 17 million (17003.4 thousand) visitors in 2003, while the memorial estates had 824 thousand visitors the same year. So, the reserve museums and the memorial estates account for practically one fourth (23%) of the annual museum attendance in Russia, which is telling of their special popularity among our compatriots as well as overseas travellers – and of the efficiency of their operation.

Right now, the Russian society is facing the challenge of self-identification anew; therefore, the support for preservation and development of the network of reserve museums should become one of the areas of the state culture policy.

Igor Kishkin  
«The Role of Museum in Development of Cultural Tourism on the Example of the City of Dmitrov»

The ancient Russian towns such as Dmitrov, which celebrated its 850 anniversary not so long ago always attract tourists attention. About one hundred thousand excursionists visited museum expositions in Soviet times. Dmitrov museum was founded in 1918. Among its founders were academician M.N. Tickhomirov, price P.A. Kropotkin and many others. Dmitrov Museum has great collections from manorial estates, churches and monasteries closed by authority in 20-s – 30-s of XX century.

The end of 80-s and the beginning of 90-s of the last century was very difficult for the museum because of economic crisis and poverty of people. It was the reason of recession in domestic tourism. In 1993 only 10 thousand excursionists visited Dmitrov Museum that is in 10 times less than in 1989.

It was necessary to work out a programme of way out of the crisis with the help of federal, regional and municipal means. About 80 students of local lore, culturologs, members of administration, teachers, museum employees, and representatives of priesthood took part in the development of this programme.

The general director of the Museum-reservation "Dmitrov Kremlin" was appointed as a leader of the group. This programme was ratified at the session of executive committee of Dmitrov town council of people’s Deputies but the further events of crushing the Soviet Power were the cause that neither federal centre nor regional centre didn’t finance this very programme of development of culture-cognitive tourism. Local administration took orientation on the reconstruction of light and textile industry, engineering industry, and agriculture, in other words, those fields which were traditional for our region.

In this situation nobody thought about tourism and about the museum.

It was necessary to prove to the local authority that tourism had a great future as a regional branch of economy and that region had the great culture-historical heritage (there are more than 200 monuments of history and culture of federal, regional and local significance).

Luckily, 2 years later when it was failed to reconstruct traditional industry and the farming didn’t give expected results the authority of our region turned to the tourism. A new team of specialists who knew the natural and historic-cultural resources of the region with the director of the "Dmitrov Kremlin" at the head was established.

Practical offers which the administration of region follows now were worked out. First it was necessary to restore all the buildings (there are 9 of them) where the museum was situated.

Second, to take the museum exposition out of the Assumption Cathedral then to restore it and to transfer it to the possession of Russian Orthodox Church, to restore all the buildings on the territory of the Dmitrov Kremlin.

Third it was decided to reconstruct the Sovetckaya Square and some building in it; then Kropotkinskaya Street, Zagorskaya street and Semenuka street which are near the Kremlin. The means of federal, regional and local budget were spent on the reconstruction of the Kremlin and the adjacent streets.

The special account where people can transfer their money was opened. The money from investors were taken too. Only the Ministry of atomic energetics transfered dozens of million rubles for the restoration of the Assumption Cathedral.

This program was fulfilled in the course of 7 years.

One more building, the museum-exposition complex with the square of 4 thousand square metres was built for museum. There are some expositions and a museum centre for children and teenagers there.

Now the museum has 10 well equipped buildings with the square of 9 thousand square metres. There is the exposition in three of them. There are 126 members in the staff of Museum but in 1993 there were only 23.

Besides this work the programme of monumental propaganda was developed, with the purpose to propagantize the historical heritage. The monument to the founder of our town Yury Dolgorukiy was placed, the 15
metre long cross in commemoration of builders of Moscow-Volga canal was placed on the bank of the Canal, the monument to Kiril and Mephody by sculptor A.I. Rukavishnikov placed in the Kremlin.

A monument to P.A. Kropotkin, who lived in Dmitrov in 1918 – 1921) appeared in Kropotkinskaya Street. There is a sculpture garlary of noble people of the XIX century in this pedestrian street.

In future it is planned to set some monuments to Dmitrov decembriests, to Dmitrov princes Peter Dmitrievich, Yriy Vacilievich and Juriy Ivanovich. Next year there will be the new monument to the first Russian saints Boris and Gleb near the Boris and Gleb Monastery.

The result of these changes is the of increasing of number of tourists.

The training of excursion specialists is the main problem now. Last year, under the order of Dmitrov Committee of Phisical Training, sport and tourism, Dmitrov faculty of Russian International Academy for Tourism prepared 20 highly-skilled excursion guides. Under the order of administration the graduates of our faculty work out the new itineraries in Dmitrov region.

Dmitrov tour agencies, museum employees use students' works in their work.

It is obvious that the great changes in region, the attitude of administration to the tourist business can not exist without the influence of Dmitrov faculty of RIAT.

It's enough to say that 2 from 13 members of town building council (the director I.V. Kishkin and the chief of socio-humanitarian Studies of the faculty I.V. Kurishev) are the employees of the faculty of RIAT.

The town-building council takes decisions on town building policy of the region.

The vice-president of Chamber of Commerce which defines the strategy of region development Z. S. Orlova is a tutor of our faculty.

In april 2005 Dmitrov faculty organized the scientific-practical conference on the development of domestic tourism, where all the authorities of Dmitrov region were present.

After the conference the first meeting of local council of Deputies took place, where the problem of development of tourism in Dmitrov region was considered.

Committee of Sport and tourism and Dmitrov faculty of RIAT have been instructed to work out the programme of tourism development for 2006 – 2010. Now the programme is ready and the main point in it is the reconstruction of pier in the Moscow-Volga canal and transformation it into passenger one.

It allow to receive in every summer navigation more than 500 steamships plying Moscow – St. Petersburg – Moscow, Moscow – Astrakhan – Moscow, Moscow – Yaroslavl – Moscow.

The fifth-year student A. Dyatlov works out the organization of river itinerary. It will be his diploma work.

It should be noticed that the success depends on local administration and its unerstanding the role of tourism in economy of our region. Tourism industry form, new working places, and can give great profits to the local budget.

It's very important to find contacts with the organizations which are connected with tourism such as museum, schools, institutes, committee of Sport and tourism, Chamber of commerce and many others.

I see success in these componets and Dmitrov experience proves it.

Yury Tchistov, Julia Kupina

«Kunstcamera: Information Electronic Complexes and Multimedia Presentations in the Museum»

1. Information as a means of preserving cultural heritage.
3. Spiritual heritage including that on display in museum collections.
4. Diversity of the museum audience's demands.
5. A modern museum must not only meet such demands but also set a principally different level of the information services provided.
6. The special role of an ethnographical museum in preserving cultural heritage.

The Museum and the Information Demands of Visitors.

• The information revolution caused transformation of the traditional information translation and storage means of museums because the museum visitor and the level of their demands have both changed.
• Information is one of the most important outcomes of the museum activity.
• Cutting-edge technologies: the transition from a closed-in museum space to an information museum with resources available for the public.
The multimedia technologies in a museum.

1. Multimedia represent the means of communicating information to the user involving the simultaneous employment of several types of computer technologies:
   - Textual
   - Database
   - Image
   - Audio
   - Video
   - Animation...
2. “Multimedia” translates from Latin literally as a “multitude of means”.
3. Any museum is a “multimedia” one essentially.
4. The task of the modern museum is to grant the visitor the option to choose their own interactive scenario of using the information put across.

The use of the multimedia technologies in ethnographic museums.

- Video clips – introduction to ethno-geography, landscapes, anthropological types, traditional abodes, customs and traditions, economic applied crafts, et cetera.
- Audio clips – the languages of the peoples of the world, traditional musical implements, et cetera.
- Interactive maps – the history of learning the ethnography of the peoples of the world, expeditions, researchers, et cetera.
- Access to surplus encyclopaedia and reference data.
- Interactive compendium catalogues and e-labelling.
- Exhibit detail viewing options.

The Multimedia Projects in the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkammer) of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

1. The Museum started the search for new forms of visitor information services in 2002.
2. 2002 – the scientific catalogue of the exhibition themed “The Last Journey of Captain Cook”: an info kiosk at the exposition and a catalogue at the Museum’s web-site.

The Big Great Gottorp Globe Multimedia Project.

2003 – Creation of a new Big Great Gottorp Globe exposition. The multimedia project allowing a virtual visit to the combined globe and planetarium.

The “Earlier Natural Science Collections of the Kunstkammer” Project.

2003 – a multimedia programme covering the history of the kunstkammern, displayed on two sensor monitors for the “First Natural Science Collections of the Kunstkammer” Exposition.

Perspective Projections

In 2005 was developed the concept of the project “Establishment of the Multimedia Information Exposition Complex of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkammer) of the Russian Academy of Sciences. This project integrates dozens of museum and scientific research projects at various stages of development and implementation. The project was submitted for consideration with a view to obtaining a grant from the Culture Support Investments Fund (the IBRD). The grant was received in November 2005.

2005 – Development of the concept and structure of the new web-site of the MAE (Kunstkammer) of the RAS; it is saturated with great many multimedia components. The contest for the project web-site design was summarised in November 2005.
The Development Prospects of Multimedia Technologies at Museums.

Today, we have sensor monitors, plasma screens with video programmes, and audio guides. What does tomorrow hold in store for us? Personalisation of information flow delivery to a museum visitor and interactive museum data systems. Mobile phone-based WAP-access to the data system at the web-site of a museum; Employment of the points of access to the museum data system using the BlueTooth connection; Use of special media-players or palmtops for Wi-Fi connection to the local data network of a museum. A pocket PC as a personal multimedia guide to a museum.

Evgeniy Lunyaev

«Traveling as an Instrument of Moral Self-perfection»

Within the limits if inevitable globalization which undoubtedly has a positive influence in particular on tourism development, UNESCO has proposed global strategies of tourism development. Among the expected results there can be distinguished the influx of foreign investments into in underdeveloped and developing countries and as a consequence the struggle against poverty, development of infrastructure, the increase in employment of local population in the sphere of tourism and rise of educational level. Besides this, the work on preservation of tangible and intangible heritage which are in danger of disappearance is guaranteed. These objectives were formulated by United Nations Organization at the Summit Planet Earth in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and expressed in Agenda the main tendency to conciliation on the stable base of environment protection, economical development and struggle against poverty.

In October 1999 at the Session of the General Assembly of World Tourism Organization in Santiago The Global Ethic Tourism Code was adopted unanimously. In the preamble to this document the term ‘tourism’ is elucidated in the spirit of Organization’s ideology: ‘Due to straight, spontaneous and not importunate contacts, which come to be between men and women, representing different cultures and ways of life, tourism is a powerful factor providing peace and strengthening friendship and mutual understanding between the peoples of our planet’. The creators of the Code are firmly convinced that in the sphere of tourism ‘economics and ecology, environment and development, openness for international contacts can be conciliated’, i.e. tourism is considered to be a means of realization of global tendencies, but such function of tourism as ‘protection of social and cultural originality’ is also underlined.

Cultural-cognitive tourism is a unique accessible instrument to make up an intercultural and interreligious dialogue in the universal language of culture. The deepest bases of any culture, including contemporary culture, as I see it, are concentrated in the field of upbringing. Upbringing-in-tradition forms pledge to acquire a future Citizen of the World: a well-educated person leading his or her life according to the traditions of his or her native ethos and topos, knowledgeable of culture of other communities and, what is most important, tolerant to the uniqueness of others.

Children start understanding the surrounding world from the family, the house, the yard, and the nearest street. At the age of 6-8 the integral perception of the city, country, world space yet doesn’t exist. And the task of the family, teachers and school consists in upbringing-in-tradition, conforming to language, ideology and religion – but also in line with the spirit of the place, local customs. Real preservation of ethnical and national cultural traditions depends on people, on natives. It’s them who’ve got to preserve “genius loci”, the spirit of place – in their family legends and traditions.

In the course of the Days of European Culture many wonderful projects were realized – for example, in St Petersburg there was initiated ‘The European Walkway’. Its objective was to relate about the contributions of representatives of more than 20 European nations into development of St Petersburg. Beside that, lots of investigations were conducted, dedicated telling about the 300-year-old history of the city, basing on the example of one nationality (Swedes, Jewish people or Germans) – one layer of population, one confession, one profession.

Systemic and active understanding of the world is in the basis of the guided trip method teaching of his history (history of culture). I suppose that one’s entrance into the world should begin from understanding the surrounding city, or country. In order to appreciate full value of a masterpiece of European or Eastern culture, one
should realize the uniqueness and value of a particular historical region, where one was born/brought up, and
only then one can compare and admire (not understand and blame).

New things are learned in comparison; humans tend to compare new things with something well-known, –
primarily with tradition that one was born into or brought up in. Only pure minds, free from ignorance, a free
idea aimed at understanding the Truth can move.

The basis of excursion method consists in integral corporal, visual and intellectual experience; this concept
was expressed by quite a few theorists and practitioners of guided tours (I.M. Grevs, N.A. Geinicke): 'Excursion
inevitably leads cognitive process along the lines formed by certain muscular sensations, which accompany the
process of touring, reaching the object; excursion is kind of motor-achievement of knowledge.'

Journeys and trips are widely appreciated just because during them ‘the precious love to Motherland is born,’
because they help to ‘cultivate taste in journeys around one’s country.’ In the beginning of the 1920s, historian
A.V. Bakushinsky wrote: ‘Historical distances are no obstacles. The Spirit of traveling moves apart the horizons of
time and space for a Watcher, artistic value of the past becomes real via one’s experience. There are no spatial
or national borders for experiences of this kind.’

Medium-size countries of both Eastern and Western Europe are in a strange state: they need to join European
processes in order to attain active/productive realization (i.e. ‘presentation’ and ‘development’) of their economi-
cal or cultural potentials. This means that they have to join the process of globalization – whether by means of
entering the EU or introducing European currency. On the other hand, each nation tries to keep its own internal
cultural originality, to avoid total unification. Citizens, most of whom perceive politics mostly as a phenomenon of
’screen culture,’ admit all economic benefits of external associations. However any attempts of cultural influ-
ence (we speak about the so-called ‘Europeanisation’ of culture) are considered to be sort of cultural expansion.
These processes can be proved by some obvious examples.

In Budapest – a rather successful cosmopolitan European city – there’s a new museum of Terror (‘Terror Hása’).
Ideological order, aimed at ‘patriotic enlightenment’ of citizens of the post-socialist Hungary, consists in telling
about collisions of the Hungarians with fascist Germany and the Soviet Union. Archive materials and sequences
of news-reels present identical organization of war machines designed by ‘Hitler’ and ‘Stalin’ – marching grey
hordes of soldiers, aggressive propaganda and strong leaders. In these halls Germany and Soviet Union are both
interpreted as aggressors, Hungarians as people–martyr.

Forced depression, sympathy to those oppressed, hatred to aggressor nations – that is the mood which is
conditioned by visitors, whether they be Hungarians, Russians, or Americans. In the last hall this mood comes to
climax. Part of modern history is shown on film screen: withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of Hungary
in 1989. Old Magyars freeze here with tears in their eyes and sigh of relief.

Is patriotism or ideological order for patriotic upbringing conditioned by need to conserve cultural originality
of nation at the state level?

In 2007 Czech Republic will assume European currency. Czech citizens are not much delighted by this fact,
because next would price increase come (to be exact, it’s labeled as ‘Europeanisation,’ or being equaled with the
European prices). For 5-6 years this country has been actively preparing to join the European community, taking
progressive political and economic steps. But even now people are worried about preservation of their national
culture. ‘Eurorepairment,’ ‘European cuisine,’ ‘European living standards’ – all these images look scary (‘will there
still be place for our traditions?’).

In 2002-2004 these moods continually gained momentum. Czech cuisine, which turned into the basis of
commercial tourist services, began to depart from traditional recipes in favour of alleged ‘European taste.’ The
Czechs grew alarmed. It has become popular to write and reprint manuals of Czech cuisine – to save the National
Taste. Thus, tourism has become the saving niche for culture: couleur locale attracts visitors, and, therefore, their
money, ‘capitals,’ which in their turn help to support national originality.

Ekaterina Bylkova, Evgenia Bucharova

«Festival «Lake People» as a Mechanism of Museum
Tourism Development»

In 2005 The Museum of Nature of Buryatiya together with republic’s museums realized the project «Great
Siberia. Treasures of Buryatiya» at support of Charity Fund of V.Potanin. The basic idea of this project is creation
both cultural event in region, and technologies of promotion of Buryatiya’s cultural resource on the world tourist
market. The project should become a source of positive changes, including both city, and regional infrastructure
to generate special space of region development, that promoting capitalization of cultural and natural potential
of territory in the form of tourist product.
The actuality of the project is connected with designing sociocultural actions in relation to one of the most perspective, but at the same time economically not developed territories of the country. The cultural potential and natural riches of Republic of Buryatiya – first of all, lake Baikal – could become a basis of the powerful tourist industry of world significance. But for today Buryatiya is absent on the world tourist map, because of the closed status of region during the Soviet period and because of absence of internal investment resources, therefore the region potential of the cultural heritage is not developed by tourist industry absolutely.

To change this situation of Buryatiya positioning in the tourist market it is possible due to the organization sociocultural action which would allow to include cultural, natural and historical potential of Republic in a network of the international communications through the market of cultural tourism. We offer the Festival «Lake People» as an example of such event. It is one of museum festivals in our country who considers the cultural action as the tool of research of ecological and social problems of «lake people», representing a rich cultural humanitarian heritage of people living near Baikal and other world lakes.

Festival «Lake People» as the bright colourful show having the ecological content, expressed by innovative forms, is directed on formation of an attractive image of territory that assumes stimulation of development of tourism in region.

In connection that the festival has museum roots, its concept, goals and problems have the specific character which is expressed, first of all, in accents on preservation of a cultural and natural heritage especially significant for territory world natural and cultural heritage. The first festival (2001) has been conceived as means of search for ideas for a new conception of Museum of Nature of Buryatiya and for transition to a new level of communications for all republican museums, and also for search and development both new museum technologies, and modern technologies of management. When designing the second festival (2003), accent has been displaced from professional audiences to wide publicity.

The practice of two festivals has shown that ethnoecological focused conception has proved itself vitality. The problems put before professional community have been solved, and for the further development it was necessary to change (to expand) scale of the festival according to new purposes and priorities, which focused on development of festival as tourist product. Thus, the festival becomes not only means of development of museums, but also means of development of region.

It should be consideration that museums remain the main subjects, who capable to act as active creators of development space of cultural tourism. On the one hand, museums are institutional form, and another, they have unique intellectual advantages and they are curators of cultural and historical heritage.

Recently, interest of republic government to problems of ecology and ecological education has raised and this is expressed in pass corresponding laws and realization different federal programs. On the other hand, they also interested in cultural actions as means of creation of favorable image of republic.

For this reason when festival conception was changing the direction of cultural tourism has been chosen. The actuality of this choice was defined by a complex of the specified factors. Development of museum and event tourism, promoting assimilation and development of a cultural heritage, in the same time can remove anthropogenous press of "wild" tourism from ecologically vulnerable landscapes, simultaneously satisfying growing needs of the population for self-realization, creating an image of the ecological focused territory.

Stages of preparation and realization of the project, and also the events of the festival, such as carrying out seminar on development of strategy of cultural tourism in republic, creation of web-site of museums of Buryatiya, development of guidebook about cultural tourism, development and approbation of intermuseum tourist route "Lake People", realization of competitive, exhibition and presentation programs of the festival, became the colourful show involving tourists in region, visitors in museums. Totally the project, being animation, allows to solve, on the one hand, problems of translation of heritage, and another, offers the mechanism of attraction of means for its preservation.

Tatiana Nikitina

«From Tourism to Traveling»

There is a concept “here and now” developing actively in the contemporary post-modernist society. Unlike the 80s of the previous century, marked by the neophytism of a general visitor, who “exploded” the museum, the new millennium has produced quite a different tourist, who has become much more intelligent and claims individual and a better quality service by specially made programs. A pilgrim/tourist/sightseer now is not content with the role of a “hastily” versed dilettante, “eating” in hurry a single product, which has no other alternatives. No, he is getting keener and keener to be actively involved in the reconstruction of historical mystery 1:1, to touch unique legends implicating the magic of reality. The museum in this capacity is becoming a sort of a lever,
but not just “a black box”. It is making a kind of metaphysical shift presuming various degrees of immersion into a memorial/nostalgic event. A tourist, for instance, is getting less and less satisfied with the verisimilitude of the guide’s story about L. Tolstoy’s leaving Yasnaya Polyana. He is concerned about the correlation between the historical truth and its interpretations.

There is a direct connection and feedback between the museum and the reality. Not only does the museum copy life, but so does life in fact. We can see that now everything is conserved, or put into the museum space: space/time/action. A contemporary tourist tries to penetrate into the tradition; he sets up expeditions that would quote synchronously memorial events, such as L. Tolstoy’s leaving Yasnaya Polyana.

The museum is backing an individual visitor, and is changing noticeably a service concept. Democratic, global, mass tourism is becoming gradually a thing of the past. The history of tourism starts its new and different era, connected with “cultural travels”. This kind of tourism, in its cultural references, relies on literary and artistic models. The word “tourism” is impregnated with negative connotations. It is not by chance that there is a noticeable differentiation on the tourism market between a traveler’s personal experience and “tourist” behavior, associated exclusively with commerce and a quick tour of sights.

Having safely overcome proletarian concepts, the contemporary tourism is becoming free from ideological impacts. The tourism phenomenon, with its universal experience, can be conceived as a journey from a “tourist” to a “traveller”. Thus, the new form of tourism is a spatial component of individual self-assertion, emerging as a result of private perceptions, but with regard for collective concepts.
DEVELOPMENT OF ECOLOGICAL TOURISM IN ESPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS

Maria Prchalova

«UNESCO Sites: Sustainable Development and Ecological Tourism at Territories of Biosphere Reserves and World Natural Heritage Sites»

UNESCO has the mandate of the United Nations to safeguard the cultural and the natural heritage of the world. It is uniquely placed to explore the social, cultural, ecological and ethical dimensions of ecotourism.

Ecotourism, if used wisely, can be a powerful tool to help eradicate poverty and pave the way towards sustainable development.

A long-term intergovernmental interdisciplinary UNESCO Programme Man and the Biosphere (MAB) develops the basis, within the natural and social sciences, for the sustainable use and conservation of biological diversity, and for the improvement of the relationship between people and their environment globally. In the framework of the MAB program a network of biosphere reserves has been created. Biosphere Reserves promote solutions to reconcile the conservation of biodiversity with its sustainable use.

Biosphere reserves serve in some ways as «living laboratories» for testing out and demonstrating integrated management of land, water and biodiversity. They are ideal places to test and develop innovative tourism models that benefit local people and maintain cultures, biodiversity and associated values.

Each biosphere reserve is intended to fulfill three basic functions, which are complementary and mutually reinforcing:

- conservation function – to contribute to the conservation of landscapes, ecosystems, species and genetic variation;
- development function – to foster economic and human development which is socio-culturally and ecologically sustainable;
- logistic function – to provide support for research, monitoring, education and information exchange related to local, national and global issues of conservation and development.

