

Building a Common Past

World Heritage in Russia under Transformation,
1965-2000





unipress

Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte Osteuropas / Cultural and Social History of Eastern Europe

Band 11

Herausgegeben von

Dittmar Dahlmann, Anke Hilbrenner, Claudia Kraft,

Julia Obertreis, Stefan Rohdewald und Frithjof Benjamin Schenk

Corinne Geering

Building a Common Past

World Heritage in Russia under Transformation,
1965–2000

With 17 figures

V&R unipress

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über
<https://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Gedruckt mit der Unterstützung des Leibniz-Institut für Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen
Europa e. V. in Leipzig. Diese Maßnahme wird mitfinanziert durch Steuermittel auf der Grundlage
des vom Sächsischen Landtag beschlossenen Haushaltes.

Diese Arbeit wurde 2018 als Dissertation am Fachbereich Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften
der Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen angenommen.

© 2019, V&R unipress GmbH, Robert-Bosch-Breite 6, D-37079 Göttingen
Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Das Werk und seine Teile sind urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung in anderen als den gesetzlich zugelassenen Fällen bedarf der vorherigen
schriftlichen Einwilligung des Verlages.

Umschlagabbildung: World Clock Fountain, Manezhnaia Square, Moscow. © Corinne Geering

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

ISSN 2365-8061

ISBN 978-3-8470-0959-7

Contents

A Note on Transliteration and Translation	9
Acknowledgements	11
Abbreviations	15
List of Figures	17
1. Introduction	19
1.1 Building a Common Past	19
1.2 International Cooperation in Heritage Conservation within and with Russia	32
1.3 Analysing Transformation	43
1.4 Organisation of the Book	57
2. Many Approaches to One Common Past: International Cultural Cooperation and Divergent World Heritages, 1945–1988	61
2.1 Between Division and Convergence: International Cultural Cooperation during the Cold War Period	63
2.2 The Soviet Perspective on the International Politics of Conservation	95
2.3 <i>Mirovoe kul'turnoe nasledie</i> : The Contribution of the Soviet Peoples to World Culture	113
3. From Monument (<i>pamiatnik</i>) to Heritage (<i>nasledie</i>): Soviet Discourses on Cultural Heritage	121
3.1 Situating Heritage Sites: the <i>Svod pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury narodov SSSR</i>	123
3.2 <i>Pamiatniki istorii i kul'tury</i> : The Monuments of History and Culture	130

3.3 Marxist-Leninist Approaches to Heritage: The Historic Town in the Present	143
3.4 The Museum Boom: <i>Muzeifikatsiia</i> and Conservation Areas . . .	153
3.5 <i>Èkologiia kul'tury</i> : Bridging the Nature-Culture Divide	170
4. International Heritage Initiatives and Institutions in the Soviet Union	181
4.1 The Institutional Structure of Heritage Conservation in the Soviet Union, 1965–1985	184
4.2 Participation in UNESCO Programmes	206
4.3 International Actors within the Soviet Union	220
5. <i>Perestroika</i> and the Transformation of World Heritage	243
5.1 Translating <i>Perestroika</i> for UNESCO and Transforming Soviet Heritage	245
5.2 International Cultural Cooperation during <i>Perestroika</i>	267
5.3 Soviet Heritage Sites Become UNESCO World Heritage	293
6. Re-Internalisation of World Heritage	311
6.1 Post-Soviet World Heritage Conditions in the Russian Federation .	314
6.2 Developing a New Approach to Heritage	328
6.3 The Integration of Post-Soviet Heritage Sites into the Framework of UNESCO World Heritage	344
6.4 Heritage as a Resource for Regional Development: The Kazan' Kremlin	365
7. Conclusion	375
List of Archival Collections, Libraries and Other Institutions	389
Filmography	393
Bibliography	395
Annex A. List of UNESCO World Heritage Sites in the Russian Federation	433
Annex B. Map of UNESCO World Heritage Sites in the Russian Federation, Inscribed 1990–2000	437
Annex C. Organisation of the Soviet Union's Administrative Structure .	439

Annex D. List of Cited International Conventions, Charters and Resolutions	441
Annex E. List of Cited Legal Documents Enacted by the USSR, RSFSR and RF	443
Index	449

A Note on Transliteration and Translation

This study adheres to the system of transliteration used by the Library of Congress. Because many of the Russian names featuring in the study were transcribed differently in the referenced sources (e.g., A. G. Khalturin appears alternatively as Chalturin, Halturin and Haltourine), other more familiar English transcriptions of Russian names are not used. Differences in transcribed names and places in the sources have been retained. Citations in Russian have been translated into English with the original Russian transliteration provided in footnotes; the same procedure applies to French sources. Titles of archival sources in Russian are only provided in English translation for reader-friendly reasons.

Given the international scope of the subject-matter of this study, precise translation is often not possible because of the lack of equivalent terms in other languages. The name of institutions, legislative instruments and concepts in Russian convey connotations that differ from those of equivalent English terms.¹ Therefore, in many cases, the aim is not to arrive at an exact translation; rather it is to reveal these connotations and their embeddedness within the Russian discourse and the Soviet and Russian state systems. Russian notions (e.g., *pa-miatnik*) are deployed with an English translation in brackets upon first mention in order to avoid any confusion of the Russian discourse with the notions expressed in English (in this case *monument*). To ensure presentation of the text in a reader-friendly way, English translations of the names of institutions and programmes are provided with the original Russian name in brackets upon first mention. In the case of legislative instruments, only the English names are provided in the text, while the original Russian names of these documents can be found in Annex E titled ‘List of cited legal documents enacted by the USSR, RSFSR and RF’.

1 See A. K. R. Kiralfy, ‘The Soviet Civil Codes and Subordinate Legislation’, in *Codification in the Communist World. Symposium in Memory of Zsolt Szirmai*, edited by Ferdinand J. M. Feldbrugge (Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1975), 177–184, here 178.

The historical account of the process of inscribing sites in the UNESCO World Heritage List also entails the use of different names for the same sites depending on whether references in the study are to the names of the buildings and sites in question, the different titles of nominations submitted by the State Party and adjusted by international bodies, or to the ascribed names of the final UNESCO World Heritage sites. In order to distinguish between these different names, the official names of UNESCO World Heritage sites are provided in italics (e.g., *Church of the Ascension, Kolomenskoye*), while the names of nominated sites are set off in quotation marks (e.g., ‘Architectural-archaeological and natural complex of “Kolomenskoye”’). No distinguishing marks are used for the names of the buildings and sites in question (e.g., Church of the Ascension).

