259
"Issues of Historical Preservation in Central Europe and Russia"

Conference Proceedings

edited by Jodi Koehn

The Kennan Institute, together with the Woodrow Wilson Center/Kennan Institute Moscow Alumni Association and the Polish Committee of the International Council of Museums (ICOM), organized a conference entitled "Historical Preservation: Issues Confronting Eastern Europe and Russia" in May 1994. Held in Radziejowice, Poland, the conference was funded by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Federal Conference Fund, the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies Endowment Fund, and the Polish Committee of ICOM.

This transcript was prepared from a recording of the conference. As some speakers spoke in English and others spoke through simultaneous interpreters, the Kennan Institute apologizes in advance for any inadvertent errors in reporting their remarks.

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies is a division of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Through its programs of fellowships, meetings, and publications, the Institute encourages scholarship on Russia and the former Soviet Union, embracing a broad range of fields in the social sciences and humanities. The Kennan Institute is supported by contributions from foundations, corporations, individuals, and the United States Government.

Kennan Institute Occasional Papers

The Kennan Institute makes Occasional Papers available to all those interested in Russian studies. Occasional Papers are submitted by Kennan Institute scholars and visiting speakers, particularly those who wish to receive timely feedback on their work. Copies of Occasional Papers and a list of papers currently available can be obtained free of charge by contacting:

Occasional Papers
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704
Washington, D.C. 20024-2518
(202) 287-3400

This Occasional Paper has been produced with support provided by the Russian, Eurasian, and East European Research and Training Program of the U.S. Department of State (funded by the Soviet and East European Research and Training Act of 1983, or Title VIII). We are most grateful to this sponsor.

The views expressed in Kennan Institute Occasional Papers are those of the authors.

Transcribed by Jade Shiveley
Edited by Jodi Koehn

"Issues of Historical Preservation in Central Europe and Russia"

Conference Proceedings

edited by Jodi Koehn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

by William Craft Brumfield and Blair A. Ruble

The present is a moment of uncommon complexity for the preservation movement in Central Europe and the former Soviet Union. Once the prerogative of the state, preservation is now searching for combined public and private sponsorship at a time when weakened, underfinanced state institutions and undercapitalized fledgling private entities lack adequate resources for the task at hand. The cultural patrimony of several nations is threatened by decay, theft, and insensitive reuse.

U.S., European, and Russian cultural preservation specialists gathered 16–18 May 1994 at the Radziejowice palace outside Warsaw to examine critical issues confronting historic preservation initiatives in the former socialist world. The program—which included group discussions, site visits, and a review of Russian television's coverage of preservation issues—was sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson Center, the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Woodrow Wilson Center, the Kennan Institute's Moscow Alumni Association, and the Polish Committee of the International Council of Museums (ICOM). The following transcript records those discussions.

Conference participants focused on the dilemmas of managing preservation programs that consider multiple cultures and multiple heritages, and the role of preservation initiatives in developing and maintaining a sense of nation and on defining a sense of place. Participants also visited Polish sites.

Many participants underscored the critical importance of local initiative and grassroots mobilization, while others spoke of the need to balance several competing financial demands. Each formerly socialist state, the group concluded, is struggling to establish an appropriate balance between private and state responsibility for historic properties. Western participants counseled for the need to reduce continuing deterioration of many sites, leaving restoration to a future time when greater resources are available. Russian speakers, for their part, heatedly discussed the desirability of returning spiritual objects and structures to religious organizations that may not be able to ensure their proper care.

Speakers argued for sustaining national and local efforts to document and record the current condition of objects and sites, educating wider groups of people in the need to continue preservation efforts during a period of acute economic hardship, and raising the educational and professional level and training of specialists in the field. Regions and states must establish predictable decision mechanisms that can provide a context for the resolution of disputes over the disposition of historic objects and sites as such conflict is sure to increase throughout the region.

In view of the depressed economic situation and meager social resources in much of the Russian countryside—conditions that have led to the neglect of many architectural monuments, especially churches and former estate

houses—a number of the Russian participants asserted that local efforts would be difficult to sustain without help from larger regional or national organizations. Even the Russian Orthodox Church, with its interest in reviving rural parishes, cannot maintain—much less restore—the abandoned churches in areas such as the Yaroslavl Eparchy.

Comprehensive, practical solutions to the complex cultural questions of architectural preservation are elusive. Yet the ramifications are extensive, from the issue of national consciousness to the sustaining of a viable tourist industry, from community pride in local traditions and history to the survival of places of worship. As events elsewhere in Europe have demonstrated, architectural monuments are all too often the target of destructive impulses unleashed by the worst forms of ideological and national intolerance. The conference proceeded under the assumption that historic preservation in Russia as well as in Central and Eastern Europe would not only preserve a valuable cultural legacy, but would also attest to the renewed health of a civil society.

In closing, we would like to thank Jade Shiveley and Jodi Koehn for preparing this transcript of the conference proceedings.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION: ISSUES CONFRONTING EASTERN EUROPE AND RUSSIA

16–18 MAY 1994

Radziejowice, Poland. Cosponsored by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Federal Conference Fund, the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies Endowment Fund, the Woodrow Wilson Center/Kennan Institute Moscow Alumni Association, and the Polish Committee of the International Council of Museums (ICOM).

Opening Addresses.

Wojciech Kowalski, Professor of International Law, University of Silesia; **Blair A. Ruble**, Director, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies; **Grigorii Kaganov**, Leading Scientific Worker, Institute of the Theory of Architecture and City Planning, Moscow, and former Short-term Scholar, Kennan Institute.

Panel I. Maintaining a Sense of National Heritage.

Discussion Leader: **Wojciech Kowalski**, Professor of International Law, University of Silesia.

Richard Longstreth, Professor, American Studies Program, George Washington University; **Leszek Jodlinski**, International Center of Culture, Krakow; **Feliks Razumovskii**, Co-Creative Producer, Artistic Broadcasting, "Fate of Russia" television program; **Tat'iana Vasil'eva**, Director, Office of Cultural Affairs, Iaroslavl' *oblast'*.

Panel II. Defining a Sense of Place.

Discussion Leader: **Grigorii Kaganov**, Leading Scientific Worker, Institute of the Theory of Architecture and City Planning, Moscow, and former Short-term Scholar, Kennan Institute.

Boris Nikolashchenko, Head of "*Tsentr*" Planning Studio, Institute of the General Plan of the City, St. Petersburg; **John Stubbs**, Program Director World Monuments Fund, New York.

Panel III. Multiple Cultures, Multiple Heritages.

Discussion Leader: **Samuel Gruber**, Director, Jewish Heritage Council, World Monuments Fund, New York.

John Maciuika, Department of Architecture, College of Environmental Design, University of California, Berkeley; **Father Georgii Mitsov**, Priest, Church of the Ascension of Christ, Pskov *oblast'*; **Leonid Raputov**, Senior Researcher, History of Architecture Department, Moscow Architectural Institute; **Lester Borley**, Secretary General, Europa Nostra, Edinburgh.

Panel IV. Practical Problems and Conflicting Interests.

Discussion Leader: **Blair A. Ruble**, Director, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies.

Larisa Bannikova, General Director of Historic Restoration, Novgorod *oblast'*; **Tat'iana Vasil'eva**, Director, Office of Cultural Affairs, Iaroslavl' *oblast'*; **Roger Lewis**, Professor of Architecture, University of Maryland, and columnist, *The Washington Post*; **André Meyer**, President, Commission

Fédérale des Monuments Historiques, Lucerne; **Aleksei Shchenkov**, Leading Scientific Worker, Institute of the Theory of Architecture and Planning, (VNIITAG).

Panel V.
Preservation Pluralism.

Discussion Leader: **Blair A. Ruble**, Director, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies.

Antony French, Senior Lecturer, Department of Geography, University College, London, and former Fellow, Woodrow Wilson Center; **William C. Brumfield**, Professor, German/Slavic Department, Tulane University, and former Research Scholar, Kennan Institute; **Blair Ruble**, Director, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies; **Aleksandr Vysokovskii**, Department Chief, Institute of the Theory of Architecture and Planning, and Director, "Polis-3" consulting firm, Moscow, and former Short-term Scholar, Kennan Institute.

Site Visits to:
Zhirudowa

Zelazowa Wola, home and birthplace of Frederic Chopin

Arkadia Park

Old Town Warsaw

Video Viewing
"Fate of Russia" television program, Feliks Razumovskii, co-creative producer

PARTICIPANTS

European Participants:

Lester Borley
Secretary General
Europa Nostra, Edinburgh

Tony French
Department of Geography
University College, London

Andre Meyer
President
Commission Federale des Monuments Historiques, Lucerne

Polish Participants:

Leszek Jodlinski
Researcher
International Center of Culture, Krakow

Wojciech Kowalski
Professor of Law
University of Silesia, Poland

American Participants:

William Craft Brumfield
Professor of Slavic Languages
Tulane University, New Orleans

Samuel Gruber
Director
Jewish Heritage Council World Monuments Fund, Syracuse

Roger Lewis
Professor of Architecture
University of Maryland

Richard Longstreth
American Studies Program
George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

John Maciuika
College of Environmental Design
Department of Architecture
University of California, Berkeley

Blair A. Ruble
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
Washington, D.C.

John Stubbs
Program Director
World Monuments Fund, New York

Russian Participants:

Larisa Bannikova
Vice Director for Restoration and Historic Preservation
Novgorod State Joint Museum National Park

Grigorii Zosimovich Kaganov
Leading Scientific Worker
Institute of the Theory of Architecture and City Planning, Moscow

Father Georgii Mitsov
Priest
Church of the Ascension of Christ
Pskov Region

Boris Vasil'evich Nikolashchenko
Head
"Tsentr" Planning Studio
Institute of the General Plan of the City, St. Petersburg

Leonid Borisovich Raputov
Senior Researcher
History of Architecture Department
Moscow Architectural Institute

Feliks Vel'evich Razumovskii
Co-creative Producer
"Fate of Russia" television program, Moscow

Alexei Shchenkov
Head, Department on Mastering Heritage
Institute of the Theory of Architecture and City Planning, Moscow

Tat'iana L'vovna Vasil'eva
Director
Office of Cultural Affairs,
Iaroslavl' *Oblast'* Administration

Aleksandr Arkad'evich Vysokovskii
Department Chief
Institute of the Theory of Architecture and City Planning, Moscow

and
Director
"Polis-3" consulting firm
Moscow

Opening Address.

WOJCIECH KOWALSKI: It is my privilege and pleasure to give these opening words today. We are in a place called Radziejowice, near the palace. This palace was built of wood in the fourteenth century, then it was rebuilt in brick in the sixteenth century, then, as you can easily discover, it was rebuilt several times. We decided to organize this meeting here because it is not far away from Warsaw and it is a quiet place; a good place for discussion.

As you very well know we need to discuss various problems, various aspects of the protection of national, cultural heritage. When I first learned of this idea, I was fascinated because I remember one of the seminars held in Salzburg, organized by Harvard University in which the idea was to confront the understanding of heritage and preservation in Europe and America. The results were really fascinating. Our approaches were completely different and the discussions were quite long and very intensive. I think we will have a chance to do this once more with our colleagues from Russia. The concepts of this discussion will be explained by our colleague, Blair Ruble, who is the Director of the Kennan Institute, which, in fact, organized and sponsored this meeting. Thank you very much.

BLAIR RUBLE: I would like to thank Ambassador Kowalski for being such a good host. He has learned a lot about democratic elections in the short time that I've known him, because when we first met he was working in the Ministry of Culture and now you see him listed as a law professor as a result of democratic processes. But, still, I should say that this meeting would not have been possible without him and without the support of the Ministry of Culture of Poland. The Ministry is hosting us at this beautiful site. We'd like to thank them.

There are two other people who are not present who must be mentioned as well. Zbigniew Lewicki of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs was responsible for getting us in touch with one another. Charles Blitzer, who is director of the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C., provided the finan-cial support for us to be together. So even though Charles is back in Washington I think we should all have warm thoughts about him.

This meeting grew out of several conversations I had with three alumni of the Kennan Institute: William Brumfield, Grigorii Kaganov, and Aleksandr Vysokovskii. William and I examine the issue of historic preservation whenever we go to Russia. And Aleksandr and Grigorii came to Washington and talked to people about historic preservation. There was one moment when the four of us were together and we started talking about how different the Russian and American conceptions of preservation were and are and how interesting it would be to get a group of people in the same room to talk about some of these issues. How educational it would be, both for Russian and American colleagues, to hear one another. When I met Ambassador Kowalski, he thought that having Europeans in the room would add an important dimension because European perspectives are different from both American and Russian. Therefore, we have all ended up at this beautiful spot together.

Rather than focusing around formal presentations, we thought that it would be better to draw out moments of disagreement. I think it would be very healthy if we can identify places where each of us as individuals have different points of view about shared problems. If the discussion goes well, we may think about follow-up activities. But right now, I think the main purpose of the discussion is to put on the table questions that we have all been thinking about and try to explain ourselves to people from a different background. In doing so, we should help each of us understand our own position better. So that is why the Kennan Institute is sponsoring this event. That is why the Woodrow Wilson Center, of which we are a part, has sponsored this event.

GRIGORII KAGANOV: First of all, I would like to say thank you to the Woodrow Wilson Center and to the Kennan Institute. Thank you for enabling all of us to meet here in this near paradise. As to the heart of the matter, the heart of the problem which brought us here, I would like to say one thing.

Belonging to a culture means being included in a common memory, even against your own will. Possessing a memory does not mean being happy, because memory includes not only what we would like to remember, but also what we ought to remember for our own benefit. We would probably like to forget a lot of things, but memory is not sleeping. We know it is awake. It reminds us not only of the pleasant parts of our lives, but of the most unpleasant aspects. This is the main function of memory. At this conference, we are prepared to discuss all aspects of the problem of historical monuments and historical sites. I have a feeling of gratitude to this very insistent memory. I would like to say thank you once again to the people who organized this meeting, both on the American side and of course to our Polish hosts.

BLAIR RUBLE: Each of you submitted a paper, a very short paper based on five questions. We have compiled both English and Russian versions of your statements. I hope that you all have the booklet now, which has the program and the statements. We then set out to try to group people under certain themes, themes about which there seemed to be special feeling in the five page, six page, statements that you submitted. This does not mean that you can only speak on those subjects. It just means that we would like you to initiate a general discussion. We hope that everyone will participate in the discussion on all subjects and that you are not surprised by seeing your name listed under one subject or another. I think, probably, before I turn the podium over to start the discussion on "Maintaining a Sense of National Heritage", that we might simply go around the room and introduce ourselves so that everybody will know precisely who is who.

Before we get too much further, this is Monique Principi from the Kennan Institute who has handled a lot of your organizational matters. We should thank Monique for our being here and if you have a particular question about travel or finance, she is the person you need to see.

WILLIAM BRUMFIELD: My name is William Brumfield. I am a specialist in Russian Studies at Tulane University; a professor. My own special interest is in the history of

Russian architecture and its preservation. I have published six books on Russian architectural history including, most recently, *A History of Russian Architecture* published by Cambridge University Press.

FELIKS RAZUMOVSKII: I am Feliks Razumovskii. I am a presenter of a special program on Russian television concerning the history of Russian culture. The program is called "The Fate of Russia". We have produced approximately fifteen programs during the last two years on different aspects of Russian culture. These programs appear on the t.v. screen roughly once a month. I also published several books and a number of articles concerned with history and the history of architecture. This is where my main interests lie. Thank you.

FATHER GEORGII MITSOV: I am a priest of a church in a Russian village. My name is Father Georgii Mitsov. For about ten years I was a research worker studying the history of painting—the passage from icon to portrait. Then I was an artistic restorer in Gatchina, near Petersburg, in a former tsarist summer palace. And now, for six years, I have been a priest in a village church, the Church of the Ascension of Christ. My aim is to help man to merge his physical needs, those of everyday life, with his spiritual needs. As Father Pavel Florinskii, a great authority, said, "Each culture derives from a cult." So, in order to bring sense into our life and to make it humane and fruitful, you cannot be either just a working horse or just a fanatic. Living under your realized emotional and spiritual qualities leads to a kind of a split human being. He tries to force himself into a certain framework. Therefore, I was glad to accept this invitation. The problems that are going to be discussed here will help me and will probably be useful to those present here; to get into the details, into shades and hues of the problems that will be discussed here. Thank you.

JOHN MACIUIKA: I am a student at the University of California at Berkeley. I am a student of architectural history. My interests that have brought me to this conference are in trying to understand architecture as part of, perhaps a small part of, a much larger cultural history, particularly of Central Europe, bracketed for myself in my studies, bracketed in the east by my studies of the Baltic nations, particularly Lithuania, and bracketed in the west by my study of Germany and Austria. My architectural studies are very closely connected with trying to understand political culture, especially the formations that have led to what we might call modern consciousness in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including such phenomena as nationalism. I am hoping to contribute whatever I can to our discussions in understanding different conceptions of what national/cultural heritage means and the place of historic preservation in this field. Thank you.

ANDRE MEYER: My name is Andre Meyer. I am President of the National Commission for Preservation and Restoration of the Historical Monuments and Cultural Heritage in Switzerland. I am interested in the methods and the technologies of restoration. I am teaching at the University of Berne, in the methods of conservation and historical monuments.

TONY FRENCH: My name is Tony French, from University College, London. I am a geographer

and my special area and interest is the social geography of towns and historical geography of towns in Russia and in the other republics of the former Soviet Union, in particular, Belarus and Uzbekistan. In this particular field my recent work has been producing a report for the government of Uzbekistan for the conservation of their historic Islamic monuments in Bukhara, Samarkand, and Khiva.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: My name is Richard Longstreth. I am a professor of architectural history and director of the graduate program in historic preservation at George Washington University in Washington, DC. Most of my research and writing is on historical subjects, but I have been involved both as an academic and as a citizen in preservation activities in many parts of the United States for over twenty years. I have devoted the last seven years to working with a Washington group called The Committee of One Hundred that is devoted to many planning and environmental concerns. With my work in particular, the group is saving buildings and districts. I've done this at the national level, too, through the Society of Architectural Historians. I, like many others in the U.S., am very parochial in outlook. We focus on our own community, our own nation, perhaps, but know less about the rest of the world. I am hoping I may have something to say that is useful to you, particularly from my first hand experience in this, and that I will learn a great deal from you as well.

JOHN STUBBS: My name is John Stubbs. I am Program Director of the World Monuments Fund based in New York. I have been at that organization for three years. Prior to that I practiced architecture for eleven years in New York City. Prior to that I worked for the US National Park Service in Washington, D.C. At the moment, I am also an Associate Professor of Architectural Preservation at Columbia University, teaching two courses; one in history, theory and practice of architectural preservation and another course on the long, long history of architectural classicism.

I would like to briefly introduce now the World Monuments Fund and what we are trying to do. The World Monuments Fund is a nonprofit, private organization based in America that is trying to do what it can to advocate saving the best of man's cultural patrimony around the world. We have come across some methodologies that I hope I can share with you over these next three days, some of which I think are very promising. In closing, I would like to mention that on the back table here, I have brought a fair amount of literature that explains what the organization is all about and how we do what we do. I invite you to take any of that material you care to have. I look forward to meeting and talking with each and every one of you over the next three days. Thank you.

LESZEK JODLINSKI: My name is Leszek Jodlinski. I am a Ph.D. candidate at the university in Krakow. First of all, I represent the International and Cultural Center in Krakow and its department, the Institute for Urban Studies, Architectural and Monumental Preservation. To some extent, the name of this institute explains my reason for being here. Personally, I am interested in twentieth century architecture which, of course, also touches on some questions of heritage such as to what extent it

is the common issue and to what extent it is in the scope of interest of national agencies and institutions. At our center there have been some programs already underway on heritage issue, on marketing cities, and on managing historic cities. I hope that I will be able to learn a lot here and take part in some discussions, particularly in the cases that deal closely with research programs we have already started in Krakow. Thank you.

GRIGORII KAGANOV: I am from the Institute for Theory of Architecture and Planning in Moscow. The field of my interest is in the formation of an urban environment, especially in old Russian cities, particularly Saint Petersburg. I have a few publications. Thank you.

WOJCIECH KOWALSKI: My name is Wojciech Kowalski. I am a professor of International Public Law at the University of Silesia. For the last two and a half years I have been working in governmental service as Poland's, commissioner for Polish heritage abroad. As an academician I have published some books. Two of them are on the problems of restitution of works of art in various situations, mainly restitution as one of the ways to eliminate the effects of war and changing and shifting borders. After my public service is finished, I will go back to the university in southern Poland where I will teach my students and also write on the various aspects of legal protection of cultural property.

BLAIR RUBLE: My name is Blair Ruble and I am Director of the Kennan Institute in Washington, D.C. I am trained as a political scientist and about fifteen years ago I was invited to write a book about how the politics of Leningrad worked. Since I was unable to find out how the politics of Leningrad worked. I started trying to understand how that remarkable city came to be the way that it is and began to look at the politics and economics of the development of the city of Leningrad. It resulted in the publication of a book called *Leningrad: Shaping a Soviet City*, which appeared just as Leningrad was neither Leningrad nor Soviet, but I hope I have something to say about how various factors, including preservation, have an influence upon the shape of cities and how the shape of cities feed back into political life. I am mainly here as a bureaucrat, so I will stop with that.

ALEKSANDR VYSOKOVSKII: As a researcher for the Institute of the Theory of Architecture and City Planning, I am engaged in the study of city environment. I also have organized a special, private consulting firm, Polis-3. We have developed programs of development, such projects for about ten Russian cities. The most important aspect is socialization and the attitude of different groups of population, of different strata, to the monuments of culture. I hope this subtopic will find a place for discussion here in our seminar and I will learn a lot of important and interesting things from the seminar. Thank you.

ROGER LEWIS: You asked earlier why we were here. I think I am here because I am the official generalist, or eclectic. Number one, I guess I am an architect and urban planner. I have practiced architec-

ture since the late 1960s when I built a collection of buildings in Tunisia, in North Africa, where I served in the Peace Corps. I came back to Washington, D.C., became a teacher and now I am a professor of Architecture at the University of Maryland, which is right outside of Washington, D.C., where I do not teach history, I teach architectural design and sometimes architectural theories. Then, finally, to help pay my bills, I also am a journalist. I write a column for *The Washington Post* called "Shaping the City" (we didn't take that from the title of your book), which is a column that appears almost weekly about architecture, urban design, housing, historic preservation, and almost any thing else having to do with the physical environment.

I should add that perhaps another reason I am here is that I have travelled quite a bit to Russia. I first went to Moscow in 1968, returned in 1989, lived for a month in the Gostinitsa Rossiia, the Rossiya Hotel, which allowed me to become really familiar with some of the problems of historic preservation in Russia because, as some of you know, in order to build that hotel they had to demolish some buildings. Currently, with Blair Ruble, I am involved in trying to help restore the Dom Faberge in Saint Petersburg. I suspect those are some of the things that brought me here. Thank you.

LESTER BORLEY: My name is Lester Borley. I live in Edinburgh, in Scotland, although I act as the secretary general of a body called Europa Nostra, which is based in the Hague. We are a federation of two hundred heritage organizations in twenty-nine European countries. Our principle task is the development of a public awareness, education and involvement in the heritage. I hope very much that during these two days we will talk about public involvement and awareness because it seems to me a critical first step in getting people to conserve their own heritage.

Before that, I was the Director of the National Trust of Scotland for ten years. Therefore, I have practical experience of managing people and managing properties. We owned 120 properties—castles, palaces, towns, villages, mountains—which received two million visitors a year. We were also a membership organization and that was the public commitment to the heritage. We had 250,000 members, which was five percent of our population, which is actually larger than any political party membership in our country. That is a significant fact, I think, when dealing with the politics of the heritage.

Before the National Trust, I wandered as a member of the tourism industry and I worked as the British Tourist Authority in America, Australia, and West Germany and helped to develop tourism in Britain. I was the director of the English Tourist Board and the Scottish Tourist Board.

I have been to Russia, but I don't claim intimate knowledge. I have been to Moscow, Leningrad, Tashkent, Samarkand, Bukhara, Khiva, and Alma Ata, so I do know something of the great treasures of your country. To sum it up, I suppose the reason I am here is that I am a practitioner in the business of cultural heritage management. I am also very eager to promote the concept of people's understanding of cultural landscapes.