Collectively, biosphere reserves form a World Network. Within this network, exchanges of information, experience and personnel are promoted. The network of biosphere reserves constitutes a tool for the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components and is a unique instrument for international co-operation aiming at tracking the path of sustainable tourism through sharing of knowledge, best practices and experiences for designing and managing ecotourism.

While Biosphere Reserves are areas of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems which are internationally recognized within the framework of UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme, sites on the World Heritage List are cultural and/or natural properties recognized by the World Heritage Committee as being of outstanding universal value.

Both Biosphere Reserves and Natural Heritage properties are important sites where to conserve and protect biological diversity, cultural values and heritage. This aim should underpin the development of all activities in protected areas, including when undertaking projects and activities related to tourism.

Tourism is the world’s largest industry and studies predict its increasing growth. At the international level, tourism has traditionally been measured in International Tourist Arrivals and International Tourist Receipts.

Tourism is an important factor in the management of many protected natural areas, including many biosphere reserves. Yet tourism is ambivalent, by its very nature. On the one hand, tourism generates well-known advantages. Visitor fees, concessions, and donations provide funds for restoration and protection efforts. Tour operators and hotel chains can play a role in the management of a site either with financial contributions, aiding monitoring efforts, or encouraging their clients to follow guidelines of responsible tourism. Tourists can support artisan activities and help to strengthen threatened cultural values.

Tourism also generates well-known problems. Tourism growth is difficult to control. Guiding development is a time-consuming process involving establishing policies, ongoing dialogue with stakeholders, and monitoring to determine if desired conditions are being met. Tourism activities require environmental impact assessments and carrying capacity studies.

Within UNESCO, several initiatives seek to promote a new tourism culture, based on common sense and the responsible use of the natural resources and cultural assets of each destination.
The World Heritage Centre is engaged in a number of tourism related activities, including the effects of tourism development projects on the inscribed values of individual sites.

Within this broader concern for tourism interactions with the natural and cultural environment and protected natural areas, many individual and regional groups of biosphere reserves have given special attention to tourism and tourists.

In this framework, the specially protected natural areas are trying to keep balance between the need of environmental protection and socio-economic needs. They also have to interact with the social and economic environment. One of the ways to make that interaction smooth and mutually beneficial is the development of the eco-tourism in the specially protected areas. Thus, ecotourism in nature reserves (incl. buffer zones) may serve as a tool for raising public awareness on the goods and services provided by protected areas, going beyond the traditional functions of conserving wild flora and fauna, which are commonly associated with nature reserves society.

Olga Krever, Aleksey Butorin
«World Nature Heritage Properties in Russia»

The Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted at the 17th session of the UNESCO General Conference on 16 November 1972 and came into force on 17 December 1975. The main goal of the Convention is to unite the international community effort to identify, preserve and promote comprehensively the global-importance monuments of culture and nature. As many as 21 countries ratified the Convention in 1975. The number of the parties thereto has reached 180 by now.

So as to increase the effect of the Convention, the World Heritage Committee and Fund were established in 1976. Two years later, the first culture and nature objects of relevance were inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Of all the natural objects, «The Galapagos Islands», «Yellowstone National Park» (USA), «Nahanny National Park» (Canada) and «Simen National Park» (Ethiopia) were the first to be given the World Heritage status. Then, the List developed into a very weighty thing in terms of the geographical coverage of the Planet Earth as well as in terms of the number of sites included. The List covered 160 natural, 628 cultural and 24 mixed sites in 137 countries of the world by the end of 2005. The Convention protects such well-known natural places of note as the Great Barrier Reef, Hawaiian Islands, the volcanoes of Kamchatka, the Grand Canyon, the Mount Kilimanjaro and the Lake Baikal. The overall acreage of the natural objects of the World Heritage accounts for over 13% of the total acreage of all the specially protected areas around the world.

The Convention grants extensive opportunities in the legal, information and economic fields, as well as it does contacts and liaisons that have evolved and improved over longer than three decades. The status of a World Heritage site helps obtain a range of advantages in the natural environment protection context as well as in the sense of comprehensive support to the territories inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The main advantages can be tapered down to this short list:
- Higher prestige and popularization of the objects in the List;
- Priority granted in raising funds in support of the World Heritage sites;
- Development of the alternative ways of nature management (firstly, of environmental tourism);
- Surplus guarantees of intactness and integrity of the unique natural sites;
- Organization of the natural site condition and state of conservation monitoring and control.

The Situation in Russia.

Russia (formerly the USSR) signed the Convention in 1988. Russia has now 15 cultural and 8 natural sites in the List and shares the 3-4 places with Canada coming after Australia (11 objects) and America (12). Thirty Russian specially protected areas inclusive of 11 state nature reserves and 5 national parks have the World Heritage status.

The following sites in Russia have natural World Heritage status:
- the «Virgin Komi Forests»;
- the «Lake Baikal»;
- the «Volcanoes of Kamchatka»;
- the «Golden Mountains of Altai»;
- the «Western Caucasus»;
- the «Central Sikhote-Alin»;
- the «Uvs Nuur Basin»;
- the «Wrangel Island Reserve».
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Work is currently being carried out to present on the World Heritage List those natural sites included on the Russian Federation’s Tentative List, namely, the «Putorana Plateau», the «Magadan Reserve», the «Commander Islands» and the «Dauria Steppes».

Work is also underway to expand Russia’s Tentative List of prospective and nominated natural complexes with the addition of sites such as the «Green Belt of Fennoscandia», the «Bikin River Valley», the «Kuril Islands», the «Great Watershed of Valday», the «Lena Pillars» and the «Volga Delta».

Russia is doubtless rich in natural complexes that are unique and, very importantly, undisturbed by human activities. By the approximate estimate of scientists, there are about 20 territories in Russia worthy of natural World Heritage status. The most prospective sites were identified as part of a joint project on boreal forests, which was implemented by UNESCO and The World Conservation Union (IUCN).

The Tentative List.

It was decided at the 24th session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee to assume the Tentative Lists of natural objects of the States Parties beginning in 2003. Since then, the World Heritage Centre may only consider requests for nomination of the natural properties on condition that they have been declared in a relevant Tentative List. The Tentative List includes all the natural complexes likely to be nominated, whilst the State Party is under no obligation to submit them for inclusion on the World Heritage List eventually.

Russia only submitted its Tentative List of the natural heritage properties once; the list was submitted to the World Heritage Centre in 1994. The natural complexes declared in that list are inscribed on the World Heritage List already.

The Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation offered the following properties to be included on a well-balanced Tentative List of the Russian Federation (the offer was made in early 2005):

- the «Putorana Plateau» (Putoransky State Nature Reserve);
- the «Magadan Reserve» (Magadansky State Nature Reserve);
- the «Commander Islands» (Komandorsky State Nature Reserve);
- the «Dauria Steppes» (Daursky State Nature Reserve).

The choice of the given objects was based on the analysis of their natural significance carried out by the scientific and public organizations and approved by the Ministry of Natural Resources in the years 2000-2004. During this period, documentation necessary for submission to the UNESCO World Heritage Center was prepared for all territories. Furthermore, for all territories, executive organs of the corresponding subjects of the Russian Federation sent proposals to the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation about their inscription into the UNESCO World Heritage List.

Gulnaz Amrahova


Azerbaijan sits on the crossroads of the historical caravan routes that once connected Europe and Asia, the North and the South. Azerbaijan possesses the wealth of natural and biological diversity, and a chain of specially protected natural reservations that are the basis for the eco-tourism to spin off in the country.

The geographical particularities of the republic that form its bio-diversity and provide conditions sufficient for the preservation of the diversity are characterized by the specific relief, climatic and geological features and the landscape mosaic.

Such massifs as the Greater Caucasus and the Caucasus Minor, and the Talysh Mountains are remarkable for the diversity of eco-systems due to the altitudinal zones within the territory of Azerbaijan.

Those mountain eco-systems have the highest biological and terrain diversity, endemism and the high economic value.

The territory of the republic pertains to two physical-geographical countries, namely, the Caucasus and the Near East Plateau, and is divided in five natural-climatic zones: the South-East of the Greater Caucasus, the Caucasus Minor, Nakhchivan, Talysh and the Kura-Araz Zone. Each of these has diverse natural features.

The flora and fauna of Azerbaijan were formed under the influence from various forming centres of the Paleo-Arctic and are distinguishably rich and diverse.

More than 4500 different kinds of higher plants and 1800 kinds of animals, all distributed over the nine climatic zones, are found within the territory of the Azerbaijan Republic.

This diversity is the result of the geological history of the region and the variance of the climatic conditions that had created a favorable ambience for existence and adaptation of this wealth of bio-diversity.

As many as six national parks – Shirvan, Ordubad, Altiagaj, Ghirkan, Ag Gyol and Absheron – were established upon the initiative of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Azerbaijan in this country over the
three years past. The significance of these parks makes them immensely interesting when it comes to attracting tourists over.

The Ghirkan National Park established in 21435 hectares in 2004 and including the relict and endemic forests of the Tertiary Period is indicated in the UNESCO World Heritage List.

The total acreage of the specially protected territories equals 638.8 thousand hectares as of now.

Establishment of national parks in the republic provided the suitable grounds for development of the eco-tourism, and practically set this process in motion in Azerbaijan.

The eco-tourism section of the Provisions of the National Parks focuses especially on organization of such tourist routes that would exclude environmental impacts but would satisfy the tourists' demands at one and the same time. To achieve this, the Provisions say, the following is necessary:

- hotels or living quarters for tourists meeting the relevant international standards;
- international-standard consumer services;
- arrangements for conducted tours and other public events;
- high-level transport services;
- local craftsmen's souvenir sales.

Development of the eco-tourism in Azerbaijan is of immense importance to the economic progress of the country.

The following factors are supportive of eco-tourism development:

- the diversity and exceptional aesthetic value of the natural landscape;
- the high natural potential;
- the unique flora, the relict and endemic species of which are included in the Republican as well as the International Red Book, including the iron tree, the chestnut oak, the pink siris (the silk tree), the zelkova, the Ghirkan box-tree, the danaya and many other species;
- the unique fauna; it is noteworthy that only Azerbaijan has such populations of jeyrans (goitered gazelles), moufflons and the water-fowl as these;
- the unique eco-system;
- the possibility of watching the wild animals in their natural habitats.

The Shirvan National Park is unique in this respect.

The observation sites are from where tourists visiting the Park can watch goitered gazelles, flamingos, swans, ducks and the other wildlife found there.

The presence of specialized tourism organizations.

Personal operators interested in promoting the eco-tourism.

That is a reference to state organizations, local authorities and commercial organizations.

The eco-tourism is a kind of activity aimed at the use of the biological and terrain diversity, and organisation of public recreation. It also plays an important enlightenment role.

It should be mentioned that a lot has been done to promote the eco-tourism in Azerbaijan. First of all, the Commission was established for the State Programme of Tourism Industry Development; the panel unites the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Tourism, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.

Eco-tourism projects are being developed with the involvement of non-governmental organizations.

The infrastructure to promote positive progress of all kinds of tourism is being installed in the provinces of the country; this includes the hotels and international-standard recreation zones either built or refurbished already. Advertising campaigns are being waged to propagate the eco-tourism and attract eco-tourists.

Henceforth, and in order to promote the eco-tourism, the aforementioned Commission intends a series of actions, such as:

- Implementation of the institutional and economic basics of the eco-tourism;
- Development of regulatory documents and economic mechanisms;
- Establishment of a national centre for the eco-tourism;
- Compilation of a database;
- Specialist staff training.
Vsevolod Stepanitsky

«Ecological Tourism at Specially Protected Areas. Problems and Prospects»

Even though the Russian laws do not dedicatedly interpret the notion of the eco-tourism in the specially protected areas, the eco-tourism is what should be promoted and is:
- Facing the nature;
- Materially harmless for the natural environment;
- Aimed at environmental enlightenment;
- Caring about protection of local socio-cultural communities;
- Ensuring steady development of the regions covered with tours.

In the Russian Federation, creation of protected areas is a traditional and efficient form of the nature protection work. Today, Russia has:
- 100 state nature reserves (zapovedniks);
- 35 national parks;
- 69 federal preserves (zakazniks);
- 50 regional nature parks.

and that is not counting the numerous provincial preserves and wildlife sites.

Development of the eco-tourism in the modern world is firmly tied to protected areas, such as national parks, nature parks and refugia.

Russia might seem to be no exception with having over 200 thousand people and over 800 thousand people visited its reserves and national parks respectively during 2003.

However, the eco-tourism development situation concerning the reserves and parks of Russia is quite problematic; what's more, there are specific difficulties in the individual cases of reserves, national parks and nature parks.

On reserves.

The Hamletan question “to be or not to be” was never answered unequivocally when asked about the eco-tourism in the reserves for many years. The discussions have flared with many members of the scientific community and officials of the Reserve administrations insisting that the eco-tourism would not be appropriate in their reserves (they still insist on this premise of theirs now). Their argument was that, historically, the Russian reserves had been on their special way that would not permit eco-tourism within their boundaries but would only tolerate scientific research – this is how it had always been, they said. Well, this thesis is incorrect because the inclination to eradicate tourism in reserves only became visible in the 70s; but that’s not the point: this problem has been discussed extensively over the ten years past and approximately 80 reserves out of 100 declared their interest in the eco-tourism as a result, while the federal authorities enacted a number of programme and methodology guidance documents aimed at making the use of the potential of the Reserves for development of the eco-tourism.

It should be mentioned that this potential, which is present in Russia of today, cannot be replaced with the potential of the national parks because the number of reserves is thrice as big while the existing chain of national parks of Russia cannot satisfy many people's desire to see the wildlife diversity in various physical-geographical regions, not even in the long run. There are no national parks in the Arctic Zone, in Altai, in the Far East, in the Volga Delta and in many other regions (for that, there are reserves there).

But everything proved to be much more complicate in practice.

First of all, the effective laws, while not impeding the sparing cognitive tourism in reserves, do not bind the reserves to this kind of activity. This means that this or that reserve's participation of whatever eco-tourism programme or activity is absolutely arbitrary and only depends on the attitude of the administration in each given case. Whilst in USA, for instance, development of the eco-tourism is made the immediate responsibility of the administration of any national park or refugium.

Secondly, the small scale of activity is characteristic of all the eco-tourism in the reserves of Russia; they have dozens and hundreds, or at best thousands of visitors every year. What's more, visitors to central memorial estates of just a number of reserves constitute the majority of the total attendance figures; furthermore, the visitors are mainly either pupils from local secondary schools on conducted tours or the customers of the nearby recreation homes. Meanwhile, the proper cognitive tourism involving specific reserve-crossing routes is under-developed, to say the least. The Valley of the Geysers in the Kronotsky Reserve in Kamchatka, one of the highest-used cognitive tourist sites, only has 3000 visitors a year as against 2 mn tourists annually in the Valley of the Geysers in the Yellowstone National Park, USA.

Development of mass tourism to match the overseas national parks' scale is quite out of the question when it comes to our reserves. Further, nobody ever thought of doing this and it's not that it is feasible. However, a limited and cognitive (rather than entertaining, like “we listen to birds and not transistor radios here”) and
carefully regulated reserve tourism would only raise the rating of our reserve business, given the reserves’ sizes, specializations and traditions. It would also help them win more public respect and more of the authorities’ regard (which is something that the reserves lack so much). Lastly, this kind of tourism could be one more – and very weighty, too – argument against the incessant attempts at employing the natural resources of the reserves in other forms of economic activity.

Right now, only a few of the 100 reserves of the country have really rather than declaredly appreciated the importance and seen the prospects of the cognitive tourism and are taking constructive steps towards its development. This pack includes the Lazovsky and the Far East Marine (Dalnevostochny Morskoy) Reserves in the Primorsky Region, the Shulgan-Tash in Bashkortostan, the Astrakhansky Reserve in the Volga Delta, the Sayano-Shushensky in Krasnoyarsky Region, the Laplandsky Reserve in Murmansk Province and the Katunsky Reserve in the Republic of Altai.

On national parks.

Differently from the reserves, the national parks have tourism development as one of their principal and officially declared fields of work. However,

The forestry authorities that had controlled the national parks until the autumn 2000 had not paid the subject much attention for long years – not to mention governing it methodologically.

Evidently, development of tourism in the national parks requires establishment of the efficient infrastructure.

When the Federal Law “On Specially Protected Areas” was being composed in 1995, huge hopes were pinned on the idea of developing the relations in the national parks that would be analogous to the concession-based relations in the North American national parks. The mechanism of licensing and renting land areas for tourism development and recreation purposes was embedded in the Law being oriented for precisely this idea. Were the hopes on the emergence of such relations fully justified? Not quite, unfortunately. We never saw a concessionaire to match the American ones, felling as responsible for the nature-protection aspect of the business, contributing as much to the cause of environmental education and as inclined to not only entertainment but also cognitive tourism.

No tourism business licenses were issued in 15 out of the 35 national parks in the first place in the past years. Land was only rented for the purpose in 17 parks. Apparently, there is a number of hindrances to the broad use of the contractual and firstly of the rent relations in the national parks, including, among other things, the dubious profitability of investment projects undertaken in rented sites. Few people would want to invest out of the pocket in capital construction in other’s land; investors would be more enthusiastic about renting allotments with existing infrastructure but there are not many sites like this in our parks, unfortunately.

The extraneously compound and very red-tape licensing and rent procedures of the national parks are equally unhelpful when it comes to promoting tourism. The practice of the few years past shows only too clearly that all those super-complex procedures are no guarantee against corruption or transactions that bring the parks economic damage.

Especially importantly, the low that imposes on the national parks the task of promoting tourism do not include a single mention of the eco-tourism but only refer to tourism and recreation in a rather generic way. This lack of thought given to the laws’ composition put development of mountain skiing resorts, sanatoria and recreation centres, sporting fishing and hunting and even recreational furnishing of the Sunday picnic lots for townsmen alongside the cognitive tourism as one generic task for the national parks of Russia – very contrary to the international practice and notwithstanding it. Today, promotion of the mountain skiing infrastructure in the Sochinsky, Prielbrusie and Nechkinsky National Parks, of recreation homes, sanatoria and camping sites in the Valdaisky, Pribaikalsky, Tunkinsky, “Samarskaya Bend” (Samarskaya Luka), “Bashkiria”, “Curonian Spit” (Kurshskaya Kosa) National Parks, of fashionable hotels in the “Orlov Woodlands” (Orlovskoye Polesye), of sporting hunting in the “Meshera” and “Meshersky” National Parks is categorised as “arrangement of recreation” but contradicts the very idea of the national parks established world-wide over the 100 years past. At the same time, only a few national parks, such as the Kenozersky, “Paanayarvi”, “Ugra”, Zabaikalsky and “Yughid Va” National Parks can boast proper development of the cognitive tourism with the accentuated enlightenment basis. Then again, the scale on which this work is being done is not big there, either. In all of those parks, development of this kind of tourism is largely due to the “raison d’être” aspects of their chief administrators.

On regional nature parks.

Unlike the system of national parks that have not a single new unit added in the past 6 years, the grid of nature parks is developing intensively enough and is capable of making a worthy contribution to development of the cognitive tourism. At the same time,

1. These parks have no centralised financing channels and it is the prerogative of the federal subjects, dependent on the local provincial administrations’ interest in the parks’ work (and the financial capacities, which differ from province to province) at that, to finance the parks. It is for this reason that while there are finely funded nature parks, which are building their powerful infrastructure (for example, the “Lenskie Stolbi” Park in Yakutia), there are also several parks that only exist on paper, as it were (for example, the parks in Belgorod and Magadan Provinces, in Kalmykia and in Dagestan).
2. The Russian legislation has considerable flaws aggravating seriously the operation of the regional nature parks. This is true of forestry, land relations’ management and organisation of site protection. Differently from the national parks, the nature ones are not the full owners of their territories and subordination to many superiors is their lot. This hardly helps organise efficient work, including as regards the eco-tourism.

3. As regards development of the eco-tourism, the chain of the regional nature parks cannot replace the other protected areas nation-wide owing to this geographical specificity; it can only supplement this. The territories the primal (country-wide) interest with reference to development of the cognitive tourism are only represented by the nature parks in Karelia, the highland part of Altai, Yakutia and Kamchatka, but there are none in the Caucasus Mountains, at the Baikal, in the Highland Shoria, the Arctic, on the Kuril and the Commander Islands and in many other very interesting regions where there are reserves and national parks.

There are certain hindrances to development of the cognitive tourism that apply to reserves as well as national parks of Russia, among which I would mention the following:

1. The absence of vivid economic stimuli for the cognitive guided tourism to develop. This activity has no substantial influence on the wages and incomes of the reserve and national park administration personnel, owing to a number of reasons, while the reserves and the parks have simpler and more efficient methods of supplementing their budgets. Besides, the current socio-economic situation motivates the administrative bodies of these federal budgeted institutions to stay inactive rather than to earn money independently.

2. The eco-tourism requires a professional approach and pardons no amateurishness, just like any other serious business. At the same time, the reserves as well as the parks are badly short of highly-qualified specialists in this field, which shortage is experienced whilst there is no system of training and upgrading the existing staff whatsoever. As a result, the reserve and park staff have but feeble understanding of the specific features of organising the cognitive tourism, the essence of tour operation, pricing policies, the importance of advertising, marketing and information coverage for visitors.

3. Pricing is a stand-alone issue. More often than not, and in an attempt to increase revenues, reserves and parks wind up their prices unjustifiably instead of expanding tourist handling and multiplying paid services. Otherwise, they try to charge fees for everything they can (for example, for visitors’ taking private photographs in their territories). All this is unhelpful for development of the eco-tourism.

4. However paradoxically, almost all the reserves and national parks that declare their dedication to the cognitive tourism have no properly-equipped eco-touring routes and paths (of which there are more than 800 by the official stats). Right now, there are such things in the Kronotsky, Kavkazsky, Lazovsky and the Far East Marine (Dalnevostochny Morskoy) Reserves, as well as in the Kenozersky, Vodlozersky and “Paanayarvi” National Parks – and that’s about it. In other cases, we can only talk about frequented paths and usual movement directions, but not about environmental routes and ways.

5. Lack of information is another substantial problem. For instance, only 32 out of the 135 reserves and national parks can boast their own web-sites. Besides, not every web-site will provide prospective visitors with adequate information. As regards the happy owners of the few better web-sites, those are the “Paanayarvi”, the “Ugra”, the “Yughid Va” and the “Elk Island” (Losiniy Ostrov) National Parks and the Lazovsky, Kutunsky, the Big Arctic (Bolshoy Arktichesky), the Central Forest (Tsentralno-Lesnoy), the Putoransky and the Oksky Reserves.

6. One more important issue: everyone who knows how the system of the Russian national parks is organised and, at the same time, has seen the famous national parks of the world – in USA and Canada, for example – knows about one manifest difference between, namely, that the parks in those and other countries have demonstration of wild animals in their normal habitats as an unalienable element of the eco-tourism. For instance, the author walked 2 km along the pedestrian path of the National Park in the suburb of Anchorage, Alaska, and could watch approximately 70 elks and 4 black bears in autumn 2005.