Acknowledgements

This book is a slightly revised version of my doctoral thesis that I defended at the University of Giessen in January 2018. The encouragement that I have received from many individuals in the writing of this study has been invaluable. The research that it presents would not have been possible without the support of the institutions and individuals who devoted time to responding to my enquiries, offered moral and financial support and provided critical feedback. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to Thomas Bohn at Justus Liebig University in Giessen and to Andreas Schönle at Queen Mary University of London. Their belief in this project and in my abilities, combined with their critical feedback, helped propel this study to its completion. I would also like to thank Eva Maurer, who mentored me during my master's degree programme at the University of Bern and who supported this project from its inception.

I wish to thank the series editors, especially Julia Obertreis, Anke Hilbrenner and Stefan Rohdewald, for their support and critical feedback in the process of preparing my thesis for publication. I would like to extend special thanks to the Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO) in Leipzig for generously providing the necessary funds for the publication of this book. The doctoral thesis was awarded the dissertation prize of the Working Group on International History of the German Historical Association (VHD) and the Dr.-Herbert-Stolzenberg-Award for the Study of Culture; I am honoured and very grateful for this recognition.

I was able to devote slightly over three years to this project thanks to the generous financial support provided by the International Graduate Centre for the Study of Culture (GCSC) at the Justus Liebig University in Giessen. I received a full doctoral scholarship and travel grants from this institution to conduct research in Paris and in different towns located in the Russian Federation. I am also grateful for the scholarship I received from the DAAD-Network titled 'Cultural contact and conflict zones in Eastern Europe' that enabled me to spend two months as a guest researcher at the Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies at the Kazan Federal University. I enjoyed and

benefitted from the lively and inspiring research environment in Giessen. I am thankful to my peers for the many fruitful discussions we had that motivated me to constantly refine my research. I am especially grateful to Paul Vickers and Benjamin Brendel for their comments on earlier drafts and to Katharina Kühn, Christopher Zoller-Blundell, Lyubomir Pozharliev and Magda Dolińska-Rydzek for sustained and inspiring exchanges.

Furthermore, I was given the opportunity to present the preliminary results of my research at conferences and workshops held at several other universities that generously covered my travel and accommodation expenses. I thank participants at these events, especially Julia Röttjer, for their much appreciated feedback. I thank the Department of History at the Vytautas Magnus University Kaunas, the Collegium Carolinum in Munich, the Gotha Research Centre of the University of Erfurt, the Department for Eastern European History at the University of Mainz, the Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO) in Leipzig and the AHRC-funded project titled 'Socialism Goes Global', the Imre Kertész Kolleg Jena, the Leibniz Institute of European History (IEG) and the Leibniz Research Alliance 'Historical Authenticity' for funding support.

During my research stays in Paris as well as in Moscow, Petrozavodsk, Sergiev Posad and Kazan' in the Russian Federation, I was granted access to documents in archives and libraries. I am greatly indebted to the staff of these institutions for helping me with my enquiries, for their warm words and encouragement and for shared tea and lunch sessions. I am grateful to staff at the UNESCO Archives in Paris, in particular, Adele Torrance; at the ICOMOS Documentation Centre, especially Lucile Smirnov; and at the UNESCO-ICOM Museum Information Centre in Paris for allowing me to work with their material. I am equally grateful to the archivists and librarians of the Russian State Library, the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GARF), the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ARAN), the Russian State Archive of Literature and Arts (RGALI), as well as the National Archives of the Republic of Karelia (NARK) and of the Republic of Tatarstan (NART) for their patience and the assistance that they extended to me during my research visits. My research was completed in the archives of museum-institutions. At these locations, I would like to express my gratitude to Ol'ga A. Poliakova at the Moscow State Integrated Art and Historical Architectural and Natural Landscape Museum-Reserve; Svetlana V. Nikolaeva and Tat'iana N. Manushina at the Sergiev Posad History and Art Museum-Reserve; Svetlana A. Anokhina at the Patriarch's Architectural-Restoration Centre (PARTs) at the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius in Sergiev Posad; Ol'ga G. Bukchina and Kseniia V. Kuznetsova from the UNESCO Department of the Kizhi State Open-Air Museum of History, Architecture and Ethnography; and Svetlana A. Konovalova from the Historic-Architectural and Art Museum-Reserve of the

‘Kazan Kremlin’. I was extremely fortunate to meet Inna S. Khrapova, Ekaterina M. Bulatova and Svetlana V. Il’evich at the Russian Research Institute for Cultural and Natural Heritage in Moscow who introduced me to other members of the Institute and facilitated my visits to the Institutes for Cultural Research and for Art Studies in Moscow.

I would not have been able to complete my study of the archival documents without the deeply valued assistance extended by individuals who participated in the processes described in this study. In many cases, their insights helped me to grasp the subject matter at hand and thereby to bring to life processes that were often not reflected in written records. I am greatly indebted to Iurii A. Vedenin, Evgenii P. Chelyshev, Natal’ia O. Dushkina, Rafaël M. Valeev, Vladimir I. Pluzhnikov, Tamara Iu. Semënova, Elena G. Shcheboleva, Ekaterina A. Shorban, Galina A. Makarovskaia, Denis Shaw and Andrei Petrov for generously devoting time to respond to my enquiries.

The generous provision of the possibility to work in the Lernoullianum at the University of Basel granted to me by the Educational Technologies unit greatly facilitated the writing up of my dissertation during the final months. Elina Khafizova was always ready to help me with any Russian translation issues. Radhika Johari’s copy editing and comments were invaluable in helping me to polish up this English manuscript.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family and friends for accompanying me on this journey. I am extremely fortunate to have had Benjamin’s support in all situations near and far, from the exhilarating highs to the nerve-wracking lows, and I thank him for his reminders to enjoy life, always, even during the most strenuous moments.