SAM GRUBER: My name is Sam Gruber. I am Director of the Jewish Heritage Council of the World Monuments Fund. By training I am an architectural and urban historian with a specialty in medieval cities, but for the last five years I have directed a program geared at the identification, documentation, protection, and preservation of Jewish historic sites around the world. We have initiated surveys, technical studies and restoration projects in countries ranging from Morocco to Poland, Czechoslovakia to the United States. We have not done any work in Russia. I have worked in Poland a great deal in the last few years. We have just issued a report on the Jewish sites in Poland and are initiating restoration work of the temple synagogue in Krakow, which I hope some of you will have a chance to visit if you go there later this week.

By necessity, I have become immersed in issues of preservation of minority culture, particularly ethnic and religious minorities, and how difficult that often can be. That is one of the issues that I hope to address at this meeting. Thank you.

LEONID RAPUTOV: My name is Leonid Raputov. I am a Professor at the Moscow Architectural Institute, department of history of architecture and town planning. The sphere of my interests is the history of town planning, of the turn of this century *art nouveau* in Moscow and the history of British, actually English, city planning. In April of last year in London, I had a talk on this problem devoted to the 1944 plans of development of greater London by Patrick Ambercrombie. Thank you.

ALEXEI SHCHENKOV: My name is Alexei Shchenkov. I am the head of the Department on Mastering Heritage in the Institute of the Theory of Architecture and City Planning in Moscow. In a broad sense my interests can be qualified as the problem of the relationship between heritage and the present. In a more concrete way, I was first interested in closely related problems; the history of city planning and the reconstruction of historical cities. I have a number of books published on the subject. From the reconstruction I passed over to the problems of restoration and am the head of a big project studying the history of restoration work in Russia. Thank you.

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: My name is Tat'iana Vasil'eva. I am the head of the Office of Cultural Affairs in the Iaroslavl Oblast, in the center of Russia. Our committee is a new organizational unit aimed at the preservation of national heritage. It was set up at the mayor's office and functions parallel to the committee on culture. As the chairman of this committee, I see my main task as creating a unit of preservation of historical sites, which would be a safeguard for complex, all around study and preservation of historical sites, uniting the efforts of local experts and those of the international level. Therefore, I am deeply interested in the subject matter of today's conference. I expect to learn a lot and to find answers to many questions that bother me, for I do realize that many problems are common to different nations.

LARISA BANNIKOVA: I am an art historian, vice director of the Novgorod State Joint Museum National Park. Our museum national park includes all historical sites of Novgorod, and other his-

toric towns of the Novgorod district. Our activities include the restoration of both real estate and movables. But if movables are a priority of museum workers and their restoration and conservation is never really channelled, it doesn't matter what the state bureaucrats would say about it except for matters of financing. The restoration, usage, and preservation of the historical sites which are real estate, private properties, depends to a large extent on how the bureaucrats would look at it. Very often, we are facing fairly critical conflicts and we are living through such a conflict in Novgorod. I would like very much that all those present will help me to better understand our problems and will offer suggestions or at least compassion. Thank you.

BORIS NIKOLASHCHENKO: I am Boris Nikolashchenko. I am the head of a special planning institutional center in Saint Petersburg, in the Institute of the General Plan of the City. We are engaged and concerned with the city planning of Saint Petersburg. I am also the head of a private workshop which is engaged in architectural planning of some particular sites in Saint Petersburg and in its suburbs. My major task is to harmonize the existing controversies which can be easily overcome with the problems of economic policy or the proper policy for funding such work. This harmony very much depends on the concrete methods and legal procedures used and it is very important to discuss them. I hope that our discussion here will allow me to better understand these problems. Thank you.

Panel I. Maintaining a Sense of National Heritage.

AMBASSADOR KOWALSKI: Thank you very much. The subject we would like to focus on is "Maintaining a Sense of National Heritage". The idea is to give the floor to four people who should talk about their understanding of national heritage. I would like really to focus on that subject because when reading your papers sometimes the subject is very wide, the scope of the problem is very general. Please tell us what you can, what you think about the national heritage and maintaining a sense of it. Please, Richard Longstreth, you have the floor.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: Thank you. What national heritage means, I think, varies considerably from nation to nation and can vary considerably within nations as well. The remarks I wanted to make today do not necessarily apply to other places, but they might, or they may be the base of some ideas that are useful. What I wanted to focus on is what we refer to as our national historic preservation program, which was created in 1966, when our federal government really got into policy making for preservation in a significant way. In framing that legislation and in the many rules and regulations that emanated from it, I think much was taken from the European experience. But there was, to me, one very significant difference. The difference is that, in the US, since that time we have had no hierarchy in our listing of historic properties of any sort. Everything receives the same treatment. Currently, this applies at the national level with our national register of historic places and any preservation work that the federal government is involved in. But it also, then, trans-

lates to our states and also to our localities—municipalities, counties, or whatever—most of whom have adopted this same system. They are all different in detail, but the absence of hierarchy is a common thread and a very important one.

Why did this occur and why am I raising it today? Basically because we do have three levels of significance for our national register but they are of equal weight. There is national significance, state significance, and local significance. Those of us who work in preservation, or conservation as most of you call it, focus on local significance. Local significance is what we really deal with and part of the rationale for it is that the heritage of the nation as a whole, particularly when the nation is made up of so many different peoples, is more than our great national monuments—the U.S. Capitol, Independence Hall, Yosemite Park, and what have you. It is the composite, the aggregate, of all of these localities (all of these little towns, all of these rural areas, all of these neighborhoods in cities), many of which, from an historian's viewpoint, are not significant beyond their region. They are not individually of transcendent value, but collectively they do define our nation. Our nation from the standpoint of its collective memory would be far the poorer without this aggregate.

That's a key reason, but then there is also a personal reason. In an early preservation/conservation conference held twenty-five years ago, shortly after all of this legislation had passed, the state preservation officer in Vermont, which is a small state in our northeastern sector, said, "Most of my constituents—most of the people to whom I am foremost responsible, the citizens of Vermont—are not like you and I. They don't get on an airplane and travel all over. They don't see Minneapolis in the midwest. They don't go to St. Louis or San Francisco or Los Angeles or Houston or Atlanta. Most of my constituents live in rural settings and spend most of their lives in Vermont. For them, their town, their township, their community is what they know and what they cherish. For them, that setting, that community, really is their national patrimony."

This gets to another essential point, I think, the difference in the way preservation or conservation is structured in the US, which is that most of the responsibility for whatever gets done is done at the local level and through citizen activists. It is through the citizenry. We don't trust our governments, or at least we have a healthy skepticism towards them. We try to work closely with them, but still we feel it is a private sector responsibility. Having a system that is non-hierarchical encourages citizens to invest their energies in protecting what they have. It is a way that encourages people to get involved and, therefore, we also have no real system of priorities for what should be preserved.

As an architectural historian, or if I were a geographer or what not, I could sit down and list without too much problem, even in a community: these are the most important things, these are what we should be looking at first simply from the standpoint of their significance. But that often is not what happens. Things get preserved because some group identifies them and says, "This is important to us." And I may not think so but we understand. They do and therefore we let them do that. It's a messy process and the

physical work on the property is not always exemplary. We should license our architects to work on historic buildings, although we don't. However, a wide variety of things and a large number of things are conserved/preserved as a result of this process including many things that wouldn't even necessarily be thought of in some other countries. And I will close now.

LESZEK JODLINSKI: Well, I wrote in my paper that I am quite skeptical about the idea of national heritage. I would like to put forward a couple of questions toward our Russian guests, that I think might be of importance, in order to realize or perhaps to share some experience referring to the issue of the heritage.

First of all, although it may seem obvious, I think that it is worthwhile to discuss what heritage really is, to what extent it is a mixture of history, of social life, of beliefs, mythology, whatever it is. Just put it as a question, because I think it is not an objective term. It is quite subjective.

Experience shows . . . that it is very difficult and to some extent very risky to define heritage as a national. Living in what we call Mittleurope, or Central Europe, one can realize that the historical resources that heritage is derived from belong to different nations and to some extent different heritages are formed from the same history. So maybe just putting aside the criteria of national heritage . . . is easier and much more interesting. Maybe the first task that should be undertaken is to concentrate on creating local heritage, or to turn our attention to local heritage—what is called the local significance of this heritage. I think that this would allow an attempt to create interest in the surrounding local countryside and local landscape or allow us to see national heritage or to define this term much more precisely.

I will summarize by saying that we realize that Central Europe has to recognize mixed heritages, not the existence of only one. Something that one may observe, as I also included in my paper, is that quite often, unfortunately, heritage, or the creation of national heritage, is overused in this part of Europe for different political reasons. There is, I would say, the inclination to create a national heritage of one place, denying the other nations a claim and the opportunity to use the same resources of history to create their own heritage. This creates a phenomenon where it is sometimes difficult to speak, officially, about Polish heritage, of what used to be called Polish Eastern Territories of Hungarian heritage on the borders of these two countries, etc. . . .

Local heritage derives something for the people that is connected with authenticity. That allows us to create institutions . . . to serve as economic and social instruments which can help people reach an understanding of the local heritage. Thank you.

FELIKS RAZUMOVSKII: I would like to warn you that this will be a personal point of view on the problem. If we look at the feeling of national heritage against the background of what Russia is going through now, talking about the present in Russia, it would be quite appropriate to use a definition of an ideological crisis of *Weltanschauung* connected with economic crisis and other crises.

Part of this great national crisis is the crisis of understanding of the

national heritage, which we are going through now. What is it connected with? In my opinion, until recently we had an approach to heritage which I would define as using a journalistic definition as a stone chronicle; if not a stone chronicle, then a wooden chronicle. All the studies on heritage, and there was much research done on historic towns in Russia, treated the problem as a physical problem, of a particular historical site, even of a whole town; but it was treated as an object, in isolation from other towns, from the whole country, from the historical background, from the historical landscape with which it was inseparably connected. Meanwhile, the historians of culture, such authorities as Academician Ligachev, put forward an idea of landscape, a panoramic vision, taking in life and understanding space that was the soil on which the Russian culture grew. In this context of the landscape vision, it became clear that by separating the town from its rural setting, or town from town, we are impoverishing that feeling of national heritage. We are making it less full and significant. We are impoverishing the sense that was placed in this idea by those who created the phenomenon.

I would like to illustrate an example of such impoverishment. In 1975, a treatise was published in the register of the Cultural Monuments of the Moscow district. This treatise documented all of the historical sites that had been studied by that time in the Moscow district, a large and most historically important area of Russian territory. As one example, I will discuss Kashira, a small Asian town on the Oka River. Administratively, the limits of the Moscow district extend along the Oka River. The complex of the Belopesotsky Monastery was placed in one volume because it is located on one bank of the Oka River and the town itself was described in a different volume. It is a unique situation when these two are combined in one unit because the monastery is a spiritual focus of the town and every citizen, every resident, visited it frequently. It was specifically built there and became separated from the town so that the space of the historical setting was a more important monument, by joining the two together, than either the monastery or the town were individually. They became separated in this register in the Moscow district.

I can provide many more examples of such subdividing, of the separation of the towns from their rural environment. Such an approach object by object did not allow one to feel the basic principle of the Russian architecture which could be called "modesty". I insist on this word because it had a special meaning not only in the moral sense. Modest meant something that would close the view that screens you from being seen.

Architecture must be modest. It should limit its physical size so as not to dwarf the area, not to close the view, not to screen the view of the surrounding landscapes. For example, if we talk about Moscow, the view from the Kremlin of the surrounding villages and forests was one of the major artistic factors accounting for the beauty of Moscow. What I am driving at is that we should overcome this crisis of understanding the heritage and start talking not about the individual objects and individual sites, which were treated hierarchically in Russia. There were national monuments and local monuments. Instead, we should start talking about the uniform,

single, historical landscape which is quite stable. You can find such landscape in the areas which do not have any very old sites, but where the landscape is very old and historical.

Another example, also from the Moscow district, is the ancient town of Ruzha, which was the center of the principality in the years of feudal Russia. Ruzha only has one historical monument from the eighteenth century. But the first mention of the town goes back to the fourteenth century. The first four hundred years have left no trace of the existence of the city, no historical monument that could be introduced, entered on this wooden or stone chronicle. The historical landscape of Ruzha has been preserved and is a monument of great value. It is a good monument of the early Moscow culture.

I believe that overcoming this crisis in the understanding of national heritage is connected with restoring such ideas as land, soil. The historical landscape, in spite of all of the troubles which Russia went through during its history, has been preserved quite well.

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: I will try to be short. I am mainly engaged in the practical aspects of preserving heritage, not in theory. In our district, the Iaroslavl district or *oblast* in Russian, we have more than 6,000 historical sites. Therefore, the problems which have been discussed now refer to us quite in full because what we have is part of the national heritage. In my opinion it is very important not only to have a clearer definition of national heritage, in order to establish a more precise categorization of this historical monument, to make the terminology more precise—for very often it is not unified and everybody uses the terms in different contexts—but we should also work out mechanisms or instruments that would help us to preserve the national heritage. In Russia we currently have a situation where the structure of state agencies working on the preservation of heritage requires serious reform as life shows it. To make myself clear I will remind all of those present here that in Russia we have a system in which the Ministry of Culture has a special board on the preservation of historical monuments. In local government departments on culture there is a special section for the protection of heritage, or special scientific and industrial centers that are economic units which combine local supervision with the actual work. As a result, the state organs and protection of the national heritage are not independent. They are subordinate to the ministries under which they function. They cannot be objective in what they are doing.

Secondly, they have almost no experts on the staff. The reasons for this are many and I am not going to go into them. Life prompts us, if locally now, especially in such historical centers as Iaroslavl, to set up an efficient service for the preservation of national heritage. Our legal system is rapidly changing regarding what concerns property and heritage inheritance and there are problems of giving back to the Russian Orthodox Church and other churches the property which was once theirs. If we do not create powerful, effective and expert bodies locally then we will lose the fight. Therefore, two years ago in Iaroslavl, an area rich in history, the administration of the *oblast'* came to the conclusion that an independent committee on the preservation of the national heritage should be established. The

members of this committee are all experts from different areas of art: history, art, architecture, art history, and so on. The task of the committee is to develop long term projects which will find and preserve historical monuments and also supervise over those who use them as well as other functions which are normally the functions of the state run agencies. These functions have now become the duty of our specialists and experts.

We have lawyers on our staff of the committee. Many legal norms concerning the protection of historical monuments in our area have been accepted by the administration. We have managed to enforce these norms and are keeping an eye on their continued enforcement. Of course the actual financing of these projects is very important, not just their being marked on some sheet of paper. We developed an instrument in which certain sums are allocated from the federal and the district's budget using non-budgetary means that also exist on the town level. Financing programs are purposeful and directed. During the past three years we have managed to proceed with the restoration work (the conservation work), to continue at archaeological expeditions and also to document national heritage, which is also a very important task.

I would also like to say that now cultural heritage and its preservation has become more and more present in the minds of common citizens. It has even become fashionable, a part of mass culture. As one of our lady scientists said, "It is better to have mass culture than no culture at all." I think that all of these things can be revised later, but we have lost so much time that we must be very active. We will also find some money to popularize our heritage. Beginning this year we have a special program, multi-media. It is the computerization of our field of work. I would like to stress once again that the historical sites of each town cannot be looked upon as separated from the rest of the world heritage. It is our duty to preserve what has been left in our care.

We also forget another aspect of heritage. We must preserve not only what has been left to our care, but also what we are creating, what we will leave to future generations. This is probably the weakest point or greatest problem for our people. Thank you.

WOJCIECH KOWALSKI: Let us start a discussion in the sense that we have already had more or less prepared statements. We are talking about the sense of national heritage. As you very well know there is a concept of common heritage, of mankind, for example. There is a concept of national heritage and certain remarks were also made on local heritage: how it can be orchestrated, if it really works or not, whether these concepts are only theoretical. Whether we can really talk in one language. Whether we really understand the same thing by saying national heritage, or not.

I remember a document from 1945 in which we had to leave certain territories as Poland and there was instruction that we should take from this territory whole Polish heritage. What does Polish heritage mean? Objects made by the Polish artists or pictures showing the Polish landscape? Probably the clerk was asked to prepare instructions, and his imagination of the national heritage found his picture in the instructions. Of

course we did not do that, so the instruction was not fulfilled, but it is one of the practical uses of this concept.

So I would like to ask one more question: do we really need to maintain a sense of national heritage? Who would like to tell something about that?

GRIGORII KAGANOV: I would like to add some remarks to the very nice speech by Mr. Longstreth. To the principle of locality, I have already talked to him about that problem and now I would like to talk about that to all of the others present. Today, if something lacks very sharply for an appropriate and whole understanding of architectural inheritance and heritage in Russia, possibly it is exactly this: the feeling of pride for people's own local holy places, holy sites, and holy objects.

To what extent we can see that this feeling has disappeared I can give you a small example. Georgia, as a part of the former Soviet Union which is known for its more developed feeling of national and local pride, will be much more illustrative for Russia as a whole. Once my wife and I visited one of the oldest places in Georgia. They told me, "You should pronounce it properly. Not In-seta, but In-se-ta."

There is a very ancient church in that town which is an object of the common pride of all Georgians. There are local people who love that object and activists explain to the tourists what that place means to Georgians. One of them saw in our hands a small book published in Moscow about the town of Inseta. He came up and told us, "What do you want? How much do you want me to pay for this book? I can pay you any amount you mention. And you, please, give me that book. I want to know the truth, the whole truth about the cathedral church." Unfortunately the book did not belong to me and I could not give it to that man, but he quickly copied a small chapter from the book. That situation is a very interesting one. Only in the book published in Moscow could that man, who spent all his life near that cathedral church, learn many important details about the site.

This problem is also very important in Russia. In Russia, the feeling of pride for local sacred sites has almost disappeared by now. Very often only some people from Moscow care about sacred sites in small Russian towns and only they defend those values from deterioration by the local population. In Moscow itself, we can still feel that pride for local sacred places. Some Muscovites can say with pride, for example, "In this church, when Sovarov died there was a service held here." Even some forty years ago that feeling of local pride was alive in Russia. The fact that now that feeling has almost disappeared is the biggest threat for the common national, cultural heritage. I cannot understand how we could come back to the state of imagination which was underlined by Mr. Longstreth.

BLAIR RUBLE: I find it interesting and amusing that in a room with so many Russians and Americans we are finding it difficult to talk about national heritage, because we're both countries in which political figures have no difficulty talking about Russian national heritage or American national heritage. While Mr. Longstreth's discussion of local feeling was touching, if one were to go to a

political rally headed by Ross Perot, or some other national figure playing upon patriotic feelings, he would not necessarily be talking about saving Vermont heritage. It does seem to me that there is a very emotional aspect to what specialists might want to call national heritage, which perhaps politicians understand better than architects.

There is a sense of attachment to nation and nation's past which seems to move and motivate people. We haven't seemed to talk about that emotion yet. It would be interesting, I think, to hear from speakers from various countries represented around this table whether or not there really is some sort of general notion of Polish national heritage or English national heritage or American or Russian that operates on a different level from our discussion, but when you go to a political demonstration you understand that it is very real.

LESTER BORLEY: I was going to say that the concept of the heritage is an intellectual one which many people in ordinary life cannot comprehend. It is very difficult to put labels on things which people regard more simply and essentially as around them, as you so well described. I don't know very much about the Russian education system and how it is structured, whether it is on a national curriculum or whether it is decentralized, but in my own country I have been to asked to say what heritage means to a Scot. I am a Welshman who lives in Scotland, but I will explain the Scottish sense of nationhood. It is one of a nation that has emerged from some sort of, if you like, repression. It is 700 years ago that a Scottish king defeated an English king and gave a strong sense of nationhood. However, it's not the rallying cry which politicians use because we are still part of a bigger United Kingdom. However, I think a Scot would identify with Scotland before he identifies with the United Kingdom.

The London Times just published a book about the peoples of Europe. It's a very interesting book. I had thought like my colleague, Mr. Meyer, who sits on committees in Strasburg, that we were dealing with 42 European countries. *The Times* has revealed to me that we are dealing, actually, with 100 nations in 42 countries. That, I think, begins to make the distinctions between a country as a nation and the people within that nation. But in my own work in the National Trust for Scotland, we place great emphasis on capturing the minds of young people. The age group which we find most profitable is between the ages of eight and thirteen, because at that age there is still a sense of wonder. There's almost an unsophisticated sense of absorption and it may be difficult for us in this room to put behind us our preconceptions and it may be impossible for us to translate our heritage in what I call "simple terms", terms which can be grasped by other people. I come back to the point that people do identify with what they recognize most easily and they do, using the word of writer, E.M. Forster, "connect". That connection must be made, it seems to me, among the very young because they don't carry with them in their intellectual baggage all of the misconceptions of a political past.

I think I would like to make sure that during the next three days we underline that importance of the structured approach to education.

ROGER LEWIS: Let me speak from the perspective of an observer of what goes on primarily in the United States, but also draw some parallels with what is going on both in Europe and the rest of the world. It seems to me that we've been concentrating on the word heritage at the national or local scale. I would like to actually concentrate for a moment on what I see today as the paradox inherent in the word "nation."

I was making some notes to myself about what constitutes the measures, if you will, of nationhood and I wrote a bunch of words down such as commonality of language, commonalities in culture such as art, music, literature, and of course architecture. I wrote down words like economic unity or integration, geographic or regionally defined commonalities. I even wrote down words like a soccer team, or a football team. Then I wrote down some words that are very simple to understand. I went from street, to neighborhood to town (or district), to city, to state, and finally to nation. What, of course, I had to add to all of this is that the change in technology and culture that is occurring as we speak, that is the traditional boundaries between nations are becoming less important for certain things. The paradox I spoke of is that we are living in a local culture, but also a national and global set of cultures that are, in my opinion, overlapping. I think what I am getting at here is that we don't have to make a choice between local versus national. Rather, we have to accept the notion that Robert Ventura called "both/and" instead of "either/or".

I think that we recognize that, for the future, the idea of nationhood is going to become more complex. Witness what is going on in the former Yugoslavia. Witness what is going on in the United States in which there are people who think of themselves more as citizens of a state than citizens of a region or citizens even of a county or a city. I think given that, the notion of heritage becomes very complex. It is becoming more inclusive rather than exclusive. I think that, from my perspective as an architect where I always try to achieve inclusivity in designing projects, we need to take the same approach in talking about "national heritage". That is, I don't think national heritage is just one thing or even can be defined as national. I suggest that the future is going to be about multiplicity of heritages and that we will probably at some point in the very near future find that we are even crossing traditional borders in order to protect someone else's sets of heritages.

ALEXEI SHCHENKOV: I think that Mr. Jodlinski's remark on the threats, which the problem of national heritage includes, was very important. Heritage is always dialectic. It is always controversial because it always belongs to the past and to the future. It has private and general aspects, so the positive and negative aspects of heritage have big mutual ties. I would not like to talk too much about national heritage. There was a spokesman who talked very well on that problem. I would like to stress that the national heritage is a way of self identification of the man with his environment. It is a necessary point of the social-psychology of continuity of development. That is why the central part of Warsaw was reconstructed as the point of national remembrance, but aggressive nationalism is very strong. It was long before the events of the Trans-Caucasian region of the Soviet Union when some specialists were talking

about the threats of one Trans-Caucasian nation making the monuments of another its own. I cannot tell you whether the facts are real, but, it was an example of a national heritage and its ideas on the service of political goals.

I fully agree with Mr. Kaganov that national holidays are very important for us as a positive aspect of our ties with our own past and as our pride of our holy or sacred places. I think that problem is quite separate. The problem of the nationality of the heritage is a separate problem which will be discussed later.

ALEKSANDR VYSOKOVSKII: I would like to touch on three problems. The first is: what do you understand by monument? A few years ago I had the chance to become acquainted with the legal system and legal acts of some East European countries on the subject of protection of monuments and historical sites. In all of these East European countries, the notion of heritage and the notion of the monument was very broad. Some included landscape and even part of the historical ensemble or individual buildings. For example, the Moscow Kremlin, The Krakow Wawel, and the Athenian Acropolis are all historical monuments. The degradation of part of any of them would lead to the degradation of the whole ensemble. If the Nike Terrace Temple was destroyed the whole Acropolis would lose a lot. So the idea is quite broad and we should work on making the concept of monument more precise so that we would all be discussing the same thing.