In our national and nature parks, however, this is a more problematic matter because the animal populations are scarce; the animals are shied by frequent encounters and would not let people come near them. Besides, the tour organisers of our parks do not worry about the matter much. But they should, because demonstration of animals in their everyday existence to visitors is:

- An important element of the appeal of the eco-tourism;
- A crucial element of the environmental enlightenment, education and nature-protection propaganda, as well as of mobilising broad public support for the specially protected natural reservations;
- A substantial nature-protection factor that provides added guarantees of the maintenance of wild animals’ natural population sizes.

**On management.**

The exceedingly inefficient state management of the concerned territories and its evident degradation over the past 4-5 years, also, devaluation of the accumulated national experience and disdain of the international experience, and the disparaging attitude to professionalism are among the hindrances to development of the eco-tourism in the federal specially protected areas of Russia. The immense country that Russia is has no specialised state function appointed and able to govern such sites (by analogy with the National Parks Service functions of USA, Canada or the South Africa). The most constructive way out would be to set up a specialised Federal Agency.
for the specially protected areas, which would be authorised to implement the state governance of this field. It is only once this issue has been solved that Russia can make the management of its system of the specially protected areas efficient and make the fullest use of its potential in order to promote the eco-tourism.

What must be done to ensure development of the cognitive tourism in the specially protected areas, then?

The following is needed:

- Infrastructure should be created to ensure visitor services, which job can be solved with involvement of third-party investors operating in the eco-tourism as well;
- A system of material incentives for executives and specialists working effectively in the field of eco-tourism development should be established;
- A whole set of excursion programmes aimed at various visitor categories should be composed;
- The environmental touring paths and routes should be arranged properly; a certification system covering them should be developed and implemented;
- New nature museums should be established and the existing ones should be modernised, and information centres should be set up in specially protected areas;
- Programmes and projects aimed at demonstration of wild animals in their usual environment to visitors should be developed and implemented with reliance on the international experience. Such facilities should envisage increase of the wildlife populations to fill the natural capacity of the reserve in each given case;
- Development of the tourism-associated small business should be fostered;
- The advertisement/information support, marketing and promotion of tourist products domestically and in external markets should be developed;
- A reference system covering natural and historical-cultural sights, routes and tours should be established and so should be a tourist service support system and a uniform basic package of associated information and advertisement materials;
- Partnership between reserves, national parks and nature parks, on the one hand, and Russian and overseas eco-tourism companies and other entities interested in the cognitive tourism promotion, on the other hand.

Petr Silivestru

«Ecological Tourism at Specially Protected Areas. Problems and Prospects»

The Republic of Moldova ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on June 23, 1993. In accordance with the provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, the system of natural areas protected by state was set up. This system represented the background for the Law on the Fund of Natural Areas Protected by State.

This Law stipulates the legal background for the setting up and functioning of the fund of natural areas protected by state, its principles, mechanism and statute, as well as the responsibilities of the central and local public authorities, NGOs and civil society.

According to the above-mentioned Law, the Parliament approves the biodiversity conservation policy and strategic program for the development of the natural protected areas. It also gives approval for the establishment of the scientific reserves, national parks, biosphere reserves, botanical, dendrological and zoological gardens, and decides upon taking under protection other natural areas.

The Government of Moldova implements the biodiversity conservation policy and strategic program for the development of the natural protected areas, as well as allocates funds for scientific programs and provides equipment for the development of the fund of state protected areas.

The Model Regulations on the category of areas and complexes to be included in the fund of state protected areas, including Model Regulation on the Biosphere Reserve, were developed and approved through a Government Decision.

The fund of state protected areas includes natural objects and complexes of high importance for: (i) biodiversity and habitat conservation; (ii) researches of the natural processes and restoration of the ecological balance; (iii) ecological education of the population. The primary data on the fund of natural areas protected by state are used while elaborating plans on territorial development.

The total area of the natural areas protected by state is 66467,3 ha (1,96% of the country area). According to the calculations of the ecologists, the state protected areas need to be extended up to 5% of the entire area country by 2010. At present the landscape reserves cover 34200 ha (or 51,5% of the fund of natural areas protected by state);
the scientific reserves spread on an area of 19378 ha (or 29,4% of the fund of natural areas protected by state). Other categories of state protected areas are the following: nature reserves – 8009 ha, resource reserves – 523 ha, multifunctional management areas -1030 ha, botanical gardens – 104 ha and nature monuments – 191 ha.

A huge natural heritage is preserved in this fund of state protected areas, but there are still many territories that correspond to parameters of areas with high significance.

No biosphere reserve exists on the territory of Moldova and, unfortunately, the establishment of such a reserve is not currently provided.

According to the national legislation the biosphere reserve has the statute of a scientific-research institution and is managed by the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources.

The main purpose of the biosphere reserve is to protect the elements and physical-geographical units of national and international significance, plant and animal species, to allow scientific researches within the system of global monitoring.

The main goals of establishing a biosphere reserve are:
- To protect and conserve the biological and landscape diversity (of genetic and ecological fund);
- To protect and stimulate the "ex-situ" reproduction of rare, endangered plant and animal species;
- To support scientific researches;
- To contribute to the dissemination of knowledge related to the protection and structure of biosphere reserve;
- To establish conditions for tourism and entertainment.

With regard to the international cooperation in the field of biosphere reserve setting up, it is worth of mentioning that their establishment is provided by regional agreements signed by the Republic of Moldova. Such an example can be the Agreement signed on June 5, 2000 between the Ministry of Waters, Forest and Environment Protection of Romania, Ministry of Ecology and Territorial Development of Moldova and Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Ukraine. This Agreement provides the cooperation within the protected areas in the Danube Delta and includes the scientific reserve “Lower Prut” (Moldova), biosphere reserve “Danube Delta” (Romania), Danube Biosphere Reserve (Ukraine).

Unfortunately, this Agreement is not implemented by any of these countries. The main reason is the lack of funds. The national environmental programmes and plans elaborated in Moldova provide to renew the approach of the above-mentioned Agreement and to review the issue on the creation of the biosphere reserve on the territory of Moldova (specifically the Lower Prut area, which is a transboundary river).

The Lower Danube countries supported the initiative of Romania in 1999 and with the support of WWF signed the Declaration on the Cooperation between the Ministry of Ecology and Territorial Development of Moldova, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Ukraine and the Ministry of Environment and Water Resources of Bulgaria and Ministry of Waters, Forest and Environment Protection of Romania on the creation of the Lower Danube Green Corridor. One of the conditions for the successful implementation of this Agreement is to set up the biosphere reserve in the area of the Lower Danube.

The policy on tourism in Moldova is developed, implemented and monitored by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

The global tourism traditionally is evaluated by the number of foreign visitors and tourists and income coming out of this. The evolution of these indicators points out that the global tourism industry has the tendency of growing.

The expansion of the international tourism globally started with the 60s. The phenomenon of tourism starts growing then due to international visits (more then 50 million) and after the 70s the tourism gets a character of mass at the global level.

Currently, the contribution of tourism in the national economy is insignificant. The low level of possibilities and income coming out of tourism put Moldova among countries with poorly-developed tourism.

For the last 10 years the dynamics of tourism development tends towards decreasing the number of tourists. This tendency is related to the negative factors occurring in the social-economic domain of the country. One of the reasons why the number of visitors is so low was generated by the change of tourism market structure and the lack of investments in the infrastructure of Moldovan tourism. The marketing in this field was not paid attention and Moldova was not efficiently introduced to the international markets of tourism. However, since 2002 the number of tourists has gone up as a result of reconstruction and update of the International Chisinau Airport, thus the possibilities of accepting more routes, flights and airlines developed.

There is the tendency of local tourism growing for the last decade. In order to make some changes in this situation, the “Day of Wine” was initiated and declared as national holiday. It is celebrated at the beginning of October and foreign guests are invited. This holiday was celebrated in many localities of Moldova this year and gathered lots of guests from abroad.

This fact shows us that Moldova possesses a rich potential for attracting foreign visitors. Moldova has a chance to improve its payment capacity by offering tourist services. The products offered to tourists could be the environment and values created by man (natural heritage, culture, customs and traditions, service for visitors).
The Republic of Moldova possesses a rich natural heritage for attracting visitors. The most remarkable features of the natural heritage are the landscape; moderate-continental climate that allows to develop different kinds of tourism; hydrographic network of the country which includes about 3000 rivers and rivulets, the biggest being the Nistru (660 km along Moldova), the Prut (695 km) and a network of channels and water reservoirs: Dubasari (on the Nistru) and Costesti (on the Prut). The mineral water is a resource of interest for tourists and occurs everywhere in Moldova. This is a resource for SPA therapy. Currently, there are about 30 sites known for SPA therapy and mineral water springs.

According to the Law on the Fund of Natural Areas Protected by State there are 12 categories of protected areas in Moldova, including 178 reserves and 130 nature monuments, which represent a huge potential for tourists. Moldova has a rich and diverse cultural heritage that could be successfully used in tourism. The Middle-Age castles that preserved in a good shape, archeological complexes, rock monasteries, houses of the former landlords and peasants from the past centuries represent diverse interest for visitors. There are many old churches, monasteries, historical sites and museum which conserved the cultural heritage of the country. There are about 140 cultural monuments, which can be included as sites of interest for foreign tourists. Unfortunately, many of them cannot be shown in the nearest future, due to the fact that they need to be restored.

The "ecological tourism" or "ecotourism" provides the development of all forms of tourism, tourism management and marketing, observing the natural, social and economic integrity of environment in the shape of researching the natural and cultural resources for the future generations.

The ecotourism is a new form of long-term tourism and, for the moment, is specified neither by the environmental law, nor by the sectoral environmental strategies (on biological diversity, climate change, forest fund development) and by the national and local environmental action plans related to ecotourism.

The main places of interest for ecotourism in Moldova are the areas of Codri, the Prut River and the Middle and Lower Nistru.

Many rural areas, agricultural lands, forests, parks, rivers, being both under state or private property, could be selected as places of interest for ecotourism.

There are some gaps to be mentioned with regard to the legal and normative framework, such as the lack of a legal act regulating the legal aspects of ecotourism; the national environmental law does not have provisions on the ecotourism in accordance with the international standards in this field; the local authorities are poorly interested in the development of the ecological tourism and the management of the eco-touristic areas completely lacks (lack of the elementary knowledge on ecological tourism and management of areas appropriate for ecotourism); the road infrastructure is poorly developed in areas representing interest for ecological tourism; the knowledge of ecotourism marketing is missing; the national and local programmes on the development of ecotourism and training in this field are missing too; the penetration of the "wild" tourism into the state protected areas make to believe less in a sustainable tourism, including ecotourism.

The Government of Moldova approved the Strategy on the Development of the Sustainable Tourism in Moldova for 2003-2015, in order to establish an adequate background for the development of the local and international tourism in Moldova and to implement the Law on Tourism No. 798-XIV of February 11, 2000.

The purpose of the Strategy on the Development of the Sustainable Tourism in Moldova is to set up the adequate background for the integrated and sustainable development of the local and international tourism development, which can bring cultural and social-economic benefit to Moldovan community.

The Strategy was elaborated by the Department on tourism development with the support of Sustainable Tourism Development Project, UNDP, Moldova.

The implementation of the Strategy requires the coordination, investments, training and marketing, which means cooperation among Government, local public authorities, business community and civil society.

The Law on Tourism No. 798-XIV of February 11, 2000 and other normative acts in force represent the legal framework for the implementation of the Strategy. However, to implement some concrete forms of tourism (rural, ecological, wine tourism, cultural, SPA centers, social, etc.) it is necessary to elaborate and implement additional normative acts.

The sustainable tourism development provides ecological sustainability, which ensures the conservation of biodiversity and biological resources.

There are national plans that provide the inclusion of the protected areas in the touristic network. These plans also foresee the development of these areas, creation of normal conditions for tourism development: construction or restoration of roads leading to these areas, installation of indicators, setting up of camping and hotels.

The main strategic directions in the implementation of state policy on tourism are the following:

- Elaboration of the Law on Ecological Tourism or an annex to the existing Law on Tourism;
- Harmonization of the legislation in accordance with the international standards;
- Implementation of the educational program at the local level (local authorities and population);
- Population training in the field of ecotourism;
- Elaboration of local, national and regional programs on the cooperation in the field of ecotourism;
• Observation of the current environmental legislation and elaboration of the modern ecological system on hosting tourists in areas of high interest;
• Elaboration and implementation of the program on ecotourism marketing based on market studies;
• Preparation of educational materials on ecotourism;
• Extension of the fund of state protected areas at local and national level.

The development of tourism has to be sustainable from the environmental point of view, economically viable and profitable, fair from the ethical and social point of view. The tourism in Moldova has to be developed in the context of regional, national and international tourism.

The improvement of the legal framework on ecotourism provides the following:
• To harmonize the legal background on tourism in accordance with the EU legislation of in this field;
• To coordinate the legal background on tourism with other legislative acts, such as: Water Code, Forest Code, Law on Green Areas in Rural and Urban Settlements, Law on Monument Protection, Law on the Fund of Natural Areas Protected by State, Law on the Principles of Urbanization and Territorial Development, Law o Consumer Protection, etc.
• To prepare normative acts contributing to the creation of the economical environment for stimulating various forms of tourism in Moldova and drawing up the investments for the projects on tourism infrastructure development (rural, ecological, wine tourism, cultural, SPA centers, social, etc.).

The implementation of these recommendations requests improvements and changes in the Law on Budget. The participants in the World Summit on Sustainable Development (August 26 – September 4, 2002) in Johannesberg agreed to support the sustainable development of tourism, including non-consuming and ecotourism, and considering that 2002 was the Year of Tourism and International Year of UN Cultural Heritage, also taking into consideration the World Summit on Ecotourism (2002) and the Quebec Declaration adopted there, and the Global Ethic Code on Tourism adopted by the World Tourist Organization, in order to get revenues for the local communities out of the tourism resources and to strengthen the cultural and ecological integrity of sites representing interest for tourists, and to protect environmentally-vulnerable areas. The sustainable development of tourism and strengthening the rural and local population potential request to undertake measures at all levels for:
• Strengthening international cooperation, contributing through foreign investments and maintaining partnership with state and private sector at all levels;
• Elaborating programs, including educational and public awareness raising ones, allowing population to develop ecotourism and get revenues, contributing at the same time to the conservation of environment and cultural heritage;
• Supporting the work done in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity, including activities on sustainable development of tourism approached as a global issues and related to various ecosystems, sectors and thematic fields.

Artem Grigoryan

“Development of Ecological and Ethnographic Tourism in Natural and Historical Reserve “Arpi”

The “Arpi” nature and history reserve and the adjacent territory cover almost the entire mountain valley of the Gnishik River geographically; the area comprises 4565 hectares and is situated at 1200-1300 metres above the sea level.

This territory stands out for its geographically and geologically unique formations, the ancient outcrops, caverns, waterfalls and springs. These include the Ertich outcrops, the Maghil, Mozrov and Arjer caverns – all of world-wide importance.

The described territory is also remarkable for the diversity of its flora and fauna; it is a habitat for such rare species as the Near Asian leopard, roe, moufflon, bear, lynx, partridge and various kinds of snakes.

There are found approximately 500 herbage species including 42 rare species entered into the Red Book of the Republic of Armenia. Thanks to the caverns, the cold springs, the wildlife and flora and the abundance of fruit-trees, this territory has been populated by the humans since Neolith. Numerous husbanded terrain scraps, settlements and necropolises survived to our days there.

Right now, there are three villages established in the Early and Late Middle Ages in the said area.

Only the Areni village that is adjacent to the Yerevan-Goris motorway leads a modern and full-scale life. The government bound the highland villages of Gnishik and Amagu to moving to more comfortable localities in order to improve the living conditions of the population; this was during 1950-60. Now, the village of Amagu is deserted while only 20% of the former population remains in the village of Gnishik still.
The desertion of the villages was accompanied by the oblivion of the specific ethnography, household traditions, customs, crafts and environmentally clean production (of milk, mazoni, cheese, butter and honey).

The territory is rich in the valuable cultural heritage. The state lists of the Republic of Armenia include 212 monuments of history and culture that are situated in that territory. Those are mainly the traditional homes with the "Azarashen" roves, necropolises, the Mediaeval cemeteries, khachkars, strongholds, bridges and churches.

The whole territory was crowned by the completed monastery complex of Noravank in the 9-14 centuries. In the 13th century, the monastery was the spiritual and cultural centre of the Syunik province of Armenia; it is situated on the northern slope of the picturesque Gnishik river ravine. This architectural complex adds magnitude to the beautiful natural environment and becomes an inseparable part of it.

Noravank has been attracting many people who live the believing, spiritual and cultured lives over centuries and does so now.

In spite of all that, the region is left unattended for the time being.

While the socio-economic condition of the country was worsening over the 10-15 years past, the exhaustive use of the natural resources led to the poorer flora and fauna of the locality, as well as brought about impoverishment of the cultural landscape and the most ancient orchards. The environmental condition of the Gnishik river valley worsened the most dramatically; the partial re-coursing of the river towards the village of Rind put many flora and fauna species on the verge of extinction.

Considering the big natural and cultural potential of the one of the unique parts of the Armenian nature, as well as the environmentally lamentable condition of the region, the specialists of the Armenian ICOMOS Organisation and the Agency for Protection of History and Culture Monuments of the Ministry of Culture and Youth Affairs of the Republic of Armenia have developed a protection programme for the historical-cultural heritage of the territory, for restoration of the historical villages and for continuous development.

The goal of the programme is to organise infrastructure systems promoting tourism in the valley of the River Gnishik, within the boundaries of the Arpi natural and historical reserve. The infrastructure systems will be based on the country-side traditions and lifestyle, revival of the old crafts, environmentally clean produce and visitors' introduction to the culturally valuable heritage and the extraordinary geographical, flora and fauna environment. The programme will enable the natural reserve and the adjacent territories to become a centre of culture, eco-tourism and adventure tourism, which, in turn, will provide for economic development of the Vayotsdzor Marz.

Alexander Zateevv

«Katunsky Biosphere Reserve as a UNESCO Natural World Heritage Site»

Katunsky Biosphere Reserve is located in the highlands of the Altai Mountains near the borders of four states: Russia, Kazakhstan, Mongolia and China. It is situated in the Ust-Koksa administrative unit of the Altai Republic.

The Reserve's territory is the part of the Central-Altai geographical province, and it includes southern and northern slopes of the Katunsky Ridge and northern slopes of the Listvyaga ridge. The altitudes vary from 1300 to 3280 m.a.s.l. The average altitude of the area is 2110 m, and this allows referring Katunsky BR to the most elevated reserves in Russia. Occurrence of the glaciers, snow fields and high-mountainous lakes is important and attractive feature of this area. The significant part of Katun runoff – the main river of the Altai Mountains - is formed within the reserve's territory.

Within Katunsky BR the greatest part of Western Katunsky glaciation center, which is 148 glaciers of 79.8 km², is located. The activity of ancient glaciers is marked by specific Alpine relief.

The climate is extra continental. Rivers are typically mountainous, with steep-sloped valleys. The total length of rivers in the reserve is 1200.2 km; the density of river net is 0.79 km/km². There are 135 high-mountainous glacial lakes within the core area.

The vegetation is characterized by high diversity of steppe, meadow, wood and high-mountainous communities, changing each other by altitude. The equal areas of meadows and woods on the mountain forest belt and great extension of high-mountainous humid vegetation demonstrates the uniqueness of this territory among other Russian nature reserves.

Biodiversity of this territory is rather high. Totally, 663 species of vascular plants, 215 spp of mosses, 793 spp of lichens, and 264 spp of fungi are identified. The wild goats, red deer, bear, sable are typical animals in

mountain forests. In general, the reserve's area is habitat for 51 spp of mammals, 132 spp of birds, 3 spp of reptiles, 1 spp of amphibious, 8 spp of fishes, including inscribed into the Red Data Book of the Russian Federation snow leopard, big cormorant, black stork, burial ground, golden eagle, black signature stamp, saker falcon, grey crane etc.

The distant (from 20 to 100 km) from the settlements location of the core zone is the specific characteristic. The reserve borders with Natural Park Belukha (Russian) and Katon-Karagaiskiy National Park (Kazakhstan). The other adjoining lands are insignificantly disturbed by human activity. The major types of land use there are grazing, collection of non-timber forest products (cedar nuts, medicinal plants) and tourism. The core zone is situated within the most elevated autonomous position, and this allows us to assume that the land use in the adjoining lands doesn't affect the reserved ecosystems significantly.

In 1998 Katunsky Reserve had been designated as the cluster of “The Golden Mountains of Altai” World Natural Heritage Site. Equally, the Mt. Belukha, Ukok plateau, Altaisky Nature Reserve and Lake Teletskoye are the other clusters of this territory.

This site had been nominated under fourth natural criteria as habitats of the most representative and important species. The key characteristics of the site are:

– Altai is unique natural region of Siberia;
– Altai is the outstanding example of biological diversity;
– Unlike other mountain system: the Sayan, the Kuznyetskii Alatau, the Pribaikal Mountains and Zabaiikal Mountains, the proposed territory contains greater demonstrable biodiversity and abundance of species. In the area of the proposed site is the fullest representation and the best Reserved of all zonal types Siberian ecosystems
– Altai mountains are outstanding example of biological evolution;
– The nature of the proposed territory is an example of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;
– The territory includes a great number of natural complexes, many of which are compact and easily accessible for visits that allows for short exploratory excursions in order to demonstrate the unique natural biodiversity;
– The area of the ecosystem is sufficiently large to reserve the populations for the overwhelming number of the unique animal and plant populations.

Present Activity of Katunsky BR

General directions of development of Katunsky Reserve are protection of natural ecosystems, monitoring and researches, ecological education and logistic support of sustainable regional development. The main topics are presented in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranger Service</th>
<th>Protection of core and buffer zones of the BR Joint raids with other nature conservancy organizations within adjoining to the reserve’s lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research projects and monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring of components and processes in ecosystems Applied researches on ecological issues of the land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological education</td>
<td>Ecological education of children at schools Club “Friends of WWF” Ecological education in mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistic support of sustainable development of Ust-Koksa district</td>
<td>Project on sustainable livelihoods (with support from Biodiversity Conservation Center) Support of traditional economies (apiculture, red deer farming) Development of ecotourism in the BR and adjoining lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides, in 2004 the transboundary collaboration with Katon-Karagaisky National Park (Kazakhstan) was initiated to better conserve the vulnerable nature and to support the local population of Altai-Sayan Ecoregion and transboundary areas of the Altai Republic and Eastern Kazakhstan. The general directions of this collaboration are organization of joint protection of the area, joint research projects and monitoring and organization of transboundary ecotours. For the long-term perspective the nomination of Katon-Karagaiskiy Park into UNESCO MAB program is supposed.

Development of Ecotourism

The present territory of Katunsky BR was actively used for active recreation before the establishment of protected area. Several well-known itineraries to Moulhinskije lakes, Lake Tajmenje, foothills of Mt. Belukha passed through its present area. That is why we have chosen the organization of ecotourism as one of the general directions of Katunsky BR's development. The legal base is provided by Federal Law “On Specially Protected Areas” and Regulations for state nature reserves.

For ecotourism development several itineraries were planned and approved by the Ministry of Natural Resources. The most visited sites are equipped with services, when needed the path is repaired. In the buffer zone several stations for tourists have been constructed.