Abbreviations

AIESEE	International Association for South-East European Studies (Association internationale d'études du Sud-Est européen)
AN SSSR	USSR Academy of Sciences (Akademiiia nauk SSSR)
BICER	Baikal International Centre for Ecological Research
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
FIJET	World Federation of Travel Journalists and Writers (Fédération Internationale des Journalistes et Ecrivains du Tourisme)
GDR	German Democratic Republic
GlavUOP	Main Administration for the Protection, Restoration and Use of Monuments of History and Culture (Glavnoe upravlenie po okhrane, ispol'zovaniuu i restavratsii pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury)
Giprogor	State Institute for the Design of Cities (Gosudarstvennyi institut proektirovaniia gorodov)
Goskompriroda	USSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature (Gosudarstvennyi komitet SSSR po okhrane prirody)
Gosstroi	State Committee for Construction (Gosudarstvennyi komitet SSSR po delam stroitel'stva)
GUOP	Main Administration for the Protection of Monuments (Glavnoe upravlenie okhrany pamiatnikov)
IASDSC	International Association for the Study and Dissemination of Slav Cultures (alternatively in sources to be found with the abbreviation of the French name Association internationale pour l'étude et la diffusion des cultures slaves (AIEDCS) or of the Russian name Mezhdunarodnaia assotsiatsiia po izucheniiu i rasprostraneniui slavianskikh kul'tur (MAIRSK))
IASCCA	International Association for the Study of the Cultures of Central Asia (Mezhdunarodnaia assotsiatsiia po izucheniiu kul'tur Tsentral'noi Azii (MAIKTsA))
ICOM	International Council of Museums
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites

ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
IFESCO	International Foundation for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Co-operation (Mezhdunarodnyi fond gumanitornogo sotrudnichestva gosudarstv-uchastnikov SNG MFGS)
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
KASSR	Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic
MAB	Man and the Biosphere
NABU	German Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (Naturschutzbund Deutschland)
Narkompros	People's Commissariat for Education (Narodnyi komissariat prosveshcheniia)
RAN	Russian Academy of Sciences (Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk)
RSFSR	Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic
SSOD	Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Contacts (Soiuz sovetskikh obshchestv druzhby i kul'turnykh sviazei s zarubezhnymi stranami)
TASSR	Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
US	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
VOKS	All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (Vsesoiuznoe Obshchestvo Kul'turnoi Sviazi s zagranitse)
VOOP	All-Russian Society for the Protection of Nature (Vserossiiskoe obshchestvo okhrany prirody)
VOOPliK	All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments (Vserossiiskoe obshchestvo okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury)
VTsSPS	All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (Vsesoiuznyi tsentral'nyi sovet professional'nykh soiuzov)
WDCD	World Decade for Cultural Development

List of Figures

- Fig. 1 Architectural Ensemble of Kizhi Pogost. Photograph by the author (July 2012).
- Fig. 2 UNESCO World Heritage designation displayed at the entrance to Kizhi Pogost. Photograph by the author (July 2012).
- Fig. 3 I. S. Glazunov: *The Contribution of the People of the USSR to World Culture and Civilization* (1980). Courtesy by Moscow State Art Gallery of Ilya Glazunov.
- Fig. 4 Depiction of the Golden Ring. Adapted by the author from the documentary film *Zolotoe kol'tso. Drevnie Goroda Rossii* (*The Golden Ring. Ancient Towns of Russia*), produced by Tsentrnauchfil'm in 1974.
- Fig. 5 Convent of the Intercession, Suzdal'. Photograph by the author (August 2014).
- Fig. 6 Suzdal'skii kreml' and Museum of Wooden Architecture, both included in the Vladimir-Suzdal' *muzei-zapovednik*. Photograph by the author (August 2014).
- Fig. 7 System of especially protected natural territories of the USSR. Adapted by the author from A. M. Krasnitskii (1983).
- Fig. 8 Church of the Ascension, Kolomenskoe, Moscow. Photograph by the author (August 2014).
- Fig. 9 Schematic depiction of state institutions and organisations dealing with the study, protection and restoration of immovable monuments in the RSFSR. Adapted by the author from Vatrov, Pankratova and Cherniakvskaiia (1987).
- Fig. 10 Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius. Photograph by the author (April 2015).
- Fig. 11 Stills from the trailer produced for the planned series, *The Temples of the World* (1990), directed by G. Davitashvili.
- Fig. 12 Solovetskii Monastery. Photograph by the author (July 2012).
- Fig. 13 Solovetskii island complex. Photograph by the author (July 2012).
- Fig. 14 Kazan' Kremlin. Photograph by the author (April 2016).
- Fig. 15 Kazan' Kremlin with the UNESCO flag positioned on the roof. Photograph by the author (April 2016).
- Annex B Map of UNESCO World Heritage Sites in the Russian Federation, Inscribed 1990–2000. Illustration by the author.
- Annex C Organisation of the Soviet Union's Administrative Structure. Wikimedia Commons.

1. Introduction

1.1 Building a Common Past

Kizhi ... this word should stand in one line with such names like Acropolis and Rome, Samarkand and Paris, Novgorod and Kiev. It is here, on this tiny island, in the middle of the boundless dark forests of Zaonezh'ie that wonderful, irreproducible works of architecture stand. Wooden churches and farmhouses, made by Russian carpenters, became masterpieces of world architecture.¹

These lines appear in the opening passages of a tourist guidebook published in 1968 about Kizhi Island, which is located in what is now the Karelian Republic in Northwest Russia. Aleksandr V. Opolovnikov, the author of the text, was an architectural historian and restorer who specialised in wooden architecture characteristic of the Russian North. His restoration work in the 1950s laid the foundations for the displays of the Kizhi State Open-Air Museum of History, Architecture and Ethnography that was opened in 1966 for the purpose of preserving this architecture. In the European tradition of open-air museums, wooden buildings such as farmhouses, churches, sheds and bathhouses were disassembled and moved from the surrounding region of Zaonezh'ie to the small island complex in Lake Onega. As the only original structure located on the island, the so-called Kizhi Pogost ('enclosure' in English), comprising two churches and a bell tower that date back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, has become one of the most iconic Russian heritage sites (Fig. 1). The open-air museum on the island of Kizhi was one of several museum-reserves established during this period. It featured centrally in public discourses and institutionalisation efforts in the late Soviet Union, demonstrating the increas-

1 'Kizhi . . . Èto slovo dolzhno stoiat' v odnom riadu s takimi nazvaniiami, kak Akropol' i Rim, Samarkand i Parizh, Novgorod i Kiev. Ved' zdes', na malen'kom ostrovke, sredi bespredel'nykh sumrachnykh lesov Zaonezh'ia stoiat udivitel'nye, nepovtorimye sozdaniia arkhitektury. Dereviannye tserkvi i izby, srublennye russkimi plotnikami, stali shedebrami mirovogo zodchestva'. The Russian names of Kyiv and Samarqand have been retained in the translation. A. V. Opolovnikov, *Kizhi* (Weimar: Landesdruckerei Thüringen, 1970), 5.

ing concern of Soviet authorities relating to the protection and study of cultural heritage.