Second, there are three levels of monuments. The first is not just national heritage, the Acropolis, the Wawel, the Kremlin. These are monuments which belong not only to a particular national culture, but they belong to the whole world, to the global community. This has been stressed in many international documents. The second level is national heritage. For Russia, there are many towns, many churches, and historical buildings which do not represent such a high level and are not so meaningful for the world culture, but they are very important for those who have a feeling of national culture. And the third level are the local monuments. I use the word in a conventional and arbitrary way. As an example, in a small Moscow town, Klin, near Moscow, there is a small house which has no special cultural or architectural sense. What makes it so important is that Tchaikovsky, the composer, was born there. People come here to venerate it from all over the world. The local activists are the only people who support such small places which are part of the national pride for the people of that particular country. Thus the three levels.

The third question: what is there to protect and who is to protect those monuments of history, art and architecture? In Britain, as we know, many historical castles belong to this or that family, and they become inherited from generation to generation. They allow the public entrance for a certain fee and only at a given time. In Czechoslovakia in the 1950s and 1960s they took another path. The state took under its protection a great number of castles spread over its territory. This was part of the national pride for the entire population. I saw how teachers with their school children during their holidays were walking from one castle to another. This was a way to educate them of the pride of their own nationhood. This was

also cultural education because in the castle they also saw pictures and music. This was a cultural education without being nationalist because they were educating a feeling of pride, not for just being part of one country, but part of the European or general heritage. Now, when these castles become private property, it is accompanied by the loss in such national pride in having them. So there are two possible ways. On the one hand, it is state protection or private protection. However, what is good in one country is not good in another.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: I think that one of the issues that Mr. Ruble introduced is that politicians often focus on things that people feel are threatened. At the moment we have the good fortune not to have a threatened sense of national identity in terms of culture. We may feel threatened in terms of economics, which is what Ross Perot hammered home again and again. Having focused on the concept of place, let me change a little bit and focus on type for a second. There are certainly types that transcend place and are quintessentially important to a nation. One can think of a very obvious example. One thinks of a country house in England as a type with which thousands and millions of people very closely identify as an integral part of their national heritage. For many Americans, the skyscraper is central to our notion of a city and the things that we've done. Often, however, types such as these are not recognized from the standpoint of protection. This has happened recently in the United States with the movie theater. The great movie houses built in the 1920s which are not peculiar to the United States, are again, quintessentially American in many ways. Modest-sized family farms are becoming more and more recognized as many of these are threatened due to economic changes. The free standing single family house has been a central part of the making of the American landscape since the seventeenth century and continues to be really an icon of the American dream. There are many people who don't necessarily recognize this from a historical perspective. I am working with students in communities outside of Washington, most of which started in the twentieth century as prosperous blue collar and lower white collar suburbs. In presenting our findings to the community, this is a non-renewable resource. We can no longer produce these bungalows and other vernacular housing forms as moderate income housing, within this price range. Your community, among many others, shows in various ways how this continues to be an integral part of the American landscape even with large scale urbanization and centralization at the turn of the twentieth century.

The shopping center would be another example; I have been trying to save several of them. I would like to save many more. The bus depot. One thing that took eight years was saving the Greyhound bus depot in Washington, D.C., which was not an innercity line but an intercity line. In the 1920s and 1930s, Greyhound became a major carrier of people from rural areas to urban areas and facilitated a very important part of our urban migration at that time. A person from the review board who decided whether or not this was going to get listed after our presentation said, "You know, I first came to Washington on the bus. This building was my introduction to the city and the

place where I would live for the rest of my life." That was very important. Our delegate to Congress at that time wrote the same thing, that for many people this was the equivalent of Ellis Island for European immigrants to America. That is a more localized example, but this happened all over the country as well.

Often, physical artifacts can possess very potent social, cultural meaning that transcend place. Every nation has them. They differ from nation to nation, but you can establish some sense of commonality between various localities.

ALEKSANDR VYSOKOVSKII: I would like to act once more as an observer from outside and to ask two childish questions. First of all to myself, what are the links between the two notions, heritage and national heritage? Does one constitute a part of the other? Is there any sense in differentiating between heritage and the national heritage? How could we put our discussion in a more exact way in differentiating this way these two notions? Even the short discussion which we have had already can deliver an exact answer to that question that we cannot differ national heritage from heritage as a whole. To use the term of national heritage, in order to be constructive and positive, let's leave it for the politicians and national groupings and just keep in mind, that this is a dangerous term as was stressed by Mr. Jodlinski.

The second question, on the other hand, is that it is essential when we talk about heritage not to subdivide it into levels of more or less importance, but to take it in a certain context. What is the purpose of using the term in discussing it? Then everything becomes much clearer and much more precise. It may happen that the national heritage is the one supported and funded by the federal organs and not with the actual structure of the preservation of monuments. Therefore, the national monument, national heritage, or any other kind of heritage should always be placed within a very distinct and well-defined context.

Another important and childish question: is there any connection between the notion of heritage and heritage itself? Are they interconnected? At least everybody implies, when talking here, that such a connection exists. The crisis of the notion of heritage has been presented very clearly. Mr. Razumovskii did it. He said that the idea of heritage should not be regarded as a set of independent objects, just imagine that a new concept of heritage has won.

I ask myself a question. What will it do to heritage itself after a better, more correct, concept has become prevalent? Is there feedback between the two? A good idea for heritage will immediately bring good results for heritage itself. Or is the difference between heritage and the idea of heritage just like the difference between the recipe for an apple pie and an apple pie itself. Or is the feeling of duty and responsibility the same as responsibility and duty itself. The apple pie can be eaten but the recipe cannot. But, without a good recipe you don't get a good apple pie.

It would be very interesting to discover this feedback. I am sure you know a lot about it. I simply wanted to draw your attention to this aspect of the story on the very complicated connection, if there is one, between the idea itself and idea and the heritage itself.

ANDRE MEYER: I would like to come back to the notion of national culture and underline the programs that are attached to this notion. What about a little country like Switzerland? We have four languages and four cultures and tell me, what is the national heritage in Switzerland. Is there a national heritage? I think we can only speak about a national heritage as the nation existed during the middle of the nineteenth century, when national feelings were coming and the national state was growing up. From there we can speak of a national heritage. So you can speak from the post offices and you can speak from the Parliament houses as a national cultural heritage. Before that, there didn't exist a national culture because that is a political notion. It is the notion of the political state which grew up in the middle of the nineteenth century. I think we must be very clear on this fact.

Next, I think we have to speak about culture. Culture in this time is local. It is always local cultures. I think that for this notion we have to be very clear in this sense so we cannot speak from national culture. We can speak about the nineteenth century from a certain national culture. However, we can speak from a national interest. We can speak from the Pan European interest or a world interest in the culture. When we lose this monument of national interest then it's a loss for the entire nation. When you lose a monument that is important for the whole world, then it's a loss for the whole world. It's a loss. I think we have to clear these notions. The interests can be national, local, Pan-European, but the heritage, it's a culture heritage, and it's not a national cultural heritage. It's very important to see this.

While I am speaking, may I also come back to the definition of the culture. What is culture? I think I remark in my work, that we have two different definitions attached to the culture. We have the scientific definition, I would say, and the historical definition as the monuments are something of both scientific and historical interest. In addition, we have the definition attached for the population, for the people. That's the most emotional or aesthetical. There are quite different ways to have aspect on the cultural heritage.

I think we should, perhaps, not now but tomorrow and the next days, also speak of these different attachments. It is very important to know that the population, the citizens, have an emotional, aesthetical attachment. Old things are beautiful, we like them, but I think the real attachment must be the scientific, historical attachment. Only with this attachment can you also protect the culture of the twentieth century. You can also accept the political monument as a culture. Even if you don't like it you have to maintain this. I think we have to speak about this notion, too.

WOJCIECH KOWALSKI: Maybe I should be silent as a discussion leader, but being the only lawyer here I would like to remind you that there is also a legal standard in international conventions, the national heritage—and it gets more important, especially in the Unigyoi works on the restitution of stolen or illegally exported art objects. The concept of national heritage, the idea of the problem of finding a link between the object and the state or nation or the piece of land is really getting important. But sorry, maybe I should be silent.

LARISA BANNIKOVA: I would like to slightly change the aspect of our discussion of national heritage, excluding the legal and historical aspects and concentrating on the aesthetic and moral aspects of it. How can we define it? The same person here once would call this heritage national or all-national; that Russia, which is multinational, must talk not so much about national heritage but all-Russian heritage, all-nation heritage.

I would like to talk about my area. We are now reconstructing a Polish cemetery which is also to us a part of the national heritage of Russia. We are trying to restore this Polish cemetery where Polish people were executed. How can you explain to the people that we are restoring a Polish cemetery? We travel around villages. We buy old things there. We bought sixty icons from peasant families. We have restored them. You should have seen the joy of those who restored these icons and our own joy when it appeared that among those icons taken from the small peasant houses, there were several ancient, fourteenth and sixteenth century Byzantine icons. We never thought of such Byzantine icons, being not our icons and we would be proud to possess them as part of our national heritage. As to the politicians, I think they shouldn't be allowed close to this notion. Then there would be no dangers coming out of it.

Now I would like to argue what has been said by Mr. Kaganov. Moscow is a kind of a protector in relation to smaller towns, but at the same time Moscow was a destroyer to these ideas of national heritage. How would people know much about their heritage when the most beautiful fifteenth century cathedral used to store potatoes? In Novgorod there is a beautiful church, the Dmitrii Solunskii Church from the fifteenth century. Young people could get all kinds of education but history began in 1917. The people were deprived of their past. They say that if there was no past there will be no future. When we travel around villages, grandfather and grandmothers show very good signs of reverence. There are very little signs of national heritage. Little elements of material culture are relics for them. It is very difficult to talk them into selling such objects. People would be poor, they would give their things to the museum and would come and see how they are shown in a museum showcase but they would not sell them. It is not so broadly known, but it is true.

As to the education problems, Novgorod today supports the concept that has been discussed before. Gymnasium colleges include in their regular curriculum ancient history both of Novgorod and of Russia as a whole. Our museum also makes it part of its program. If you would like to visit, please do. We will show you all of it.

FATHER GEORGII MITSOV: As a man who has close ties with people in his everyday life and who tries to help in some way to make them more human, I am interested in the factor of personal experience of a man. One of the experts in the psychology of children said, possibly he was a Pole, that a small human being wonders, "Am I the same human being as the others?" When he grows up he says, "Oh, am I a human being just like all of the others?" That state of imagination of the mind comes to the man when he is already a grown up. But a human being in his own or different

environment can adapt only when having some base in him. He needs some values in him and the heritage on which he will base the difference of that heritage can be material. It can be money heritage or it can be a heritage of emotions—that so often has no difference for a man. One of these factors can compensate the other one for many people. That's why for a poor man, so often his owner and his history are his only capital. Without that, he is just bankrupt in his life.

My spiritual teacher once said that the only thing a man can do in this life is to understand and realize this life. This understanding or realization of the life does not need any specific way, any specific forms, or means. It just needs a choice of who you are, with whom you go through this life, and what your values are. That is why for a Chinese man who works on his field, the most important point is the center of the village in which there is the cemetery. Working, he always stands in a position in which he faces his ancestors—his fathers and grandfathers. For a Russian now, cemeteries have lost their sense. Many just pay tribute in the hope that when you die you will be treated in an honorable way: that your children will come to your grave the same way you went to the grave of your parents. The majority of Russian graveyards are attached to churches. From the bell tower of my church the graveyard looks like a deck of an aircraft carrier, where all graves are oriented toward the east and are getting ready to fly up. The cemetery dates back to the sixteenth century. It's interesting that somebody who may have no ties with religion and normally wouldn't go to church for regular sermons says he would do anything he can to have his relatives buried in that sacred part of land near church in the graveyard, in the churchyard.

Below the church there is an architectural excavation site two and a half thousand years old. Further off there are seventeen mounds. Close by there are estates of Count Lvov and the parents of Field Marshall Kutuzov, who fought Napoleon, buried in the crypt of the church. He's the one who gave us victory over Napoleon. But people are not interested in all of that. Going abroad, a man, in order not to get dissolved in the general mass of people, begins looking for his roots and begins attending church, which he never did before. In this way he brings back to himself in an abstracted way what he could have as a part of his reality.

Some sorrows, as the saints believed, could help a human being understand what his essence is and the necessity which makes him a human being. If we look back, we remember Job and his sufferings, when God allowed Satan to do all he wanted to him but not touch his soul. He was given remuneration. For me, it is more important in the course of this conference to define the essence of the human being since all of us come from one mother, have Adam as our father and are God's sons and daughters. We can be happy with the joys of each other because when you lose your essence and you dissolve, you don't become a global human being. Without your own personal capital you can't participate in general affairs. That is why I think that Mr. Gruber collects all traces left by his countrymen. This makes the world alive and palpable. Without a conscious under-

standing of one's own self this is impossible.

BORIS NIKOLASHCHENKO: I would like to return to the beginning of our discussion, to the words of Professor Longstreth and of Professor Jodlinski. I can understand that they did not see the tendency, the notion of national heritage as opposite to the general notion of heritage. As far as I understand, their conclusion was that you can understand national heritage only through understanding local heritage. It is even more important because it can also bring together the positions of Mr. Lewis and Mr. Nikolashchenko. All of this sounds so close to the words of Nikolai Everikh, who never talked about the national heritage of a territory because he understood that the notion of nationality is so difficult that we cannot start with it. We can understand that notion of nationality only starting with that notion of territory and its heritage. He was talking about the tribes who have lived on this territory.

I must also say that the notion of local culture sounds ambiguous in English and Polish, but in Russian it is somehow connected with the level of administration, "which remained". With that word, we define only the level of administration. In Russian, it is better to use the word territorial heritage or original heritage. If you would allow me to give a small example, I can show that there have been very good words about depoliticization of the problem.

In our Leningrad district, which still is called Leningrad, there is an old town, Old Ladaga. Quite recently it has been proven that this is the most ancient settlement on the territory of the Russian state, older than Kiev and Novgorod. However, this fact was not made very popular because at the beginning this was a Norman settlement. Varangians lived there. It was not Russian, which sort of depreciated its value. Our Russian theoreticians did not like it because our science was politicized. For some time, Ladaga was the capital of the Russian state. In this role it was succeeded by Kiev. Other capitals were Novgorod, Moscow, and Petersburg. There were four capitals in Russia and the oldest was Ladaga, a fact which was not made public because it was founded by the Normans. This should not diminish its importance in the understanding of Russian, in the same way as the fact that Normans, in 1066, conquered Britain did not diminish the feelings of the Brits. This is a sign of the nation's maturity, when we stop being ashamed of our roots. We now have signs that the Russian nation has become more mature because all of the materials and research data concerning Ladaga have been published recently.

FELIKS RAZUMOVSKII: I would like to talk about the two interesting questions put here. What do you understand by national culture? This notion has its own sense. Father Georgii was talking about the major, essential aim we have in life. It is understanding what we are. He said that for this you do not need any external means, but at the same time he showed that these means are necessary. For the Chinese this is a cemetery. He is looking at the cemetery and feels that he is Chinese.

Russians also had those factors that allowed them to identify themselves. I think that these are the true elements of national heri-

tage. This cultured national landscape of which I had been talking is one of them. Only we should know how to use them. You must possess a certain medium, a certain language in order to make use of it. This language, I called it panoramic vision or landscape vision, is the ability to absorb the landscape as something of greater importance than each individual element. Otherwise, each river would be Jordan and each lake would be a sea of life. If we do possess this language which allows us to make full use of the national culture as the source of cognition of life, then we can talk about national cultures. If we do not possess this language, if we have lost it, and for us historical monuments are just objects to be protected, then of course it is not heritage. If the politicians try to present them in this way, then of course it is easy to use national heritage for political games. So this is the common language for and through which this heritage has been created.

Now we can pass over to the second question asked by Mr. Vysokovskii. What difference does it make that we change our understanding of heritage when once we looked at it object by object and another time we recognized this landscape vision? What change does it bring? Why is it important? I think it does bring a change, because then heritage begins to work for us. It helps us to find our place and to understand what we are. Of course, the consequence will be that the people will protect such heritage. As long as heritage is just a number of objects listed in certain registers, they will do nothing to protect them.

SAM GRUBER: There are several topics to address and I will certainly get to them in the next few days. I would like to deal with Father Mitsov's comments maybe tomorrow when we have the discussion on cultural diversity. I would like to give a few thoughts perhaps to sum up of some of the ideas on national monuments and heritage. I believe that it can be a dangerous term, but I think it is one that we have to deal with because it is one that is widely used and one that we have to confront in the legal and popular framework. In a very practical way, we have to confront it because it is the way that we must deal with the mechanics of preservation and conservation for many of our sites. The guidelines and particularly the funding for historic preservation often trickles down from the top, or national entities, so we have to deal with that reality. Mr. Meyer made some very, I think, telling definitions; the idea that national monuments or national heritages is what is in the national interest. Of course, this is a very attractive idea, although national interest itself is very subjective and what that means is open to interpretation. It seems that maybe we can break down the ideas of national heritage or national monuments into certain categories and then take what is best from each of these categories and perhaps together we can modify an existing definition into a more useful one.

Perhaps in a neutral term, national heritage would of course be defined by geographic boundaries. In that case, whatever happens or whatever exists within Poland's contemporary boundaries would be Polish national culture, whether it is German, Jewish, Polish, or Belarusan—as long as it is within the borders, it is Polish. Certainly that is very inclusive, it may not be popular with everyone. Clearly

national heritage is more than that; it is cultural. We all recognize that and I think when it is used as a cultural concept it can be a positive, unifying force. It unifies people and places with shared values and experiences. These are both the good and the bad experiences that were referred to before; sites of great glory and shame. They are part of the national heritage, too, but are a part that is shared by the population.

Then there is the political notion of national culture. We have talked about the general disgusting nature of politicians, but they are the ones that are actually moving the agenda forward in many cases. We have to deal with what is defined as the political definition, too, as oppressive as it often turns out to be. I think the political definition is often the cultural definition defined by a winning majority. It is not the shared culture of everyone. It is not necessarily even the shared culture of everyone within a geographic boundary, but it is the political cultural definition defined by a ruling party or elite. The political definition and the political monuments are the ones that disappear over time. They are the Lenin statues that are toppled. They are the churches that are burned during the French Revolution. People don't like them and they don't last. The cultural values are the ones that continue. I don't have a solution, but I think if we recognize these different aspects of national monuments we can perhaps deal with them more effectively.

Lastly, I think all of these have to be considered in the educational process. I think it is true that historic preservation without education is meaningless. It is just a collection of objects. It is like collecting butterflies. It means nothing to the people today and it does no honor to the people of the past. I think it is true today that there is great alienation in the world from our past. I was recently reading statements by skinheads and neo-Nazis and what became clear was that all of them seem separated and feel very divorced from the past. One of them said, "For us, the time is five past twelve." That is, we are not part of what happened before, we have no input into it. They are alienated. They are not affected. They were not educated between the ages of eight and thirteen about the values of the past, those traditional values that Father Georgii was talking about. Whether we are religious or not, I think we all recognize that there are certain values that are worth transmitting. I believe that the great role of historic preservation, whether it's an individual monument or whether it is a neighborhood, whether it is a farm, or an immigration station, whether it is an Orthodox church or a Czech castle, is that these are the doors from which we enter the past, which we can communicate with the past, and in which we can capture those values. All of us, to a certain extent, whether we are bureaucrats or technicians, have a responsibility to act as the interpreters of those values and to use the vocabulary of monuments to communicate those values. We speak the language and communicate those values to people today. I think it is a very serious responsibility. I hope that we can make some progress toward that and, in fact, go back to our countries and help to define national monuments and establish national agendas in this direction in our own homes.

FATHER GEORGII MITSOV: I have a very short remark. In part, Mr. Ruble already said what I was going to say. I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there is a different understanding of national heritage. There are state notions of heritage—political and, of course, first of all, the general cultural notion of heritage. Here I would like to cite Mr. Khomokov, a Russian national thinker, who asked a question of rhetoric more than 150 years ago: "Why are we interested in culture? When it seems that the general human aspects should draw our attention first of all?" It was the period when everybody dreamed of those general humankind issues in every aspect of social life, in culture, in literature, etc.

He answered his question, of course, that all human issues are very important. I do not know any example when that generally was not expressed in a national form. It is always expressed in a national form.

ALEKSANDR VYSOKOVSKII: I also have a very short remark. On the idea of Father Georgii Mitsov, I think that is really the highest criterium for defining the national heritage; heritage as a way to save your soul. I think that is a purely Russian approach to the problem. It is Russian because it is both useless and right. It is so right and it is so useless. It is right because, really, it is the most important point, the most important criterium, and the most important goal. But it is really useless because nothing comes out of it. Salvation as itself and salvation through monuments is still a purely individual matter. Nevertheless, I am so grateful to Father Georgii for putting that very high criterium for our discussion. I think the rest of that concrete method of work with heritage, all the ways of social techniques, physical planning, and economic approach make sense only when they are involved in the approach which was presented by Father Georgii.

Possibly it's a defect of Russian culture, but we always prefer to talk about highly spiritual matters. Unfortunately, we always did much less for realizing that in real life. I think that our meeting is one of the steps which will let us feel that high Russian idea with that important Western rationalism.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: Very briefly on the matter of national heritage: preservation and conservation in the U.S. sounds wonderful, but it is very messy. People get very emotional. It is like having a delinquent child in some ways; it happens at the worst time, everybody hates you for it and so forth. One of the problems we have often had is one group versus another and one group's response to something or other which others of us would love to say essentially, "It is not my history. I am of a different origin, different country, different race, different social group, what have you." The response to that, I think, has to be that many of us live in and inhabit settings that are very different from those in which we grew up or from which our parents came. This happens both ways. There are all sorts of appropriation, if you will, by various groups of different places. These places can assume new meanings through that process. It is another layer and a very healthy and constructive one. This is not just an intellectual or a cultural construct, because it also works. It has to work in the real world, the political world, of protecting sites in our country. Some people say that all preservation is local, but I try

to emphasize out of experience that we need a strong federal presence and we need the states, too. We need a system of checks and balances between all of those. It would be a disaster if preservation was left up to the federal government, but it would be equally disastrous if the locals had it all to themselves. You need the combination, you need to work constructively so that you get the best of both worlds. We do not want cultural jingoism, but we don't want cultural Balkanization either.

JOHN MACIUIKA: I agree very much. I think Professor Longstreth made some very poignant and good remarks with respect to the practical aspects of preservation in a very real world context. I would like to go back to the two speakers immediately before that, particularly Father Georgii and Aleksandr Vysokovskii. In reference to the idea that the personal, psychological or moral dimensions of individual experience are somehow useless, I think that my own respect for Father Georgii's remarks derives from the fact that in our quest to define national, cultural heritage, we are using the concept of the nation as a means to try to understand how individuals in any society can forge meaningful linkages between themselves and among each other. We are given in this day and age the concept of national culture. As Andre Meyer has reminded us, the concept of national culture has been given to us because it is a historical artifact that lasted certainly until the present day. We have watched only in the last several years the large scale historical shifts that can occur between, say, an empire and a nation. If we look at the Arab countries we can look at shifts from the national paradigm to a fundamentalist, in this case Islamic, religious paradigm. That is to say regions of the world choose cultural forms by which to organize themselves.

I won't go on at length about this. We will have plenty of time to address it tomorrow and the next day, but I am interested in the notion of the nation itself as an artifact. I am also interested in the very human need to forge linkages between people and also, as Professor Longstreath pointed out, the need for some forms of authority, some forms of hierarchy—I think Sam Gruber alluded to this—some forms by which the resources of societies can be dispensed. These meaningful links between people can be made concrete, whether in buildings or landscapes.