Different programs of ecotours for different categories of tourists are under realization in Katunsky BR. They are summer schools for children and students, scientific, adventure, elite tours etc. Inalienable part of each tour is knowledge of nature and its protection in the reserve. Most of itineraries demonstrate to tourists principles of sustainable regional development and realization of Seville Strategy for Biosphere Reserves within deer farm at transition zone of Katunsky BR.

The works on information background of ecotourism development are being conducted in several directions. Firstly, this is the advertisement of ecotours. For these purpose two web-sites has been constructed. They contain general information about Katunsky BR and its activity and proposed itineraries. Also the reserve prepared and published the book “Development of recreation in the Altai mountains. Case study of Ust-Kokska district”, based on our own researches. This book is designed for managers, investors, travel agencies and tourists. Systematically the articles in well-known magazines about traveling are published. The information on ecotours in Katunsky BR repeatedly was presented at the travel exhibitions (Tursib). Purposeful work with travel agencies is being done constantly.

At the mostly pressed tourist paths monitoring of ecosystem state is being conducted to prevent negative transformations of natural complexes.

Development of ecotourism in Katunsky BR and Ust-Kokska district in general cause the increase of income of local people, mainly because of additional money from transport services, renting houses and horses, selling the local food and hand-made souvenirs. The people who live in the settlements on the main tourist itineraries (Multa, Maralovodka, Kajtanak, Katanda, Tyungur, Koucherla, Terecta, Verkh-Ujmon, totally 25% of population of Ust-Kokska district) get the significant additional income. In each of abovementioned villages from 5 (Kajtanak, Maralovodka) to 100 (Tyungur, Koucherla) persons are involved into tourism organization. The participation in ecotourism industry, for instance, by renting one horse, allows to get additionally 10 000 rubles per season.

Taking into consideration the high level of unemployment in the district and low average income of local people, the development of ecotourism with active involvement of local people could significantly increase their income and tax return into district budget.

The results of sociological survey, conducted in 2003, shows that 23 % of people in Ust-Kokska district concern the ecotourism development as one of the most effective ways of economic activity. Moreover, 20% concern this as the effective way of nature conservation. In 2004 27 % of inhabitants have been provided tourists with local goods and services (that is, first of all, rent of vehicles, horses, sale of local food and souvenirs). And 21 % of people could increase the amount and volume of produced goods and services if the effective mechanism of its realization will be developed.

23 % of inhabitants would like to know more about how to get involved into ecotourism development. Based on this demand, Katunsky BR has conducted special training courses for local guides among unemployed local people. This training course includes both theoretic background in ecology, history and economy of region, psychology, fundamentals of tourism and safety, and practical works on the ecological paths of Katunsky BR. Now quarter of the students is actively involved into tourism industry, and this fact allows us to consider this event successful. Taking into account lack of professionals in the tourism industry and interest of local people, we consider organization of such training courses periodically.

Problems of Ecotourism Development

Despite of that Altai is one of the most famous and attractive recreational regions of Russia, currently the potential of UNESCO WHS statute is poorly used for development of tourism in Katunsky BR and other clusters of “The Golden Mountains of Altai” site. There is no information about this site in the region; the public awareness on this particular site and on the UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage is insufficient. The coordination between five clusters of the Altaian WHS is absolutely absent.

These problems seem to be mostly caused by absence of Federal Law on protection of World Natural Heritage Sites. There is only one law on protection of one concrete site – “Lake Baikal”, whilst other sites are only managed as federal or regional protected areas. The second issue is absence of federal governmental structure to be responsible for the activity of World Natural Heritage Sites in Russia.

Despite international obligations, Russia took to protect WHSs; there is no special funding except for that provided for the protected areas. Also the coordination of World Natural Heritage Sites is provided partly by non-governmental organizations (Natural Heritage Protection Fund).
The main problem in the field of ecotourism development in protected areas among others is organization and management of touristic activity. The need for federal governmental structure to manage the ecotourism development in protected areas is noted. The proposed functions of this structure are:

- To develop criteria of ecologically sustainable tourism and certification of ecotouristic paths and services to access its correspondence with international principles of sustainable tourism,
- To provide common information space and to involve nature reserves into international system of ecological tourism development,
- To organize marketing, advertisement and promotion of touristic products of reserves in Russia and abroad,
- To establish the center of professional training in the field of ecotourism, to conduct seminars and summer schools permanently,
- To develop and implement common civilized politics of price-formation for ecotouristic services and goods,
- To work out recommendations on common standards of design of information stands, equipment and design of ecotouristic paths, etc.,
- To prepare recommendation on equipping, designing and planning the work of visit-centers and museums of nature,
- To work out standards of stylistic decisions of advertisement and other publications,
- To develop mechanisms of monitoring and control of ecotouristic activity for prevention of ecosystem damage and loss.

Particularly in Katunsky BR in addition to above-mentioned, following issues of the ecotourism development could be identified:

- Technical base and infrastructure (roads, transport, hotels, etc) is not well developed because of the lack of funds;
- Problems in marketing, advertisement and promotion of ecotours. The statute of World Heritage Site gives the good pre-condition for promotion of ecotours, but mainly because lack of appropriate funds no marketing studies are conducted and the advertisement is insufficient.
- There is no legal base for regulation of the human activity in the transition zone. The transition zone doesn't have the statute of protected area; all the projects are based on the agreement between administration of the reserve and landowners.

Natalia Moraleva

«The International and Russian Projects of Development of Ecological Tourism in Reserves and National Parks»

The main driving force behind the developing eco-tourism in Russia is doubtless the support from the international environmental organisations. Various international organisations financed a whole range of projects dealing with development of the eco-tourism in various reserves and national parks of Russia during the past ten years. Those included the projects of the US Agency for International Development /USAID/ and the World Wildlife Fund /WWF/ that dealt with development of the eco-tourism in the Far East; a series of projects by the Institute for Steady Communities (ISC, the ROLL project) serving to distribute the relevant positive experience in the Khabarovsk region and Amur provinces, the Altay-Sayan eco-region and the Northern Caucasus, Karelia and Central Siberia. The TACIS and WWF played a great role in the development of the eco-tourism in Karelia and the Russian North. At Baikal, the development project dealing with a chain of guesthouses owned by the local people was supported and the experienced gathered in its course is being distributed widely currently (the ROLL project, the ISC, the USAID). The eco-tourism promotion opportunities of Baikal were studied earnestly within the frameworks of a World Bank project. In Kamchatka, the eco-tourism promotion projects are financed by the UNDP. The Nature Management and Environmental Protection Department of Moscow has been paying serious attention to promotion of the eco-tourism over the two years past.

It was the Far East bio-diversity preservation project implemented by the WWF at the expense of the USAID in 1996-1998 that set the eco-tourism development in the Russian specially protected areas into motion. That was the first instance of a clear outline of the problems hindering the progress of the eco-tourism not only in the Primorsky region reserves but also throughout the system of the specially protected areas of Russia. One of the outcomes of the project was that the Dersu Uzala Eco-Tourism Development Foundation was established and became eventually the communicator of the eco-tourism ideas in Russia. The activities of the Foundation

---

3 General Directions of development and organization of activity of state nature reserves in the Russian Federation for the period to 2010. Moscow, 2001
created a momentum behind energetic proliferation of the eco-tourism ideas across the whole national system of protected areas.

The Dersu Uzala Foundation implemented a weighty set of projects promoting the eco-tourism in reserves and national parks in the period from 1998 until 2005. The experience gathered in the Far East project was distributed to all the Far East reserves first (1998) and to the protected areas of the Sayan-Altay Region (the Sayano-Shushensky, Khakassky, Katunsky, Altaiisky, Kuznetsky Alatau and the Ubsunur Depression (Ubsunurskaya Kotlovina) Reserves, the "Shushensky Bor" National park and the "Kazanovka" nature/archaeological park) then (1999-2000) within the frameworks of the ROLL programme of the ISC. The next step in replicating the practical results was in the form of the eco-tourism development project that was based on the Teberdinsky Reserve in the North Caucasus (2001-2002). Then came the eco-tourism development project in the Vodlozersky National park (2002-2003) and the project of establishing a museum of the traditional natural resource usages in the area of co-operation of the Central Siberian (Tsentrnalno-Sibirsky) Biosphere Reserve (2004-2005).

The UNESCO Moscow Office supported in 2003 a not big project aimed at documenting the action plan to implement the Seville Strategy in the Laplandsky Biosphere Reserve and eco-tourism promotion was an important programme element there. During 2003-2005, the Foundation's specialists developed an eco-development strategy and a business-plan for four specially protected areas of Kamchatka (Kronotsky Reserve, the South Kamchatka Preserve, the Nature Parks Bystrinsky and Nalichevsky).

The specialists of the Dersu Uzala Foundation initiated a new trend in the progress of the eco-tourism with the financial support of the Nature Management and Environmental Protection Department of the City Council of Moscow in 2004-2005. That was the idea of arranging eco-camps for pupils of the secondary schools of Moscow within reserves and national parks. Eleven eco-camps were organised for 500 Muscovite pupils in that period.

Further, the Dersu Uzala Foundation specialists developed over 100 programmes and routes for different visitor categories, determined the recreation loads, held the training seminars for the preserved territory personnel and training courses for the guides and had an eco-path equipped in the "Shushensky Bor" National park – all in implementing international projects. Also and for the first time ever, attempts were made in earnest at involving the local population in the eco-tourism.

A lot was done to promote the eco-tourism ideas and advertise eco-tourism programmes, including the launch of the www.ecotours.ru web-site, publication of articles in the GEO, the Russian Conservation News, Voyage, Gravitation Force and Liza magazines, et cetera. An illustrated book entitled “Eco-Tourism in Sayan-Altay Region” was published in English; another book, called “In the Mountains of the Caucasus”, was published as well. So were the promo handouts. “The Eco-Tourism on the Way to Russia”, the first ever eco-tourism methodology guide, was published in Russian in the format of the WWF project – and became a proper bestseller.

It can be said now that, in general, the implementation of the international projects notably increases the speed of the eco-tourism development in the provinces. There’s observed a steady growth in attendance and in the revenues of the participating protected areas. The eco-tourism is developing the most successfully in the reserves of the Far East, and especially so in the Lazovsky and the Far East Marine (Dalnevostochny Morskoy) Reserves, further, in Sayan-Altay Region (the Sayano-Shushensky and the Katunsky Reserves), and in the North-West (the Laplandsky Reserve and the Kenozersky and Vodlozersky National Parks).

The Russian Eco-Tourism Association was established upon the initiative of the Dersu Uzala Foundation and with the support of the WWF in 2001, with the goal of uniting the protected territories, public organisations, travel companies and governmental officials. The mission of the Association is to promote the eco-tourism development in Russia on the basis of the relevant international principles, as well as to support a constructive dialogue between all the parties concerned so that a balance of interests can be found to ensure development of the eco-tourist business and fulfilment of the environmental protection tasks. Doubtless, the Eco-Tourism Association will need the international support as well as the backing of the Russian governmental bodies if it is ever to achieve such grand goals.

Unfortunately, we have got to admit that the international interest in promotion of the eco-tourism in the specially protected areas of Russia has abated somewhat over the past few years. The development of the eco-tourism is only backed in the UNDP projects for the time being and, to our mind; one of the reasons why this happens is the absence of a clear state policy and programme concerning development of the eco-tourism. The specialist staff of the Dersu Uzala formulated the concept and determined the main fields of operation for the reserves and the national parks of the country in connection with the eco-tourism development; that was done to the orders of the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation in 2002. In 2003, the programme document “The Main Development Areas for the System of the State Nature Reserves and National Parks for until 2015” was approved by the order of the MNR. However, implementation of the programme as never started; moreover, the MNR stopped considering the eco-tourism development in the specially protected areas as a priority of late. Instead, the scale of the issue were downplayed to “development of recreation in the national parks”, which is certainly not adequate to the true potential and the capacities of the Russian chain of the specially protected areas.
The Nature Management and Environmental Protection Department of Moscow is the most active supporter of the eco-tourism development for the time being. It is planned to expand the children's eco-camp projects further; those projects could eventually serve as a basis for a juvenile environmental movement. The plans of the Department include the eco-tourism promotion in the specially protected areas of Moscow.

Tamara Gorjacheva

«Development of Biosphere Reserves and Ecological Tourism in Krasnoyarsky Kray»

Traditionally, nature reserves in Russia have been seen as zones for saving typical and unique natural landscapes: for taking care about a great variety of flora and fauna; for protection of natural and cultural objects are partially or completely confiscated from practical using. The fact remains though that they have got a special protection regime and seem to be under regulated, traditional and practical leadership. Protected zones and reserve territories are exactly the areas, which implement and develop ecological tourism in order to keep governmental proposal, concerning the forming of ecological world outlook with the purpose to assist people through the orientation by nature (Alexeeva, Nuhimovskaya, Reimers 1983; Borodin, Krinitsky, 1981; Sokolov E.E., Siroychkovsky, 1981; Siroychkovsky, 1998; Yakimov, 2001; Bolshakov, Siroychkovsky, 1998; Kolokov, 1998; Kol, 1998; Rassalov, 2001; Shestakova, 2003; Stepanitsky, Trotsky, Fedotov, 2003 and others).

The disposition of nature reserves on the banks of the Yenisey contains all natural zones and subzones, which are located from the North to the South – Big Arctic (Bolshoy Arkhtchesky), Taymirsky, Tungusssky, Central-Siberian (Tsentralno-Sibirsky), Putoransky, Stolby, Sayano-Shushensky, Khakassky Reserves, the National Park “Shushensky Bor”, the Azas and the Ubsunur Depression (Ubsunurskaya Kotlovina) Reserves provide tourists with systematically organized knowledge in order to develop their ecological world outlook and to learn the research of biological variety.

Undoubtedly, ecological camps and expeditions provide customers with plenty of deep knowledge in biological variety of Yenisei areas; they require the necessity of thoughtful behavior while facing with wild nature; they suggest opportunities to underline the unity of human beings and all the alive creatures, which inhabit the Yenisey’s territories. The leading role in the possibility of developing of the ecological tourism on the basis of nature reserves plays reserves scientific departments.

Thanks to their efforts in 1925 the first attempts, concerning the researches of a great variety of mountain taiga in the East Sayans have been undertaken. Not only special reports and research works (manuals) were published by scientific departments, but also articles, connected with biology, ecology of animals and plants within the reserves (Nasimovich, 1974; Larin, 1983; Delper, 1988; Muchamediev, Knorre, 1998; Zavatsky, 1998; Pospelov, 1998; Lopatin, Savchenko, Smolina, 1998; 1990; Sonnikova, 1992 and others). Due to this fact it seems not very complicated to prepare materials for lectures and use it for conducting sightseeing tours and it helps to create programmes according to ecological issues. For instance, a manual called “The taiga through children and animals comprehension” 2005 is devoted to the experience of the childish ecological expedition organized and provided by Moscow state school №57 within the Nature Reserve “Khakassky” (Moscow, 2005). In the Krasnoyarsk Region the most active and useful researches in developing of ecological familiarization tourism, ecological camps and expeditions are being promoted by Sayano-Shushensky Biosphere Reserve (Sashko, 1998; Rassalov, Sonnikova, 2003; Rassalov, Leiman, 2003; Stachcheev, 2003). The development of scientific-practical tourism in the ESIT was opened in 2003. The department was based on practical knowledge of Sayano-Shushensky Biosphere Reserve. It was just the beginning of the development of the aim programming “Tourism promotion in Shushensky region 2004-2010” (Lagusev, 2004)

A social project “Preservation of bio variety through the changes in consumption of sources of wild nature and regulated tourism among a plant of residence of Shushensky district” was worked out and introduces by Sayano-Shushensky Biosphere Reserve (Vasilenko, 2003). Within the project the students of the East-Siberian Institute for Tourism get on the-job-training. This practice includes the development of rural tourism on the territory of Shushensky region and research of tourist sights (Goryacheva, Puzakova, 2003). Projects, connected with the development of ecological and familiarization trips through reserve are initiated by the reserve’s authorities and the East-Siberian Institute for Tourism. So, the expedition to the buffer zone of the reserve and its biosphere polygon on the mountain-ridge Idgir was held by administration of ESIT and the students with the purpose of working out a familiarization tour called “12 legends of the Sayans” (Berlyakova, 2004). Students who participated in the expedition using the collected material – developed contented projects, which were presented during the fest among Krasnoyarsk colleges. All these projects have been highly rewarded.

In 2005 the Reserve’s staff and ESIT developed a familiarization route called “Sayanskoe reservoir”. The partnership project of children ecological camp “I am the resident of the Earth” is being brought to light. Among
our future planning are implementation of the developed routes in tourist business, research work of ecological routes in the Biosphere polygons of the Reserve “Sayano-Shushensky”: “Yenisey Islands – nature monuments of Yenisey”, “River Shush - nature monument”, “Following the path of N.L. Martyyanov” and other.

Vera Tchizhova

«Development and Introduction of Modern Methods of Management by Streams of Tourists in Especially Protected Areas»

Tourist flow management is one of the principal issues to be addressed when planning eco-tourism in the protected areas in any Russian region, be it the Caucasus, Altai or Kamchatka. On the rationality of the flow organization depend not only the success of eco-tourism operation but also preservation of landscape complexes and of natural and cultural sites.

Tourist flow management has several components worthy of a mention. First of all, it is necessary to determine the maximum permissible environment loads (MPEL) as early as in the course of projection work. The measurement shall be based on possible natural environment changes under the influence from recreation. In the majority of cases, the premise that the bigger the load, the more material the changes is taken as an axiom. As a result, limitations and bans have been the main means of determining the MPEL for long enough.

The long years of the enquiry into the matter, local as well as overseas, called into question the firmness of this premise mentioned above. As a result, the author developed the ten basic principles underlying determination of the MPEL in application to the eco-tourism development:

- **the principle of limiting factors**: determination of the MPEL should be based on the search for, and analysis of environmental and physical factors limiting the load from recreation;
- **the principle of the individual approach to each route**: the MPEL should be determined separately for each touring route and upon consideration of the specific natural and organisational conditions;
- **the principle of taking account of the psychological comfort criteria**: the psychological comfort factors should be taken into account alongside the environmental and physical ones;
- **the principle of load minimization**: the smallest values of the three above-mentioned types are taken as the permissible load;
- **the course principle**: the factual load on a route should be set at the MPEL by gradual increase rather than at once;
- **the principle of environmental monitoring**: constant monitoring of each route’s condition by making “section analyses” at least three times a year (before the touring season’s start, amidst it and immediate on its end);
- **the principle of MPEL adjustment**: depending on the condition of a given route and the specific social-economic conditions, the MPEL can be reduced, increased or remained unchanged on an annual basis;
- **the principle of rational route arrangement**: in the MPEL values largely depend on how well tourist routes are arranged;
- **the principle of compliance with the environmental protection regulations**: it is necessary to develop environmental protection standards and rules that tourists would understand and appreciate;
- **the principle of tourist conduct control**: environmental monitoring should include not only constant route status control but also tourist conduct control, and be implemented by periodical “section analyses” through questioning them.

The generalization of the local and overseas experience permitted the author to put together the most fortunate examples of environmental protection arrangements on the eco-routes, which are quite applicable to the national parks and reserves of Russia. Besides, the author suggested a compendium of tourist conduct rules while in the specially protected areas – those rules are marked by the benevolent tone and the explanatory design, and are easily customizable for any specially protected areas in Russia.
Natalia Danilina

«Possible Sources of Financing and Innovative Projects of Development of Ecological Tourism in Specially Protected Areas»

The Russian network of the specially protected areas (SPA) is one of the biggest and best developed in the world. The Russian SPAs have been involved in the international co-operation increasingly energetically over the past decade, during which their administrators have had the opportunity of learning the relevant international experience and showing their practical ideas and achievements. The already-implemented GEF project of preserving bio-diversity in the Russian Federation played a big role in this process and so did the projects by the UNESCO and many overseas and Russian charitable foundations and organisations. However, it would still be premature to talk of the integration of our network of the reservations into the global reservation community. At the same time, it is evident that international co-operation is needed for greater stability of the Russian reservation system’s progress. Co-operation is required with those international organisations that are connected with the SPAs; the world experience ought to be learned and tailored to the specific conditions found in Russia. The fact that the specially protected areas reference, publications and websites are predominantly in English is a major drawback because the English materials are only accessible for but a small proportion of those who have to do with the activities of the Russian protected areas.

Development of tourism in the specially protected areas is still a fairly new business to the Russian national parks and the other relevant reservations. The experience of the countries that have long advanced this aspect of operation of the protected sites and have accumulated the expertise over decades and even over centuries in a number of cases is absolutely crucial. It is imperative to make use of the best international practice in the development strategy for the SPAs in Russia.

The projects that are implemented in Northern Eurasia and are aimed at development of the specially protected areas, among other things, include development of the eco-tourism. Those are the UNDP projects in Russia (Kamchatka, Povolzhye [the banks of the Volga]), in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, the trans-boundary project of the GEF in the three Middle Asian countries of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Kirghizistan, and the European Commission’s Tacis-funded project of “Development of the local socio-economic initiatives employing the potential of the SPAs and the environmental non-commercial organisations”. The project is aimed at development of trans-national co-operation between Russia’s specially protected areas and the public organisations working in their interests, as well as the specialist organisations in the European Union (the Euro Park Federation, which has more than 300 members being the non-commercial organisations, SPAs, associations, et cetera) and the 50 participants of the Interreg Project. One of the goals of the project is to help local economic development via elaboration of eco-tourism strategies within the specially protected areas; they are then tested in the pilot sites. The joint project of the UN Environmental Programme and the GEF, which has entered the implementation phase in August this year, is called “Creation of a Network of Training Centres for the Specially Protected Areas Employees by Using the Successfully Probated Experience” this project may promote generalisation, distribution and implementation of the best Russian and world experience of promoting the SPAs, including as regards development of tourism. This project is under way in the following four countries: Belarus, Russia, Kazakhstan and Ukraine. However, the outcomes of it will be distributed via the channels of the World Commission for Protected Areas (WCPA) of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) to the other Russian-speaking parts of Northern Eurasia as well as around the world. The plans include organisation of co-operation, co-ordination of activities and collaboration with the other projects that are in implementation in our territory to handle the following subject:

- arrangement of international meetings, seminars and practice training sessions to initiate new ideas/methods of implementing reservation-based tourism development programmes;
- evolution of tuition programmes and methodological reference for the SPAs specialists, the SPAs -based non-commercial organisations, local authorities and tourism companies to ensure efficient tourism development involving the protected areas’ potential while taking account of the local population, province and country interests;
- planning and implementation of pilot tourism development facilities in model territories with improving local socio-economic prospects and with local community involvement in decision-making;
- publication of the best overseas and local practice;
- proliferation of project results via web-sites, books and newspapers; participation at the international conferences.
**Alexandr Drozdov**

«Synthesis Cultural and Naturalists Plots in Ecotourism Projects»

The environmental imperative will only become effective provided that every man on the Earth will acquire the three essential and sufficient elements of the environmental culture, namely:
- comprehension of the environmental norms based on the natural and social laws;
- integration of such norms into their world outlook;
- adequate course of action.

It is this goal precisely that the eco-cultural tours should pursue.