Opolovnikov's guidebook presents the structure, located on a small island on the northern Russian periphery, as a masterpiece of world architecture. In doing so, it introduces the reader and potential visitor to one of the core ideas in international heritage conservation that has prevailed from the 1960s onwards and that constitutes the subject matter of this book. Opolovnikov praises the sublime character of the site, expressed by its remoteness and the pristine nature surrounding the architectural complex. At the same time, his description transcends the boundless dark forests of the region and positions Kizhi among other well-known heritage sites located in various countries and spanning more than two millennia. Kizhi is portrayed as the tangible endpoint of an evolutionist account of world history that begins in the empires of classical antiquity. The outstanding value of the architectural complex on Kizhi dating from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is deemed equal to that of the acclaimed architectural structures of Ancient Greece, the Roman Empire, the Mughal Empire, the medieval metropolis of Paris as well as the medieval state formations of Kievan Rus'² and the Novgorod Republic that preceded the Russian Empire.

Until today, all of the sites mentioned by Opolovnikov have been included in the UNESCO World Heritage List and they now literally 'stand in one line', exhibiting the Convention's basic criterion of outstanding universal value by fulfilling at least one of the ten criteria determining the inclusion of cultural and natural properties.³ Among them, the Soviet sites located in Samarqand, Novgorod, Kyiv and on the island of Kizhi were only considered for inclusion in this List following the facilitation of international exchanges by the policies of *perestroika* in the late 1980s. Amidst these political changes, the three Permanent

2 Because the sources on the history of Russia are pivotal in this study, the Russian name of the period of the Kievan Rus' has been retained.

3 With the coming into force of the World Heritage Convention in 1975, the nomination of sites by the member states to the Convention and their successive inscriptions by the World Heritage Committee has been ongoing since 1978. The criteria for the inclusion of cultural and natural properties in the World Heritage List have been defined in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. In 2004, the six criteria for cultural properties and the four criteria for natural properties were combined within one set. All of the versions of the Operational Guidelines can be found in: UNESCO, 'The Criteria for Selection', in *World Heritage Centre*, Web. The sites mentioned by Opolovnikov have been inscribed as *Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura* (1980, extended in 1990), *Acropolis, Athens* (1987), *Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra* (1990), *Kizhi Pogost* (1990), *Paris, Banks of the Seine* (1991), *Historic Monuments of Novgorod and Surroundings* (1992), *Samarqand – Crossroad of Cultures* (2001). Information according to UNESCO, 'World Heritage List', in *World Heritage Centre*, Web.



Fig. 1: Architectural Ensemble of Kizhi Pogost



Fig. 2: UNESCO World Heritage designation displayed at the entrance to Kizhi Pogost

Delegations of the USSR, the Belarusian SSR⁴ and the Ukrainian SSR to UNESCO submitted the ratification instruments for the World Heritage Convention in October 1988.⁵ Thus, the participation of these Soviet republics only occurred during the final years of their existence. Shortly after the ratification, all four sites in Kyiv, Novgorod and Samarkand and on Kizhi were included in the first Soviet tentative lists and were subsequently nominated and inscribed in the List in the early 1990s during the period of the Soviet Union's disintegration. Consequently, a plaque on the entrance wall of the Kizhi Pogost today identifies the ensemble as a UNESCO World Heritage site (Fig. 2).

In view of the late adherence of the Soviet Union to the World Heritage Convention, Opolovnikov's statement appeared prophetic and through its grouping of these sites, it expressed defiance of contemporary geopolitical constraints. Opolovnikov wrote the aforementioned guidebook at a time when Kizhi and the Notre-Dame de Paris were positioned on either sides of a divide induced by the systemic conflict of the Cold War. Visitors to these sites were limited, because of visa restrictions on both sides and, furthermore, because the tourism industry in the Soviet Union was strictly controlled by the state. However, this reality did not constrain an imagined alternative of these sites as belonging to one world, thus constituting parts of world heritage. This idea was expressed repeatedly over the years by Soviet experts at a time when similar ideas were popularised in the West and in countries of the so-called Global South. It ultimately found its most explicit expression in UNESCO's Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of 1972. Against this background, Opolovnikov's writing belongs to the same discursive formation as the concurrent preparatory work undertaken for the Convention within the headquarters of the international organisation, UNESCO, in Paris. In 1968, an expert group constituted in Paris discussed the same subject matter articulated by Opolovnikov in the Soviet Union in the same year. This coincidence is not surprising given that Opolovnikov, as one of the leading experts on Russian wooden architecture, was familiar with the work of UNESCO.⁶ Therefore, during the Cold War, world heritage can be considered as a trans-systemic concept that crossed not only state borders but also ideological di-

4 This state's official designation within UNESCO was Byelorussian SSR, which was derived from the Russian term. The designation used throughout this study derives from the name in Belarusian.

5 The Soviet Union held three seats in the UN system as a compromise in response to the Soviet Union's initial demand for sixteen seats, that is, one for each of the Soviet republics. See Stanley Meisler, *United Nations. The First Fifty Years* (New York: Atlantic Monthly, 1995), 16.

6 Opolovnikov worked as an expert for UNESCO and attended the Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians held in Venice in 1964 during which the Venice Charter was drafted. See *Vserossiiskoe obshchestvo okhrany pamyatnikov istorii i kul'tury, Aleksandr Viktorovich Opolovnikov* (Moskva: Opolo, 2002).

vides.⁷ Consequently, the discursive formation of world heritage was governed by the same rules that were maintained and modified by different agents and could even exhibit incompatible elements.⁸