WOJCIECH KOWALSKI: Thank you for this discussion. We had a very general discussion with many extremely interesting remarks. I do not intend to make any conclusion, but I would like to make one remark from my experience. The notion of Polish heritage is very popular in this country. Poles really like to use this notion. They are very proud to have this Polish heritage. But, living in this part of Europe, full of remnants of the cultural activity of other nations, this remains the cultural activity of other nations. I strongly, even desperately sometimes, advocate the concept of the heritage of Poland. Not Polish heritage only, but the heritage of Poland. My God, the Auschwitz concentration camp is not our Polish heritage, but it is on the list of world heritage as Polish heritage. At least people say that it is Polish heritage. No, it is the heritage of Poland. Of course, I am at this moment very close to the concept of territoriality, which was mentioned today, but I think that is a kind of solution.

Panel II. Defining A Sense of Place.

GRIGORII KAGANOV: The first part of our session today will be devoted to the sense of place in the life of human beings. It is so important that a human being be tied to a certain place that he would keep memories that would tie him to a local culture.

The idea of place is an arguable concept. On the one hand, it has been shown quite convincingly that every normal human being is not able to have a vision of the world other than through some concrete places. The world does not exist for human beings. Actually, we know these are places connected with his life. I think this is a very important circumstance in favor of a local approach.

On the other hand, what is the place? It is not so easy to find a common solution for this notion. For one person it will be a very small space between two small houses, or between two small hills. For another person it will be a space between two mountain ranges where he brings his sheep to feed. For somebody living in an arctic area the place is not connected with the borderline between water and earth. In winter the ocean freezes over and there is one space linking the land and the ocean, what is there below the snow level is not important—what is the water and what is land. This is place, he is living there. For us, it is a desert and for him it is full of life. Let us decide for ourselves what sense we would imply in the word "place".

This place should be small enough that one human being could really identify himself as part of it and big enough for it to have a distinctive cultural sense for other people. Let us try to do that, if you don't mind.

BORIS NIKOLASHCHENKO: In order to be more productive, let us not devote too much time to formal definitions. A place for me is every place where people live. Mr. Kaganov is right in saying that the place could be very small or very big. It is the natural landscape that is a decisive factor, whether it's a small place or a big place. It would be right to devote some time to discussing the sense of the idea of place. It would be consistent in our analysis, which is not a very productive way, but if we start from that we can subdivide the identification process into five operations.

We must first of all understand how this natural landscape has been formed. For this we need geological materials and historical evidence of its formation. For example, St. Petersburg is a big valley between two plateaus which had never before been inhabited, or at least had been inhabited to a very little extent, because the area consisted of swampy lowlands very uncomfortable for living. When we begin the study of that area as a place, we begin with a geological setting and the geographical features of it. What this landscape looked like at the moment when people started settling there is very important.

Then the history of the settlement itself becomes important—how the settlement developed. It is the force of this operation that is the history of the social consciousness, including the peoples' awareness of this place and the development of the settlement there. The fifth operation is the qualitative estimation of this place from the point of

view of the modern people living there who continue to settle there and develop the place.

Kevin Lynch suggested a good way of doing the fifth operation. In fact, if we admit that the sense of any notion is outside it, then for the place which is considered space the only other measure is time. That is the context for place. If we try to give some preliminary definition for the sense of the word place, we can say that the sense of the place is the history of the settlement which developed there.

I will talk in detail about each of these five operations if you would allow me to do so. The first operation, the landscape, should include not only geography and geology, but also the basic perimeters of climatic changes. For a human being to live in a place climatic changes are very important.

When we go to the second operation, describing the landscape at the time when human beings appeared there, what is very important is the ethnic, cultural type of the population that inhabits it. How well does it fit economically and culturally into the landscape? How indigenous is the population? How settled is it? Is this place just a transit episode for them, or does the settlement become permanently inhabited? Does the existence last for a long time? The roles of important historical figures in the development of a settlement are also important factors. That is, what were the state and economic aspects and the motives that made the population stay there? What is more important among those motives? Was it utilitarian, pragmatic, economic factors, political, military, or some other which influenced the fate of the settlement to a great extent? What were the reasons for founding a settlement there? Was it just the will of a dictator, of a totalitarian regime, or some public reason? The spatial type of settlement is also important. Is it a local point, a town, a monastery, or a fortress? Were there several settlements neatly scattered over a large territory?

For the third factor, the development of the settlement, two processes should be focused upon. Did it develop from one point as the rings on a tree, as the old towns developed, growing around a nucleus, or was it a kind of carcass framework of streets when a settlement was simultaneously set up in a large area? It is also interesting to follow the development gradually. Was there one general plan that many generations followed or were there some sudden changes? An example is Haussmann's plan in Paris, when suddenly a new plan was introduced and you can see both traces of the old places and Haussmann's Paris coexisting.

Two types of settlements present two principles of development. The first is when you scratch the text off and write new text on the old paper. The other is when you write in the new ideas in between the lines of what has already been in existence. Most of the European towns developed following the second type. What a place was in the history of a nation is very important for a country. It may be a small place revered only by the local population or it may be a place which was an important stage in the development of the whole country and influenced it a great deal.

In addition, it is important to understand what the priorities of this town are, what are its real

estate monuments, other categories, or hierarchy? Finally, what are the frustrations and the triumphs of the particular place? Sometimes this influences our estimation and appreciation of the place. How the community that has been living there accepts her vision of the place and the public awareness of it is also very important for the place's identification. These are various descriptions of the life there—iconography, photography, poetical and literary records, paintings—and how it is reflected in the consciousness of the population. It is important to differentiate between the testimony of the local people who live there, indigenous populations, and the travelers who go through the place and leave their memories of it. Besides, there is a myth that every place is connected with. This mythology may appear in very different kinds of testimonies. In historically rich areas there is a secondary reflection, which appears as the basis of all of this information that has been formed in the public consciousness, a special branch of signs develops, the signs of the place. It is very important to give the floor to the specialists who devoted their lives to studying the place scientifically.

I will not concentrate on the fifth issue. I direct you to Kevin Lynch who did it so well that I am not going to dwell upon the subject. In the end, there must be some synthesis, in our case maybe it would be too much to call it a definition in the scientific sense, to understand the sense of place. Understanding is an alloy of scientific analyses with the feeling of the place which you can only develop by living there. Therefore, it is difficult to talk about a place because you don't have a chance to get this feeling until you live there. You cannot create a bank of data or a bank of definitions that are abstract and alienated from the subjects and objects of our study. It is the kind of synthesis where there is no distinct boundary between the subject and the object. Therefore a purely scientific discussion is hardly possible. A good example of such a synthesis can be provided by people who have some artistic or literary talent to reflect and to describe the place. I am not going to read, but I have two examples. The way Antseferov writes about St. Petersburg, which he called the city of tragic imperialism, expresses the essence in three worlds. Hadson described Venice—I can provide you with the chance to read it if you would like—you cannot express this in two words you should simply read it. It is about fifteen lines of a beautiful text.

In conclusion, we can make the definition more precise. It is the place, the sense of the place and the history of its being settled by the people realized through an artistic synthesis of understanding and feeling. Why is such understanding so important? Each place requires a special code to be set up of rules and limits to any changes in this place. This code should be adequate for the particular place. It should also be oriented to balance the interests of the part of the community that stands for preservation of the place and the part of the community which stimulates change and introduces some activity into its life. The balance of these interests is harmful, whichever part is willing. If the rules are too rigid, it will lead to stagnation of the economy of the place. Finally, it would be harmful to the sense of place itself and may lead to the destruction of its monuments. The heritage may suffer. On the other hand, if the rules are

too lenient and changes too radical, this may also lead to very negative economic results. The sense will be changed of the place and altogether the place will suffer.

JOHN STUBBS: "Defining a sense of place" I completely agree with what was said earlier about how subjective this question really is. In dealing with the issue it is obviously very hard to define, it depends on who is asking the question. Both of the key words in the expression "sense of place" can be considered problematic. Is the sense of place a region? Is it the world? It is everything, depending on who is asking the question and probably when it is being asked.

Sense of place. The word sense. What senses are we referring to? Is it perception of myth or reality? Whose sense? The sense of a life long resident of a place or the sense of a first time visitor? Which senses? Sight? Smell? Sound? Is it a sacred place or an everyday place? These are questions for environmental psychologists and have been addressed in several books in recent years. It really has a lot to do with the abilities of the human mind. Various psychologists have experimented not only on human perception but also on the perception of other animals. Famous experiments have been conducted on rats, astronauts, and other living beings—how they perceive and react to space. What is their sense of place?

What we do know is that there are enriched environments and impoverished environments. Peoples' reactions to both types of environments are very different, ranging from complete apathy for a place to a passionate love for a place. I have been to a place in the last year where I am quite convinced that nearly every citizen of the place would die for historic buildings. I certainly could not say that about the inhabitants of parts of my own city, New York, where people are completely apathetic regarding the place and the buildings that form the place.

When these kinds of questions involve history, they necessarily ought to involve historic preservationists. Thus, defining a sense of place has to do with noting the distinguishing characteristics or integrity of a specific site with regard to historic architecture and its context. We are talking about integrity of historic association or currents and include the usual questions: the birth place, the signing of the treaty, the location of a murder. Another form of integrity is integrity of style: pure Gothic revival, neoclassicism, or some combination of styles that are just character defining aspects. Integrity of use is a certain character defining aspect, not only high-minded uses, but also things that have to do with the labor industry, those kinds of things. Integrity of material—how materials were manipulated in various ways, integrity of craftsmanship and detail, integrity of age—how age provides a certain intrinsic value to a structure or a sense of place. The older the building the more reverence we might have for it. This, of course, goes for artifacts as well, or even parts of artifacts. There is integrity of a physical setting, or the landscape, or the context, for an individual building or an enclave of buildings, particularly with regard to water and land. This whole question of why places were constructed where they were constructed is a question that is not asked enough, in my opinion. In my experience,

one can trace the source of so many decisions to build to the single word of water, whether it is providing transportation and is a life source for the inhabitants in a ground form like a great river or a spring that attracted animals or early inhabitants of a place after which more sophisticated civilization grew. Then you have combinations of these special forms of integrity and that is where the problem becomes quite interesting from our point of view.

All and all, these are aspects of the character of a site. Many sites have unique qualities. In fact, all sites are distinct from one another, but what is really special, in many cases, is the authentic variety that results at a place that has changed over time. This is a variety that is impossible to reconstruct or replicate. Changes over time at a particular site determine what a particular place means over time. Pick an ancient city. Rome for instance, what Rome meant in republican times, in imperial times, medieval times, renaissance times, baroque times, modern times. What one building in Rome meant, the Coliseum, what it was before it was the Flavian Ampitheatre, what it was for the people when the Flavian Ampitheatre was open, what it was for the Christians, what it was in the Middle Ages when it was mined for its stone, what it was in the Renaissance when it inspired architects, in the Romantic period when people commented so on the jungle-like setting of the Coliseum. There is the question of interpretation, a sense of a place and how it changes over time. No two places, or historic sites, that is, are exactly alike, which means the procedures for preserving and presenting each site must be tailored to the circumstance.

First, one must consider the threats to a place. They have to be well understood. The chief threats to a sense of place are the usual perils of antiquity: fire, flood, war, natural deterioration. The main threat, it seems, is from man, especially population pressures and population sprawl or unplanned development. There is also great danger, as we have learned, from modern planning and failures of modern planning. This is a principle aspect of the business to be considered. It seems that most modern planners have gone about their tasks from the standpoint of creating, whereas the task of historic preservationists and preservation planners, as it were, has more to do with curating. There is a fundamental difference. In fact, different personalities are almost drawn to these two aspects of the field of planning.

One assumption certainly is that the issue of landscapes must be tied to the problem of saving and enhancing the built environment. As for implementation, there are a great number of good examples to look to as to what to do. There is the defining of a methodology and the inventory of places. What makes places special and what are these character defining aspects at specific sites. We have referred to Kevin Lynch already, but he is coming at it from a modern planner's point of view, which is certainly a marvel. His book is world famous, but I think the stress with his work has more to do with creating than curating. I am not trying to detract from the importance of the book, but I am suggesting there is another point of view that people seriously interested in history and historic preservation might take in addition to Kevin Lynch's good work.

As far as what to do, there are plenty of good examples. As professionals in the field, we all know them. For farm lands, look at the great examples around the world—French farmland, Czech farmland, and how beautifully maintained they might be. As far as individual buildings, the thousands of historic districts that work in the world, you need look no further than the individual sites. There are plenty of sites to look for. So, the question of what to do is not so much the issue. The question is how to do it.

Implementation is the question. A good part of the issue is how to read the landscape, which brings up the large question of interpretation, which is connected to the word appreciation. A part of all of this is preserving the prototype, the real thing. You see in certain places like this world famous city, where restoring a building or a work of art is all about conserving the prototype. Rebuilding the Staroe Mesto in Warsaw is a world famous example, but I would like to leave this discussion with one question having to do with defending history and the integrity of history. I think this will be a challenge that we all have to face increasingly in the future. In some parts of the world, history is threatened with being cheapened by certain approaches playing fast and loose with the meaning of history. These are huge questions about the viability and validity of enterprises such as Walt Disney World, the replication of entire historic environments, or attempts to do this in other places of the world. These are concerns that I think we all have as preservationists and that will increasingly be subjects for our agendas in the near future. It is relevant because we are talking about historic integrity. I would like to leave with those few points. I have probably asked more questions than I have provided answers. Alas, as we have heard twice already, this is a hugely subjective question. Like the word love, it means a lot of things to a lot of people.

GRIGORII KAGANOV: Thank you. I have a question, too, if you would allow it. What is that wonderful place where people are ready to die for each historical monument?

JOHN STUBBS: Armenia.

GRIGORII KAGANOV: They are dying there for other reasons, too.

JOHN STUBBS: I will never forget tours of Armenian church sites by people, not just historic monuments' experts, but locals, who convinced me that historic buildings are more important than human life. Thank you.

GRIGORII KAGANOV: There is one thing that I would like to add to what you have said. The place may be different, it may be the whole world. It may be the size of the whole world. A popular song comes to my mind, which was popular in the Soviet Union. The refrain is: "My address is not a house or a street. My address is the whole of the Soviet Union." My daughter became very sad when she first heard this song and said, "Poor, poor man. Is he living just in a forest under a tree?" If for a human being the place becoming the whole world means that he is homeless, then he is placeless.

One more consideration. Each place, I believe, has more than one inhabitant. Of course we can discuss the way you posited that human beings are enemies to the place, but there are no places without

people. The whole problem of participation is the problem of several people colliding in the same place. This is the core of our history.

FATHER GEORGII MITSOV: Two towns were mentioned in the previous discussions, Rome and St. Petersburg. This is one of the problems that has been bothering me for a long time. I would like to share with you my understanding of the problem that Peter I, the emperor, had when he decided to build a city which Pushkin said was built against a proud enemy. Blok, another poet, said that we will start a world fire, having revolution in mind, also to tease the bourgeoisie of the whole world. The city was started as a kind of a threat not only to the Swedes, who were their neighbors, but also to the whole world in Blok's words.

A city begun with such a main view had to have some strong support, not just the piles that were put into the swamps, but some other kind of support. That was the idea of Rome, which was bothering Russia and which found its development in St. Petersburg. There were no Seven Hills there, no earlier history, no continuation, and as far as I understand it, Peter created an environment which in his understanding would be equal to that of Rome. He had no love of art, but he bought Italian sculpture for the summer garden. He invited Italian architect Sergini Martanovi and they created a pseudo-Roman setting. Since everybody knows that all roads lead to Rome, they tried to build a Rome here and to give St. Peter a town. Rome has only a cathedral of St. Peter, but without this idea of Rome, to whom the whole world belongs, Russia could not claim its place in Rome. Peter required some capital, some spiritual capital. That is why the city was created as a senitope. You know that in ancient Greece, if somebody died and he died far away from home or he drowned in the sea, they still made a grave for him, prayer was read, and the soul of the dead was called three times. Everybody believed that he was living there in that grave.

A similar thing happened to St. Petersburg. The major cathedral of St. Peter and Paul, the epicenter from which the cartography of the world is at zero meridian of Russia, had this feeling of the heart, since Peter had the same name. You had to somewhat relate the town both to him and to the apostle Peter. This helped Peter in his life, but basically it helped him to develop his ideas, to inculcate them. Later, this sense was taken away from the town. On Peter's birthday, which is the thirtieth of May, as an ideological diversion they celebrate the memory of Isaac the Dalmatian, the saint. The construction of the largest cathedral in St. Petersburg was begun by the architect Montferrand. This identifies the main cathedral of the city with the day on which Peter the Great was born. In this way the city began to be named after Peter as a human being. Recognition of this fact called for the building of the belfry of the St. Peter and Paul Cathedral up fifty meters and the return of the proper name to the city without understanding what it means. This is about the same as writing the word "God" with a small letter (this was the tradition in Soviet Russia), because for us, St. Petersburg would mean what it had meant to Peter, to whom it was a kind of a driving force for developing Russia.

I wanted to say that not only the material factors, the will of the ruler, the presence of water and not even the sacred site, but the purposefulness are orienting the whole effort and inculcating a global idea to one concrete place. This is a strong stimulus for development.

ALEKSANDR VYSOKOVSKII: I would like to change the topic slightly. I think we have talked enough about the spiritual aspect and content of place. I wanted to continue our discussion about the threat for the place which man creates. I share the opinion of Mr. Stubbs, contrary to what our esteemed chairman said, for I think I know which people Mr. Stubbs has in mind. You are talking about architects and designers, who are the real threat to a place. These people, having very good intentions in mind, try to protect a place from physical danger, and this often ends in deterioration of the place's condition. One recent example is the idea of protecting St. Petersburg from floods. They built a protection wall which cuts the Finnish Bay, not letting the water to St. Petersburg. This was, of course, not the decision of architects and designers, but, of course they supported it, carried it through and implemented it.

The results are obvious. The largest part of the Finnish Bay simply died. This is a great threat when the designers take upon themselves the right to make decisions—what is good and what is bad—in order to support or save a place. They make these decisions themselves or are supported by the authorities, without discussing these ideas with the people inhabiting the place. However sophisticated your message might be, your knowledge and understanding of the situation would not save the place from the horrible designer.

As a second point, I would like to ask one question. Is the sense of place connected with the legal right of ownership? Can you say that if somebody possesses a place, a house, or a piece of land then he is responsible for the preservation of the surroundings in which he lives? It is for an owner that protection of his real estate is the most urgent necessity. If a human being is not an owner, he becomes apathetic to what is going on. Is it enough to replace the sense of ownership with the sense of place? That is the main question.

In the Soviet Union, this kind of substitution was made on a mass scale. A whole class of pseudo-owners appeared, which believed that they were owners of a particular environment, but they were not. They forgot about places in the way we talk about them. The legal rights of ownership and the sense of place are very closely and intricately related. I think it is important to discuss this here during today's discussion, because so far in our country there is a complete ban on private ownership and restitution on any historic site, contrary to the Western practice. Is this positive or is it negative?

ALEKSEI SHCHENKOV: I wanted to draw your attention to the perception of place. As with any other heritage, it has always been connected with how important or unimportant it is for a human being. When talking about historical heritage, what comes out first and more often is the historical content. The history of a place, of a site, or of a building becomes more important. Aesthetic perception comes next, taking the second

or maybe the third place. This is probably true for culture in general.

As a paradoxical example, a well-known specialist studying Pushkin's work, *Ni pomneshchii*, was complaining that during his lectures people were not very interested in his analysis of the beauty of Pushkin's words. It was not the verse and the poetry that interested them, but the biography of Pushkin's life. This is quite understandable. History is closer to the people and easier to understand. This is the first item on which I wanted to concentrate.

I would like to add that what follows are some formal qualities which are important because they are markers of history. People can be proud of a huge cathedral, or by the decorations or ornamentation of a place, but it is their tie to history. The second point I would like to dwell on is that this historical content may be regarded as valuable as part of the culture to which you belong by the right of birth, or because it is part of a different culture. Let us take, for example, Russian heritage in the United States, or the Indian's heritage in Alaska.

Modern American curators of national parks are contemporary inhabitants of the place and take it as their own culture. They are interested in it and show interest in it. They emotionally accept it and this emotional involvement concerns not only the educated part of the population, or people directly connected by their professional interest to this, but also broader masses of the population. It is interesting to compare the American Indian heritage and Russian heritage. I was told that local Indians who were christianized also take the Russian heritage in Alaska as part of their own heritage. One of the tribal Indians told me that the Russian Orthodox Church in Sitka is the best, most beautiful building in the world. He was so deeply and so emotionally involved in taking it in as part of his culture and heritage.

The third point is in response to Mr. Vysokovskii's comments. Culture may become your own by tradition and by place, but the place will not always be your own just because you own it. If you simply own a place and you have no roots connecting you to it, then the decision to change, to pull down, or to build something new will be easy. History knows many examples of this.

TONY FRENCH: I think what I want to stress is that the spiritual place is actually a remarkably changeable feature. It seems to me it is rather like the air around us. It is there all right. We can feel it, but we cannot see it. To an even lesser degree can we take hold of it and it changes all the time. I think that Boris Leseyevich was right when he suggested that the creative artist is the one who can define the spirit of place, even better than the academic or the scientist. One can think of artists who have succeeded in doing that, whether it is Sinclair Lewis and his main street in America, or Hardy and his Wesics in England. Or possibly, the thought crossed my mind listening to the comments about St. Petersburg, Falconet's famous statue of Peter the Great, which was raised as a monument to glorify a tsar, but was taken into the broad Russian culture by the poem of Pushkin as the "Bronze Horseman" and, therefore, was carefully preserved. One might have thought that the statue of a tsar would not be

saved during the Communist period, but all through the siege it was protected by sandbags. It was saved because it was then part of a different kind of sense of the place of St. Petersburg.

This varies too, even within one place and between groups of people. In the old St. Petersburg before the revolution, it was perceived in a different way by the aristocracy who came there seasonally for their season in town than by the workers who lived in the city all year round working in the factories. In the different parts of London today, people have a perception of their own area of London, whether it might be Tower Hamlet in the east end or the area around Slone Street—different social areas. Because their local perceptions are different, their perceptions of the city as a whole is different. There is London, but it is seen as many different things by different people.

In the same way, this changes in time. John Stubbs made that point very effectively with the example of Rome. It can be actually quite a short term change, almost from generation to generation. One has only to think of when one is talking to one's students and of how differently they can see a place from one's self and one's own generation. Social change is taking place all of the time. People will leave one place. One can think of economic change in the old coal mining villages of South Wales, or the north of England. There was an intense sense of place and of community bound together around the mine where everybody worked. The coal mine closed and there are still people living there, but that sense of space has totally changed. The old sense has now gone. It may be a very much poorer sense of place, but it has changed within one generation. This means that the meaning of the monuments can also change relatively quickly. The sense of their importance, as the sense of the general place, has changed. Though, of course, there can be things that do survive in spite of everything. I think, perhaps, Arbat Street is a case of continuity of the way people see it. It was always a street where people walked and shopped. That is what it has become now, it has been pedestrianized. It has maintained a role in the consciousness of people in Moscow. It does not even have to be in a built environment. One can think of Laxton, in England, where by accident of history the Medieval three field system has continued. Now people go to see it almost like a museum of Medieval history, but it is continuing in the old way.

ROGER LEWIS: Tony French picked up on something I was going to add to the discussion; this idea about changing or shifting values. I think that is a very important point to keep in mind. If I can elaborate on the relationship of shifting values to the intellectual shifts that occur, I would like to remind everybody of something that we talk a lot about with our students; which is how often we architects and planners (and I have to accept my guilt as being one of those people) do things because they seem like a good idea at the time, only to find out later that they weren't such good ideas. I was reminded by the comments earlier of what happened in this century with respect to the avant garde theoretical speculations of, in particular, Le Corbusier with his *vivadouse* and his radiant city concept for Paris. The impact of that theoretical mind set was tremendous both in Europe and America. We see its

consequences in the housing estates around Moscow, in New York City, in St. Louis or in Warsaw, Poland. The ideal place in space was thought to be, of course, a vast park with freeways, or autobahns, coursing through them with buildings raised on pilots with helicopters (you've all seen the pictures) landing on roofs. It was extraordinary how many people bought into this concept and built millions of square meters of space and place predicated on that.