**The “Framework” Tasks**

The subjects, programmes and contents of eco-cultural tours should incorporate a wide range of scenarios the implementation of which would help solve the “framework” tasks in three groups, which, in turn, would form a tour context:

1. Description of the main eco-cultural concepts, their backgrounds and significance, inclusive of:
   - the ancient environmental culture concepts and those of the modern conventional societies;
   - the post-industrial society sustainable development concepts.

2. Systematisation of the principal environmental components of both the conventional and the modern cultures, namely,
   - the environmentally steady and conventional forms and elements of nature use under different natural and historical conditions;
   - the manifestations of the environmental imperative in rituals, beliefs, folklore and other traditional arts.

3. Identification and analysis of the eco-cultural heritage and of the modern environmental culture of the Russian provinces:
   - the ethnic and social groups that bear the traditional environmental culture, of their labour and other activity;
   - the traditional nature use areas, their condition and status;
   - the environmental culture monuments (natural objects, collections, et cetera);
   - the environmental ideologies and community conduct codes in towns and in countryside.

**The eco-cultural tour and programme organisation principles**

Such tours (programmes) should:
- show the mutual adaptation of the socium, the economy and the nature in the context of the cultural landscape concepts; also, integrate the culture and nature studies and knowledge;
- underline the manifestations of the past, present and possibly future problems of nature use, while also suggesting solutions and mitigation steps for at least some of those problems;
- be so arranged as to serve at least as a supporting (and sometimes as an organising) component of the cultural landscape;
- be in line with the universal eco-tourism principles.

More often than not, the culture promotion organisations, including the UNESCO, fail to pay enough attention to preservation of the eco-cultural diversity. This is why the eco-cultural synthesis is so important in touring programmes concerned with the cultural landscape. The possible examples of such synthetic programmes are a Russian countryside cottage as an eco-cultural phenomenon; springs and rivulets in a town; the cultural and environmental functions of national parks and memorial estates.

**Olga Tcherbakova**

«Development of Ecological Tourism in Area of Lake Baikal»

In recent years ecological tourism has been of great concern all over the world. The name ecotourism, probably, is spread on all kinds of active cognitive tourism, the arrangement of which answers all requirements of nature preserving.

The objects of ecotourism are the unique slightly damaged nature landscapes. They are the specially protected areas: reserves, preserves, natural monuments, national and natural parks, etc. National and natural parks have to be functionally zoned paying special attention to the strictly protected zones and to the zones available for
visiting them by tourists. The reserves may be visited restrictfully—only in the internal zones, but more freely—
from the side of the buffer zone. All these should be strictly regulated.

The purpose of ecotourism is deepening the ecological education and bringing up different groups of popula-
tion. While conducting some ecotours we should follow the strict norms and limits.

A very important principle of ecotourism in any place of the world should be its coincidence with the de-
velopment of its region.

It’s obvious that Baikalsky region has a great tourist potential but, unfortunately, it is not such significant in
the world of the tourist market. The reason is some factors preventing incoming tourism in the region.

One of the greatest problems is the prohibition of the development of some tourism activities in the central
ecological zone of Baikalsky region that makes the development of “legal” tourist infrastructure difficult.

The development of the tourist business on the banks of Baikal is chaotic, primitive and irrational. The tourist
camps made of wood, are alike, they are built very quickly right at the water. The design of the camps is rather
plain without any special local features and colours at all.

The poor development of the infrastructure, the financial shortage, the lack of the hotels with modern facili-
ties is the factors of the tourist reality.

The absence of good conditions for the investment into the tourist infrastructure makes the service tourism
prices incredibly high, and it means that the recreation at Baikal will be one of the most expensive in the
country.

The prices and quality for the accommodation in our hotels are not equivalent. The number of the hotel stars
is often exaggerated, that’s why the tourists, Russian and especially foreign are surprised and indignant.

Our serving staff is not quite experienced and highly qualified. Sometimes the people have not any idea on
the demands and wishes of their customers, especially the foreign ones.

The absence of the state non-commercial ad of the tourist possibilities of the Baikalsky region abroad is also
a reason of the slow development of our ecotourism.

The two great problems of the development of Baikalsky ecotourism are “wild” tourism garbage in the region.
According to the Olkhon authority’s calculating about 120 tons of garbage appear on the Olkhon island annually.
The leisure centers situated in the region remove the garbage from their territory themselves, and judging from
their clean area they do it well. But the forest zones being close to the settlement Huzhir are badly polluted.

There are many conflicts, accidental and intentional breaking the law because of the absence of the law
Status on the lands belonging to the Pribaikalsky National Park. The situation gets worse because the federal
law establishing the order of the transforming the land from one category into another hasn’t been adopted yet
and besides the procedure of dividing the land into the state property hasn’t been also done yet.

But we see the perspectives of the development of ecotourism. The level of life can be increased due to
the development of the economy based on the tourist business, but at the same time the nature should be
preserved. We can achieve this development because actually there are not any traditional economic and eco-
logical contradictions.

Baikal will preserve its tourist (economic) attraction if the nature is special and unique here. It also means
that the representatives of tour business who will get their profit from tourism will be interested in nature pres-
ervation more than anybody else.

But it will be later. And meanwhile it is necessary strictly regulate tour activities at Baikal, strengthening the
ecological control and requirements. Maybe the number of the non-organized tourists will be limited if the pass
capacity regime is introduced.

The complex scheme of the development of the ecotourism at Baikal should contain some target programmes
including the programme of collecting and utilizing the garbage and the programme of locating the tourist
centers on the basis of the research data.

The central ecological zone of the Baikal natural territory has its special status of law, it means that special
rules of the tourist and rest arrangements should be developed for the zone.

Sergey Mendelevich
«Problems of Development of Ecological Tourism»

It appears to me that consumers’ opinions are the last thing to concern the participants and organisers of
the meeting. This is precisely why our Ministry of Natural Resources is on its own, the tourism administration is
on its own and the numerous tourist organisations are on their own as well, perhaps. I cannot recall even if at
least one conference or a working meeting, even in the Soviet epoch, let alone in the Russian time, at which
the Ministry of Natural Resources and, say, the protected areas leaders, and representatives of the federal tourism
administration and of the numerous public tourist organisations, of the Mountaineering Federation, for example, faced each other. This is saying that there is no co-ordination and there will be no normal interaction and normal eco-tourism development for as long as the parties concerned do not wish to contact each other.

Generally, it should be remembered that our protected areas occupy 8% of the territory of the country, which is a vast area minus the towns, agricultural areas, military proving grounds, concealed territorial formations – where does a tourist go, then? Especially if they are active?

It was very difficult for a Soviet tourist to get into any reserve – very difficult if not impossible. The situation is quite the opposite now – we can go anywhere at all provided that we can pay. One might think that the protected areas heads regard their territories as paid car-parks – not entirely without the support from the seniors of the Ministry of Natural Resources. Money is extorted from tourists on any pretext but absolutely no services are provided in return.

There are examples; the national protected areas directors actually ordered to charge money. For passage talons, for a helicopter flight-through, for taking photographs or for driving or just walking along a road.

This year, I had a conflict with the keepers of the Teberdinsky State Nature Biosphere Reserve. They stood on the road that leads to the Alibek mountaineering camp and took money – not too much, 20 roubles, - from everybody passing by. I was prepared to pay that money instantly, but on condition that I would be told what I was paying for. They were giving me a service ticket and I tried to find out what services I was paying for. They told me, go see the senior hunter if you’re interested, he will explain. I told them, well, it’s not the senior hunter but you who charge the money. So, tell me, what I am charged for? The road has been there for 70 years – it was there when there was no Reserve, in fact, so, what I am paying for? None the less, when tried to take the film away from me and spoil it, and they tried to take the camera away from me and toss it into the ravine when I took a photograph of theirs.

It should be mentioned that illegal extortion is often done by the people who are not the best sort, to be honest. In the Prielbrusie National park, for example, they simply hired local bandits who walk up to the alpinists using the rope-road go the Elbrus Mountain and ask them if they would go higher than the final station. If it’s “yes”, the people are told to pay 250 roubles and – if the alpinists are from abroad – 20 dollars. What for, the people ask. They say, well, there’s the Reserve directors’ order to that effect. I heard of those cases in which a big group of alpinists made of hefty blokes would pay the money even though that’s illegal. They knew that, they said, we wouldn’t pay; they were talked to so, the other side tried to hurl them off a precipice, literally – they simply had to pay in the end.

They charge 40 dollars per capital per day for walking through the Valley of the Geysers – not for services of any kind, not for a helicopter – just for walking through with a rucksack on your back and around the Valley of the Geysers you pay the administration of the Reserve 40 dollars. What for? Absolutely no services but fees are taken practically everywhere.

We have sued them a couple of times and won all the six cases. In the Elbrus Area, we on a case, we had been charged 500 roubles and must be given 17 thousand back; we won a case in the Meshersky National park where tourists had been charged illegally, and so forth.

As to the suggestions. First of all, the legislation must be put in order, just elementary order in the protected areas. Most importantly, people should follow the existing laws. What are the laws like? The Law on the “Specially Protected Areas” says, “Permits shall be obtained to visit the reserves”. But there is no such clause in the law on the national parks; none the less, the national park managers want the people to obtain those permits though this is just not feasible. Take the Sochinsky National Park, for example – where do those millions of people get the permits?

We also have a law about the freedom of movement and on the freedom of abode choice, et cetera. Well, this law has a complete list of the reasons for which any citizen’s freedom of movement can be restricted and that list does not include the specially protected areas. So, what happens is that one law contradicts another – there’s clearly a need for streamlining, isn’t there?

The Law on the Specially Protected Areas includes a clause to the effect that one must obtain the protected area’s authority’s permission to duplicate images – well, this is a ridiculous stipulation. We had that letter from the administration of the Prielbrusie National Park demanding 20 thousand from the Free Wind Newspaper because we had printed the photographs of the Elbrus Mountain, for example.

Should the publishers of a geographic encyclopaedia or a geography text-book pay for a photograph of Elbrus as the highest elevation in Europe, then? Should they pay the national parks for that? That is, there are many reasons to alter our effective legislation.
Nikita Vronsky, Rodion Sulianziga

«The Promising Model of Aborigine Ecotourism for Russia»

By the aboriginal eco-tourism we define the activity in this economic segment which is organised and implemented by the Indigenous People of the Russian North, Siberia and the Far East (referred to as the IPON hereinafter). The purpose of this activity is to ensure preservation and use of the landscape resources including the biological diversity resources; the other purpose is to achieve a sustainable economic situation of the aboriginal population.

There is no efficient aboriginal eco-tourism model in Russia yet – it has to be developed. For that, we have the clear pre-requisites. There are two principal pre-requisites: the resources of the environmental and the ethnic tourism in the vast area populated by the IPON and the great number of their communities that were established in the past decade and that want to operate tourism.

The IPON Assistance Centre showed initiative and developed a project aimed at creating an innovative model of aboriginal eco-tourism in Russia. The European Commission backed the project and so it will start to work in 2006. The overall task is to assess the potential and the investment opportunities, and to establish the information and an HR bases for steady development of the eco-tourism in the IPON areas. This work is to be done in the three model regions, namely, in Yakutia, in Primorye and in Kamchatka.

The project will work on creating a tourism model with reliance on the IPON representatives and for the benefit of their communities. After the model is developed and tested, and after the methodologies and the organisation tools have been analysed and tested also, this model can be distributed to the other IPON-populated regions of Russia.

The project will progress in the following four directions:
- development of a general plan (a strategy) of the eco-tourism development with reliance on the IPON capacity, and composition of a relevant tuition course;
- development of strategic plans for organising eco-tourism with reliance on the IPON resources;
- creation of regional and local partnerships for development of the eco-tourism;
- training the IPON representatives in the eco-tourism as a kind of economic activity.

The project-born geographical database will make it possible to make mapping modules to assess investment capacities to promote sustainable eco-tourism development in each region as well as to set a foundation for compilation of tourist guides and advertisement materials.

The existing standard of the communication basics under the project participants’ command makes it possible to unite the various-level regional databases in the Internet. This will produce a common eco-tourism reference and data system covering the IPON traditional nature use territories.

All the three pilot regions are known well for their tourism capacities. A certain proportion of their potential is in use as it is but the tourism benefits miss the IPON. The project’s goal is to correct this unfairness. Representatives of the IPON communities of the three major regions of Russia will for the first time be able to taking the training in the basics of organising and developing the eco-tourism as a steady business of their own and in their native territories.

The proposed project is an innovation to Russia. Its innovativeness lies in that it is not only designed to promote steady eco-tourism (not the most popular type of tourism in Russia yet), but also strives to ensure sustainable eco-tourism progress with reliance on the IPON and for the benefit of the IPON, who are the least protected communities socially, economically and politically and who are also the most needy segments of the Russian community.

The environmental and the ethnographical tourism is destined to develop in such regions as Yakutia, Primorye and Kamchatka. The task of the project is to protect this process against ill-thought and spontaneous tendencies, and to make it steady. This will first be done by the active involvement of the IPON in the tourism business. The IPON mentality is that of stability. Therefore, if the IPON govern the tourism business development facilities on their own, this alone will be a guarantee of stability for these projects as well as for steady development in a broader sense of the word.
The specially protected areas (SPAs) and firstly the reserves and the national parks have always been very appealing to tourists interested in the nature. The marketing significance of the SPAs was manifest even in the epoch of economy administration when the mere fact of protection of a natural object (a territory, a complex or a monument) signalled to the public the importance and the interest of such an object. The role of the SPAs as the eco-tourism business development tool is higher still in a market economy environment.

However, development of the eco-tourism in the SPAs goes between the Scylla and the Charybdis. On the one hand, the eco-tourism is strongly motivated to escalate the clientele like any business would be, and this alone is ripe with the devaluation of the original values on which it rests, namely, the natural wilderness and inaccessibility of the nature and the chance of departing from the civilisation for the sake of cognitive communication with the nature. So, unbalanced advancement of the eco-tourism business can destroy its own foundation. On the other hand, any flow of visitors and especially that attracted to make profits is very dangerous because it can disturb the local wildlife, damage the flora, violate the natural processes or destruct the natural complex in question either in part or in full (as a result of large-scale construction work, for example), or have natural specimen plundered as souvenirs, et cetera. This would be against the main purposes for which the SPAs are established and they are established to preserve the wildlife in its primal state and protect the natural processes and keep them as they are.

Well-balanced and environmentally friendly involvement of the SPAs in the eco-tourism development is possible but only providing the strict observance of, first, the hierarchy of the SPAs priority tasks and, second, of the basic SPAs management principles. We have accumulated considerable relevant experience that shows us how the regulatory frameworks should be developed and the practical management of the SPAs eco-tourism be governed. It is known full well that reserves and national parks have different specific features. However, the estimations provided below are generally applicable to any SPAs. The reserves being the strictest-regime SPAs with the highest scientific research priority demand more careful regulation of the eco-tourism opportunities. The existing experience enables us to say safely that only adequate, strong and correctly managed reserves can afford to organise eco-tourism in their own territories efficiently and safely to the protected natural complexes. The reserves that will deserve to be called adequate and correctly governed in this context will have the efficient protection of the natural complex including strict imposition of the reservation regime; full-scale monitoring of the main eco-system components; consistent scientific research into the priority subjects and processes. Naturally, such tasks must be put in the charge of the professional staff in a competent protection unit, and in the charge also of an adequate scientific department. Implementation of these priority tasks does not only defend the sites from possible errors in the local eco-tourism development but also provides the process with the appropriate management and information coverage. The “portrait” tourism, to wit, visiting the nature only to see the sights, the animals and the flora is much less interesting (and lower in demand) than the eco-tourism is, for the latter tells the people a lot of interesting things about the eco-system workings, the biological specificities and the animal conduct, and the herbage life and features. In other words, the standards of protection and the level of scientific research in reserves and national parks are the independent eco-tourism marketing factors as well as the safety devices firmly in place. It is only scientific monitoring of the natural complex component status and the feature research inclusive of the research into the reactions to the quantity and activity of visitors that can, put together, ensure the environmentally-friendly the eco-tourism development in the SPAs. It should be noted that many consequences of the visitor impact on landscapes, eco-systems, animals and herbage are slow in manifesting themselves and can only be detected by research and monitoring producing findings early enough for counter-action to be taken and the eco-tourism management in place to be adjusted accordingly.

Right now, the stagnation of the SPAs network and the absence of adequate centralised governance of the whole national SPAs system are the main impediments to the eco-tourism development. The Russian SPAs network’s history dates back over almost a century; the scientific foundation is profound and many generations of the prominent Russian ecologists contributed to its creation. The elements of this theory are used in the SPAs governance in other countries successfully. The SPAs network is present in almost all the geographical parts of the country and in every federal province administratively. The practical SPAs operation has diverse and specific complications and management problems, and addresses different-profile tasks in the routine course of work. The absence of a specialised regulatory, governance and co-ordination agency causes the factual decline of the whole SPAs network. Given this situation, the provincial eco-tourism potential of the SPAs cannot be utilised while all the attempts of the individual reserves at launching the eco-tourism are not supported either in regulation terms or financially and are unlikely to bring forth positive results worthy of a mention.
It should be appreciated that the quantity and quality of the SPAs make an independent marketing factor. Why is Alaska considered world-wide as one of the most attractive eco-tourism regions and even sets an example of basing the whole state’s economy on tourism, for example? In Alaska, the SPAs of different statuses occupy approximately 25 per cent of the territory. From the marketing point of view, this substantial proportion is a clear indication of the presence of many prominent natural sites and objects worth the special protection status in Alaska. And this is true of the whole state. That is, a SPAs network taken as a marketing factor rather than only the individual SPAs ensures attraction of eco-tourists to the region concerned. The untouched and vast wildlife is another most powerful appeal to eco-tourists. The so-called “charismatic” animals like the big predators, hoofed animals, web-footed mammals and whales (and the primates in the tropic areas, of course) play a special role. The level of wildlife protection and the population culture with respect to the animal world are the key factors in this context. Taking the given example further, there are many animals in Alaska and they are not afraid of people; the nature begins at one’s threshold there, as it were; big animals walk up to houses, even. If the people want to see wild animals, they spend their money to go where they will see the animals and where the animals are not driven into panic at the sight of people – in short, where the animals are easy to find and see. Russia is little competitive in this sense. Even in the SPAs, the animals are scared because they are shot down the instance they tread over the SPAs boundaries. The attempts at obtaining hunting permits in the SPAs by hook or by crook are not rare, alas. So, it should be realised that promotion of the progress of such a promising business as the eco-tourism is will require comprehensive activities and measures and depends directly on raising the levels of culture.

Speaking of the SPAs, development of the eco-tourism and boosting the appeal of regions to eco-tourists and just tourists, one should remember that the SPAs system should incorporate not only the federal-importance reserves and national parks, but also the regional natural and ethno-natural parks (territories). Not individual sites but a chain of the SPAs of different statues ranging from federal to regional and further down to municipal would be the most efficient tool of developing the eco-tourism. The provinces and the federation districts would benefit the most from creation of numerous protected areas with the status of the regional (provincial, municipal) preserves and parks, natural monuments and ethno-natural parks preserving not only the valuable natural landscapes and objects but also the objects of the archaeological, ethno-cultural or historical note. This could ensure diversity of opportunities to organise information or supporting services for this business. Monuments of culture and history cannot be put out of the national landscape or separated from the natural environment in which the concerned ethnos was formed. It is precisely in combination with the originality off the local nature and the ethnic specificity that the biggest appeal of any territory to tourists lies. It should be remembered that development of a SPAs network has an important national mission for it ensures the integrity of the historical national natural landscape as a basis for the ethnic and cultural originality of the local peoples as well as of the strategic eco-systems that keep intact the very natural ambience and bio-diversity – regionally as well as nationally. Either aspect is important and not only for the physical or moral health of the nation, but also for efficient economic development based on tourism and the eco-tourism.
At the beginning of the third millennium the approach towards the state property has strongly marked influence of two multivector tendencies, one of them is the looking forward to increase of this property social function efficiency and (simultaneously) socialization of a state itself as an institution. Other tendency implies that the state already doesn’t see acute demand for infinite deduction in its sector of number of state property objects, that until recently had the fundamental importance in social reproduction process.

It is possible to refer to such objects facilities of industrial and social infrastructure, facilities in sphere of public services: facilities of railway transport, automobile roads, sea, river and aerial ports, pipeline transport, hydrotechnical buildings, facilities for production, transfer and distribution of electrical and thermal power, lines of communications and communications, facilities of water-, heat-, gas-, and electric power supply, many other objects, as well as establishments of culture and mass communications, science, education, public health service etc..

The period from 2001 to 2005 was distinguished by the political and economic stability in the Russian Federation. During economic stabilization the society and the state started to approach problems of culture again. It was an important step to adopt the federal purpose-oriented programme “Culture of Russia (2001-2005)”, with help of which they managed essentially to stop the bust in cultural sphere, to achieve extension of state participation in its support, increase financial backing. In its turn it allowed to prevent the loss of number of cultural monuments, to reinforce international and interregional relations.

However, as it is mentioned in a new federal special purpose program “Culture of Russia (2006-2010)”, cultural problems accumulated during economic bust significantly exceed capabilities of the state in their solution. The branch, traditionally oriented toward state financial support, was the least prepared to market economy. Deterioration rates of especially valuable immovable objects continue to fall behind rates of their restoration. A lot of them, being nation-wide property, are not subject to privatization according to current legislation, nevertheless they cry out for significant investments, associated with their upkeep and reconstruction, as well as for effective management.

In principle today the process of gradual loss of national property of country (both tangibles, and spiritual values), accumulated by previous generations goes on.

Current economic situation in cultural sphere in the Russian Federation is characterized by the following factors:

- the share of budget funding in structure of cultural organizations income achieves up to 80%;
- the real need of investments related to upkeep and reconstruction of monuments and objects of cultural heritage is valued at 100-600 milliard rub., that is more than 10 times larger than volumes, provided by the budget (for example on the territory of Moscow region about 40% of similar objects do not have balance-keepers and they are more or less ruined)⁴;
- annual irrecoverable loss in breaking and lost monuments comprise hundreds billion roubles;
- more than 90% of employees in cultural sphere (about 1200 thousand people) are employees of public sector. Average wage of employees in culture institutions is 40% lower than average wage of Russian working population in general.

The impartial analysis of represented factors allows making a well-defined conclusion: the active search of such decisions is persistently required, which would give the possibility to provide the safety of monuments of
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⁴ Thus, according to report of Accounts Chamber of Russian Federation about results of check for accounting completeness, efficiency and enforcement of legislation when using and disposing objects of historic and cultural heritage of federal (Russian) values located in the territory of Central Federal District over a period since 1992 to 2003, totally in the Moscow region there are 1310 objects (of historical and cultural monuments of federal importance). From the mentioned amount 130 objects (10%) are under state registration. During that check it has been found that the certification of such facilities is practically not performed. From total number of monuments 43% are in satisfactory condition; 14.4% are in unsatisfactory condition; 14.6% are in emergency condition; 2% are lost irrevocably. From the total amount of objects about 27% are more or less actively used. With respect to funding about 450 mln roubles are assigned annually in Russian Federation from budget for maintenance and monuments restoration, including the Central Federal District which annually receives about 125 mln roubles. (refer to: http://www.ach.gov.ru)
culture and cultural values, as well as to create the economic mechanisms allowing culture to develop effectively under market conditions. In mentioned FSPP "Culture of Russia (2006-2010)", it is emphasized that essential factor to the branch development, is creation of public-private partnership institutes, that provides the development of the market of cultural values, joint participation of government and private industry in the development of this market, in economic projects of cultural sphere.