The subject of this study is the world heritage discourse and associated practices in Russia between 1965 and 2000. This time period contextualises the more narrowly defined transformation process described above by revealing long-term changes in international cooperation related to heritage conservation in Russia. At the same time, it considers the reform processes of *perestroika* as part of a double transformation entailing concurrent international reforms. The changes in the UNESCO World Heritage programme associated with the preparation of the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List unfolded simultaneously with the reforms and disintegration of the Soviet Union. The Global Strategy was adopted in 1994 as a response to long-standing criticism of the imposition of a Eurocentric interpretation of heritage on the rest of the world that favoured cultural over natural heritage and monumental structures over vernacular heritage, while considering living traditions only to a very limited degree. Therefore, the period between 1988, when the Soviet Union ratified the Convention, and 1994, when the World Heritage programme was adjusted in response to the changing global situation, was characterised by the double transformation prompted by the *perestroika* reforms and the preparation of UNESCO's Global Strategy. This double transformation was of particular salience for the elaboration of heritage policies in the early post-Soviet Russian Federation where experts were inspired by the concurrent international discussion to which they sought to actively contribute. Moreover, in the late Soviet Union, the international reforms resonated well with the re-interpretation of cultural policies that had hitherto been based on the ideology of Marxism-Leninism.⁹ In view of the convergence of these two transformational processes, a case study that explores the deployment of the notion of world heritage yields rich insights into the increasing internationalisation of cultural

7 For the notion of 'transsystemic' in Cold War History, see Michael David-Fox, 'The Implications of Transnationalism', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12.4 (2011), 885–904.

8 Foucault defined a discursive formation as a system of dispersion entailing a number of statements that exhibit regularity and are subjected to rules of formation that are the conditions of its existence, coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance. Of particular interest for this study is Foucault's idea that two concepts may simultaneously appear within the same discursive formation as incompatible elements that 'are formed in the same way and on the basis of the same rules'. Michael Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language* (New York: The Pantheon Books, 1972), 39, 65.

9 Soviet sources on cultural policy usually referred to Marxism-Leninism as 'Lenin's principles'. See, for example, A. A. Zvorykin, N. I. Golubtsova and E. I. Rabinovich, *Cultural Policy in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* (Paris: UNESCO, 1970).

policies in the second half of the twentieth century. Thus, this study seeks to answer the question of how Soviet world heritage in Russia was re-interpreted as UNESCO World Heritage and re-integrated in a changed international setting following the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Here, 'Russia' collectively denotes the Russian Soviet Federative Soviet Republic (RSFSR) (until 1991) and the Russian Federation (since 1992), as well as the pre-1991 Soviet Union with respect to international relations.¹⁰ During the period of this study, the notion of world heritage was evidently not limited to the specific context of UNESCO World Heritage, though today it is most prominently associated with the flagship programme of this international organisation. Thus, the notion has never been an exclusive designation of heritage sites inscribed by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee. Moreover, the conservation of cultural heritage developed into the most widely known field of UNESCO's activities over a period of several decades and only began to be recognised as such, both in Russia and internationally, during the transformation period that commenced from the late 1980s.¹¹ Against this background, this study departs from the premise that several variants of this concept existed simultaneously in different places, forming part of one international discursive formation.

'World heritage' in this study refers to heritage sites that from the 1960s onwards have been perceived to be of value for the entire world and that have consequently prompted a proliferation of international collaborative initiatives in heritage conservation.¹² Thus, on the one hand, this concept includes internationally coordinated practices such as scientific analysis, documentation and restoration focusing on heritage sites, and on the other hand, it denotes individual sites within a global imaginary. This explains why the discourse of world heritage, though it invoked the global dimension of heritage sites, did not necessarily require the international setting for its articulation. It could equally be expressed by an individual like Opolovnikov, positioned in a remote location, thus revealing his or her global awareness. In this sense, the approach chosen in

10 The RSFSR was represented by the USSR delegation in international organisations and the Russian Federation continued these international relations as the legal successor state of the Soviet Union.

11 Several sources from the late 1980s and early 1990s attest to this new role of cultural heritage within the overall activities of UNESCO. See, e.g., USSR Permanent Delegation to UNESCO, 'Cultural Questions at the 135th meeting of the Executive Board of UNESCO (Information)', 14 November 1990. RGALI, f. 2329; Ministerstvo kul'tury SSSR, op. 35, d. 3284, l. 186.

12 The major international organisations, tasked with the conservation and promotion of cultural heritage, were all founded between 1959 and 1965. These organisations are the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), established in 1959, and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Monuments Fund (WMF) that were both established in 1965.

this study follows the conceptualisation of global intellectual history developed by Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori who describe the global not only as an analytical category of the historian, or as the scale of the historian's subject matter, but also as 'a subjective category used by historical agents who are themselves the objects of the historian's inquiry'.¹³ Accordingly, the aim of this study extends beyond merely attempting to trace the global contacts of Russian experts and transfers and cooperation relating to heritage. Instead, it aims to analyse how these experts in Russia perceived heritage and actively promoted it as world heritage through their discourses and practices.

Against this background, the short passage by Opolovnikov, cited above, can be viewed first and foremost as a normative statement that invokes a high degree of valorisation of the site and consequently of the responsibility of experts like himself to present this masterpiece to the world. Thus, Opolovnikov insists on the active production of Kizhi as a site of global significance: 'And if they do not yet know much about [these wooden buildings on Kizhi]; if they are not famous and popular in such a manner as the Notre-Dame de Paris or the Taj Mahal; those are guilty of this [ignorance] who must study, preserve and propagate the heritage of our national culture'.¹⁴ In this self-reflexive statement, Opolovnikov first refers to himself as an architectural historian and restorer who studied and preserved wooden buildings and who wrote these passages in order to popularise them. His introduction of a normative dimension for his own actions indicates that he perceived this work to be the shared responsibility of Russia's architectural historians, restorers, museum employees and tour guides. This study focuses on these different kinds of experts, as well as diplomats and policy-makers, who inventoried, restored, interpreted and showcased the cultural heritage of the Soviet Union as belonging to world heritage. Their expertise evolved in relation to the heritage sites that are examined in this study within the global imaginary. Notwithstanding disagreements and misunderstandings among them, they succeeded in collectively building a network that defined Russian and Soviet culture at a given point in time within the Soviet Union as well as the international community. This double perspective can be considered central, as the development of Soviet heritage and that of global heritage cannot be understood without reference to each other. During the second half of the twentieth century, these experts were actively engaged in building a common past together with experts from other countries.

13 Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori, *Global Intellectual History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 5, 16–17.

14 'I esli o nikh eshche malo znaiut, esli oni ne stol' izvestny i populiarny, kak Sobor Parizhskoi bogomateri ili Tadzhi Makhal, to v ètom lish' vina tekhn, kto dolzhen izuchat', sokhraniat' i propagandirovat' nasledie nashei natsional'noi kul'tury'. Opolovnikov, *Kizhi* 5.