We in the United States were, I believe, awakened as much by a book as anything else. Jane Jacobs wrote a book called *Death and Life of Great American Cities,* which Boris Nikolashchenko's comment about Kevin Lynch reminded me of. Jane Jacobs wrote this book, as you probably know, about thirty-three years ago and said, "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. We have made a mistake here." Again, as you probably know, over the last twenty years the theory and intellectual discourse has changed. We architects and planners are now trying to reinvent urbanism to serve as a cure for what we intellectually and mistakenly changed during this century. I say this only to underscore the points made about being alert to the fact that the cultural values or at least the intellectual cultural values, can change for the better, but can also move us in the wrong direction. I think we have to be wary of that possibility.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: The question of ownership, I think, is a very important one in preservation and the short answers are no and yes. First the no. Land ownership has been inherent to the settlement of much of North American territory since the seventeenth century. It was one of the things that distinguished that region from many others on the globe, certainly at that time and for some years thereafter.

We regard land ownership as one of our great dreams and one of our great rights. Beginning in the seventeenth century and the first period of settlement in what is now the U.S., we have not been good stewards of our land. We have not used it effectively in terms of production of food or in terms of mineral resources, although we like to think we are getting better at doing that. We have not used it very effectively in terms of settlement either. Certainly the greater part of the history of American cities is to create things to last for less than a generation. In many major American cities in the nineteenth century, fifteen or twenty years was considered a normal lifespan for a building and then something else would happen. This occurred most intensely in the city centers because they were expanding and getting denser. It also occurred, and much less has been written about this, in residential areas as cities at a very early date were also spreading laterally to a far greater degree than a number of cases in Europe.

The tendency would be for the people who first occupied a neighborhood to leave that area in relatively short order. This process still goes on. We can see it today. It is not in "inner-city" neighborhoods, but in neighborhoods, many of which were built in the nineteen-forties or nineteen-fifties, that are now in a state of decay. It is a part of the landscape most of us do not see, but it is very large and its implications are quite ominous.

Now the yes part. The call for reform in this process where you would have continuity and a sense of stewardship of land that you own came not from planners so much—there was no such thing as preservation or conservation at the time as a largely organized activity—but from real estate developers who sensed that they could get more. In return, they could sell more property at greater profit if there was a package that helped guarantee property values. A small, but still very important for paradigms, percentage of what was built was planned real estate developments of that sort.

Preservation, our protection of historic districts, started with the idea of protecting property values as well as cultural values. It was always done out of a threat. The first city in which this occurred was Charleston. The threat was from rich northerners coming down and buying wood work and other ornamental pieces from the great houses the old families had and could barely afford to maintain. Another example is Georgetown in Washington, D.C. This was a threat of apartment house development. It can be a threat of denser development. It can be a threat of decay.

There can be many threats, but that is often what propels and motivates people now to have something, an insurance policy, that gives them a greater sense of feeling that one's house and property will be maintained and increase in value. The threats also give people the opportunity (although only very few people take advantage of this) of managing change to a greater degree than they can under other circumstances in their community. It is hard to get people motivated to do that. We do not know how many historic districts we have in the United States. There are many thousands, and the change has largely been a grassroots effort. The federal government is not responsible. Those of us in academia are not responsible. Professional elites are not responsible. It has been a ground swell, and a very effective one. Again, there are two sides to the equation, because the sloppy stewardship is still very much a part of our heritage.

BLAIR RUBLE: Concerning Tony French's comment about change and speed, I think it is important to remember that people's attitudes about a place can change extraordinarily quickly. This is not only in the rootless United States, but also in more established cultures. If one thinks about a place in Moscow, there is one building that had very different meaning five years ago, in August 1991, than in October 1993. That is the so-called White House. I think that is a very good example of how quickly attitudes about place can change and the emotional meaning of place can change.

Regarding ownership, the history of the Soviet Union may have demonstrated that at the end of the twentieth century, ownership is a necessary condition for a sense of stewardship, but it is hardly sufficient. John Stubbs mentioned the Walt Disney Company. Those of us in Washington, DC are aware of a plan to build an American history amusement park right next to one of our most historic Civil War battlegrounds. This amusement park is complete with a "slavery ride". That idea is so perverse that it suggests that ownership alone is not sufficient to preserve a sense of place.

Panel III. Multiple Cultures, Multiple Heritages

SAM GRUBER: "Multiple Cultures, Multiple Heritages", I think, is a key issue confronting conservators, both theorists and practitioners, around the world. It is a particularly important issue for those of us who work in the United States, because the United States is an ethnically, racially, and religiously diverse country founded on the notion of cultural pluralism. It is also an issue of extreme importance for all of our colleagues from Central/Eastern Europe and from all of the countries of the former Soviet Union, including, but not exclusively, Russia, because of the incredible ethnic and national mix of peoples that reside in those political nations.

We have seen in recent years, particularly since 1989, the rapid political changes which have brought to the surface increasing ethnic tensions, most notably in the former Yugoslavia. We have also seen the rise of intolerance and misunderstanding in almost every other country in Europe (in the west and in the east) sometimes leading to violence and sometimes leading to political separation. We are faced with the immediate problem of trying to address the histories of diverse ethnic, national, racial and religious groups who occupy the same place in a climate where the mood is more toward, I think, separation and distinction rather than unity. It seems to me that a very important goal of all people who are setting out to interpret the past, either in writing or in stone, is to make a special effort to make that work applicable to today's situation.

I have always felt that historic preservation for its own sake is a fine, but not a particularly necessary, occupation. That may be a terrible thing to say in this setting. I think historic preservation is only worthy when it can serve the people who see and who use a place, when they can appreciate it, and when they can learn from it. We serve the people of the present and we honor the people of the past by telling the truth, by encouraging truthful discussion, and by hoping that behavior in the future will benefit from this knowledge of the past.

I mentioned before that my immediate concern has been in dealing with the Jewish legacy around the world, but I have been particularly occupied with identifying sites of Jewish heritage in East/Central Europe. I am always confronted with the different ideas about the sense of place which we just discussed. I find that, as several people mentioned, there are not only many different senses of place through time, but even at one given time different constituencies of people have very different senses of a single place. I think for many of us, the same site can have very different histories. On a more positive note, different sites can have the same history. To use the examples of Jews and Poles, or Jews, Poles, and Germans, they may have lived in a place together, but they perceive the history of that place very differently. It is like Rushomon, you hear a different story from each teller. On the other hand, one often finds in speaking or reading of the history of these people who lived in the same place or lived in different places nearby that despite their differences there are overreaching, unifying aspects in their lives and in their histories, too. One of those would be that

for many of them, they considered themselves Polish, even though ethnically they were not Polish. They were part of a political system and a cultural system that was defined as Polish.

This is certainly the case in the United States, where I think the vast, vast majority of people, no matter what their backgrounds, whether they have come from Lithuania like my great-grandparents, Romania like other great-grandparents of mine, China, Africa or South America, there is a strong sense, certainly within a generation or two, that history and those origins are very much part of a personal identity. We are all unified also in the sense of being Americans. I think in many ways it is easier for Americans because the United States is a new country, we have all been tossed up on the shores together in a big tumbled mass. We do not have geographic rootedness to enforce separate identities. We share today. We share the present and the future. In Europe that is not the case. History and geographic rootedness is a much stronger and demanding partner and weighs heavily on peoples' definitions of themselves and therefore in their interpretations of their history.

We are going to look today at, and a few of our participants will be discussing, the issues of how to confront the histories and material cultures, because we are talking about monument preservation, of distinct minorities, and diverse ethnic and religious groups occupying the same place. I would ask all of the speakers even when they are discussing theoretical aspects, the significance and the spirituality of a particular place or a particular history (this is not just aimed at Father Georgii), to try to actually to pull ourselves down to earth and to think of some practical ways in which these multiple pasts can be tolerated and cherished in a contemporary situation.

There are issues that we must confront. The first is identification or recognition. Secondly, and very importantly, is mutual respect. With respect, or maybe at the same time, is education—the two go hand in hand. Only then, when we have identification and understanding, respect and education, can we seriously talk about protection and preservation. If there is time I will make a few remarks at the end perhaps indicating some encouraging instances of cooperation, post-war cooperation, but particularly instances from the last ten years of Jewish/Christian dialogue where the preservation of monuments has actually spurred cultures to come together and to get to know each other better. I think I have talked long enough. I will save those remarks and let our other speakers proceed. First, John Maciuika, who has given us two pronunciations of his name—I thought this was very important because it does indicate how cultures adapt— is going to address some of the question, I think pertaining in many ways to his own, at least his own family origins in Lithuania. It will be an illustrated talk.

JOHN MACIUIKA: It is true that I have been giving context dependent pronunciations of my last name. To the Americans, the pronunciation is Mas-u-ika. To the Russians, the pronunciation is Ma-ch-o-itka, in recognition of the lack of letters in the English language that would allow the proper pronunciation to be there.

In any event, I want to underscore Sam Gruber's points about the preconditions for preservation.

The preconditions that he mentioned were identification, recognition, mutual respect, and education. I think that the last of these, education, is the one I will most closely address.

SAM GRUBER: While we are waiting I am going to just make a few remarks that I was reminded of, actually, in reading John's paper. He will probably address these, but it reminded me of, also, something Professor Kowalski said yesterday about contemporary history also being full of lies, intentional or unintentional, because of the denial of the multi—I am using an American catchword today—multi-cultural past. Poland was a multi-cultural country. Probably no country in Europe lays claim to that more. Even in Switzerland the cultural units tend to be homogenous within the country. In Poland the cultural entities were mixed within each community—German, Jewish, Russian Orthodox, Catholic, Polish Catholic—all together. Today there is great pride in Poland in Polish culture. Poland today is a homogenous country, mostly of ethnically Polish Catholics, and this is totally unrepresentative of the many, many centuries that created Polish culture. Therefore, history is not being served by promoting this notion of Polish culture.

John, in his paper, has mentioned a similar situation in Lithuania.

JOHN MACIUIKA: I come to this conference as an historian studying the past, but also as a person struggling to make sense of the challenges and the issues of the present. Beginning in 1989 and 1990, it was widely recognized that we had reached the end of a particular post-World War II era. For the last five years, events have proceeded with a dizzying rush; a rush that has defied control of many traditional governmental institutions. It has defied the efforts of scholars to give the post-Cold War era a clear or coherent meaning.

One thing that has not changed in this post-Cold War era is the fact that we are living in a modern world; we continue to live in a modern world in which the nation-state is still a dominant reigning paradigm. Most of our maps reflect this perception. The interest in portraying borders is the primary piece of information around which we organize our understanding. This does not have to be the case, as this map of the peoples of the former Soviet Union, showing more than one hundred ethnic groups reveals to us. The closer we focus our attention, the more ethnic and cultural subgroups are evident, each with languages, traditions, buildings, and rituals inherited from past generations. Modern national defense, national economic policies and governmental institutions tend to overlook and even threaten local cultures of a traditional nature.

This fact was not lost on the artists and political cartoonists of the former Soviet Artists' Union in Moscow. Much of these artists' work, in fact, portrays the difficulty that bureaucracies have in integrating peoples' social, economic, environmental, and cultural needs. From the former Soviet Artists' Union, a picture from the newspapers in Moscow is an example of the feeling the artist has for the disregard for nature that was happening as satellite cities ringed Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities. Yergin Havermaas, a German intellectual whose work tries to reintroduce collective, moral conscience into modern life, suggests

that modern technology and specialization have, in fact, victimized modern society in some basic ways. Specifically, specialized categories of knowledge such as bioengineering or macroeconomic theory or even modern government, have split since the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century into their own separate "domains of rationality" and sometimes into their own separate cultures of rationality.

I would like to submit that our efforts to understand multiple cultures and multiple heritages must include an awareness of the forces that threaten to break the thread that connects us with our past. To our surprise, the very forces that threaten social cohesion and social coherence are labeled, unthinkingly and all too often, as the forces of progress.

The only way to bridge different categories of knowledge and build awareness of our past is to better appreciate and determine our present through education. We here, in this room, have been sponsored by a rare modern institution that has a vision of shared, cross-cultural understanding. I am speaking, of course, of the Kennan Institute. We have been brought together to this beautiful place to educate ourselves and each other.

It is only by teaching our children that cultural heritage is as important as it is complex will we be able to leave our young people with monuments and a world that are, indeed, worth preserving. Education is, perhaps, the only area where we can act significantly as individuals, but we can also act on the level of a locality, perhaps in a village, in a monumental setting, on the level of a city and a region, and on the level of nation-states. This means that villages and government agencies can all be important in their own way on behalf of educating people about their own and other people's traditions.

SAMUEL GRUBER: Before we move on to the next speaker I would like to ask John a question or two concerning Lithuania today. In your paper, you clearly indicated that Lithuanian culture is primarily a peasant culture. Into the twentieth century, ninety percent of those who spoke Lithuanian as a language were living in rural areas. Today, of course, the cities, too, are claimed as part of Lithuanian heritage and the restored castles of the former Lithuanian kings who, apparently, did not speak Lithuanian but Old Slavonic. Then the cities that grew up later around the centers inhabited by Germans, Russians, Jews, and others are all part of Lithuanian national heritage. Of course, the population of Lithuania today is also comprised of a large number of ethnic Russians, some of whom have families that have lived there for generations. Others have moved there more recently as part of settlement policies of the former Soviet regime. A tough question: in a general sense, how should the Lithuanians today, those in power, address the question of the multiethnic past in this multiethnic present? Maybe we should just start with one or two concrete measures which might be taken up and then we can look for some other suggestions in the course of the other papers and try to weave these themes together.

JOHN MACIUIKA: Sure, I would be glad to. First, let me only say for those of you who had the time and patience to read my paper on Lithuania in the packet, that the statistics having to do with popu-

lation were part of a historical effort to show changes in the Baltic. It is correct, as Sam was repeating from the paper, that in the nineteenth century, Lithuanian culture was ninety percent rural and had very few inhabitants of cities. This fact presented challenges for their efforts to build what I call a coherent national identity. However, it also presents a fascinating case study in exactly how national identity is fashioned in the modern world.

As for the current state of affairs, of course many things have changed since the late nineteenth century. Lithuania now has a degree of independence that it has not seen in many years. The Baltic states of Estonia and Latvia face a more difficult demographic situation because in both of those countries, the percentage of ethnic Estonians and ethnic Latvians numbers approximately fifty percent. The current situation in Lithuania is that the number of ethnic Lithuanians is close to eighty-five percent, posing a different set of issues for Lithuanian government than the very difficult issues in Latvia and Estonia. What I am referring to there, specifically, is the ability on the part of the Lithuanian government to give participatory voting rights to ethnic minorities—Russians and Poles, for example—who make up the largest minorities. They have been able to do so without a sense that their national government or identity was threatened in any way. In Latvia and in Estonia this issue will take a long time to solve. Latvians and Estonians have not felt nearly as comfortable giving citizenship rights to Russians who have been born, in fact, in these regions. The demographic statistics, I think, make it obvious as to why the Latvian and Estonian governments are more hesitant. They are currently still negotiating how they will work with minority populations.

Tying back in with my own remarks which may have, I guess, seemed a little bit abstract in the sense that they dealt with modernity as the condition in which we still try to figure out our problems in modern nation-state forms. I would hope that the governments of these nations can responsibly educate their own people as well as residents who are from minority ethnic populations about the needs to get along, as well as to appreciate the historical circumstances that have brought them to live on the same soil. This does not have to represent a threat to either group of people.

My interest in national identity and national culture derives from the persistent way in which national identity in the twentieth century has become an almost pathological symptom on a large scale. Cultural heritage needs to be taught in a way that encourages people's appreciation. It seems very easy in times of economic hardship and frustration for autocratic rulers—we can run a list of many of them: Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, and on down the line—who have successfully taken advantage of desperate economic situations in which angry people can easily be directed toward action based on the notion of a national heritage or myth that is spurring violence.

SAM GRUBER: Everyone should think about these practical applications—education, perhaps at a primary level, about other cultures, church exchanges, those kinds of things—that can be implemented easily and at little cost. That is always an important con-

sideration. The next speaker will be Leonid Raputov.

LEONID RAPUTOV: We can speak about different good or bad monuments—bad monuments like Auschwitz. They reflect the ideology of the society which existed in a certain period of time and all of them are also monuments of the material culture reflecting the whole spiritual life of the society. That is why I would like to bring to your attention a small text about the city planning and architecture in Moscow of the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, which will let you see what was going on in Moscow's architecture in that period of time. When the spiritual life of society and the architecture were going together, the spiritual life of Moscow of the silver age with activities of patrons of art was closely connected with what was going on in Moscow before.

At the turn of the century, the social life of the capital, with its high moral standards, was confined to educational institutions and cultural buildings. They developed these cultural institutions through the charity of great art lovers and patrons of art, privately. Many of these buildings were built up in different areas of Moscow, where a new street appeared. At the same time, a new generation of industrialists and merchants tried to find ways to get closer to the artistic circles of the capital. A deep interest in the world and national culture that was a characteristic feature of a new generation of industrialists caused a kind of a feeling in them that they would like to collect in their homes. A rich collection of manuscripts, pictures, invitations of artists and poets, organized amateur theatricals and parties show the revival of the traditions of cultural life of early periods. For many representatives of industrial circles, social life and charity became part of their individual, spiritual and moral health. You can see in it a special feature of the Silver Age culture that cuts through all spheres of social life and was rooted deeply in tradition. In this way the social life got a new stimulus for its development and it influenced the city planning ideas, the existence of new streets and historical squares around which new culturally oriented buildings were put up.

The city planning history of Moscow Square shows that the high moments and low moments were directly connected with the cultural, public and social life of its time. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the influence of cultural and public life was revealed in a new function acquired by the squares. Educational institutions necessary for the town were financed privately. The historical squares of Moscow are closely connected with the social and cultural life of their time. During these two centuries they have gone through three important stages in their development. To give a small example, I would like to name some big objects which were built in that period: the Pushkin Museum of Art, which was built on funds from private support; Shaniavskii People's University, which became the second center after Moscow University for education. Temiriazev, Pavlov, Herzen, and other well known scientists were teaching there. The Institute of Archaeology was also built with private support, especially by Mr. Rabushinskii; the Tretiakov Gallery of Art and so on.

These are three phases which we can see in the development and which are closely connected with the development of social life. The first stage was concentrated on Classicistic squares like Theater Square, which was meant for public meetings and also for military elites.

At the time of modern art, at the end of the nineteenth century, the flourishing of social life was transferred from the square itself into the buildings around it. For example, the Metropol Hotel on Theater Square, was built as the center of social life of Moscow. It was not just a hotel; there were theater libraries, exhibition halls, and a place for balls or social functions. The same is true of other squares. The People's House in the Vidinskaya Square was the center of activities for Stanislavskii, a famous art director. It is only after the revolution, when social, cultural and religious life became strictly controlled by the totalitarian regime, that these buildings and these squares lost their significance. The buildings became devastated, deteriorated or changed their function. They became storehouses for potatoes or the university became a university for training political functionaries and so on.

In the course of time, the attitude of the authorities to these buildings began to change. Right before the Second World War, there were calls made by the state to protect them. The war years and the destruction that followed made the representatives of the authorities not only take the position of very decided protection of historical heritage, but also helped move forward the idea of protection by the state of architectural monuments or city complexes. This idea found support in the various strata of the population and also in professional circles, but the understanding by professional circles are the problem of defense of architectural heritage and city complexes.

There were two main concepts which became clear in the sixties. These were the concepts and approaches to the historic heritage. One of them underlined the priority of upkeep and protection of that heritage as a live testimony of the social, economic and cultural lives of different periods. The second one was defended by those who strived to touch the problems of modern city planning. Believing that the old city planning was just an obstacle for the new projects in the city, they believed that protection of the old architecture was only a matter limited in time, because the old architecture, in their opinion, was an obstacle for that development of Moscow. The building of new prestigious complexes in the new development areas of Moscow, along with the building of freewaysm was meant to create a new, much more modern image of Moscow. Discussions between those who defended one or another of these concepts regarding the problem or approach to the historical heritage were pushed far away by political events of the recent years. In the new social and economic conditions, this discussion is waiting for its continuation.

SAMUEL GRUBER: I think that presentation refers also to our previous discussion on sense of place and emphasizes the difficulty that we all face in preserving not only the cultures of different peoples, but also in choosing which culture, which time, to emphasize. Mr. French has already discussed how rapidly things changed. Of course, the choice of what's valuable from the past in every present, itself

always changing, will, I think, despite the most earnest efforts of preservationists, always remain a highly subjective judgement. We all know, though, that once something is destroyed it is gone forever. That is why, I think, most of us, whether we are politically progressive or not, tend to be culturally conservative, or, perhaps I should say, culturally, cautious.

Lester Borley will now address some of the issues of multiple cultures. He is uniquely qualified, being involved in many of the preservation concerns of Europa Nostra as well as the National Trust of Scotland.

LESTER BORLEY: I do not want to speak for very long, but would like to give some, what I call, signposts which might help direct the effort, particularly where we are talking about multiple cultures and a multiple heritage.

First of all, an anecdote from my own youth. I was brought up in London and went to college at the east end of London. I got quite interested in the populations in East London. I realized that historically, we had a Protestant Church in East London which had been used for the Protestant faith of the Huguenots who had come to seek, if you like, security in a country when they were subject to religious intolerance elsewhere. In due time, that Protestant church became a Jewish synagogue, as the next wave of Jewish immigrants arrived in the east end of London. You must understand, it was near a port and was the only place where immigrants could find a home. That is no longer a Jewish synagogue. That building is now a Bangladesh mosque. I think that, perhaps, epitomizes what we mean by the absorption of minority cultures in our country.

The second anecdote is one where I had to lose my preconceptions of what is heritage. This was when I went to New Zealand last year for the first time and encountered a minority culture, the Maori culture. Now the Maoris have built wonderful houses. When they have completed the function of the building they do not restore it. When they finish with the building, they consider the spirit of the building to be dead and will not allow you to restore it because there is no purpose in restoring a building whose spirit has died. Of course you see the best examples in the museums in Auckland, but you will not find the Maori people using the western concept of restoration to preserve a building whose spirit is gone.

Similarly, if you live in Australia you have to come to terms with a different concept of spirituality. The Ecomoss Convention, or Charters, which protect historic buildings and cultural assets, had to be modified for Australia, under the Buddha Convention, to allow for areas where people had no specific sense of space, but had a general sense of spiritual belonging. It is not unusual for Aborigines in Australia, working in a western mode, to suddenly get up and go off because they have to go "walk about". Now these are responses of different minorities, and I only give you these two anecdotes because it seems to me that in coming to terms with those different cultures, with those different minorities, other complex societies have been much better for it.

Now what are the sign posts along the way in Europe? Well, to begin with, I represent not only

the National Trust for Scotland (I have got some literature explaining how we protect our heritage and involve people in the process), but the wider structure of Europa Nostra, which is two hundred heritage organizations in twenty-nine European countries. This shows that there is a tremendous movement at the moment in Europe by the people themselves.

So far at this meeting, we have devoted an awful lot of our intellectual time to the definition of culture and have talked about the constraints imposed by government and by administration, but we have given very little thought to the mobilization of people. I think we must concern ourselves with people's own contribution to their cultural stability. It is all very well for someone from Western Europe to say to people from Central and Eastern Europe that you must do something about it. You will be amused to note that in Western Europe, in the European Union of twelve nations, it is only since the first of January 1994, that we have actually admitted a thing called "culture" into the Treaty of Rome. When we created the Union forty years ago we took culture for granted. We chose to emphasize social and economic ambitions. Since the Maastricht Treaty came into force, we can now legally do what we have been doing illegally for forty years, which is to develop culture. However, there is a wider body in Europe called the Council of Europe that I mentioned yesterday, which embraces forty-two nations in Europe.

A very important meeting was held in Vienna in October 1993; the very first summit of heads of state governments of the Council of Europe. I would just like to quote very briefly from that Vienna Declaration. It is very significant because it addresses the issue of the right of the individual to his culture and says that there should be perhaps a European Convention on human rights in the cultural field by provisions guaranteeing individual rights, in particular, for persons belonging to national minorities. That, I think, is a very important political step in Europe because it recognizes the fragmentation and uneven distribution of minority cultures and emphasizes the need to act in order to face what it calls tribalism and exclusion.

"Now Europe," it goes on finally to say, "has a community of spirit which can only be founded on common values, including, in particular, that which is at the foundation of all human rights philosophy; the equal dignity of all human beings." That is really what we should be talking about. It is not the buildings but the people. There has been too little discussion here about people and unless you talk about people you will never motivate the great constituency that lives in Europe and in the East and Central parts of this continent.