At the same time at the moment various points of view on PPP take place, including its essence. The range of opinion differences of scientists, specialists, experts, representatives of legislative and executive branches of different level varies a lot with respect to the essence of mentioned economic institute: from full identification of public-private partnership as concessionary relations in spheres of economic and social infrastructure to determination of PPP as a institutional and organizational alliance between state and business in order to realize socially significant projects and programs in broad spectrum of branches of industry and scientific research and experimental design works, as far as service industry.

Taking into account the fact that at present in scientific and periodical literature there is no avowed determination of public-private partnership, which would fully and adequately reflect its essence, it is possible to suggest the following determination of PPP essence.

Public-private partnership is a form of interaction between state and private sector, with such basic characteristics like the balance of interests, rights and obligations, consolidation of parties assets with public orientation of objectives and the problems to be resolved.

It seems that base signs of public-private partnership are as follows:
- parties of PPP are the state and the private sector;
- parties interaction in PPP is consolidated on official, legal basis (agreements, contracts etc.);
- interaction of mentioned parties has really partner, equal in rights character (i.e. parity and balance of mutual interests should be obtained);
- PPP has clear-cut public, social orientation;
- during the process of projects implementation, based on PPP, assets of parties (the resources and deposits) are consolidated and combined;

Financial risks and expenditures, as well as results achieved in PPP shall be distributed between parties in proportions, according to mutual agreements, fixed in appropriate agreements, contracts etc.

According to common opinion of scientists and experts, including those of World Bank, there is no unique model of public-private partnership in the world.

At the same time, from variety of PPP forms it is possible to separate major ones that include:
- various type contracts, concluded by the state with private sector;
- lease relations;
- finance lease (leasing), if one side is the private industry;
- public-private enterprises;
- product-sharing agreement (PSA), used mostly in use of bowels;
- concessionary agreements (contracts).

At present time they use in Russia all main forms of public-private partnership, applied in the world practice, except for concessionary agreements. At the same time concessions are the most developed complex and prospective form of PPP.

Peculiar "competitive advantage" of concessions in comparison with other forms of public-private partnership consists of the following:
- concessionary agreements (contracts) are concluded for rather long period, therefore the concession operator and concession provider can plan their activity in terms of strategy;
- concessionary agreements (contracts) give private industry the maximal freedom in process of economic activity performance, that, fundamentally, distinguishes concessions from other forms of PPP, for example of public-private enterprises;
- concessions is a specific kind of so-called "concessionary business", during implementation of which the special type of taxation is used practically all the time;
- concessionary agreements (contracts) as a rule contain so-called "grandfathering clause", which serves as a guarantee of nonuse of new legislation norms, unfavourable for concession operator, for a certain period, agreed by parties;
- concession provider keeps the right to dispose the object of his property, concession operator recieves the right only to own and use the mentioned object;
- concessionary agreements (contracts) within limits of essential fixed in them contain rather hard requirements for fulfilment of obligations taken by the concession operator, violation of which can entail the severe sanctions towards latter from concession provider.

Interest increase in our country to PPP institute is significantly conditioned by the adoption of the Federal law "About concessionary agreements", that has long and difficult history of its creation. Adopted by the State Duma of RF in a first reading on April 3 1996 with original name "About concessionary contracts, concluded between
Russian and foreign investors, this draft law passed the arduous path of long-term coordinations, amendment and revisions.

The adoption of mentioned law has the exclusive significance because having come into effect from the moment of its signing and laid foundation to creation of full concessionary legislation in Russia, it opens the real way for integration of concessionary model of PPP into a number of key sectors of Russian economy including the field of social and cultural infrastructure.

It is known that since the beginning of 90s of the last century a lot of countries started to use PPP mechanisms together with legal and financial schemes in the field of industrial social and life and social and cultural infrastructure, as well as management of municipal service.

From the same period two basic PPP models (mostly concessionary) have a wide-spread use in the world: “French” and “English”. It is avowed, that in the sphere of delegated management of infrastructure facilities, being one of public-private partnership forms, France has the experience of more than one century which is characterized by its diversity.

So-called “English” model of private-public partnership originates from 1992, when government of J. Major has announced a new conception of the state property management – “Private Finance Initiative” (PFI). According to this conception long contracts and agreements on provision of services are concluded with representatives of private sector that, as a rule include obligations of investment character as one of essential conditions. In “English” model of PPP the responsibility for granting key public services remains for public-sector.

According to the information of Institute of International economic and political research of Russian Academy of Sciences, in Great Britain since the beginning of 90s of XX century to present more than 450 projects have been implemented for a total sum of 32 milliard euros in the field of road service, transport, health protection, law enforcement and defence. And only in few cases the matter concerns large projects: the projects with the cost of more than 150 million euros comprise only about 7% of their total amount, and the cost for the most part of implemented projects is from 1.5 to 30 million euros. According to estimation of Great Britain Ministry of Finance, in 2002-2005 years 36 milliard dollars will be invested on a contractual basis.

At present the number of the states where public-private partnership is being developed in various forms, is continuously increasing. The following tendencies are noticed in the development of similar projects in various countries of the world:

- in a number of the European countries (Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Italy) the legislative acts were adopted, facilitating PPP in implementation of the relevant projects;
- in Netherlands, Germany and Austria pilot projects of PPP are still at an early stage of development. In Germany they associate great prospects in development of transport and road infrastructure with process of private-public partnership expansion;
- new countries – members of European Community – Hungary, Czechia, Slovakia, Croatia and Poland, lagging from former EU members in infrastructure development seriously need the development and implementation of projects based on PPP;
- in Canada and Australia the concept of public-private partnership is included into government programs;
- in many developing countries (China, Malaysia, Argentina etc.) first projects with participation of government and private industry are also being developed.

The analysis of modern world experience of public-private partnership supports the prospects reality and the economic efficiency of implementation of plans based on PPP (including concessions) in social and cultural sphere.

So, the modern practice of private-public partnership in Germany contains clear examples of implementation of projects in housebuilding sphere. In June 2005 subdivision of German building company Hochtief specially founded for such purposes signed a contract, according to which since August of this year it will fund, restore and then manage the Centre for professionally – technical training in Leverkusen. The Centre consists of three building complexes and reckoned to category of historic monuments. The cost mentioned contract is estimated at about 70 million euros.

During next three years this company will invests about 26 million euros into an extensive program of restoration and modernization. The Hochtief subdivision will be responsible for construction, and it also will cooperate with local bureau for protection of historic heritage, and the company subdivision for management of buildings will be involved into management of already built school center.

(Ref.: http://www.stroylist.ru/index/ppp?page=12&uin=29&iid=897)

The fact deserves special attention, that since 90s of XX century “in countries with transition economy and in developing countries more than 2700 PPP were created, including field of infrastructure”. (For more details refer to: Vedomosti. February 21, 2005).

According to the information from report of London’s international finance service, involved in support of UK’s financial services export, projects based on PPP are being developed today in 60 countries of the world. Only in Great Britain the cost of object of so-called “private financial initiative” (PFI), which is the major form of PPP in
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this country, during last ten years reaches up to 24 milliard pounds and within the next three years is planned to implement projects for a total sum of 12 milliard pounds. Annually up to 80 new agreements are concluded. And according to data of British government, similar project provide 17% of economies for country's budget. (Ref.: http://www.eatu.ru/?gstrAction=DOCLgintLjcID=71).

However the foreign practice of PPP knows negative examples as well, when they had really major failures and fiascos, and in some cases the state had to undertake “the burden of caused by them enormous expenditures”.

So, in Mexico it was a failure of a major programme of toll road construction, which costed more than 7 milliard dollars for the state. In Indonesia and Argentina after crash of agreements about PPP because of financial crises, private investors exposed damage claims for gigantic amounts. The Hungarian government had to nationalize the first toll road, accepted the debt in the amount of 300 million euros. (Ref.: Vedomosti. 2005. 21.02.).

According to the information of World Bank, totally about 6% of PPP projects in countries with transition economy and in developing countries were revoked or the results of their performing were recognized as extremely unacceptable. As a result the interest of private investors to such projects decreased, and the total volume of the investment into projects, implemented with the help of PPP, has not attained that peak yet, that took place at the end of 90s of the last century.

As it was noted earlier, the Federal law “About concessionary agreements” opens the real way for integrating concessionary model of PPP also into the field of Russian culture.

So, according to item 14 of article 4 in the law, the real estate can be the objects of concessionary agreements, that is included into objects of the public health service, education, cultures and sports, as well as other objects of social and cultural and social and life purpose.

The postulate is wide-spread and reflected in FSPP “Culture of Russia (2006-2010)”, according to which, investment into the cultural sphere, as a rule, doesn't have direct economic effect, because the culture is traditionally most conservative branch and the least adapted to market relations.

At the same time if to limit the scope of public-private partnership in the field of culture by branches, directly related to property-land complexes, among which: restoration and operation of monument and objects of cultural heritage, long-term management of historical and cultural complexes etc. then it seems that in economic realities of today's Russia the most optimal and the most effective form of PPP in the field of national culture can be exactly concessionary model of public-private partnership.

As it was already noted before, the essence of concessionary mechanism is that concession provider (state) provides for concession operator (private sector) on temporary and onerous base the right of possession and use of the state property under condition of obligatory investment by latter in order to create a new property or for qualitative improvement provided to concession. During the implementation of concessionary agreement the concession operator pays concession provider stipulated charge for usage of state property, pays the established taxes and undertakes, as a rule, all commercial risks, associated with operation of state property objects. Upon the expiration of concessionary agreement term the property shall be returned to concession provider. The selection of potential concession operators on a competitive basis gives the state a real possibility to make concessionary relation easily controlled and transparent.

Seems that those monuments and the objects of cultural heritage can be transferred to concession, which are nation-wide property and they are not subject to privatization or other alienation.

Within the context of posed, speaking about the most possible directions of concessionary model of PPP use and about potential concessionary objects in the field of Russian culture, it is reasonable to outline following directions and objects:

reconstruction / restoration, building and operation of real estate objects, including museum-manors, monuments of architecture and architectonics, museums-arenas, concert centres, hire concert sites etc.

infrastructural building development for territories, adjacent to monuments;
management of historical and cultural complexes;
real estate management (museums building, libraries, theatres etc.);
management of cultural values funds (museum, film storage vaults etc.);
introduction of new information technologies, in particular in museums and librarianship.

From our point of view, now the number of cultural heritage objects can be offered as potential concessionary objects (the question is, first of all, historical and cultural complexes of our country, related to objects of world heritage).

The transfer of right for maintenance reconstruction and development of infrastructure of historical and cultural complexes to private investors, in our opinion, now will be the most effective in terms of concessions, because this form of public-private partnership is capable to provide following two main conditions under which the object of cultural heritage can bring appreciable and fixed income:

attraction of sufficient initial investments to create and develop the infrastructure of historical and cultural complex, and also for necessary restoration or reconstruction works;
provision of current organizational efforts and expenditures for functioning of historical and cultural complex, for its saving.

Two additional arguments in behalf of choice of exactly concessionary model of PPP in concerned sphere imply that the state at present doesn’t have sufficient means, and the historical and cultural complex (as a cultural heritage object of federal level) cannot be privatized.

Seems, that with respect to cultural heritage objects, implementation of concessionary agreement will be far more efficient than performing of lease contract. In this context it’s necessary to pay attention onto their significant distinctions.

So, according to Federal law “About concessionary agreements”, one side (the concession operator) is obliged at his own expense to create and/or to reconstruct specified by this agreement real estate (hereafter – the object of concessionary agreement), that is under ownership of other party (concession provider), to conduct business using object of concessionary agreement, and concession provider is obliged to present to concession operator a right of possession and use of subjects of concessionary agreement for carrying out above mentioned activity for a period, stipulated by this agreement” (item 1 of article 3)².

The lease contract, if to apply to Civil Code of the Russian Federation supposes that:

“Separable improvements of rented property made by the lessee are his property, unless otherwise is provided by the lease contract. In case when the lessee at own expense and by approbation of lessor made improvements of holding, not separable without damage to property, the lessee after termination of contract has the right for compensation of cost of these improvements, unless otherwise is provided by the lease contract” (item. 1, 2 of article. 623, Civil Codes of the Russian Federation)⁷.

It’s necessary to underline also, that according to concessionary agreement “concession operator performs registration of objects of concessionary agreement on particular balance and the amortization charge of this object is provided (item 16 article 3).

According to mentioned law concessionary agreement “is contract, including elements of various contracts, provided by federal laws” (item 2 of article 3)⁸.

For example the land, related to historical and cultural complex, should be leased to concession operator (article 11)⁹.

Posed earlier affords ground to make a conclusion, that concessionary agreement is more direct method of provision of conditions, necessary for the preservation of cultural heritage objects, than the lease contract.

As a pilot project, planned to be realized on the basis of PPP, the historical and cultural complex – “State memorial nature reserve “Country-house museum of L. N. Tolstoy “Yasnaya Polyana” is proposed. The infrastructure development (the construction of new tourist and hotel complex) of mentioned cultural heritage object is offered to be completed on terms of concession. Duration of concession is 15 years.

Effectiveness of concessionary agreement from national treasury point of view, budget effectiveness


- public (social and economic) efficiency of projects;
- commercial efficiency of projects.

Specific character of investee (concessionary object) makes to introduce some specifications in applied approaches. Historical and cultural complex (the object of cultural heritage) is, as a rule, an object of state property, transferred for operational management to the correspondent culture institution. In this case such object of cultural heritage is not an element of national treasury (refer to item 4 of article 214 of Russian Federation Civil Code)¹⁰.

After conclusion of concessionary agreement object of culture assignment to culture institution is canceled, and culture object becomes the element of national treasury, being according to concessionary agreement in temporary ownership and use at one or another private legal body.

Efficiency of cultural heritage object transfer for concession can be estimated by effectiveness of capital and current expenditures in increase of value of such objects as an element of national treasury. The budget effectiveness of investment into object of cultural heritage can be regarded as the particular case of effectiveness, in term of national treasury.

Stated approach is a development of concept, contained in dissertational research of V. Yu. Muravyeva¹¹.

8 Ref.: Rossiyskaya gazeta (Russian newspaper). July 26, 2005
9 Ref.: Rossiyskaya gazeta (Russian newspaper). July 26, 2005
Evaluation of cultural heritage object can be conducted in compliance with "Methodics of economic (monetary) evaluations of cultural heritage objects (historical and cultural monuments) of Russian Federation peoples" (draft of methodics was prepared by group of authors, which are officers of Independent non-profit organization "Centre of independent evaluation", of Federal Agency for Culture and Cinema, Federal State Cultural Institution "Agency for the administration and use of historical and cultural monuments" in 2005, refer to: www.allinsurance.ru).

It's necessary to pay attention to the booking of indirect losses or incomes, which is associated with specific character of investment into infrastructure development, into improvement of historical and cultural complexes territory (objects of cultural heritage). Such investments incorporate potential of changes, not related directly to this complex. For example transport companies, providing the passenger traffic flows in the region, as well as shopping centers, adjacent to territory of respective historical and cultural complex etc. can have losses or profit. Besides losses of Federal and regional budgets can be accompanied by profits of private structures and conversely, common both budget profit and private profit is possible.

The specific character of investments into infrastructure development of complex and in territory improvement makes to take into account also the unavoidable indirect effects.

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{бюджет.}} = \frac{\Delta C_{\text{историко-культур.компл.}}} {I_{\text{частн.}} + I_{\text{бюджет.}} + \Delta P_{\text{бюджет.}} - \Delta P_{\text{бюджет.}} \pm K\Pi, \text{ где}}$$

| Эбюдж. | budget effectiveness of concessionary agreement; |
| Ичастн. | investments of private PPP investor (investments of various years are brought to one year and summarized); |
| Ибюдж. | investments of state (budget investments) (investments of various years are brought to one year and summarized); |
| ΔРбудж. | change (positive or negative) of budget current expenditures for functioning of historical and cultural complex within duration of concessionary agreement (annual values of changes are brought to one year and summarized); |
| ΔПбудж. | change of budget income (taxes, different payments) within duration of concessionary agreement (annual values of changes are brought to one year and summarized); |
| КП | indirect losses (Added) or additional indirect incomes to budget (Added), changes of taxes or other incomes to budget from other objects, indirectly related to discussed historical and cultural complex (annual values are brought to one year and summarized); |
| ΔСисторико-культурн.компл. | change of historical and cultural complex cost within duration of concessionary agreement (the part of change is underlined, which can be related to registered expenditures). |

Desired budget effectiveness should be less or equal to 1. In this case total expenditures (investment and current) are less or equal to increase of historical and cultural complex cost.

2. Commercial effect of concessionary agreement for private investor

$$\sum_{i=1}^{T} \frac{\Pi_i, \text{частн.инвестиц.}} {(1 + R)^i} \pm K\Pi \Pi_i, \text{частн.инвестиц.}$$

| Ичастн. | investments of private PPP investor (investments of various years are brought to beginning of the first year and summarized); |
| Pi, тек. | current expenditures of private investor in year i (conventionally supposed, that current expenditures are made in the end of every year); |
| ЧПi, частн.партн. | net profit, available for every investor in the year i (supposed, that net profit comes at the beginning of every year); |
| Тконц.согл. | duration of concessionary agreement; |
| i,...,T | years of concessionary agreement; |
| R. | discount multiplier, allowing to bring annual flows to one year (risk-free rate with payment for risks); |
| KП | indirect incomes of different years brought to beginning of the first year (added) or losses of different years (deducted). |
Thus it is necessary to summarize the report by several main conclusions.

1. The economic essence of public-private partnership (PPP) is relations between state and private sector, arising in the process of their interaction, basic peculiarities of which are the balance of interests, rights and obligations, the assets consolidation of parties assets under public orientation of purposes and problems to be resolved.

2. Concessions are not only “complicated”, but also in greatest degree developed and prospective form of PPP. Within reforms carried out in Russia, in our opinion, the concessionary model of public-private partnership should be integrated into the system state property management.

3. The adoption of Federal law “About concessionary agreements” # 115-ФЗ dated July 21 2005 adumbrates the beginning of full concessionary legislation creation in Russian Federation, as well as opens the real way for concessions into a number of key sectors of national economy, including into the field of social and cultural infrastructure.

4. The analysis of foreign practice of public-private partnership reveals that number of countries, where PPP is developing, is continuously growing. Implementation of projects based on partnership of state and private industry provides the significant economies for budget of respective countries (for example 17% in Great Britain). The world experience of public-private partnership acknowledges the prospects reality and the economic efficiency of PPP based projects implementation (including concessions) in the field of social and cultural infrastructure.

At the same time the foreign practice knows also negative examples of similar projects implementation. The analysis of the world experience in this sphere testifies that following main factors lead to such situation:

- projects of PPP in field of infrastructure, as a rule, are related to major capital-intensive real estate objects, and the pay-back time of such projects often exceeds 20 – 25 years. Therefore one of main tasks in the process of creation of PPP state regulation strategies in sphere of social and cultural infrastructure is creation of more detailed normative-methodical base, than for other sectors of economy;
- state must obligatory control tariffs and the quality of service in the field of life and social-cultural infrastructure, which, as a rule, are given exclusively. At the same time the increase the tariff on services, which are used by the majority of population, can generate political risks. The state has a temptation renounce fulfilment of taken liabilities to private sector;
- in order to ensure the balance of interest, rights and obligations of state and private sector the adequate mechanisms of standard, contractual and financial support are required.

Otherwise the balance of PPP project parties inevitably breaks down.

5. At present in most states the concessionary model of PPP became the real alternative of privatization of state property, including the sphere of social and cultural infrastructure.

6. At the moment our country provides real conditions for integration of concessionary model of PPP into a system of state property management in the field of social and cultural infrastructure. The complex of such basic conditions includes:
- objective demand of national social and cultural infrastructure development, that today doesn't meet growing requirements of market economy and doesn't provide availability for population to cultural values enough;
- urgent necessity of special purpose programs development and taking of certain decisions, aimed to save cultural heritage objects of Russia;
- 7. The organization and deployment of concessionary activity in our country requires creation of adequate management system for such activity. Due to the fact that in federal law in force “About concessionary agreements” the similar organizational profile is not available at federal level, it is proposed to use the following control circuit of concessionary process in sphere of cultural and mass communications means.

In structural frames of Russian Federation Government one should create the inter-departmental commission, which would include representatives of Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Russian Federation and Ministry of Culture of Russian Federation.

Mentioned commission will carry out the management of concessionary process in sphere of culture and mass communications at federal level in close cooperation with Federal Agency for Management of Federal Property (ФАУФИ) within limits of its functional authorities.

8. Seems, that in process of development of national strategy for regulation of public-private partnership in the field of Russian culture on concessionary base, it is necessary to take into account first of all the legal status of monuments and objects of cultural heritage. Such status can be laid in basis of classification of mentioned objects, key purpose of which is creation of original “hierarchy” of them. This classification will be the initial material for forming of so called “concessionary rating” of both monuments and objects of cultural heritage, top line of which, certainly, should be taken by especially valuable objects of cultural heritage of Russian Federation peoples.

Absolute leaders in “concessionary rating” will be of course monuments and the objects of cultural heritage, included to the List of world heritage and being under the protection of UNESCO.
Culture people and economists feel lack of mutual understanding, and it’s not accidental. In conditions of violent changes and reduction of resource security, the situation occurred, when the society mostly ceased to understand needs and views of culture people, and in their turn they ceased to understand this society. And economist is a person who, anyhow, represents the view of society as a whole.

Such mutual understanding, as a rule, arises during more or less stable times, more or less successful. It’s impossible to call our own period successful, but some stabilization comes, therefore at present it is necessary to look for this mutual understanding.

The normal system of relations supposes partner relations and not relation when one asks for, and another one gives money or does not give. These are relations, when possible acquisitions in wide sense and the possible expenses for each of parties are taken into account.

This is, first of all, the attempt to go out on the rational game rules. The great economist Teno Terro has said: economist is a rationality ambassador in the world of social sciences. Economist is not a person who thinks only about how to line his or states pocket, but that endeavour to speculate in terms of rationality and lining rational regulations of interaction. However first it is necessary to have some interaction in order to get possibility for lining of such regulations. This supposes availability of some resource potential.

Structural institutional reforms, which are carried out now, often meet misunderstanding, because they look at reforms from the point of expecting deception. Structural reform is establishment of game rules in a wide sense, new conditions of society partnership with its sectors.

The administrative reform has caused a lot of rumors and not always desired consequences because of insufficient studying of its specific character with respect to individual branches, in particular, to cultural.

For 200 years the Government under various names existed in Russia (the cabinet council, sovnarcom, Political Bureau). This is a body, which at all times consisted of 10 to 20 peoples, responsible for the main directions of policy.

In our large economy, along with Government a lot of other economic organs existed. In late Soviet time it was called the Council of Ministers, but nobody ever considered the Council of Ministers as real Government, real Government was Political Bureau. Besides there were lots of economic organs.