World Heritage in Russia

Prior to presenting this study of world heritage in Russia, it is necessary to delineate the notion of heritage and the use of related concepts such as conservation and restoration. Here, heritage is understood as referring to past remains under the perceived threat of destruction that societies have consequently sought to safeguard for future generations. This study focuses on tangible past remains relating to the built environment, including singular buildings, ensembles, entire villages or city districts. The underlying intention of this focus is not to preclude natural heritage or intangible heritage in the form of traditions; rather it is to trace the process of transformation of the international heritage discourse from a relatively narrow technical focus on architectural heritage that characterised this discourse at its inception in the 1960s to its expanding scope, enabling a consideration of human activities in interaction with the natural environment. Thus, this study entails an awareness of the frequently artificial distinction made between cultural and natural heritage, as testified by ongoing efforts of experts to devise an integrated approach in recent decades. Nevertheless, scientific conservation policies and practices have largely evolved as two distinct strands relating to nature and culture, respectively. The chosen focus for this study is cultural heritage, as the majority of impulses for developing more integrated approaches, both within Russia and the international expert community, originated within this strand.

Conservation here is used as an umbrella term for a diverse set of practices, including those relating to restoration, preservation and rehabilitation. Restoration is geared toward safeguarding the integrity of built objects in the long term and may entail actions aimed at bringing an object back to its perceived historical authenticity. Preservation, on the other hand, is aimed at preventing further deterioration of structures or sites, while rehabilitation seeks to return already deteriorated structures to a sound condition.¹⁵ The underlying basis of all of these practices is recognition of the value of the buildings and artefacts in question that are placed under the state's protection. As this study focuses on the world heritage discourse, most of the practices described in the following chapters relate to protection and preservation; restoration is only discussed in cases where it had an impact on the development of international cooperation (e.g., in the case of the Church of the Transfiguration, which is discussed in the third section of Chapter 4). Conservation and heritage refer to the set of practices and the overarching idea guiding these practices.

15 'Historic preservation', in *Art & Architecture Thesaurus*, Web.

The process of heritage-making is generally aimed at representation of an officially accepted version of past cultures.¹⁶ Because of its deployment of notions such as sound condition and historical authenticity, the heritage discourse is highly normative and entails state-funded actions that determine which objects and what conditions are deemed valuable. The determined objects, buildings and entire sites are usually then aggregated within official registries. It thus follows that individual heritage sites always feature as part of a set, and their value is defined in relation to a larger entity, be it a city, region, nation, empire or even the entire world, as illustrated in Opolovnikov's above-cited passage. Thus, heritage is not based on the inherent qualities of objects; rather it is the subject of cultural policies that establish a framework for valorisation. Laurajane Smith, an Australian archaeologist, coined the term 'authorised heritage discourse' in order to describe the mechanism whereby the authority of expertise produces an apparent innate value of heritage sites following its identification by 'legitimate spokespersons of the past'.¹⁷ While Smith criticises the consequent undermining of alternative and subaltern notions of heritage, this study seeks to highlight the frictions that existed within the so-called authorised heritage discourse at the international level. The official discourse was itself characterised by asymmetrical power relations that complicated the establishment of any clear division between the authorised and the subaltern and necessitated a constant reworking of heritage policies.¹⁸

By adopting a historical perspective to examine the phenomenon of cultural heritage, it shows that official attitudes towards particular sites and concepts of Soviet and Russian heritage could be ambiguous and changed over time. For one thing, the late Soviet period commencing from 1965 was characterised by a growing interest in heritage among state authorities as well as among actors

16 Research that has examined the process of heritage-making, described as 'heritageisation' or 'heritagefication', often focuses on how sites represent the nation-state, thus supporting the formation of national identity. For a more general discussion of the underlying mechanism of heritage-making, see Karlheinz Wöhler, 'Heritagefication: Zur Vergegenwärtigung des Kulturerbes', in *Welterbe und Tourismus. Schützen und Nützen aus einer Perspektive der Nachhaltigkeit*, edited by Kurt Luger and Karlheinz Wöhler (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2008), 43–58.

17 Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage* (London: Routledge, 2006), 29.

18 Recently, the notion of the subaltern has been examined in relation to the official sphere of international relations and diplomatic history. The 'Subaltern Diplomacy 1930–1960' research group at Heidelberg University has explored the question of whether a subaltern form of diplomacy can be specified. In particular, Carolin Liebisch-Gümüß' dissertation discusses asymmetrical relations between Turkey and the League of Nations, and her forthcoming publication could offer further insights into the role of states at the margins of the Western centres of international organisations that are comparable to the discussion of Russia's role presented in this study. See 'A13 Subaltern Diplomacy', in *Cluster of Excellence 'Asia and Europe in a Global Context'*, Web.

within civil society. This interest emerged following the destruction of historic areas resulting from radical urban planning, for example, in Moscow's Zariad'e and Arbat districts, and the demolition of churches. The most prominent example is the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow that was detonated in 1931 and reconstructed anew between 1995 and 2000. The history of buildings like this one, Soviet anti-religious campaigns as well as the delapidated condition of historical buildings in many places contributed to an image of general rejection by the socialist state of material remains stemming from the pre-revolutionary period or associated with religion. Contrasting with this perception, this study shows that the preservation of historical buildings, including churches, was integrated with revolutionary monuments and modern technologies as part of the Soviet state's official representation to the outside world. The focus of this book is on this discourse of world heritage emanating from the point of departure of intensifying international cooperation, and not on the simultaneous destruction of historical buildings.