Now, in a way, the National Trust for Scotland, of which I was the director, faced a problem in 1931, when the country was in the depths of an economic recession and faced great social and political tension. Scotland had just come out of the first World War, in which we had all lost millions of people. We had only had ten years in which to draw breath because ten years later we were in another war. You have to realize this was a time when there was great economic depression and social disruption in which some people had imagination and courage to say that we need to create

an organization in which people can preserve their own heritage for themselves. So I put it to you, at times of great social disruption and economic malays of the moment, you should not despair. There is no time like the present for involving people in their own destiny. If one involves people in their own destiny, then I think the discussion of where minorities fit in becomes much clearer because they can see their joint destiny in this community of ideas.

Now, finally, the last signpost I would like to give you is that of UNESCO. I work with Ecomoss. I chair the Ecomoss Cultural Tourism Committee. A number of us have been worried for a long time that UNESCO has neglected this enormous area known as cultural landscapes. In the World Heritage Convention of 1972, it did not allow for the natural and cultural elements to be described simultaneously in harmony. Now the convention has been altered. It is quite interesting, because cultural landscapes include a definition of a cultural tradition. It was considered that a group of people may disappear, like the Etruscans, but that their cultural tradition can be assimilated by the dominant civilization, which survives. It goes on to describe various forms of landscape which can be, for the future, defined as of welled-heritage class or status. I think the most important of these, and please excuse the uncomfortable English words in the text, but it is called "The Associative Cultural Landscape." The meaning of that is that it is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence which may be insignificant or even absent. This relates back, I think, to Father Georgii's point about the significance of something that is long past but is deeply felt. When you described your church, the 2,500 years, it seems to me you were capturing an essence—the spiritual values of a minority within a broad cultural landscape.

I will not say anymore because I have dominated the meeting too much, but it seems to me there are clear signposts. There are good examples of collaboration of minorities, but please, let's start talking about people.

SAM GRUBER: You mention the Bricklane synagogue, or now the Bengali mosque. You also mention the Maori loathing of preserving, or prohibition of preserving, places that no longer serve their original purpose. In the east end of London, there is another structure a block away from the former Hugano Chapel, then synagogue, then mosque, that had a similar history. It is no longer a mosque, it was never a mosque, but it has now been turned into the Bengali cultural center. It was the Spittlefields synagogue. The problem here, involving people, is that the Huganos are not there. In the eighteenth century this was a chapel. The Jews who used it as a synagogue and have moved out of the neighborhood into the suburbs feel much the way that the Maori feel about their houses. Except for a few dedicated individuals, they say it has lost its spiritual value. "It is our immigrant past." "We have done better now." "Why preserve this history?" The local Bengali population is too busy earning a living and scraping by because they are a poor immigrant community, to care about who was there before. They are also too busy to invest in having the luxury of their own cultural center that requires extra time and money. This is a case where the

plans are there, but motivating the people is the hardest work. These are the problems that have to be faced.

Let us move on. Father Georgii will be the final presenter and I wonder if in your remarks you will answer one specific question for me, and I think for many of the non-Russian participants. What is the current policy, theoretical if not practical, about state aid to preserve religious buildings in Russia? I know there is not a lot of state money, but if there was, could it be used for churches? In America this is not the case. Secondly, as a priest, how do you feel? Do you feel like the Maori or the Jews in Spittlefields? How would you feel if your church no longer had a congregation? How would you feel if there was no place for you there? How would you feel if it survived and was used for some other, shall we say, appropriate function, but no longer as a house of worship?

FATHER GEORGII MITSOV: I have already spoken, possibly too much, yesterday and today, but I am very glad that our discussion has come to this point. I thank you very much for your concrete questions, which will help me keep closely to the point.

The Pskov region, where I serve now, has created its own national character that has almost 400 kilometers of border. It has a border with Estonia, Latvia, and Belarus, which formerly was a part of Poland. The Pskov region was defending the republic of Novgorod from western influence. . . . One can see more ethnically typical Polish faces there then I will find here, so we can see clear intercultural influences. The character was created almost like the Georgian one, because the soil is poor and has practically no economic sense. That land existed more like a border defending the inner parts. Now our borders with Estonia, Latvia, and more cultured countries, so far have had no influence or impact on the population of the Pskov region.

About my service in the church; often I have to serve alone because there is nobody to come to my service. I belief, however, that service in a church is not only education for the people, but has value in itself. That is why I continue to serve. I really hope that sometime later it will be necessary and people will come to the church. Now, of course, some excursions come, but the stable thing which is called a community does not exist.

About the functional belongings of the church; before the war it was closed for half a year and was used as a storage place for agricultural produce. That helped it to survive because it was not turned into a cultural center, a club as we call it, as most of the churches were. People wanted to preserve this church. The state made all attempts to close it by admonishing the village authorities, and by arresting what they call the head authority of the village and putting him in prison. The people chose a new head authority who did not close the church either. Finally, when a collective farm meeting was organized, they asked the direct question, "Who goes to church in your village?" People did not want to confess that they were believers. It was decided that the church was no longer necessary and it was closed. During the war it was opened again. And what is it? It is just a wooden church, several hundred years old. On the belfry you can find an inscription from

the war years. It addresses in German, from Münster and Hamburg, two Germans who climbed up the belfry and were so attracted and fascinated by its beauty that they wanted to continue their contact with it after the war. They left their names there saying they would come back. You understand that because it is a wooden church it is easily set on fire, but it is still there. Last autumn the son of the German who left this inscription came to visit us. Fortunately, his wife was Polish, and spoke Russian well. He, himself, was a graduate of the theological department of Münster University, teaching morality to bankers. Thus, living in a small village, unusual connections can exist and still no parishioners.

What can I add? It took me ten years to decide whether to have a son because if we all die, what is the purpose of being born? What a responsibility it will be if he can ask the question: why did you bring me into this life if I must die one day? When I finally decided to give birth to a child, I started educating him by placing a world map above his cradle with underwater streams and mountains. Then I replaced it with a map of animal life and plant life. Then the natural resources and only finally, a map with political divisions of the world appeared. The world is uniform. It is God's world. The mixture of language and their separation resulted in non-understanding then and now. The language which you may learn sometimes does give you the knowledge of the culture of the people who speak this language, because it depends on the purpose of you learning this language.

Most of the monuments existing in the world exist only as themselves; they are not connected with the environment. You can see them in the history of the culture with no connection to the people who built them. There is only a connection to the period of time when they were built. This is also true in the case of Stonehenge, of the wall of Christ in Jerusalem, and of St. Sophia, which was the center of the Orthodox Church for a long time. All of these monuments relate to different nations, and different cultures, former nations and former cultures. However, they are still the magnetic centers which attract the consciousness of people if they want their consciousness to be attracted to the cultural field.

I would like to return to the main point. There is a way of survival when small people such as the Maoris have a better-developed feeling of death. The world materializes for them in its apocalyptic finale. There are other people who, in spite of all difficulties, tend to live. This gives them force and vitality. Responsibility in the eyes of their children and to their nationality will be the core idea of the nation. That is why I am not mainly interested in how to survive. I am not interested in the way of survival, even with the survival of fine monuments. What I am concerned about most of all is the continuation of life and the possibility to create more and more monuments, because without some internal sense, some idea, and some tension, no monument can be created.

Because of entropy, any room heated to ten degrees centigrade can be used to boil water in it. Therefore, without centripetal forces, the nation cannot exist. With the feelings of mutual understanding and being one with mankind, some militant relations

will become part of sport activities or intellectual games. I see the true change in the policy in our country and in the whole world, as a possibility for the Russian people to realize themselves. The future will show how it will be done, whether just on the surface or with a deep participation of the people in it. So far, the small Noah's Ark of our being together and exchanging opinions brings great joy to me.

About the state: the state allocated four million rubles for the repair of the roof of my church but I have never seen this money. When churches are restituted to the church, the state takes care of certain types of repairs that could be possible, but later on they do not actually make the repairs.

SAM GRUBER: I would like to hear about the Swiss model, perhaps, speaking about a Noah's Ark. Maybe something about the mechanics of allocations and the mechanics of equal representation. Switzerland is a delicate balancing act, but it seems to me, of all of the countries in Europe, perhaps it is the most successful model that multi-ethnic Russia will have to follow.

ANDRE MEYER: It is quite difficult to explain, and I have to say that Switzerland is not a real model because we also have difficulties in keeping our cultural heritage and in keeping and protecting the multi-culture. Perhaps before I get to your question, I think we all know that Europe is now changing a lot and is moving toward becoming a community—an economic and political community. For that reason I am very glad that Mr. Borley talked about the Vienna Convention, because that is one of the most important conventions. All human beings have a right to their personal and individual culture, and that is also the protection of the minority. I think historic preservation includes not only the protection of the multi-culture, but also the knowledge and the will of preservation of this culture.

I think the protection of the minorities and of the multi-culture, as we have in Switzerland, is connected very strongly with the political system. We have not spoken about that in connection with the multi-culture. I think that the stronger the political system and the more centralistic a system, the more difficult it will be to protect the minorities and the multi-culture. We are happy in Switzerland to have a very large democratic system. I think that is the reason we get this balance and the chance to protect the multi-cultures and the minorities. I remember a teacher in high school. He told me that in a democratic system, the minority has a bit more rights than the others. I think it is very important to know. In order to protect the minorities, you have to give them a little more rights than the others because they are the minority.

In conclusion, we have to speak about this. I think the possibility of maintaining different cultures is connected with the political system. That is very important, so I think the convention in Vienna is a very important declaration.

SAM GRUBER: Thank you. There is a question that has been brought up about who is really the ideal responsible party for perpetuating minority culture, particularly for preservation and dissemination of information about that culture into the majority? Perhaps someone would like to address this. We said that educa-

tion is an extremely important element of cultural coexistence and, therefore, of preservation, but who should be the responsible parties? Again, Lester mentioned the New Zealand example. Should we honor the Maori desire not to perpetuate certain aspects of their culture and, therefore, risk losing that information and understanding in the non-Maori society? Should I listen to certain Orthodox Jewish congregations who say, "Why bother preserving old synagogues? If there are no Jews, who cares?" Or, should it be my responsibility, the Polish responsibility, and the Russian responsibility, to say, "We care. We care and we feel it is important that everyone in that place—whether there are Jews there today or not—know that Jews were there and helped shape that society." Should we listen to Father Georgii when he says, "Well, maybe the spiritual is sometimes more important than the building"? Or should we say, "No matter what happens to the spiritual, even if we all become atheists, it is important to remember there was a time of spirituality and these churches remind us of that"? Who bears the responsibility? Do we leave it solely to those minority cultures to define themselves or is there responsibility in the majority as well? Would someone like to address that point?

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: It's a give and take. I think identification of what is significant involves people in the locality and should involve outsiders as well; each can learn from the other. Likewise, I think outsiders, if you use that term, can see things in the past of other people with a different perspective. Eventually you have to engage the people themselves, otherwise it lacks meaning. It is often difficult to do that.

I am sure many of you from this side of the ocean have heard of Williamsburg, in Virginia, which has been going through reinterpretation for the past fifteen years now. One of the recent events has been a hypothetical reconstruction of a group of slave cabins. The idea came from the historians, who are mainly white, who had gotten blacks onto the staff for the first time who then really had an influence in how the project was interpreted. The general board of colonial Williamsburg wanted it neater—more furnishings. "No, they had no furniture, stupid," would be the response of the black historians on this.

"But can we have curtains?"

"No, they had no curtains."

The attempt of this presentation is to show the messy side of history, if you will, the underside of the past, which is very important for various groups for different reasons. A lot of people do not like this, however. People, and this is white people, will walk past it at a fast pace, or a slow run. Some have covered the eyes of their children so that they do not see. People would like to have a past that is sugar and spice, sweetness and light, not necessarily a past that reveals other things. In this case, without a close white-black collaboration it never would have happened.

LESTER BORLEY: Just a very quick direct response to your question: I cannot see how we can possibly ignore the monuments of the past spiritual values which have disappeared. If that were to be the case, there would be no point in preserving the Parthenon (there are very few people who worship Greek gods these days), or Stonehenge in Britain. The

spiritual values have gone, but what those spiritual values created is still of value to us.

SAM GRUBER: In response to that, I feel that as director of the Jewish Heritage Council, one of my great achievements in helping Jews to educate themselves about the validity of their own culture in the eyes of the non-Jewish community and the integrity and value of their art and architecture, is when a photograph that I took of the ruined synagogue in Riminov, which is in Galicia, appeared in an article about monument preservation of a prominent art magazine in the United States called *Art News* on the same page as a picture of the Parthenon and of the Erechtheum. It was a point that I had been trying to make verbally for some time, that there is validity in many of these cultures. If we preserve pyramids, Greek temples, Medieval cathedrals, why not synagogues too? The curious thing is that for me, this is convincing the Jewish community as much as the non-Jewish community.

BLAIR RUBLE: It seems to me that over the past twenty-four hours, we have been much more comfortable addressing these issues from a local perspective than from the national perspective. I think the way you posed the question reveals some of the reason for that difficulty. It becomes increasingly difficult or complex to justify preserving this monument or that monument from some national perspective. At times, when it is immediately understandable why we would want to preserve it from the local perspective—a particular building may lose its initial function, be it spiritual or otherwise and yet remain an important part of the local place.

It seems to me that there is a tension running through our discussion which is reflected in the life of historic preservation efforts. It is a tension between national interest and local interest. It is a tension between playing with politicians who can mobilize resources and emotional support frequently around a national agenda and reaching conclusions about what an individual community or district might wish. As we begin to look at our discussion tomorrow, I think we should make note of the fact that we have found it easier to talk about preservation from the perspective of local communities than from nations. Maybe there is a tension and a complexity around national culture, national political systems and national perspectives, that we need to wrestle with more.

Panel IV. Issues Facing Novgorod and Iaroslavl.

BLAIR RUBLE: Over the course of the past twenty-four hours we have seen so much and so many questions have been raised. Since we have so little time left, it seems foolish to remain with the formal schedule of presentations. What I would propose is that we take the next more or less three hours and talk about two different kinds of subjects. The first will be a presentation by our colleagues from Novgorod and Iaroslavl about very concrete issues that they face. I would like to use that for the basis of a discussion of issues of financing, the role of the state, the role of private owners. To make it as concrete as possible, I will ask them to make a very brief presentation of their situation.

Then, after about an hour and a half, Tony French and William Brumfield will attempt to summarize the discussion. They will at-

tempt to review and summarize the entire discussion and then we can try to have a discussion of general issues. Now, this means that Mr. Vysokovskii, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Meyer, and Mr. Shchenkov will not give a formal presentation, but I will give them privileged access to the floor. Okay, maybe we should turn now to the questions of Novgorod.

LARISA BANNIKOVA: Dear colleagues, in the beginning of my speech, I would like to congratulate everybody on today's holiday, which is the World Day of Museums. As we all are members of a worldwide museum, protection of heritage is impossible without its restoration, reconstruction, and proper use.

I would like to share, and possibly ask for some advice on, a very concrete case which took place in our city of Novgorod. In April 1991, a tragedy took place at the Novgorod museum. Part of the wall of the bay of the oldest Novgorod Kremlin from the fifteenth century collapsed. It was not the whole bay that collapsed, not from one tower to another tower, but the center part of it. You know what a tragedy it is for the town, for the people, and for Russia. The Novgorod Kremlin is one of the oldest Kremlins. A complex of research work has been conducted to study the reason why the wall collapsed. A lot of money was spent on it. As a result, a complex of measures has been formulated and worked out in order to restore the wall. There was no doubt as to whether to restore it or not. It should be restored.

The Chronicles show that almost every two hundred years the wall has collapsed, but the people living there then restored it again using traditional methods, restoring the wall as a solid wall of a fortress, the way it had been from the very start. A course of discussions took place inside Novgorod, in the museum, with the town administration, and since it is a national monument, a federal monument, the Ministry of Culture took part in the discussion.

A project was designed for the restoration of the wall, but the body responsible for it was not the museum. As you probably know, we do not have any private owners of any museums or any national heritage properties. All of the users of the monument are random. The museum wanted to use one of the commercial services to carry out the project. The company who was invited as a contractor to carry out the work suggested a new plan because they said that the foundation would not carry such a heavy wall. They suggested that we build, instead of a solid wall, a carcass, a hollow wall structure with a brick facing that would reproduce a kind of camouflage of the fifteenth century. The museum gave a definite "no" to this project and we are still trying to defend the traditional ways of restoration. So far the conflict has not been settled.

As was mentioned correctly here before, it is the one who is paying who orders the music. The museum has no money to pay for the restoration. We are nobody in this conflict. As a result of all of this, the Ministry of Culture not only supported and accepted this project, but also made some concessions to the museum. They decided to announce a competition for the contractor to carry out the restoration. A regular building company won the competition, although in Novgorod we are hav-

ing a special scientific restoration board engaged in this kind of building work. Why am I telling all of this to you? At present the restoration has not yet started, but they are actively preparing. We sent a petition to UNESCO and are still waiting for their answer. We are looking for the public support of world communities, where, probably, all of us together will be able to win. We are part of the Hanseatic League. Their representatives came to see us. Among them was an expert of UNESCO who was quite clear in his opinion, as well as the group of Swedish restorers. The wall should be restored in the traditional way as a solid wall. I found among the classical literature letters by Aleksei Tolstoy, the writer, who even then described a similar disaster two centuries ago. In a very short time, because the tsar was expected to come to Novgorod, a mock wall was once built. Tolstoy wrote to his friend: "I visited Pskov and Novgorod and saw what kind of disorder is taking place in Novgorod just to please the tsar. They make a mock wall and call it restoration."

We are afraid that if the idea of this hollow wall reconstruction appears now in this new form, we will not be insured against new collapses of other parts of the wall, and following this bad precedent, more mock parts of it will appear. Finally, the Novgorod Kremlin will disappear as the Kremlin. It will become a kind of painting of the Kremlin.

I would very much like to hear your opinion on this subject. I cannot show you any documents because, on the insistence on the part of the museum, we are at this moment not allowed to redesign the projects and drafts. A special service was created that was specifically engaged in the problems of restoration work. They have created their own design. However, I doubt that this design was even discussed.

The participants of today's conference will express their opinions and maybe we can present a kind of a letter to the Novgorod Museum on this subject. We would be extremely grateful, because this is the kind of practical activity which will be the result of our meeting here.

BLAIR RUBLE: We will hear from Tat'iana Vasil'eva a few words about specific problems in Iaroslavl. I am not sure that, given the range of institutions represented here, we can take an official position on any one project, but I would suggest that if certain individuals wanted to take some position, they would be free to do so. I think that as an official conference that would probably not be possible given the complexity of the sponsorship.

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: Using the example of our Iaroslavl region, I would like to touch upon a question which has already proven interesting for many participants of our conference: the approach of the state and of the church to the problem of the restitution of cultural values and cultural monuments to the church. I think the situation in our region reflects the general situation, although it has a rather specific character.

Here are some figures which can prove to be interesting in order to understand the situation. Before 1917, on the territory of Iaroslavl region there were 988 churches and 33 monasteries. We now have 698 churches and 26 monasteries, many of which are in ruins. I would like to repeat that some

monasteries, like Sposogonodevskii and others, are just ruins now. At the moment, only 156 churches are being used as churches. During recent times, five monasteries were given back to the church. The rest of the monasteries and many other churches are empty. That is why the problem which we have already discussed is so acute to us, that it would be difficult to postpone the solution of that problem—of the restoration of the churches and monasteries. We just do not have any time to postpone the solution of this problem.

For a long period of time, relations between the eparchy and the museums of the region and between the eparchy and the authorities of the region were very cautious. There has been much tension in those relations and no mutual understanding. The process of restitution was begun in the year 1987, when the Fodogrovskii church in Iaroslavl was given back to the church. Its state was a very bad one. It is situated near the cathedral where the regional head of the church served. The eparchy, the church, had enough money at the time to restore the church and that made the solution of the problem realistic.

In the year 1988, the church became a church again and was given seventeen icons to start services. Then the restitution began a more complicated process. From 1988 until 1994, over seventy churches have been given over to the church. They are not equal as far as their state of preservation is concerned. As to their historical and artistic importance, they are all at this moment (except for the two churches which have no parishes) living full religious lives, but their restoration is not as quick and not as successful as we had expected.

The problem for both the city administration and the church administration is that we disagree on many points. This led us to the idea that it would be immoral to make the conflict even more acute, because we see that this hampers both the process of restoration and restitution of spiritual life and the restoration of heritage. You cannot restore heritage without restoring the spiritual side of the values.

Three years ago, a joint commission was formed to resolve the conflict. Sitting on the commission are architects, art historians, and priests from the Iaroslavl eparchy. They are very well trained for the job, which makes the commission a highly authoritative and productive body. Their trust for one another is quite obvious. The commission is co-chaired by the bishop of Iaroslavl on the one hand and by our vice-chairman of the municipality of Iaroslavl. In our relations, we have switched from cautious tension to a much greater trust which helps us to be more operative in our work. For example, we often talk about financing; financing of the churches which have been restituted to the church and now need restoration.

We have cooperated with the branch of the church authority that is responsible for the restoration of the active churches. From the figures I have quoted, you understand that we cannot restore all of the churches at the same time; we have to make choices. We choose the most important and the most significant of them. Significant not only from the point of view of historical and artistic aspects or architectural

value, but also from their spiritual importance, which we must take in to account. It is a must that this should be taken in to account.

Approximately forty-five percent of the money we have is spent on the restoration of active churches. In the first three months of 1994, 355 million rubles were allocated especially for this purpose. Half of this money was used for the restoration of several monasteries, several churches in Iaroslavl, and many other first rate monuments of architecture.

The problem of restitution of both churches and movables is also an acute problem in our region. This especially concerns our sacred icon, the Tolg Mother of God of the fourteenth century. From the national museum of our city, this icon of the Mother of God will be given over to where it was originally, the Tolg Convent. Taking into account the Vladimir, Novgorod, and Khastomar experience, we know that together with the church we must pave the way for this restitution.

We face three problems. A complete study of the icon and the restoration work on it has been given to the Russian Museum in St. Petersburg and their restoration department for this study. The task remains to create a special place where it will be kept in a proper atmospheric regime and temperature, the way it was done in Vladimir. The money for this should be brought from both sides: the state authorities and the church. The most important problem has not yet been solved. The monastery, itself, has not been restored fully and it has not been fully protected and guarded. The theft of icons and sacred objects continues to be a problem. Over 2,000 objects have been stolen from our churches during the last year. Of course, this is a great concern to all of us. We do not have enough funds for defense to protect these valuables. The cultural values which for a long time have been situated in the churches cannot be guided by our forces. We do not have enough forces or the means for that. We are looking for some points which would let the administration and the church join their efforts. We still send the information on the cultural monuments which belong to the Russian Orthodox Church to different places and also to the members of the church. In addition, we give the church documentation and all other information which we have in our files. That way we help the church to give their parishes the information of the cultural values, of the churches and its objects. We hope that the work will be quite fruitful in the future.

Another form of these activities is the following: bureaucrats, members of the city organization, often do not have enough preparation and training in the history and religious aspects of the values of the cultured objects which belong to the church. That is why we need deep consultation and intensive work with members of the church in, for example, organizing temperature status for the objects of culture which belong to the church and so on, because it is not always easy for us to see how to make it in cooperation with the religious values. We are talking only about the Russian Orthodox church here. We also have Old Believers. We have given them one monastery and a church. We have Christianer Believers. We have quite a new branch, the Church of the New Generation. We have to work with all of them. We are very cautious when this new church, for example, asks that we

give back to them the Lutheran icons, restituted to them as their property. We refused because the church they are using now used to be the Lutheran Church, and they are not Lutherans in the direct sense of the word. We expect that the Lutheran Church could be restituted, so we do not want to give away sacred Lutheran objects. In the near future, a synagogue will be open in Iaroslavl which was there before the revolution. The Jewish community has been registered and the synagogue will also resume its work.

It is a very complex life we are leading. I would like to hear from you some more qualified, professional advice on how to regulate these relations. How do you see it? How do you regulate these kinds of problems in the relations between the state and the church? I understand that for many of you, the problems were solved long ago. But, as we see in Poland, the majority of the population, more than half, are believers. This is not the case in our country. We are dealing with a much more complex situation. Nobody can solve these problems for us, but we would like to hear your professional advice.