What was assumed in 1990s? That such economic organs really will not be needed, because the state leaves from economy, leaves from culture, just the small political body remains. It miscarried in practise. And it had to fail because in such branches like culture, the state must have a serious presence. We always had the separation to political and the economic organs. The attempt to live without failed. It’s just necessary to carry out this sharing correctly.

Budget reform. Orientation onto the result. The matter concerns to justify the real needs, capabilities for objects of culture financing, reasonable requirements for use of means. Recent years fund were extracted on the principle of “how much they can”, and nobody could not answer the question, how much is needed. Economists were very few involved in peculiarities of cultural sphere in recent years. The problem is to move along this line, analysing branch peculiarities very carefully.

One more reform is fact that relates to forms of state agencies. In budget message of president dated 2001 it is stated in the following way – increase of organizational and legal forms of state institutions diversity. In cultural sphere this planned change has caused perhaps the greater incomprehension, prejudice, resistance, than in any other sphere. How should we go away from government subsidiary liability? It’s necessary to legalize and to order those things which were formed in 1990s. During Soviet time the state completely provided culture institutions, and now, in many, but not in all institutions, along with budget the great role is played by the extra-budgetary funds. We shouldn’t ignore this fact, it’s necessary to order that. We can order in two ways: one that is traditionally preference of Ministry of Finance is including of extra-budgetary funds into the budget; another one is ordering of these funds. That is what this reform is exactly brought to.

Development through the way of structural reforms is non-alternative. It is non-alternative not only because one adopted such decision, but because cultural sphere itself is interested in this. It’s necessary to perform the careful workout of the way how to do by joint efforts. And In this context the exchange of opinions, the situation simulation, the peculiarities registration is the activity which is already late and we can not postpone anymore.
Geoffrey Gamilton, Tatiana Chernjavskaja

«Programs of Development of Public-private Partnership under Aegis of the United Nations»

There is no common definition of PPP, which would be recognized on both state and private levels, by international organizations.

The first partnerships in same view, they exist now, were initiated in 1981 in Great Britain, in various cities, in infrastructure projects in cases when state funds and municipal budgets were insufficient to provide proper level of service, or for innovations on objects of state property. Therefore private fund were attracted, it all started from contracts, where specified items were stipulated. They didn't want to come up to privatization, therefore progressively all this was transformed through contracts and agreements into concessionary contracts, which are already more-developed stage of public-private partnership.

New tendencies of PPP, which are observed today, are following. First of all PPP is not only infrastructure. It has started, indeed, in transportation. The superiority belongs to Ministry of Transport or its analogues in the western European countries. Their task consisted of the development of first legal acts and first treaties on public-private partnership, on projects. Now this concept is used also in public health and education. The geography of PPP application is spreaded, and PPP becomes the hypermethod in mutual relations of state and private sector throughout the world. As to the geographical spread, PPP; not so much PPP, as use of private funds in public purposes, anyhow was met in various projects, in single projects, but the tendency itself, exactly adoption of PPP using of international experience and experience of other countries began in Western Europe, Great Britain, Spain, France, Germany. In each country the system of PPP has its own peculiarities. Now it is progressively moving to the East. Now Central Europe is afire PPP. In Czech Republic long ago, for ten years, they are trying to utilize these conceptions, but until now the law on concession is still not adopted, however some acts already exist. By the present time the public sector has created the Centre on PPP, the private sector has created the association on PPP, which represents the business, but they have got their problem, although projects already exist, first of all, in transportation. Thereby the institutional forming of PPP system has been done.

As PPP projects are mostly long-term (25-30-50 years), the problems with execution of these projects appeared, problems that couldn't be predicted before. For example the problem of risks redistribution: before private sector was completely responsible for risks in “building-management-handover” systems. Now they are trying to redistribute responsibility somehow, for purposes of most efficient use and implementation of projects.

The stable development is a projects development or, in general, use of economic potential with such targeting, that future generations wouldn't suffer from excessive consumption of resources by present generations. This is a slightly inaccurate definition, but, anyhow the stable development becomes the criterion of evaluation of public-private partnerships project. I. e. if we build something now, and our grandsons will pay off for a very long time, the credit and the debt will be exorbitant, then it's impossible to call such projects deserving when evaluating in term of stable development.

The advantages of PPP can be tax, social and economic, technological.

It the political will exists, if even certain individuals exist, which promote PPP projects, then these projects must be, anyhow.

State sector didn't have such skill for work with PPP as quality of management as one of parameters we must remember about when effectuating such projects. Who can help in wording of quality of PPP project management parameters? As one of variants it is United Nations Organization. In 1999 Kofi Anan in his speech declared about the fact that it is necessary to use the business and its capabilities for the common benefit and for development goals of millennia, one of which, # 8, exactly says that we have to unite into partnership. I. e. the state and the business have joint hands, having same goals of activities both within United Nations Organization, and created the potential for Governments. In UN the following are involved in this activity: UN development program, UN Fund and European Economic Commission; besides there are departments in other subdivisions of UN, which are concerned with public-private partnerships.

As a recommendation it's necessary to offer the establishment of Center on PPP on state level. Center on public-private partnership is mostly located in Ministry of Finance.

There are Centers on PPP in Great Britain, in Italy, in France. The progress in public-private partnerships depends on Center availability, if Centers exist, then it's easier to work with PPP. Because the Center on PPP is “the unique window” where all wishing to create such partnerships are able to address to.

Program on PPP in European Economic Commission and Alliance on PPP are support of legal institutional base, seminars and trainings, mobilization of private capital. A month ago the 4th annual meeting of Alliance took place, where current and main problems of PPP were discussed.

The Alliance on PPP is directly involved in the infrastructure, i. e. the Alliance is PPP in infrastructure, but we can not say, that the Alliance is association of experts from public-private sector and public organizations that
are interested in public-private partnership. All this started in 1980s from “Bio-T-group”; in 2000 all this turned into alliance on public-private partnership, which includes 500 members in 55 countries. Among members of Alliance on PPP there are two experts from US who are particularly actively involved in exactly projects of cultural heritage and application of new financial schemes in projects of cultural heritage, these are Donovan Rybkem, the president of USA association on PPP and Artur Smith the specialist in PPP. Here is a small message from Donovan Rybkem: “If we want live better, if we speak about life quality, then there are three constituents. This are place, where we live, the memory, brought for us by one or another city, one or another building when we return back to places, we have been before. And it’s sense of property”. Why is that all? Life quality is a cultural heritage and its support. We can and must support these things, which are very close to each of us. The private sector is same people, and if the state is not capable to finance objects of cultural heritage adequately, why not to change a bit our mentality and to understand, that the private sector also can be used for these good purposes.

Mihail Lermontov

“Experience Public-private Partnership in Sphere of Preservation of Cultural Heritage, by the Example of a Federal Monument «Manor of Serednikovo»

40 km from Kremlin there is a magnificent manor-complex Serednekovo, I deal with for ten years already as a partner in public-private partnership, passed through all stages of these trials and relations with state in all hypostasis. All these ten years, I deal with the manor is like my struggle to make the state become a partner, partner on all those obligations, it has for Federal monument, such beauties, including 117 hectares of parks, 1500 hectares of conserved zones of monument.

Today we need the decision of the Government about what it is necessary to preserve, what to preserve by assets of a state. It is necessary to make the register of objects, which are subject to unconditional conservation at the expense of state, and to ask the state for how it keeps these objects. All the rest objects are to be divided in two blocks. One block is those monuments, which are to remain under state ownership, but to enter constitutional, rental, or other relations with investors. And remaining are those objects, which will be sold with burden. Unfortunately, we don't have that by now.

We shall go to self-regulation mechanism. Self-regulation of those active potential participants of private sector in public-private partnership which can protect themselves in this space only by themselves.

All these ten years are ten years of struggle to prevent trimming of the conserved zones around monument, trimming by some commercial structures, which want to build cottage settlements. This is a fight against architectural adviser, which looks more like extortion, rather than partnership. I wouldn't like this public-private partnership to turn into the partnership image of private developers, near Moscow, and architects, who are responsible for these territories. We have disfeatured the Moscow region, disfeatured by exactly the fact that the partnership assumes only some financial relations, and the supervision over architecture, developing in the magnificent natural environment near Moscow was really thrown out of this partnership. Let's imagine that such ugliness can occur with public-private partnership in sphere of preservation of monuments.

Therefore my offer is to nevertheless pass to systemic organization of this work. I would like the Ministry of Culture to come over to design of public-private partnership mechanisms. I want, as the partner to come and to obtain the proposal from state, to obtain the formatted proposal, where the register of monument is made, where conditions are written, where I can find these objects in information space and view them. It is a paltry money for Ministry of Finance.

This manor is associated with Lermontov staying in there; Pyotr Arkadyevich Stolypin was there as well. I'm a grand-grand nephew of Lermontov, therefore I tackled this place. People, who live around such beautiful places empathize to recovery.

You know, for them it is so important to identify themselves with valuables of our people, our society, with the fact that we've got them. And it seems to me that in the future the cultural frame of Russia consist of exactly, of private reserve museums, like I call myself, and those private traders, which will acquire manors with burden, with presentation of them to people. This is same, as if to lease relics of Mirovarennaya Chamber of Patriarch’s Palace of Moscow Kremlin in concession to owners of restaurants, they would use these things for six days, and at the seventh day they would exhibit them.

There is still a great number of questions to resolve with respect to this matter.
Vladimir Tolstoj

«Business Plus «Yasnaya Polyana» – New Quality of Business»

Culture, education, health protection, agriculture, slum housing did not become state priorities of Russia. All these are urgent and essential problems. Now one more unconditional priority is proposed namely our children. Military needs, power structures, party building, petroleum-gas complex are priorities long ago, and where is the culture? Is it not needed today, not actual?

In my opinion, culture absence in our country is problem # 1. Corruption is direct manifestation of conscience corrosion, and thus the absence of internal culture. International and interdenominational conflicts increase due to insufficient tolerance i. e. respect to foreign culture. And also it’s bad with speech culture in our country, with communication culture, with amenity on roads, with culture of business conducting. All key problem of our society have ethical, moral nature, and they try to treat them through economy. However it is not possible to resolve these problems in such way. It is the same as to stun with antibiotics the weakened mechanism, needing vitamins and accurate homeopathy.

There are things, which shall be evident and clear for people with economic view of thinking: what does the culture possess and why it can be and must be the real participant, real partner in social and economic development of our country, social and economic development of Russian territories.

There are some factors here. This is indeed partnership, mutually advantageous partnership, not culture application with stretched hand to business and authority, but real joint work. What does the culture possess, what resources? First, it is branding, i. e. brand name availability. Our culture still has the attractive name, therefore many largest companies, mostly western companies; show themselves very willingly as the permanent partners of leading objects of our culture. Well, say, the South-Korean SAMSUNG esteems a lot the fact that it is a partner of Bolshoy Theatre or Yasnaya Polyana. And it, certainly, adds reputation to this company. Second thing, which is extremely important and that can give the cultural-humanitarian resource, is the reputation. The reputation of business and authority depends a lot on business and authority relation to culture.

Third is intellectual property and prodigious information resource, embedded in funds of museums, archives and libraries. It is a grandiose economic resource, prodigious.

Returning to reputation, there is one specific example. On territory of Schekinskij district, where the Yasnaya Polyana is, in three kilometers from our reserve museum the chemical giant “Sheckino-Azot” is located, which is in conflict with the museum and ecological public for half a century, more than 50 year of open furious hostility. Some time ago they adopted party decrees on reduction of chemical production, but as it often happens, “wanted as it is better, has occurred, as every time”, had cut out the most ecologically clean line, the Italian one. Now “Sheckino-Azot” is a private business, the joint stock company, which can not be shut down, because it is an urban company. More than 50% of workplaces in Schekinskij district are provided by “Sheckino-Azot” and “Chimvolokno”, which is subsidiary enterprise. With that there is almost full moral and phisical deterioration of both technologies, and equipments. According to specialists’ estimation, maximum it can last for 3-5 years; it’s a chemical giant, producing the methanol, the caprolactam, in general, not very nice for nature, for life of human and health of people things. Currently the demand for credit line or investments makes up to 300 million US dollars in order to solve a problem of “Scheckino-Azot” cardinally. That means to buy modern technology, which allows such production to locate even in residential quarters, like it takes place in Germany with BASF concern and in Holland.

Therefore to obtain such credit line or such investments, particularly from western partners government guarantees are extremely desirable. The state has no right to give government guarantees to private joint stock enterprise, interfere its business or to lobby its interests. Circle is locked, but in three kilometers “Yasnaya Polyana” is located, which is especially valuable object of cultural heritage of Russian Federation. The state is directly responsible for conservation of this pearl of national culture. Thus, unexpectedly the availability of “Yasnaya Polyana” allows the state, while protecting “Yasnaya Polyana”, to indirectly act as a guarantor of those investment negotiations, which are performed by “Scheckino-Azot” with our participation with potential investors. And in particular the Agency on industry is ready to be such guarantor, which is deeply involved in this subject. Moreover, the negotiations with potential investors or banks, which are ready to grant credits, go much better for “Scheckino-Azot”, since “Yasnaya Polyana” participates in that, because the credibility, the reputation of “Yasnaya Polyana” improves the confidence in those transactions, which are possible in this situation. We don’t understand completely, what resources we have. By the way it’s not quite necessary to have such names as Bolshoy Theatre or “Yasnaya Polyana”. Even “Kulikovo pole” has its segment or any small local notable place, which is very important in the development of surrounding area.

Fourth, we can not deny the fact that exactly the culture and its institutions are in my opinion the only serious base of real creation of civil society. And even if this resource doesn’t have material character, it is extremely important for country.
Fifth it’s a prodigious innovation potential. We saw this from the middle of 90’s, when the culture, in particular, the museums, had very complicated economic conditions, with budget of about 30% of planned amounts, certain freedoms, they get for economic activity, for grants receipt, managed very fast to master this, and with lots of innovation ideas to not only preserve, but also to obtain the sufficient capabilities and preference.

Sixth, it’s the economic activity itself. Serious cultural, cognitive tourism, which drives out really beach, entertaining, is impossible without objects of cultural heritage. But they should be subjects of these actions, and not objects, travel companies just brought their clients to. The efficient property management, service industries, production of products, I mean here also souvenir directions, recoveries of different crafts, trades.

Apart from rational there is irrational, apart from material, there is non-material, in particular the non-material heritage, which is valued a lot and today becomes a leader of major international cultural policy. If to speak about education, the education is impossible without foundation, without basement, without base of historical and cultural heritage, because without it, it’s an emasculate education, which doesn’t give protection of national interests to the country.

And final thesis and conclusion: “Business plus culture is other quality of business. Authority plus culture is other quality of authority. Life plus culture is other life quality”.

**Duglas Prentis**

«Methods of Public – Private Partnership: Practice of Implementation»

I am an authorized agent of special consultative United Nations organ, European Economic Commission, located in Geneva. This organ is “Public-Private Partnership Alliance”, the Alliance of public-private partnership, which introduces mechanisms of partner interaction, for example of Government of federal level or the regional Government, which is funding the construction of objects, the classic transport object – the toll road or automobile bridge, may be it’s a hospital, a school, or the electric power station, any other infrastructural object. Government funds its creation through tender procedures, and the private sector, consortium, constructs a project and after construction through contract for the long-term concession it uses and serves the object.

This conception, let’s call it “PPP-alliance”, is a basic concept, used by our advisory organ “Public-Private Partnership Alliance”. The alliance includes about 120 international experts from many countries not only Canada, France, Great Britain, other countries of Western Europe, but also Eastern Europe: Hungary, Romania, Poland and Czechia. So our recommendations are based on the wide international experience.

Today our discussion will deal with possibilities to finance the cultural object of Russia through application of PPP conception and its financial mechanisms. Well, as I said before, classically it was the sphere of transportation infrastructure. Now we extend it onto construction sphere of accessible comfortable dwelling, onto your national project. Our experience can be successfully used here in Russia. Our key partner is the EU and the EU is funding our projects in Russia through TASIS programmes.

I was a TASIS project manager on Ministry of Economic Development, the purpose of which is to help to implement PPP mechanisms using possibilities of new legislation on concessionary agreements through tender procedures in Russia. Now I am a head of other TASIS project – project of regional development for three regional governments: St. Petersburg, Samarskaya region and Krasnoyarsk Territory. The sphere of interest i. e. the accessible dwellings is also a part of our discussion, our analysis, how can one finance building of accessible dwelling through tender procedures, including the private sector.

How does the PPP mechanism work specifically in cultural sphere, in this new sphere? There is no large international experience yet. But the US, where such specialization exists, has the experience to finance construction of new cultural objects, for example theatre, cinema and concert hall through the concessionary mechanism.

Mr. Dmitry Amunts, the deputy Minister of culture is very interested in PPP concept implementation. Three weeks ago in London they held annual conference of “Public-Private Partnership Alliance”. There he participated in discussions on possibilities of development of culture infrastructure through PPP mechanism. In principle PPP is a partnership; it is a union between Government, between state and capital. It means, if we talk about cultural object, it’s the intellectual property of country, and if so, it’s necessary to preserve this intellectual property. If the private sector, the financial is interested in exporting of object, then of course we have to control the procedure of intellectual property using. And in your country it’s very important.

I think, may be it is really possible to implement PPP concept and its financial mechanisms here in Russia. May be European Economic Commission of United Nations will offer the procedure of concession quality control, some long-term mechanism, which could be adapted to conditions and to Russian legislation on concessionary activity.
There is a problem of concessionary agreement duration. In some cases it can be 99 years. Of course, it is not practical for culture objects. I think, if this concession will be for 15 years, may be for 20 years maximum, it’s more reasonable way. But term is only one problem. More serious problem is quality control, not construction qualities, of course, that’s a different question, but the mechanism of management quality and results control. If it is 20-25 years, and the private sector is the operator, then obligatory, if there is a powerful government, it must be the proper control as well. And I think the role of UN Economical commission for Europe is procedures certification: purely tender procedures, necessary standard legal acts and quality of operator activity.

In principle, this mechanism will require three documents: agreement with Ministry of Culture, or may be with Ministry of Culture and with Federal Tourism Agency, and with regional Government. Now there is an idea, and I believe this is practical idea to realize the pilot project based on state museum of L. N. Tolstoy in “Yasnaya Polyana”.

I know Mr. Vladimir Ilyich Tolstoy and Mr. Amunts very good. We discussed the idea of PPP mechanism use for construction of cultural centre and hotel there. It should not be the Government property, of course. On such project it is possible to work out procedures required for wider incorporation of PPP into the sphere of conservation, development and efficient use of cultural heritage objects in Russia and in other countries represented on our conference.

Denis Lukashin

«Problems of Examination of Cultural Values and the Market of Subjects of Art»

This subject is very serious, naturally, there are problems in branch, and these problems became most obvious during last cases, which are associated with forgery of art works. Examination problem on market exist, and the rumor about the fact that the examination in the market is not available is urgently messaged. However it’s not true. On Russian market there are a lot of professional expert institutions, which can carry out expert examination at a high level and in this way catch such things and exclude such facts. These are both esteemed state institutions and number new non-profit organizations.

Naturally, this problem is not accidental on market. Museum community is rather closed sphere and rather passive. I. e. the museum community hardly ever goes into dialog with state, and moreover, it is not always ready to enter in some relations on issues of its sphere regulation. This, of cause is bad, it should be resolved just at the level of non-commercial partnerships and self-governed organizations of experts for the reason that the only interlocutor of state, that can advise it on how to control the branch, is experts, which are participants of the process themselves.

The problem in branch ripened rather long ago. On general information the volume of art market in the market with state and non-governmental participation was forecasted as 2 billion two years ago. This is really true, and I would like to say that now 2 billion is just a shadow part, and besides there is rather large volume of official transactions.

The problem of market closeness directly depends on the problem of its regulation because if museums and Ministry regulate the state part of museum fund rather good, commercial part of it and specifically the market itself is regulated very hardly and actually it is regulated by its participants. Main ideological participants of this market are antiquarians. Respectively, the most of proposals for regulation comes from them. Considering that the examination branch is the independent sphere, which should not depend directly on market players, interested in buying and selling of works of art, naturally this area is to be regulated by participants of branch themselves – experts in dialog with state because no one else will be able to regulate this branch.

State regulation must put together in many spheres, including the field of control of the turnover of non-governmental part. Beginning from initial regulation – registration of those objects, which arise in the market. If Registers of real estate exist, where owners are noted respectively, transactions are registered, then in the market of movable property (is it possible to call the masterpieces of 2, 3, 10 million US dollars cost just movable property) such register does not exist. But now Ministry and the agency are preparing the project of State catalogue. This is of course enormous plus, this is the system, which will allow to control the turnover of state and non-governmental part of works of art, but at the same time this catalogue is to become register, which books this property . The state should have procedure of registration of works of art on the territory of the Russian Federation.

At the moment, there is a difficult situation on market, associated with turnover deficit for the reason that the most of masterpieces and the heritage are in state part or in private collections. Respectively, the antiquarian market exists, and arrt market should have the tool of its existence. And the tool is the picture, taking into
account the deficit and the fact that since January first they have opened the boundary for Western art. I.e. there is free import now, and therefore we should have strict enough control over the import, and the control from the moment of this objects coming to our Russian market, because the problem with forgery on market is not the news for Russia and for international market because it always existed. This problem were there as well, and it's very important for all states, because it actually introduces the misstatement in the cultural heritage, both international and Russian. This problem fundamentally influences Russian heritage for the reason that the Western European painting imported in Russia in big volume and falsified for Russian artists, will bring very large misstatement in the history of Russian art, in last large collections and museum gatherings, which could be added by this objects. They are dangerous for cultural heritage of Russia, because they don't represent other culture. The state must involve in problem of registration in a serious way, not even registration problem, but the regulation problem of private market of art works, it is one of the main problems that can become rather difficult now. The museum community currently became to understand the fact that the consolidation into the self-governed organizations and the joining the dialog with state is one of natural tasks and one of capabilities to prevent problems in the market.

Vladimir Sharov

«Economy of Tourist Enterprise in a Context of Interaction with Objects of a Cultural Heritage»

That is what a paradoxical situation. I think that the culture has the number of justified claims to the Ministry of Finance.

We wouldn't like the Federal Tourism Agency to create threat to conservation of cultural heritage and development of museum technologies. Here is the paradoxical situation, that all permanently are queuing up to Ministry of Finance, criticize, but nobody is queuing to Federal Tourism Agency. Because from my point of view this is exactly that hidden reserve of incomes, which might ensure and cover some breaches in culture. Many of my colleagues do not understand this paradoxical situation.

Nevertheless, our branch of economy has absolutely strongly marked principles and technologies. And currently integration of tourism and museum technologies is a very actual subject. It is necessary to create the interdepartmental conciliation commission. It is some public body, which will constructively discuss the number of problems between Federal agency for culture and Federal Tourism Agency. Since April we bring up an issue of creation of inter-departmental commission, and so far we have not received positive answer. But it would be very rationally, because exactly within frameworks of work of interbranch committee as public body, we can talk about main technologies of integration between two Federal Agencies. It is quite evident that entrepreneurial sector has got the technology. Our company has the status of national operator of Russia, practically the state is responsible for obligations of our company on admission and servicing of foreign tourists on territory of Russia.