The framing of heritage sites as part of world heritage not only sheds light on the process of valorisation of individual sites, but it also reveals how the concerned actors perceived the world at a given point of time. Given this focus, this study is situated at the intersection of international organisations and actors within the Soviet Union who participated in and shaped international cooperation in the field of heritage conservation. Heritage was one component of what Akira Iriye has termed 'cultural internationalism', referring to one of the major dimensions of internationalism in the twentieth century and especially following the Second World War.¹⁹ Cultural internationalism entailed various activities that were 'undertaken to link countries and peoples through the exchange of ideas and persons, through scholarly cooperation, or through efforts at facilitating cross-national understanding'.²⁰ Though Iriye acknowledges the impact of socialist internationalism, his overall account can be seen to focus on Western activities, thereby necessarily limiting the actual extent of the phenomenon.²¹ The advocates of cultural internationalism were united across national borders and ideological divides by the imaginary of a more interdependent, cooperative and mutually tolerant international community, but their shared aspirations for a peaceful international order were not without conflict in relation to each

19 Akira Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1997), 27.

20 Ibid. 3.

21 Iriye argues that the ideas of the United States 'were far more influential than their Soviet counterpart' and that the Cold War's geopolitical struggle 'existed in juxtaposition with the Americanization of the world' (11). For a critique of this perspective, see Tobias Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin. Interaction and Exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 9.

other.²² For one thing, the postulate of fostering international peace that was promoted by international bodies was aligned with the official policies of the Communist Party, whose repeated calls for peace can be viewed as a discursive weapon deployed in the Cold War conflict.²³ Yet, these calls for peace also gave Soviet heritage experts a ready opportunity to accommodate the objectives of cultural internationalism, as promoted by UNESCO and other organisations, within official socialist internationalist policies.²⁴ Consequently, the political authorities were clearly convinced by the argument that increasing international cooperation in the field of conservation served a role in maintaining international peace, promoting disarmament and ultimately preventing nuclear war.

The actors within Russia who participated in international cultural initiatives assumed responsibilities at different levels within the international expert community, as well as within the Soviet Union, the RSFSR and the Russian Federation. This study considers the connection between the global level of international governance and world heritage on one side and the local level of particular selected heritage sites as mediated by the state on the other side. The centralised governmental institutions as well as the federated structure of the Soviet and Russian states played an important role not only in terms of mediation but also in establishing the global significance of particular heritage sites. The state's valorisation of sites was evident in the official heritage registries, but it was equally apparent at the international level. To be considered for inclusion in the UNESCO World Heritage List, each site must be nominated by the responsible State Party. Consequently, the inscribed properties continue to be attributed to individual states rather than to a transnational collective set of world heritage. Thus, the UNESCO World Heritage sites in the Russian Federation represent both the selection of objects perceived to be of global significance conducted domestically by the Russian authorities, as well as the affirmation of this domestic selection by international bodies. In light of this selection and affirmation process, UNESCO World Heritage entails a bilateral process of translating heritage sites for a global audience.

22 Iriye 16.

23 Doering-Manteuffel argues that peace was used by socialist countries as a discursive weapon in the Cold War along the same lines as the use of liberty by the capitalist West. Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, 'Im Kampfum "Frieden" und "Freiheit". Über den Zusammenhang von Ideologie und Sozialkultur im Ost-West-Konflikt', in *Koordinaten deutscher Geschichte in der Epoche des Ost-West-Konflikts*, edited by Hans Günter Hockerts (München: R. Oldenbourg, 2004), 29–47, here 46.

24 Countering the argument presented by Doering-Manteuffel, Evangelista points out that Soviet policies were generally more conducive to international peace activism. Matthew Evangelista, *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1999), 7–8.

In this sense, world heritage is not an attribute that transcends an individual heritage site and state discourses of heritage.²⁵ Rather, this idea was always articulated by Soviet experts with reference to either national cultures, the subjects of the Soviet state or the international anti-imperialist struggle of socialist countries in support of the interests of the newly independent former European colonies. Moreover, the international programmes were interconnected with Soviet policies given that the Soviet Union, as a member state of international organisations, only ratified the associated international agreements in harmony with its own existing state policies on heritage conservation. International documents such as the World Heritage Convention guaranteed the sovereignty of member states in this respect.²⁶ Ultimately, this meant that the implementation of this document was dependent on domestic policies, and in some cases these policies needed to first be modified before the State Party could adhere to its principles. Thus, the building of a common past was a process that referred not only to establishing commonalities with the outside world but equally to those within the state. The USSR National Commission for UNESCO offered a figurative portrayal of this interrelationship between the international and domestic spheres in the late 1980s as two riverbanks connected by a bridge. The Soviet experts, serving the interests of their state as well as those relating to their field of expertise, were described as standing on this bridge and seeking to simultaneously advance in both directions. Their task was thus to promote Soviet achievements to the world while simultaneously receiving external impulses that would enable them to resolve domestic issues.²⁷

25 The central role of the preexisting local, regional and state efforts in the implementation of UNESCO heritage conventions is highlighted by Regina F. Bendix, Aditya Eggert and Arnika Peselmann, eds., *Heritage Regimes and the State* (Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2012).

26 The World Heritage Convention recognises the sovereignty of member states in formulating heritage policies, as stated in Article 6 of the Convention: 'Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the States on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage [...] is situated, and without prejudice to property right provided by national legislation [...]'. UNESCO, 'Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. 1972', in *World Heritage Centre*, Web, Art. 6. The problematic dimensions of this provision, including lack of responsibility and difficulties in enforcing sanctions, conflicting interests within member states and nationalist interpretations of heritage sites have been extensively discussed within recent scholarship. See, e.g., Marc Askew, 'The Magic List of Global Status. UNESCO, World Heritage and the Agenda of States', in *Heritage and Globalisation*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long (New York: Routledge, 2010), 19–44; Florian Pfeifle, *UNESCO-Welterbe. Vom globalen Völkerrecht zur lokalen Infrastrukturplanung* (Köln: Carl Heymanns, 2010); Peter Strasser, 'Welt-Erbe? Thesen über das "Flagschiffprogramm" der UNESCO', in *Prädikat 'HERITAGE'. Wertschöpfungen aus kulturellen Ressourcen*, edited by Dorothee Hemme, Markus Tauschek and Regina Bendix (Berlin: LIT, 2007), 101–128.

27 'On the participation of the USSR in the World Decade for Cultural Development'. 1989. RGALI, f. 2329, op. 35, d. 3011, l. 70.

This study's focus on this interrelationship entails the deployment of a different point of departure to that of many of the existing studies on world heritage that have either focused on local conditions and the debates surrounding particular sites or on the debates occurring within the concerned international organisations. As an entry point into the complex issue of world heritage in Russia, this study's point of departure is the set of heritage sites located in the territory of the former Russian SFSR that were inscribed as the first UNESCO World Heritage sites in the 1990s (see Annex A). Besides Moscow, Saint Petersburg and Velikii Novgorod, the locations of these sites included Northwest Russia (the Solovetskie Islands and the aforementioned Kizhi Pogost) and the region northeast of Moscow (Vladimir and Suzdal' as well as Sergiev Posad). Furthermore, the Autonomous Republic of Tatarstan has become one of the most active participants among the Russian federal subjects in the UNESCO World Heritage programme following the inscription of the Kazan' Kremlin in 2000 that was a consequence of the decentralisation policies implemented in the 1990s. The focus of this study is not so much on the centres of Moscow and Saint Petersburg but rather on these other sites, as they open up the possibility for an analysis of cultural heritage considered as an aspect of cultural policies and development that extends beyond much discussed issues of urban planning and historic cities.