BLAIR RUBLE: If we could return to the beginning of your presentation, could you review the numbers once again of churches and monasteries in 1917 and 1994?

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: Before 1917, 988 churches and 33 monasteries. In 1994, total inventory lists showed 698 churches and 26 monasteries. Some of them are just ruins. There were 156 acting parishes—some of them have two churches, four Russian Orthodox monasteries and one Old Believers monastery—five altogether.

SAM GRUBER: Just to make it clear, what do you mean by churches? Does this include the synagogue, for example, or not? Religious buildings or churches of certain denominations? Only Orthodox churches? Okay, that makes it more clear.

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: They are Russian Orthodox churches because we are talking about the eparchy. We have one Catholic church, two Protestant churches, and one synagogue, which occupies a two-story building in Iaroslavl that has been given back to it. If you want more details, I can tell you privately.

BLAIR RUBLE: I think that both of these stories bring us back to issues of authenticity, property, and money—three issues which have run through our discussions. Maybe it would be useful to hear from some of our non-Russian colleagues how all of this sounds to them.

ANDRE MEYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to come back to the case of Novgorod. Perhaps I can help a little. At the European Council we have the assistance of help and technology help. As I can hear, your problem is primarily a problem of help in technology and restoration. The best thing for you to do would be to ask for this help, assistance, cooperation, and technical help at the Council of Europe, because we have many such actions in the whole of Europe. We are helping and can then bring you some experts from outside. They can make an analysis of this case and they can tell how you can manage it. Without plans or statistics, it is very difficult to say here if this problem can be managed as you say or if it requires a different approach. I can say to you that if

you could ask for this help, then you could get this help. I think it is the same case, perhaps it is not well enough known , with the icon featured in the video we saw yesterday. Such problems should be discussed with outside experts. It is much easier. Even in Switzerland, when we have a problem it goes into a political organization program. When we and the parties are blocked, we ask for help from outside—from another country. Then it is a group of experts and it is much easier to manage. It is the same as when you have somebody from outside who is not involved in this case and can help to resolve the problems.

Perhaps for you it would be an even greater possibility. If you see that things are broken, ask for an expert from outside, from another country, or something like that. Here the Council of Europe can help. You can also ask for help directly from a person, or a country, because in Western Europe it is quite common that we are in contact and we accept such requests. Perhaps this contact is not developed now between your country and the other Western European countries. The only thing that you have to do for this help is for it to go through the government. The government has to ask the European Council because it has to pass through there. We have one problem from Russia in Kolstat that is being discussed at the European Open Council now, so I think Novgorod would be a very easy case for the council to bring you help with engineers, restorators, and craftsman who can make analyses. For the problems between church and government, I think you could ask for help in this case. We have our friend, Kowalski, who is also a representative in the Council of Europe. I think he can ascertain your request when it comes in.

LARISA BANNIKOVA: I have one very short question. It is a very lucky case that we have well known specialists here from different countries. In Russia, the old system of heritage protection has practically collapsed and we do not have a new one. It would be so useful if representatives of different countries would tell us, in brief, according to which scheme in different countries—in Switzerland, in England, in the United States—what system of protection is organized. I think you would not need more than five minutes for such a presentation.

BLAIR RUBLE: We may come back to that. I would certainly suggest that this can be discussed in private, but I would like to try and see if we can get a general discussion going and I fear this would take us to far afield at this moment.

JOHN STUBBS: I am willing to bet that there are a large number of possible technical solutions to the issue of the collapsed wall at the Kremlin, and that is good. I am sure that there are plenty of experts that could give different opinions from Europe and from within Russia. Then I remembered someone saying yesterday that experts are not always taken seriously by government. That is also universal, but it seems to me that your biggest problem is an issue of authenticity and credibility and how you have to live with the fact that someone is proposing what we call a slap-dash or superficial solution. In this case, it means a lot to the heart of Russians, your colleagues, to do it "the right way." My only suggestion is to do what is usually done, at least in the United States, which

is to force the group of technicos, the architects and engineers, who are really servants to the government at the end of the day, to propose several solutions—four or five or six solutions—and to air these solutions publicly. There could be an exhibition, and there certainly should be meetings that the public is invited to be a part of, if possible—if not the general public, then a representation of the public. That way the skeptics or the decision makers, whether they be government or activists in the community, can go through what we call the design-decision making process. There is a sort of tree of possibilities and it is incumbent upon the architects and engineers to argue, without bias, several different proposals and let the decision be made by those who are in the best position to make that decision. I think the problem would be much easier if you consider the choices.

Just to close, I would like to recommend that if you go this way, any possibility should be considered—even strange possibilities, like, for instance, using the rubble from the collapsed wall as the core of the new wall. Or, if the wall is thick enough, have a veneer and let the back side of the wall be an art gallery, who knows. But that would be the offer made by the government, which is that we are entertaining all possibilities and all of the world to become engaged in the physical, technical challenge. After that we can make a more informed decision.

ALEKSANDR VYSOKOVSKII: I would like to draw the attention of those present to one fragment of that story which clears the situation for me: money. As the representative of the Novgorod Museum said, "We are giving not to the museum, but to somebody else." I can imagine that it was the city's administration. The money was received, not by the city's administration, but by the Novgorod reconstruction, a government structure which is responsible for reconstruction.

I think that the core of the problem is not in the field of engineering. As you said quite right, the engineering field is the simplest one in this case. Several options can be presented, but the problem is the sources, the final point of financing, and who makes decisions. Why was the money given not to the museum who is the user of the money, but to the government structure which uses that money just for its production process? That is really the problem, not the engineering problem, but the social and political problem. That problem should be discussed first of all.

ROGER LEWIS: Well, this gives me an opportunity to say a few things in response to your dilemma that I was going to say in my presentation. I think that probably one of the things that is most obvious from this story is the need for an identified process for decision making, which does not necessarily solve the economic problem. In some way in response, Grisha, to your question, about what we have done in our country, in the United States we had similar problems. In fact, we did not have a problem before the 1960s; anyone who had property that was falling down probably just called in the demolition contractors and overnight it was gone. We have tried in the United States to create a process, which I believe, again, was summarized to some extent the day before yesterday, in which during the decision making, the various interests are considered and at the very

least there is a registration, of properties that are considered worthy of preservation, and in some way part of the heritage.

I want to stress that all of this is accomplished in the United States because of the law. In fact, it starts with the Constitution of the United States. All of this is accomplished under the law, including deciding what to do when a property that is historically important needs to be changed and intervention is required. In Russia today, I think we all know that the law is somewhat amorphous, changing, difficult to get an agreement. In part, there is a need for some new set of laws that are really part of a social contract that will help you go through a process that leads to what we call consensus (I do not know the word in Russian) between often competing interests that at least say, "Here is what we would like to do about this property, this wall, or this building, or this landscape."

Now that is all fine. Let us suppose we have such a process. That does not solve the financial problem, nor have we in the United States solved the financial problem. At least we have a procedure which would produce an enforceable decision "at law", as the attorneys say, that the citizens of the country, including government officials, owners of property, citizens who have an interest, either agree to the decision or they accept the decision. They may not like the decision, but that is what it means to have a society governed by a constitution and by law.

So, I would suggest that part of the solution here would be for the Russian Republic and the municipalities and the regions to convene, if you will, a kind of a congress on historic preservation and on restoration of historical properties to try and create the right process.

BLAIR RUBLE: I am struck in this discussion by some words that one of John's professors at Berkeley, Nezar Al Sayyad, recently said to me. When he interviews architectural students for participation in the city planning program he does not ask about architecture, he asks about their psychology. He asks if they like politics and if they like conflict, because for him, the role of the city planner is not an aesthetic role, but a political role that requires a special kind of psychology to be able to bring different positions together.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: There is a saying among preservationists in the U.S. If you get any two of them together in a room they will disagree and even argue. I am going to respectfully disagree with John Stubbs because I gather that in both of your cases you are dealing with major monuments, which are very important works, in which case you do it right or you don't do it at all; wait for the next generation to do it. If you have something that is really important, the last thing you want to do is open up more possibilities for a different type of solution, because you may get the wrong one. It is quite clear in your case in Novgorod, that there is a right solution, I think.

I do not know how this would work in either one of your cases, but Roger Lewis makes it sound nice and orderly in the U.S., but it is not. You work with the system when you can and when you cannot, you subvert the system. Preservation is often a radical act in that way. It is legal. You keep it

legal. Citizen activism. Get people involved—have them make a fuss, have rallies, have dinners, have fundraising (small amounts of money), get organizations, professional organizations, any kind of organization that is a legitimate one on your side, publicize your case at home and abroad.

Fifteen years ago, there was a plan to add to our national capitol building in Washington, covering the last original segment of its exterior. The architect of the Capitol was a very powerful person beholden to no one except Congress who was supporting him because they could get more offices with a good view. It was a hue and cry from the people. Organizations, and even some senators, held a press conference and said, "No, we will not tolerate this. This is unacceptable. This is your building. This cannot happen." That takes a lot of time and we have too few people who do that sort of thing in the U.S. now, but that is how a lot of what we preserve has gotten that way.

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: I would like to answer this question, both to John Stubbs and to you. The core of the problem is that we arouse the public opinion. We also aroused the public participation of social organization newspapers. For Novgorod and the people who live there, the Kremlin is a sacred place and people are tired that for three years already, the place has been in collapse, there is a big hole there. Old men, building workers, came to the museum and they said, "Let us. We are old people but we are building workers and during a month we can erect that wall." But the museum had no right to let them.

About your opinion, yes, you are right. There were some very unusual options which were offered for restoration of that wall. One of the options which was offered was to make a laboratory there inside the wall to upkeep the wall and to see the processes in the wall. But what would be observed there? What would be the sense of the observation? There would be no real wall there for observation. It was proposed that we leave open the archaeological excavation there and make it a museum, but after a year we became sure that we should not do so because it is a very difficult thing and it is a very important thing not to leave it in that form. Water filled it and leaving such a big space open was very dangerous for the building. You suggest that the government should address the European Council with a petition to help. Can the museum do it? Because the government has already accepted the decision, we are fighting the government decision now. We are opposing the government, so the government would not do it. So my question is to you, Mr. Meyer, can it be not the government but the museum itself, who would place this request to the European Council to the technological section for help? The government would not do it, we are fighting the government decision.

ANDRE MEYER: Yes, it is not the usual way, but you can try. It is better than doing nothing, I think. But I would say it is a technical problem, not a financial problem. And it is a problem, as you say, of the organization. The organization will take, I think, quite a lot of time. We have, and you have to find this organization with the law, the competence and everything. Usually the owner has the rights. Also, in our country it is

the owner who can say, not the one who is in the building. There, you can only help with the activities, with talking with the government, with people, with associations, with all of those things. That is the psychological side that you, Mr. Ruble, resolved. That is the problem. But for this case, and I think as I heard it is quite urgent, you can try as a museum. It is not the usual way, but you can see what happens. I can give you the address and you can write and ask for help. First, you have to do an analysis of the ground, and of the foundation, the Kremlin. Then you have several possibilities to rebuild or repair this Kremlin. I do not think it is such a problem because you can make an injection and you have a lot of technology. We know this technology and we have it already. I think we could give this help and we could look with your Parliament at how we can resolve this problem. So I would say, try and write. I will give you the address and see what happens. It is not the normal way, because the normal way should go by way of the government.

ALEXEI SHCHENKOV: I would like to return to the remark by Mr. Vysokovskii. Of course, it is not only a technical problem and possibly not technical to that extent. Heritage is always a field of different interests and of the crossing of that interest. A conflict always emerges here. There is also a conflict of ideologies. First, it was the state taking the properties from the church. How could we have any dialogue with that state? On the other side, it looked like the illiterate members of the church had big cultural values and how could we leave something to them? That is how it looked from different sides. Nationalists also have their own ideology. This conflict is solved to a certain extent and, to some extent, it has a new character. Along with that, there is a conflict of property rights. Agencies controlling the state of cultural monuments during the process of privatization have the option to let somebody privatize an object or site or not to let them do so, to approve some use of that historical site, or not to let it be used that way. They have the right to decide in many cases and do not leave that right to anybody else.

On the opposite side, we have normal city authorities who also want to control the important means of power. It is not only about property rights, there are also conflicts in the financial field. That is something which Mr. Vysokovskii said about his examples—the problem of order. Who will take the order for that work?

The same situation occurred in Moscow when a monument of the battle of Plevna was going to be reconstructed. When the planning organization, the designer, received an order from the state inspection on protecting the monuments, the design organization proposed a very dangerous version of that work. It was very difficult to enforce that procedure of competition between different options of the reconstruction. The problem was not in the difference of professional points of view, but more in the commercial base of that problem.

Along with that, we have a conflict of prestige of different sides. This is a conflict of possibilities to work on your own place and to have your own position. That relates to the case of the Novgorod icon which we have already begun. In many cases, these are museum workers who defend their

work and their position in the museum. Of course, we can see the possibility of improper conditions at the new user's place, but interpretation of that problem on both sides is so behind you can find all kinds of interests and interest groups.

A proper legal procedure is important, but it is not everything. It is not as simple as that. The law, if you follow it to the letter, could be quite effective, but if it is not enforced properly, or if it is interpreted differently because different interests stand behind it, this could make people ignore law or avoid it. New legislation has also been hampered for these reasons.

What can be said? Is it really so dramatic, the present situation? I don't think so. On the one hand, I think the legislation and the procedural part as a base for the supervision of all of this process should be developed. On the other hand, quite a lot depends on the human factor and human efforts at the various levels and mutual understanding that springs up at certain points. I am quite optimistic about our examples of what has been said by Mrs. Vasil'eva in her story of Iaroslavl. She underlines it herself. She stresses that we should make the conclusion that everything is just perfect. I would also say that what she offered us is a pleasant exception, and not a rule.

WOJCIECH KOWALSKI: I understand that we are still talking about the Novgorod problem. We have not even touched the Iaroslavl restitution case. Of course, there is no time to talk in detail about all of the aspects of this one case. I asked Blair if we were talking about the technology or organization and responsibility. From my point of view, it is not a technological problem, because if Russia or the former Soviet Union can send a man on the moon, I don't think it is a problem to reconstruct a piece of wall. I simply cannot believe it.

It is, rather, an organizational problem. Who is responsible to do that? Of course, the law should answer you this question. Once more, I do not think there is a gap, a legal gap in this field. As far as I remember, there is a law on the protection of monuments in Russia that is still enforced. There was a problem with a law on illicit export and President Yeltsin obliged himself to prepare a new law on this subject because I remember there was a famous appeal after certain illegal exports. Law on the protection of monuments is enforced, and I know quite well from the Polish experience that sometimes it is not even the problem of good and bad law, but just the enforcement of an existing law. This is the case; we were given these details. But, if you think this law is not good, then maybe it needs to be changed or amended. Some years ago, at the end of the former era, I was commissioned by our ministry to prepare a study on the various solutions existing in various countries on the organization of the protection—the question raised by our colleague—and we produced a study. I analyzed laws in eight states. This was just before the discussion on how to change our law on the protection of monuments. We came to a more or less common understanding that when you have a very big territory, you cannot even think about the structure of the protection of monuments in the sense, we call it, the vertical structure. It is possible in Holland, or Hungary, when you have a small

country, when within half an hour you can go anywhere and solve the problem. Many times, the ministry is very far away, the telephone does not work and you have no car. So the ministry is not really in the position to help you, that is for sure. In Poland, we discussed that because it is not a very small country, but it is still not a very big country, we decided not to look upon the ministry at all.

We really think that to develop our law, the municipality has a responsibility. Of course, in that case, the monument cannot be private. This is the best idea if it has an original and really good owner. Good means not an artificial owner, because in the previous era we had owners, but they were very artificial in the sense that the state ordered you to be an owner; a cooperative or an institution had no chance to escape being the owner of the monument. I think about the really good owners. If it is such a kind of monument that you may not give it to the owner, in such a case as, for example, old fortifications, this kind of monument should be the property of the town, and the town should be responsible for its protection. That is very simple. We discussed this a lot because we thought, first, that it was probably because of our socialist education that if we give this responsibility to the very lowest level of administration, or just to municipalities, they will not take care of it. That was the main mistake, because after four years we realized that the ministry is not an owner. The ministry administers only three or four national museums now and has no direct responsibility for monuments. All of this is in the hands of regions and towns. We realized that the situation is much better. They do not have much money but they are much more effective and efficient. Towns, even small towns, which we completely did not expect, are very proud because it is now their problem, not the problem of the ministry, which is three, four hundred kilometers away. Normally, a palace is the problem of the ministry, or the church was always the property of the Church in Poland, but a monument was something completely far away from the local administration or town council. Now the town council is responsible. Our ministry also gave all of the theaters, museums, operas and all of these cultural institutions back to the town councils. There was a great fear that they would close it and change it to cinemas, but they did not do that. If the people want to have the cinemas and if they are to elect the town council, then the town council cannot simply close because of the lack of money. The town council is obliged to find this money.

In May, we had town level elections. I see how the people tried to show that we did so much for our town, our community. This monument was restored and that monument was restored. We were really surprised to read the local press; they have never been so engaged before. I think this is the only solution, especially in case of big countries, and Russia is one of the biggest examples of that.

JOHN MACIUIKA: Following up on a number of the remarks, especially the last one, I would like to offer an example from the state of California preservation community. I worked for several years for the Department of Environmental Resources, which is responsible for conservation and preservation. In this case, not so much for historic monuments as for environ-

mental sites along the coast of California, about 1,600 kilometers or so. The agency of the state that was responsible, obviously, cannot be reproduced in Novgorod, but what I want to suggest is an example of how things were managed with very little money and just how much "money talks," as we say.

The agency was called the California Coastal Conservancy. This is a state level agency given very little money to preserve areas of the coast from too much privatization, actually, showing that there is a thing as too much privatization. With the little money that the conservancy has, they have been very successful over their fifteen year life span at going to local communities along the coast of California and identifying, with the local community's help, problems that they are having with environmental degradation. Sometimes it does involve old buildings, more often it is landscape considerations. In any case, the key for the conservancy's success has been bringing together political pressure and funds through project management that starts out with a small amount of what we call seed money—money that will grow, money that is a small commitment that leaders of say your museum or somewhere else can use to approach other groups and demonstrate that there has already been a financial commitment made. This happens in California so that the local community, for example, will gain the support of workers in the town who commit a certain number of people. There is actually a dollar value that becomes attached to that. That becomes the second financial commitment written down and you go to the next organization, the next interest and the next group and make an argument for you project. Based on the commitments of other groups that are getting together, they see that it is legitimate. So, soon, the conservancy's dollar commitment, or seed money, which was small in the beginning, has grown. They have accomplished an enormous amount of work over a long period of time.

Now, in your case there are a lot of political problems. It does not sound like the will of the people is being reflected on an institutional level and that is something that, hopefully, will get worked out. But in the meantime, even with applications to the Council of Europe restoration organization, for example, it may be possible to strengthen your case in your application by getting support and small commitments from people that show the legitimacy of the project.

TONY FRENCH: I don't know whether I have any very practical advice that I can offer in this particular case. The only thing that occurs to me immediately is that in Britain we do have a thing called the Know-how Fund. This is government money made available to help transfer mostly technical, but expertise to the countries of Eastern Europe and to Russia. This would, I think, be helpful if the problem were purely an engineering or technical problem, but, as I understand it, in your case that is not the problem. You know what to do and how to do it; it is more an organizational problem. Whether the Know-how Fund could help in that situation, I am not sure. It is not impossible to think of ways in which it could be encouraged to give support, but I think that would be more difficult.

Obviously, in any kind of operation the funding is so important. We have, in fact, in Britain an extremely complex system of funding working at a whole series of levels. There is, of course, the state itself and its principle government body is English Heritage. It actually owns a large number of properties and is responsible, on the basis of government money raised by taxation, for the upkeep of those properties. There are local authorities. Most of our local authorities have some important buildings in their care. Probably more important are charitable trusts. These are private bodies of people who have subscribed and who have been given money.

The most important body is the National Trust. I am very sorry that Lester Borley, who is very much involved in the National Trust in Scotland, is not with us this afternoon. The National Trust in Britain has more than a million members and it has, of course, fairly considerable funds of its own. Then there are the private owners. There are a large number of people who are private owners of buildings of national importance. Of course, they are primarily responsible for their upkeep, but in practice the costs today are so great that very few private owners can keep up a mansion simply on their own resources.

That brings into play the last, but perhaps most important group, that is to say, people—ordinary, every day, man on the street, people. This works in various ways. If you own a large mansion and it is in need of repair, but you cannot put the money up, you can apply to the government through English Heritage for assistance. If that assistance is granted it would almost certainly be on condition that the building would be open to the public. And, of course, the people who come to visit these houses also will pay to go in. So money is coming at different levels. And, of course, people can contribute in different ways, particularly to the charitable trusts by bequests. Today, it is not just a matter of leaving a big house and saying, "That house is now National Trust." Because of the cost of keeping it up, the National Trust will say, "Well, you must give us the money to help support it as well as giving us the house."

Just to end at a final point, getting people involved is, therefore, very important. Even deaf governments will begin to listen if enough people shout loudly enough and long enough, especially if there is an election coming up.

FATHER GEORGII MITSOV: I would like first of all to thank Mr. Kowalski, because his experience is possibly the closest for reception using our Russian conditions. Also, I would like to thank Mr. Shchenkov for clearing up the situation. I would like to turn now to my church and to my situation, to the situation in our land, because the situation of churches in Russia reflects so many of the problems which were shown here. Maybe then, everybody present here will have a clearer vision of what is going on and how it is going on in Russia.

After the year 1988, the Russian church was no longer under the care of the KGB. The part of KGB that was partly responsible for the church was called the Council for the Church Affairs and it had the right to solve and to make decisions in all aspects of all the prob-

lems. Now the church is quite free in its doing. Earlier abilities and possibilities of the members of priests depended on the place where they served. The more people that came to the church, the higher was the income and it was quite transparent for everybody. Very often, priests and churches were against opening new churches because that meant less people would come to their already existing churches. That is why the change of that consciousness, which was the norm earlier, has changed.

Earlier, only the unique characters of the churches led them to have a high income and all of the churches were directed from above. At the present moment, when I have to make some repairs in my small church, I have to use European methods. I write letters to the governor. I issue lists of public activists and I enforce that funding, for example for the painting of the roof of my church. When a representative of an organization responsible for protection of monuments came, there were nine people in that representation. They all came, and I had to receive them and serve a dinner for them. For one whole day, they studied my monument and wrote such a conclusion that acting according to that conclusion, I would have to close the church and to destroy the monument. Everything was bad—one could only wonder how it could have existed already for 250 years before that moment.

The main problem was that, having some funding which I fought for and achieved, the state organization responsible for protection of monuments hoped that there would be a lot of funding for my church. They decided not only to leave my site for some time, but also to keep the workers which received orders from that state agency. But we do not have that much money. That is why the money was given to me, but I had no right to receive it. Even the money which was supposed to buy paint was taken by the workers and by the building organization which was to paint the roof. Anyway, everything ended in the following situation: now all of the money I use is from the operations of private banks helping state agencies to find some profit for its members. That is the final situation which I have achieved in my affair.

When we were coming here on the train, we talked with Mr. Feliks Razumovskii about the problems and how they can be solved at the local level. I would like to thank you very much for your stories. They really make me see that it is not bad to ask somebody for money for their goals, to draw public opinion to this, to create that public opinion, and to confirm with my own activity the necessity for the joint activities. You create for us a new approach to life, because earlier we had only orders from above and our opinion had no meaning and no importance. Money always came from above. That is why when that change, *perestroika*, took place in our country, active organizations which were formed and which are emerging, were not always honest. Only the possibility of local self administration clears the human approach to this situation. That is why I would like to thank you for teaching me not to be afraid of such activities and to participate much more in those activities. I think that will be useful both for my health and for the health of our society.