So I want to tell you officially that we are the evil, which influence forming the flow of foreign tourists to Russia, in particular, exactly within the context of cultural and cognitive tourism. The first-rate national operators of the world work with countries on, so-called, five year client catalogues. Average travel agents operate on three-year catalogues. And only insignificant operators, small operators, work on annual catalogs. Unfortunately, we practically made the whole world to work with Russia on annual catalogs. And it's not a civilized method. Yes, we cannot guarantee the stability in price policy for three or five years. And it would be really irresponsibly to undertake risks. All tourism business, entrance and internal, is divided among ten commercial structures. Only three out of ten commercial structures have the status of national operator. They approximately form 70% of organized clients flow. And only insignificant operators, small operators, work on annual catalogs. Of course, currently only two travel agencies work abroad on five year catalogues, about 5 operators work on three-year catalogues, all others work on annual catalogs. Today these operators don't have problems in providing any client flow with any capacity. The only question is who need this client flow? Within last year the share of cultural and cognitive programs in total product of tourism only in our company fell by 54% to 42% relatively to last year. It's a prodigious downfall. Besides museums just do not want to enter into travel-manager technology. Museums have a strange argument. So what do you want?, why should we deal with technology of client servicing, we are first of all the scientific institution, which is engaged in museology and conservation. When we say that the museum should equally practice in parkings around its area, they say: What are you talking about, why we should do this? It's possible to name 32 points, which are controversial issues in mutual understanding between market players now. Currently we are the second Ministry of Finance, just less bureaucratized, currently we just go for some reason, and ask for something, strive for, and try to obtain. And we don't feel any feedback.
The most perfect evil today is practice of transfer of cult structure objects to joint exploitation by state and church. Here it is almost impossible to strive for some technological integration. Here there is no support from the state, and even conversely, unfortunately any visit of our president to regions finishes very sadly with respect to this set of issues.

We are kind of service-structure for visit of senior executives to regions, and every time we state, that unfortunately regular Christmas visit of senior authorities or somebody else, finishes by the fact that several facilities will be submitted to churches. I don't say that it is counternatural process, but probably you will agree, that this procedure shall be more clearly regulated on further joint exploitation, i.e. further cooperative use. We shall keep the access to tourism resources. Many people either do not understand or do not awnt to understand, what access to tourism resources is, and we permanently say at all tribunes that, please, provide businessmen of our economy segment with the access to tourism resources, first of all cultural.

Our colleagues have a lot of suggestions within frameworks of newest technologies of museum demonstration as concerns animated technologies. Because when our colleagues from abroad come for inspections, they very often see some statistic exposure line, and always ask us questions concerning animated technologies. The tour cost is significantly composed with expenditures for objects of excursion demonstration payment. We can increase this index practically twice, and may be even two and a half time, if this technology supposes action, some animation. It's a very good hidden resource, hidden resource for objects of cultural heritage in order to make the Federal Tourism Agency to become the second constructive Ministry of Finance, and the culture to extend its financial base.

Viktor Dolonko

«National Parks as Resources of Cultural and Social and Economic Development of Territories
(By the Example of a Situation in the Samara Area)»

At the beginning of the XXIst century social-economic problems were increasing in most Russian regions, including quite successful, that was Samara Region. The problem was, for instance, a shadow of increasing unemployment at the same time as conversing of plants in Samara and Sizran'. There were workers reduction comparing to Togliatti popularity extension and limitation of Zhigulevsk industrial improvement, which was caused by National park nearby.

Underestimation of the possibilities of the cultural sphere takes us to a search of “industrial” technologic, but not structural decisions to solve this problem. Culture is still considered by businessmen as a relatively resource of economic developing. That's why they weren't really ready to take a part in some real projects.

However, national park development concept has it that there should be social-cultural objects in it. According to this concept a national park should be like an adapted territory, the place for communication experiments, contemporary society existence in conclusion with nature.

A good example for this is Samarskaya Luka in Samara region and surrounding area, which is in Zhigulevsk jurisdiction and 2 country districts of Samara region.

The main suggestions, substantiatted in the report:

The problem of unemployment in a region, which had Military and Industry complex development as its aim can be solved by cultural development only in Post-industrial era.

Chains of cultural organizations, natural resource become comparable to other establishments, for example, financial ones.

Corporation financial resource is the only useful income in the situation, when the budget investments are cut down permanently. From what was said it follows that any development project is to consist something, which may give a quick efficiency.

The best choice is “landscape” film studio, as a department organization of outstanding national film company. Film studio is a way to refill the lost, caused by the USSR collapse (Yalta, Minsk, and Riga), after what national film product prime cost was reduced. This business is a method of no-conflict large investments return to tax sphere. Film studio is a source for leisure (Cinema-park), for education sphere (cinema-school). It's a source of innovating ideas in a region.

Cinema park is a source of tourism business development, a unique object, which may concentrate tourists, and there's nothing to do with basic interests. An entertain complex around the studio may include a chain of museums (Historical ethnographical museum, based on .A. Shiriaevets House-museum, I. Repin House-museum and Wooden sculpture museum), sport complex (mountain skiing and other water-technical and water-sports), balneology complex.
It follows that Cinema park is something, that should improve transport infrastructure, hotel and restaurant business. It should intensify agriculture.

Film studio, therefore, has definite advantages, comparing to many other tourism development projects in our region. It doesn't involve in-city gardens and forests, doesn't harm natural environment, it doesn't need serious budget investments.

Social significant projects absence has the only alternative- private estate erecting and gradually destruction of the nature preservation sphere.

Artem Novikov

«Economic Problems of Restoration Activity»

Cultural heritage for each people is a spiritual, cultural, economic and social capital of irreplaceable value. The heritage feeds the modern science, the education, the culture. Equally with natural resources, it is a main base for national self-respect and recognition by the world community.

One of priorities of state cultural policy is the conservation of historical and cultural monuments. Education of national consciousness is impossible in conditions of historic past elements absence. The conservation of spiritual values leads in time to accumulating of cultural potential of the country as a whole and each citizen separately.

During centuries the sphere of cultural policy and the strategy of actions underwent different changes in connection with extension of numerous peoples and nationalities influence. At the beginning of this millennia the conservation problem of national heritages is getting particularly acute in connection with process of universal globalization. Thus, the role of culture itself and associated activity gets more and more in the centre of attention, both at national and international levels.

The cultural heritage of Russia represents creations of many generations of talented craftsmen, outstanding architects, discloses the soul of people. Insufficiently gentle attitude toward own past can make a negative impact at all spheres of society life, and first of all, at the spiritual sphere.

The postindustrial civilization has realized the highest potential of cultural heritage, the necessity of its saving and efficient use as one of the most important resources of world economy. Losses of spiritual values are irretrievable and irreversible. They cannot be justified neither by development of modern society, nor by progress necessity. Accumulating and conservation of historical and cultural values are the ground for development of civilization.

Monument restoration allows keeping creations of people's hands for centuries. Already today we can bitterly recognize the irrecoverable loss of many traditions of cultural heritage elements recreation. Mostly it is related to Russia's historic development in XX century, its political peripeteia. Besides, today restorer meets absolutely new problems, unknown before. The environment pollution, unchecked urbanization and the motor transport traffic, wrong use of buildings, as well as global climate changes, caused by just listed factors make irresolvable problems for specialists. The demand in renaissance of old traditions and development of new restoration technologies and materials, lack of personnel on restoration market, absence of examination system in field of restoration due to the fact that restoration is only a portion of building sector – these are those problems, without solution of which it is impossible make up the efficient operation on conservation of historical and cultural monuments.

For this reason it's necessary to adopt the complex of measures on development of restoration activity, which will take into account the entire spectrum of existing problems. The keystone of successful activity in this field is development of partner relationships between governmental authorities, public and non-governmental sector. It's necessary to stimulate the interdisciplinary, interdepartmental approach to conservation of cultural heritage using all available resources. This task must be resolved not only by bodies of monuments protection, but also those structures of branch, which manage issues of city planning and architecture, economy and industrial development, as well as ecology, transport, and of course organizations for improvement of property complex and housing and communal service.

It's necessary to realize, that the cultural heritage is our common property. That's why the problems related to its conservation, must be resolved together.

Today the foundation for conservation of historical and cultural heritage is appropriate standard and legislative base. For the most part the legal base of monuments protection sphere is formed by the Federal law dated June 25, 2002 # 73-ФЗ "About objects of cultural heritage (historical and cultural monuments) of Russian Federation peoples".

Separate standards, aimed to settlement of legal relations on protection of cultural heritage, are contained in City-planning Code of the Russian Federation, Land Code of the Russian Federation, Tax Code of the Russian
Federation and legislation, regulating the budget relations. But for today's specialists the fact is evident that available legal base requires improvement and development, both at federal and regional levels.

First of all, it is necessary to develop and to approve on the state level the restoration standards and rules:
- on preparation, coordination and approval of design and estimate documentation for execution of works on conservation of cultural heritage objects;
- as well as for the performing of each kind of repair and restoration works, provided by the Federal law about objects of cultural heritage.

After reorganization of Russian Federation Ministry of Culture the state commission on restorers' certification was liquidated in 2004. This commission, established in 1955 by the order of USSR Ministry of Culture, performed the control over professional training and advanced training of restorers for 50 years.

Duties of certifying commission include the assignment of categories to restorers depending on experience, quality and complexity of submitted works. The wage of restorers directly depends on certification in state-funded organizations. The availability of high-qualified certified restorers in organization is taken into account when issuing licenses that mentioned in Guidelines on licensing. It is urgently necessary to recover the certifying commission. Monuments restoration quality and the licensing depend on that.

In a new list of works, which are subject to licensing, in particular, on restoration, the specialization is not taken into account. This courses the fact, that the restoration organization receives the right to execute any kinds of work with respect to culture creations of any epoch. Besides it is necessary that the licenses would be granted to those organizations, which have restorers in their staff or working under contract. Duration of contract must at least cover the term of license to be issued. It will be the guarantee of restoration quality both for enterprise and for customer and also for bodies of monuments protection.

The forced privatization can have a negative impact on restoration branch, after first stage of which in 1990s almost all major Russia's restoration enterprises disappeared. Only separate were conserved, which managed to remain state enterprises. From 2003 the next stage of privatization started. As distinct from previous it is obligatory and shall be implemented only according to one profile – enterprise conversion into joint-stock company or its liquidation in case of insufficient authorized capital. The enterprise property goes to Rosimushchestvo (Russian property). Thus, the work on conservation of cultural heritage becomes dependant on up-to-the-minute commercial interests. The privatization should be voluntary, because forced privatization can lead to destruction of restoration activity.

Monument restoration requires investments, equal or exceeding the cost of new construction. It's necessary to work out the system for complex financing of activities to guarantee the safety of cultural heritage objects that would coordinate the budgets of all levels and the off-budget sources for the most effective use of means.

Analysis of economic advantages of historical and cultural heritage conservation has shown positive influence on the economic growth in three spheres: construction and restoration, real estate cost and tourism. The positive result can be achieved by dividing of powers between state agencies of all levels, as well as by diversity of forms of ownership for use of immovable monuments. The payback of investments into restoration can come from profitable investment projects, development of infrastructure and improvement. It is important to create a favourable investment climate.

In sphere of development of heritage conservation economic motivation it's necessary to foresee the following:
- Increase of orders for restoration works from bodies of Federal and municipal authorities;
- Motivation of restoration and reconstruction taking into account priorities, given by them in current conditions;
- Conducting of repair and restoration works at the expense of fine rate loans, grants, tax benefits and current assets.

With such approach it is necessary to take into account the historical and cultural value of object, its social role, the public availability, the owner ability to be liable for his duties and the income he can receive. We should denote the border between evident and actual value of conservation, as well as direct and collateral benefits resulting from this activity. Therefore it's especially important to systematically explain citizens the value of public and private investment into the cultural monuments in order that economic groups and the urban community would realize the efficiency and the prestigeousness of investments into the cultural and historical heritage.
Vyacheslav Koldashov

«Modern Multimedia Technologies in Sphere of Preservation of a Cultural Heritage and Development of Cultural Tourism»

The purpose of creation of multimedia resources (MR) for cultural tourism development – construction of uniform information space for creation of effective system of interaction of all participants of the community interested and participating in development of cultural tourism development.

The uniform information space (UIS) includes:
- Legal base
- Target programs of various levels
- Materials of profile conferences, exhibitions, seminars, etc.
- Directory and analytical materials
- Materials for educational and educational activity
- Mechanisms of effective interaction of all participants

As participants for whom UIS is created are considered:
- Tourists, travellers, pilgrims
- Educational institutions (profile and general educational)
- Professionals of travel business
- Experts in profile areas (culturologists, regional specialists, etc.)
- Mass media
- Museums and memorial estates
- The international, federal and regional structures, including power departments and business companies interested and participating in development of cultural tourism

UIS will allow the participants:
- To tourists – more comfortable and cognitively to lead travel
- To educational institutions – to make curriculums more substantial
- To professionals of travel business and business companies – more successfully to run business
- To experts in profile areas – better to understand processes in adjacent areas and the general tendencies
- Museums and memorial estates – to attract more visitors
- To power departments – to make the proved administrative decisions; to carry out made decisions more quickly and more effectively

Methods of achievement of the purpose

UIS is created at direct participation of all participants in the specified sphere. For this purpose are necessary – the coordinating center, the executor, coauthors and the decision of organizational and financial questions.

UIS will be formed of printed editions, but basically from MR as MR have a number of essential advantages. Access to MR is carried out through the Internet, digital and interactive TV, through an announcement on satellite liaison channels (Multicasts) and on CD/DVD.

MR include (probably in several languages):
- Audio-video plots
- Electronic multilayered maps with navigators
- Convenient search systems
- Photo, figures, schedules, tables, texts with hyperlinks
- Animation and 3D effects, including satellite pictures
- References to the Internet sources
- On-line services (booking, remittances, etc.) and forums

Experience of “METEC Ltd” on creation MR

“METEC Ltd” is a coauthor of project “The Multimedia cultural-study of local lore anthology “All Russia” which coordinates by the Ministry of culture of the Russian Federation and the executor of the project “Multimedia guides on cities and regions of Russia and all World”.

Projects are carried out with use of the mechanism of public-private partnership.

During work above projects the company had been established close communications with all participants interested and participating in development of cultural tourism.
Received as a result of work above the projects experience has shown:
All participants are interested in creation of UIS and MR in particular
Participants are not always informed enough on activity each other in considered sphere
There are no structures which are engaged in creation of UIS and high-grade MR in particular
Support of the projects by federal and regional power departments, as a rule, allows to solve more quickly organizational questions at work above the projects
Business companies are ready to co finance the projects of a similar sort on mutually advantageous conditions; this process while constrains due to absence of ready and evident decisions

For creation of MR following sources of financing can be used:
Budgetary and unappropriated funds
Grants
Financing from customer
Financing from business companies, including sponsors and advertizers
The income from selling created MR
The combined sources

Conclusions:
For successful development of cultural tourism creation of UIS for all participants is necessary
At creation of UIS can be used the experience of “METEC Ltd”
For performance of the project on creation UIS it is necessary to continue the begun work and to finance the second stage, the subsequent stages can be carried out due to self-financing
THE FINAL COMMUNIQUE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The International Conference «Innovative Policies for Heritage Safeguarding and Cultural Tourism Development» was held on November 25 – 27, 2005 at the premises of the Moscow Kremlin Museums.

The conference was organized under the aegis and with a support of the UNESCO Moscow Office for Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and the Russian Federation, the Ministry of Culture and Mass Communications of the Russian Federation, State University - the Higher School of Economics and National Commissions for UNESCO of the cluster countries with participation of the State Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve «Moscow Kremlin», Federal Agency on Tourism of the Russian Federation, Secretariat of Inter-parliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States. The conference was conducted in the framework of UNESCO's international programs and projects aimed at cultural heritage preservation and cultural tourism development, and taking into consideration recommendations worked out during the seminars on Innovative Policies in the Tourism Development, conducted in the framework of the UNESCO's cross-sector Project «Caucasus» in 2005 in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia.

The conference took place in the medieval chambers of the Moscow Kremlin, the Chrism (Cross) Chamber of the Patriarch Palace and the Armory Chamber. A tour around historical monuments of the Moscow Kremlin, the Temple of the Christ of the Savior, art galleries and other sites was an organic part of the conference.

During the opening ceremony the Minister of Culture and Mass Communications of the Russian Federation, Mr. Alexander Sokolov, emphasized a necessity of improving the activities aimed at preservation of and taking advantage from cultural and natural heritage as a factor of global, national and regional development. Mr. Dendev Badarch, Acting Director of the UNESCO Moscow Office, gave an opening address on behalf of the Director General of UNESCO. The topic of the conference and an important role of its participants were emphasized in the welcoming remarks of the Rector of State University – Higher School of Economics, Mr. Jaroslav Kouzminov, and a General Director of the State Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve «The Moscow Kremlin», Mrs. Elena Gagarina.

More than 200 specialists took part in the conference and more than 70 representatives from Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, United Kingdom and Switzerland as well as representatives from Ministries of Culture, Tourism and on Youth Affairs of the cluster countries, museum employees, scientists, tourist operators, and international experts spoke at the conference. The issues of preservation and careful use of cultural and historical heritage (such as historical towns, natural reserves and safeguarded areas) for cultural, scientific and recreational purposes were discussed.

**The main goals of the conference were:**
- To initiate an international debate on legal, social, professional and scientific problems of preservation of cultural heritage, cultural variety and the development of tourism.
- To define ways to strengthen cooperation between the parties involved in the process of preservation of cultural diversity and taking advantage of material and spiritual heritage through development of cultural tourism.
- To promote know-how and the best practices with a purpose of supporting tourism, which will promote preservation of the cultural heritage and sustainable development.
- To display projects in the field of cultural heritage and steady development of the tourism, underlining cultural variety.

**The plenary and section discussions covered the following basic problems:**
(1) Cultural policies and legislative maintenance of preservation of a cultural heritage and development of cultural tourism at national and international levels.
(2) Problems of preservation of objects of the world cultural heritage and development of cultural tourism.
(3) Management of historical cities in the context of development of cultural tourism.
(4) A role of museums in preservation of cultural heritage and development of cultural tourism.
(5) Development of specially protected natural territories and ecological tourism.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Taking into account the interests of each country – participant at the conference in preservation and revival of cultural heritage and in strengthening moral principles of the society;
Recognizing that there are normative legal and economic problems in sphere of preservation of cultural and natural heritage and development of cultural tourism in the represented countries;
Emphasizing a significance of taking advantage of the cultural and natural heritage as a global, national and regional development factor;
Paying attention to that creation of effective system «cultural and natural heritage – scientific, cultural, recreational tourism and industry of traveling and rest» demands research and introduction of new industrial and economic mechanisms of their maintenance and development;

The representatives drew up the following recommendations with concrete actions to be taken by national, regional and municipal authorities, authorized heads and decision-makers, the National Commissions for UNESCO, international organizations as well as UNESCO:

1. To conduct an audit of the national legal acts devoted to a cultural and natural heritage and, if necessary, take measures on their improvement, in particular, detailed elaboration of the legislations concerning the objects of the world heritage. To include in those legal acts the norms and rules which will make institutions managing sites of cultural and natural heritage, to promote development of educational and ecological tourism.

2. To take measures for substantial integration of programs and projects for the development of cultural and natural heritage sites with programs on cultural, educational and ecological tourism. To initiate a dialogue between all parties concerned about preservation of cultural and natural heritage in CIS countries, to establish communication between historical cities, museums, protected territories and tourist business. To start a process of ascribing cultural and natural heritage objects of the cluster countries in the UNESCO List of the World Heritage.

3. To support an establishment of the market for intellectual services in the sphere of culture and tourism, and to create a legal base and practice of preservation and rational exploitation of the non-polluted natural, historical and cultural territories, which constitute a national wealth and potential for development.

4. To create (with the support of a state) an effective long-term system for financing of investment projects (including agency-level target programs), that have to do with reconstruction, assigning sites to the museum category, technical re-equipment, modernization, complete renovation, and restoration of objects of cultural and natural heritage and tourist industry.

5. To develop productive partnership of state and private sector with a view of preservation, multiplication and the most full socially useful exploitation of objects of cultural and natural heritage. To consider opportunity of creation national centers on advancement of state-private partnership.

6. To pay attention of state and municipal institutions to necessity of creation of civilized infrastructure of small historical towns, called to provide essential growth of streams of tourists and to promote preservation and development of objects of culture.

7. To pay attention of legislative and executive bodies of the submitted countries to expediency of institutional perfection of management systems of especially protected natural territories, many of which are unique, world-famous and have huge cognitive potential. It is necessary to develop and to fix precise rules of interaction of all interested sides in legislation acts, allowing to stimulate business activity under strict control of observance of national legislation, international norms and rules.

8. To take measures on development of educational programs for establishments of primary, secondary, higher, postgraduate and vocational education on themes: «The World cultural heritage and tourism», «Especially protected natural territories and tourism» and to their inclusion in plans of professional training for work in sphere of culture, wildlife management and tourism. To use more widely educational and scientific potential of the universities, the specialized establishments in the system of higher and secondary vocational education for preparation of managers and specialists in sphere of preservation of cultural heritage and development of cultural - cognitive tourism. To pay special attention to personnel maintenance of especially protected natural territories, natural and historical museums – reserves, biosphere reserves and the programs and projects of development of ecological tourism, ecological, cultural and scientific, including children and youth programs.

9. To promote development of the small business accompanying cultural, cognitive and ecological tourism. To promote creation of an infrastructure for service of visitors of especially protected natural territories and objects of cultural heritage.

10. To develop system of information support and advertising of the projects connected to objects of cultural and natural heritage. To perfect advertising and information supply, marketing and promotion of a tourist product on internal and external markets on a modern technological basis.

11. To promote adjustment of partner communications of administrations, managers and science officers of objects of cultural and natural heritage with foreign colleagues, to exchange new effective technologies of their preservation and exploitation, methods of development of cultural - cognitive and ecological tourism.

12. To develop scientific researches and design works in sphere of perfection institutional and economic mechanisms of management of objects of cultural and natural heritage and their socially effective exploitation. To pay special attention to assistance in settlement of property relations in sphere of exploitation of these objects. To develop the international cooperation on the given directions of scientific researches.

13. To create international and national systems of special encouragement of establishments, organizations, companies and physical persons for their contribution to preservation, socially useful and effective exploitation of cultural and natural heritage similar to encouragements and awards which are awarded in the field of science, arts, cinematography.
14. To implement legislative fastening of the system of stimulation and encouragements patronage/sponsor activity in sphere of preservation of cultural and natural heritage and development of cultural-cognitive tourism.

The Participants of the conference:
are confident that the results of the conference will positively influence a future development of cultural and tourist sector as well as promotion of economic growth in the participating states;
agree on the necessity to continue with organization of conferences, seminars, and working meetings in the cluster countries on the problems discussed at this conference;
appeal to the international organizations and, first of all to UNESCO, with the request for assistance in realization of the projects on protection of cultural and natural heritage.

Adopted by the conference,
November 25 – 27, 2005
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