SAM GRUBER: I would like to address the question of the many, many churches in Iaroslavl and talk about some practical actions which might be taken, based on my own experience. First, I would like to say something in regard to Mr. Kowalski's statement about not relying on the ministries. In Poland, I would say that is particularly the case. In the four years that I have been working in Poland, I have dealt with four different Ministers of Culture, I believe. Every year, one has to start from step one and now I do not even know who the Minister of Culture is because it does not really concern me. I just work with the Wojwodina Conservators and the municipalities because they live there and they are not going away. But I will say that all of those people are strapped for money here as well.

Now, about all of these churches which are all over. It is impossible to restore all of them. Certainly, it is impossible to restore all of them soon. What I would suggest, and this might be hard news for the church, is to recognize the natural downsizing of the church, that there is no longer a need for 698 churches in the region of Iaroslavl, and that maybe the 156 churches used now is the maximum that it is ever going to need. In a sense, recognize that times have changed, but work with the regional conservators to come up with an adequate and appropriate preservation policy that is not insensitive to the history of the church for the rest of those buildings. Now, it may be possible, if church membership will grow, that they will need some of those other buildings. But rather than concentrate on asking for more buildings back, they should think about putting all of their resources into maintaining those 156 churches that they already have. This is a situation that I imagine is common in other regions too, and I would suggest that this is a policy to be followed throughout the country.

In America there is no aid of any considerable amount from any government to any church or synagogue; we have very strict rules on separation of church and state. There are a few exceptions to this, but, overall, we can say there is no government aid to churches or synagogues. If they are going to maintain themselves, they must do it alone. That requires dedication from a congregation. It means enlisting members outside of the congregation who share a sense of place, who believe in the importance within a neighborhood of a church that may not be their own, but one they would like to see every day when they walk down the street. It involves hard work, often many years of hard work—everything from cookie sales to petitioning major foundations and corporations for aid. Every single strategy that you can imagine has to be used and, in combination, some of these synagogues and churches are able to raise the money needed, but not all. Those that cannot, unfortunately, go out of business.

This leaves another problem, what to do about their buildings. Ironically, in America, if a former church or synagogue is then turned in to a movie theater, it then can receive aid, but that is another question. I think you have to deal with that question first. Which of these churches will continue as churches and which ones won't? Then, you have to look at the overall situation. How many are salvageable? How many are so far gone that it would require

an extraordinary amount of time and, particularly, money, which is hard to come by. Therefore, you would be depriving the other buildings of that money. How many of those exist? You have to say, "Well, maybe of these 698 churches, 100 of them are so far gone that it would cost us a million or two million dollars each to save them and it is not realistic to invest in that effort. We must be realistic and not everything can be saved."

Looking at those buildings that do exist and looking at the limited amount of resources that exist. How should they be allocated? My advice is to avoid full scale restoration whenever possible, to put off for a later date as much work as can possibly be postponed and to use all of the available resources for the very undramatic work of routine maintenance on as many structures as exist. A few hundred dollars to fix gutters can save more money and save more buildings in the long run than thousands of dollars thrown at restoring finishes of the interior or exterior, which is a very capitol intensive investment. As long as a building is secure—water tight—you can leave to another time the full scale restoration. It is not as glamorous, but I think it saves your heritage better and it saves you money. I think this is something you already know, but you should not be ashamed of not undertaking the kind of restoration which appears on the cover of a glossy magazine. Instead you should be proud to spend your time with the nuts and bolts of saving more buildings.

How to get more money. I have a few suggestions. This regards primarily religious structures. I am well aware that though we are talking about 698 churches and 26 monasteries, there are also thousands of important secular buildings, particularly rural buildings, which need attention. This is something we have not discussed, but is also of great concern. I have a few suggestions on how money might be raised. You know that I direct something called the Jewish Heritage Council. It is a very focused group. My concern is raising money for Jewish sites. Who do I go to, do you think, for this money? Do I go to the Catholic church? No. I go to Jews, because they are the ones, I think, who are most likely to take an interest in this heritage. I also go to governments and companies, but when it gets down to it and I really need that money, who am I most likely to turn to in order to get it? I am going to go to the people who personally relate to those buildings.

I think that the Russian Orthodox Church, either on a local level or on a national level, could institute the same kind of program. You can do it even though there are fewer Russian Orthodox Churches, I believe, say in the United States than there are synagogue congregations, but I may be wrong. The fact is, though, that restoration costs in Russia are so low by Western standards that the amount of money that you are asking for from abroad can be relatively low, and therefore, palatable and acceptable by congregations, even if they are not themselves wealthy. I have seen estimates on what it takes not to restore, but at least to rehabilitate certain synagogues which have been returned. I know that many of these costs are quite low by American standards. You could ask these churches, for instance, to initiate an "adopt-a-church" program. You could go to a Russian Ortho-

dox church in Philadelphia and you say, "Listen, for 10,000, for 50,000, for 100,000 dollars, you can adopt this church in Iaroslavl. It is your property. It is your sister church. You are responsible for it. You can help." Then you can organize a tour for those people to visit. These things happen.

On a more official level, you might look where there are sister cities or initiate sister city relationships and establish this kind of reciprocal agreement. Again, an example is the city of Cincinnati which has a sister city relationship with Kharkhov, Ukraine. Many of the organizations in Cincinnati have been aiding organizations that carry out similar functions in Kharkhov. One organization, the Jewish Community Resources Council, has been aiding the Jewish Community in Kharkhov to refurbish and rebuild a synagogue which had been a sports complex and was returned to the community. I think this kind of thing with cities in America and Europe could be very beneficial. It would not work if it was between America and France, because you would be asking the French or the Americans for so much money. But right now, this is a very important time. Costs are low by Western standards, particularly lately. We are losing, the longer we wait to restore things. The same thing will happen in Russia. It is chaos now, but things will settle down, I believe, and then things will get more expensive. So those are some ideas.

I have one last suggestion. I met this morning with a dynamic woman who is the Executive Director of the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, a dear friend. She is undertaking a very ambitious, multi-million dollar fundraising program to rehabilitate that institution and to create what will be, really, the first western-style museum using western museological methodologies in Poland. She is going to America, to European countries, to governments and also to individuals looking for money, but she started right here in Poland. She did something really miraculous and really ingenious, I think.

She has gone to the foreign companies working in Poland—there are over fifteen hundred now registered in Poland. She has gone to the diplomatic core. She has not gone to the presidents of the companies. She has not gone to the ambassadors. She has gone to their wives, who have nothing to do. They are stuck in Poland (no offense, Wojciech) and they are dying to help with any project. The important thing is that these wives—unfortunately because we are still a male-dominated society, it is almost a question of only wives, and we are not talking about spouses being husbands in these positions—are extremely well-connected amongst themselves here and also in their home countries. You know that the diplomatic core rotates every few years, the businesses rotate their executives every few years and these wives go back and they have dinners, they will have receptions and they will get people involved. Everybody feels good about it. I really believe Russia will go the way of Poland. I think Poland has a great head start, both economically and socially, but Russia will have these opportunities. I urge my Russian colleagues to take advantage of them and not to feel ashamed. Never feel ashamed to ask people for money to help preserve your culture. It is your culture. The fact that an American or a Frenchman or a Swissman gives you money

does not detract from the Russianness of the culture or your devotion to it. You should use every trick in the book to get money in these ways. I am sorry I spoke so long, but I hope my experience may help you.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: You have just heard the essence of how and why preservation is a success in the United States.

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: Let me thank you for that practical advise. Let me thank Mr. Sam Gruber and others because in our work it is really important to know the details which are not common to us, especially regarding the character of our ideology and the world experience tells us that they are very efficient.

Panel V. Preservation Pluralism: Managing Conflicting Interests

TONY FRENCH: To sum up the discussions that we have had over the last few days is somewhat of an impossible task. I think that when I die and present myself to St. Peter outside the newly restored gates of Heaven, whatever I say today will probably bar me from entry and I will be sent down to the badly restored regions.

We have looked at a number of levels from the global, or international level, through the national level, which we found extremely difficult to define, to the local level. I think if there was point of agreement, there was considerable agreement that the local level is perhaps the most important level to work on and the importance, therefore, of people, but that the national level is the least key level for mobilizing both effort and money. As we have been discussing today, the importance of money, sources of money and the problems of how resources are applied and who applies them are very considerable and this again puts the emphasis on people.

Once or twice, both in the papers that were presented in advance and in the discussion, the question of education came up as an important way to get people to understand what the problems are. I think an important rider to that is, of course, education by whom? Education can be used in more ways than one, not always properly. It has to be the right sort of education; education of people in understanding, not only of their own cultures, but of other cultures.

A problem that we have been discussing today in some detail, but which already was emerging in our excursions both yesterday and again this morning, is the tremendous problem of what you restore and how you do it. The problems that were described in Novgorod of false restoration are ones that have been met all around the world, in all countries, and people will argue indefinitely over what is morally right—the morals of restoration. It was an Englishman in the last century who said, "You may not touch the monuments of the past. We have no right to touch them. You can perhaps do what you can to stop them from falling down, but no restoration is possible." That is an extreme view, the view of John Ruskin and William Morris. I do not think many people would do that. People have opposed, even, cleaning pictures on those grounds; you cannot do that. Washing buildings in Britain brings about the most violent argument. In my own college, there are people who, to this day, will

not speak to each other because of the fight we had over whether our building should be cleaned or not. There will never be one single point of view, but I think the one thing that we have in common in this group is a real sense of the importance and the urgency and the difficulty of doing something we believe to be of major value for, if you like, humanity. That is, saving its past because of the importance of that past both to the present and to the future. Whether that is a summing up or not, I do not know, but I do not think I can do any better.

BLAIR RUBLE: I am not sure that anyone can do any better, but we will see how Bill does.

WILLIAM BRUMFIELD: We are at a time of crisis, not only in Russia. A promised new world order has proven to be anything but that. This century has seen destruction and devastation on an unprecedented level, including various forms of ethnic and cultural cleansing. The fact that architecture is often the symbol and target of those actions has again been made clear to us by the events in Yugoslavia and by the shattered bridge at Mostar and many other destroyed churches, holy places, residences, entire towns, indeed the landscape itself. We live so close to the edge. Fortunately in Russia, there is still a great deal of hope and reason for hope, for regeneration and for the preservation of a cultural heritage.

I would like to point to three specific areas that I think have not been covered in our discussions. It will be very brief and rather limited in scope, but however modest, they, too, are a part of the general business of cultural heritage and preservation. The first has to do with documentation. I have spent or have been involved, over half my life in the study of Russian culture. My first trip there was made almost twenty-five years ago. I have lived there for a total of more than three years. In the course of my work as a photographer, I have been able to document and record many of the splendid monuments. I use splendid not only in the sense of luxurious, but also inspiring monuments of Russian culture. I am happy to say that the results of that work are now preserved as the first major archive devoted to Russian architecture outside of Russia itself, at the National Gallery of Art in Washington. We must continue the work of recording the condition, whatever that condition may be, of Russian monuments. As many of you know, our Russian colleagues, the situation in that respect now is, for obvious economic reasons, not good. The Shusiv Museum of Architecture is in a desperate situation, as are many other archives and historical museums. Somehow their problems must be solved if the necessary work of documentation and study is to continue.

The second point, which photography leads me to, is for education on all levels: in the schools, in public, in means of mass information, photography, and, as we saw last night in the beautiful documentary film of Feliks Razumovskii on television. Getting the image to the public can sometimes be the most effective way of arousing public concern about the destruction or preservation of monuments.

Thirdly, I would like to speak about education on a more professional level. It is, I am sure, no news to our Russian colleagues that the situation with scientific

workers is extremely serious. Inflation has stripped many people, who have worked honestly over many years, of the ability to sustain for themselves and their families a normal existence. These problems have to be addressed. Furthermore in education, institutions can no longer support graduate students, technicians, people who want to devote their lives to preservation and study of monuments of a cultural heritage. These problems must also be resolved. We must have specialists who can record and analyze from all points of view—historical, cultural, social, technical—the monuments that are a part of the cultural heritage.

I hope that as the situation in Russia takes its course as a part of the normal development of society, once again we will see proper support for educational institutions, for museums, for scholarly journals and publications, and for the training of people who know what monuments are from an art-historical point of view. If these obvious things do not occur, then everything we have discussed today will be without purpose or foundation.

I just wanted to make those few modest comments and alert particularly our western colleagues, to the often desperate situations which now exist in most institutions that preserve monuments of cultural heritage and train new generations to preserve them. They deserve our support by any means possible.

ALEKSANDR VYSOKOVSKII:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to say some words ending our final discussion. I would like to add something to that right and good conclusion to which Mr. French has come. The most important level in solving these problems is the local level. I would like to add that a less important level is the federal level. We cannot hope only that the state agencies will help us. I would even like to stress that earlier, I never believed in our regime. I have never trusted them before and I do not trust them now. In principle, I do not trust the high echelons of power, including the church. I can present a couple of arguments in support of my statement. For example, yesterday Feliks showed a good video film of the problem of restitution, or of passing back or not passing back the icon of Vladimir to the church. I would like to stress that the problem was discussed only at the highest level. The eparchy was represented by one of the highest representatives. It looked similarly on the scientific side. What could we see there? Really, they do not want to discuss that problem. They do not really make an argument. They are not interested in solving that problem. They do not want to reach an agreement. Today we listened to a very interesting story by Mrs. Vasil'eva saying that at the local level the same problem is being solved in a more humane and normal way.

A different example from our discussion—an attempt to restore the building by the money allocated on the federal level, or any higher level of the hierarchy, normally leads either to just a collapse of our hopes or to even worse results. When the Novgorod Museum asked the Ministry to provide the money for the restoration of the wall, the result was that they allocated the money but they gave it not to the museum but to some building institution that is under the Ministry. They are not interested in the best way to restore the wall, but they have their own

commercial interests which are more important for them.

Why does the Ministry have the patience to allow such a building company to do what it likes? Is it just the way the ministries work? Similarly, Father Georgii could not get a pail of paint. I am quite sure his friends could paint this church right away if they only had that pail of paint.

I am not going to go on too much, but I am convinced that today, and at least today in Russia, there is no hope and no faith in the state. The state agencies are the forces that could really save the monuments. Two conclusions should be drawn for all of those present here today. The first, for our western colleagues who are present here, I think they have learned quite a lot from us. I am able to work with our state's agencies and they know from their own experience how successful cooperation with a federal government is. We heard from Mr. Kowalski, too. So, if western colleagues want to go on working with some Russian or any other post-utilitarian regimes, there are many reasons why we should cooperate, to mutual benefit. You should understand quite perfectly what you are going to do in the post-utilitarian regime if you operate only with concrete people or concrete subjects, some concrete institution, a group of people or a certain project behind which you would find some concrete people. Only then can you achieve some success. If you go along the federal structures and, going from top to bottom, if you want to reach some concrete people, you will fail. Quite an obvious conclusion has to do with several joint projects. Our foreign friends seem to understand it all quite well, but they still deal with the higher levels.

Another conclusion is that we have talked about everything, but not about an important fragment of a monument's importance, the economic value of the monument. That economic value is also an object of a wide conflict. We always talk about the spiritual value of a monument, but we never say, although we should, that people who possess monuments are very rich people. They have big material and financial resources in the value of this monument and that financial value of the monument should be turned into money which can be used for restoration and for preservation of that monument. For that we should leave all of the allusions. First of all, the illusion connected with some hopes that state and state agencies can help in preservation and protection of that monument. That is the most important. I shed the allusion that you can be a true scientist working at a national, state institution the same way that you should shed all of the allusions concerning cooperation with state agencies in raising money for the restoration of the monuments. There are thousands of ways to raise them, but you must have a perfectly clear view of where you should look for the money. This is the major purpose of your activity. There is a shift of interests. What you have been saying is quite obvious for you but it is not so obvious for us or for the former Soviet civil worker.

Our discussion shows, nevertheless, that we have good prospects. The prospects are good because gaining experience is moving from one mistake to another. We are getting quite an enriching bank of positive experience. No matter how distressing the situation is for the people who say, "We belong to a state-run institu-

tion. We don't know where to go." We should say, "We're a state institution. We are responsible for a great value," and go to some other places, offering this value and money on it, to spend this money for preservation of this monument.

BLAIR RUBLE: The Nobel Laureate, Czeslaw Milosz, begins a chapter in his book, *The Captive Mind*, with a question. The question is: why are Americans so stupid? He concludes that Americans are not stupid; we are fortunate. We are fortunate not to have had a number of experiences which Europeans have had. A British friend of mine, Alex Pravda, teaches at Oxford University, but he spent a year teaching in Michigan. I asked him how he liked America and he said it was so charming. Charming is not an adjective I normally associate with America. We're dynamic. We're energetic, innovative, but not "charming". So I asked him why he thought we were charming and he said, "It's so charming how Americans really believe in their system."

When I am at meetings like this I frequently have the feeling that my American colleagues speak from the heart with charm and with good intention and my Russian colleagues listen with great skepticism; skepticism because they know very well that America is not Russia. Nearly all of my American colleagues at this meeting here emphasized local activism and I am sure for many of my Russian colleagues this sounds somewhat naive. It is true that we have not always faced some of the opponents you face. When Richard Longstreth was involved in demonstrations outside of the United States Congress, he nonetheless faced considerable opposition and power. When someone takes on a major American or international corporation to protect a building, this doesn't take the same kind of courage that it takes to face down an *obkom* in Russia, but it takes courage nonetheless.

I hope, as I look to the Russian future, that my Russian friends have an opportunity to become as stupid as my American colleagues. I hope that you will not forget the lesson of local activism, which I think is a lesson of the American experience. And I hope that you will not be shy and remember the image of people like Richard taking their protests to the halls of Congress.

LEONID RAPUTOV: The analysis of Mr. Brumfield of today's situation, for which I thank him very much, made me willing to say that William found the most important point in today's problem. William is a person who knows Russia very well. He saw spiritualized monuments created by people who were not looking for any income or profit making them and never in Russia. The cult of money was not higher than the cult of culture.

As for the present-day situation, I could provide one more fact to corroborate what he has said. The chair of the history of architecture and city planning in our largest institute of architecture has no graduate students. Other educational institutions don't have them either. When the older generation goes, the continuity will go, too. That is why it is so important to address the problem of architectural education. To raise the cultural level is one of the most urgent problems. Maybe if the Kennan Institute could help us to organize another conference,

this would be a good topic for one.

TAT'IANA VASIL'EVA: I also would like to make a conclusion to show an example of a positive balance of ideas, also in Novgorod. The Hanseatic Council reached that local level which we have talked so much about. The Hanseatic Council contacted the city administration and now, today, the problem of funding for a very important temple in Novgorod is solved. That problem is solved right now. So if my foreign colleagues will find a way and will have a wish to help us, always address the local level.

RICHARD LONGSTRETH: I think that as our chairman said, we have not achieved the goal which was put forward by Mr. Ruble, to find some concrete solutions for Novgorod. The most concrete was Mr. Meyer's idea of acting through the European Council. So if we ask a concrete question, what the Novgorod Museum should do tomorrow, that would be the most realistic way and path for them. That is the only thing they can do at the public level to address such an authoritative unit as the European Council. What, and how, should they do it? What should the European Council recommend to them?

There should be two recommendations from the European Council. First, as Mr. Vysokovskii and Mr. Shchenkov said, transfer to the museum the function of deciding who would be the contractor; that helps to solve the problem of money. It will just be a fitting place for the mafia if the museum will give the right to decide who will do it and how. The second recommendation is the one from Mr. Stubbs, to offer several different versions of the project; only through variation and through competition can you really do away with the bad one.

In conclusion, I would like to offer you one more example. Americans are not dull and not stupid. The major of the town of Baltimore invented a very good way of getting the money for paving the key. He appeared on the local tv and said, "Everybody wants to have his name on the bricks paving the key side, come to me and I will sell you one brick for fifty dollars." So he did. You can do the same thing in Novgorod. It would be a good way of helping from America on the level of know-how to Novgorod. Sell your bricks and put the names of the donors on them.

FELIKS RAZUMOVSKII: I want to make a short remark regarding the conclusions which were presented here. First of all, I can sign under each word of Mr. Vysokovskii, I have never had any allusions about any high levels of power in protecting heritage, but the analysis which was done here by Mr. Ruble is also very close to my opinion. Of course, the state in Russia has compromised itself so much by this time. But Russia is not America and there is practically no civil society in Russia with the exceptions of Moscow and St. Petersburg. In Russia, not only the heritage protection law, but even traffic laws are not observed. A small example from my practice: when the new project of creating on our national tv, for the first time during the Soviet time, an historical and arts program was adopted, it became clear that there were no money for that program. The State Committee on TV and Radio invited the biggest bankers of the commercial banks of Moscow and offered to them a whole list of non-commercial pro-

grams which were ready for financing. In the end of one of the programs like we saw yesterday, you could see the name of Credibank. This bank, which is now one of the ten biggest commercial banks of the country, supported the program on our tv, to which I serve as a manager. I am a director of that program. I think that in America the word of the director of a bank would be enough to create a brilliant funding for such a program, but I must say that so far we have received practically no money from that bank.

Several times I have seen a situation where the given word is not observed in the state agencies, but during the time that I have worked on our tv, I have seen such a lack of any business ethics on the side of the biggest commercial companies in Russia. You say you should have contact only with non-governmental agencies, but that is not true. You should find a balance. You should place all of your hopes neither with the state authorities, nor with the commercial ones. Knowing well the life of the Russian province, not cultural centers such as Iaroslavl or Novgorod, but small, local centers of small areas, all activity is on a local basis, public activity. All of the normal town life was destroyed during those seventy years. There, if we talk about this local policy about which so much has been said here, you do not have any body to address, unless you feel like talking to drunkards. It is like talking to the majority of the population.

JOHN STUBBS: Just a quick comment. Blair Ruble's words reminded me that a little bit further in the book, *The Captive Mind*, from 1955, which I think still speaks to us today, the mark of great literature. Milosz, who understands political systems East and West quite well, captures both of them through the metaphor of people rowing a raft. In the totalitarian raft, one leader stands and commands all of the rowers to row in one direction. They row together, they move swiftly, they move directly toward some goal, but Milosz points out that when the raft hits a sand bar the entire boat shatters and is destroyed.

In the democratic raft, in the West, there is no single leader commanding everyone to row all at once in one direction. There is a number of people paddling—some this way, some that way. The raft circles, moves around lazily and, at times, in no definite direction. But when the democratic raft hits a sand bar all that happens is that it gets stuck for a while and people continue to row and eventually the raft moves free and continues on its way.

I think I am very, very happy and proud to have been able to participate in a meeting and conference like this where I think so many ideas and opinions have been raised. We have seen no necessary straight forward direction to move but we have had a lot of possibilities and a lot of good ideas, especially this afternoon, shared that each of us can return to our home countries and possibly take some of this advice and use it. I am grateful for that.

Conclusions

BLAIR RUBLE: I think there is one more responsibility I have. Our institute was named after George Kennan, the elder, a nineteenth century writer, but it was founded by George Kennan, the younger, who is now ninety years old.

George Kennan, the younger, is known as a very influential diplomat. More than any other individual, he shaped post-World War II American foreign policy, but many of you may not realize he is also a great writer. He is one of the best American non-fiction writers and he has published his diaries in several books. One of the books, *Sketches from a Life*, deals with places. He tries to describe the sense of place of various cities he lived in—Berlin in the 1920s, Riga in the 1930s, Moscow in the 1940s, and, perhaps the best description, Los Angeles in the 1950s. So I would like to present a copy of George Kennan's book, *Sketches from a Life*, to Wojciech Kowalski because without him, as I said in the beginning, we would not be here.

WOJCIECH KOWALSKI: Once again, thank you very much. Maybe it was good that I can speak as the last speaker. I should speak of my impression of this meeting. In Poland we used to say, "The Communist system is like the Volga River. It flows, flows, and will never flow out, flow away." But now I think, after some statements we listened to from our Russian colleagues, that there is a certain hope that this river will flow away, at least in the field of the protection of heritage.

The second impression. This is probably the first conference that I have attended, but because I am a lawyer, or a political scientist or a historian working in the field of the history of architecture. I am used to talking about norms, about provisions, about laws, which are rather strict about definitions. For the first time, I can take part in the discussion on the idea of national heritage, or our lovely sense of place. It gave me a completely different approach and a chance to think about that which I normally think of in terms of norms and in terms of laws from completely another side. Maybe I can now better understand the sense of heritage and its protection. For this I would like to thank you very much.