An analysis of these World Heritage sites should take into account the federative political structure shared by the Soviet Union, the RSFSR and the Russian Federation as they are not just representative of Soviet or Russian culture. Thus, Kizhi Pogost has been considered representative of Karelian culture, the Kazan' Kremlin of Tatar culture and the Solovetskie Islands in the White Sea of the culture of the Russian North. Given that the modes of inscription of these sites into the world heritage discourse have differed, the following chapters aim to shed light on the symbolic narratives through which their integration into the world heritage discourse was accomplished. Specifically, the Church of the Transfiguration on *Kizhi Pogost* (inscribed in 1990) has been depicted as the embodiment of human creative genius, the *Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands* (1992) represents holy land that has been subjected to harsh environmental as well as political climates, the *White Monuments of Vladimir and Suzdal* (1992), northeast of Moscow, represent the foundation of the Russian state and the outcome of efforts to develop the Soviet tourism industry, and the *Architectural Ensemble of the Trinity Sergius Lavra in Sergiev Posad* connotes national treasures and the revival of the Russian Orthodox Church following the international celebration of the millennial anniversary of the Christianisation of Rus' in 1988.

The analysis of the sample of featured heritage sites located within different federal subjects of the RSFSR and the Russian Federation not only fosters an

understanding of their symbolic value as world heritage, but also provides insights into the organisation of international heritage conservation in the state. By means of these examples, the analysis seeks to show how international cooperation relating to heritage conservation was implemented in the context of the seemingly decentred organisation of Soviet and Russian heritage conservation. Consequently, the process of domestic institution-building, examined in this study, is shown to be part of the process of intensifying international cultural cooperation.

1.2 International Cooperation in Heritage Conservation within and with Russia

From the time that the World Heritage programme was launched, the criteria adopted by UNESCO for recognising certain sites as the ‘heritage of mankind as a whole’²⁸ have been criticised for imposing a Eurocentric interpretation of heritage on the rest of the world. Not only UNESCO’s aforementioned Global Strategy but also heritage scholars from diverse fields have drawn attention to the global imbalance of inscriptions positioned along the North-South divide and have discussed alternative notions of heritage that draw on the perspectives of local populations and include examples of indigenous heritage.²⁹ The post-socialist states have been largely absent in these discussions despite the fact that the territory of the Soviet Union remained a blank space on the World Heritage map until the end of the Cold War.³⁰ This negligence can be observed in studies on international cooperation in heritage conservation in general, including the burgeoning field of heritage studies, with this topic only recently receiving

28 This phrase stems from the World Heritage Convention: UNESCO, ‘Convention Concerning the Protection’, Preamble.

29 See, e.g., Christoph Brumann and David Berliner, eds., *World Heritage on the Ground. Ethnographic Perspectives* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2016); Lars Elenius, Christina Allard and Camilla Sandström, eds., *Indigenous Rights in Modern Landscapes. Nordic Conservation Regimes in Global Context* (London/New York: Routledge, 2016).

30 Julia Röttjer discusses the contribution of Polish experts to the UNESCO World Heritage programme with a particular focus on the Auschwitz-Birkenau site, while Andrea Rehling takes a closer look at the participation of the SFR Yugoslavia in the context of the Non-Aligned Movement. Julia Röttjer, ‘Safeguarding “Negative Historical Values” for the Future? Appropriating the Past in the UNESCO Cultural World Heritage Site Auschwitz-Birkenau’, *Ab Imperio* 4 (2015), 130–165; Andrea Rehling, ‘Brüder international. Jugoslawiens Welterbe als Gedächtnis der blockfreien Bewegung’, in *Brüderlichkeit und Bruderzwist. Mediale Inszenierungen des Aufbaus und des Niedergangs politischer Gemeinschaften in Ost- und Südosteuropa*, edited by Tanja Zimmermann (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2014), 277–299.

scholarly attention.³¹ Therefore, this study draws on three bodies of research. The first engages with issues of international cooperation, transfer and exchange during the Cold War. The second body comprises studies on international organisations, especially UNESCO, and more specifically on international cooperation relating to heritage conservation. The third and final body of work provides insights on heritage conservation in the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation and thus includes publications dealing with different aspects of late Soviet and post-Soviet Russian cultural policies.

In relation to the first body of research literature, it is important to bear in mind that two distinct types of international cooperation with socialist countries and with capitalist countries could be distinguished in the Soviet Union, with the most frequent international exchanges involving the so-called socialist bloc.³² These exchanges included bilateral agreements as well as socialist international organisations and the holding of regular meetings of representatives of socialist countries working in different fields. However, a significant finding of this body of research is that the actual organisation of international cooperation did not necessarily evolve along the ideological lines of capitalism and socialism. David Engerman criticises the argument that the Soviet authorities directed the actions of their allies during the Cold War as being inadequate, instead pointing out that the sources reveal frictions that existed within and beyond Soviet leadership.³³ Other researchers have affirmed the global dimension of the Cold War beyond the East–West divide, for example, by integrating the decolonisation process and the Sino-Soviet split into their historical accounts.³⁴ Of particular interest to these global histories are the relations of the Soviet Union to the so-called Third World during the Cold War.³⁵

31 See ‘State Socialism, Heritage Experts and Internationalism in Heritage Protection after 1945’, in 1989 after 1989. *Rethinking the Fall of State Socialism in Global Perspective* (2017), Web; Eszter Gantner, Corinne Geering and Paul Vickers, ‘Call for Papers. Heritage Studies and Socialism: Transnational Perspectives on Heritage in Eastern and Central Europe’, in *h-net* (2016), Web.

32 This distinction is reflected in the organisation of archival sources such as those in the repository of the Russian Academy of Sciences, which complicates research on international organisations that include both socialist and capitalist countries as their member states.

33 David Engerman, ‘The Second World’s Third World’, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12.1 (2011), 183–211, here 184.

34 Westad’s notion of a global cold war has prompted several subsequent studies. Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War. Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Own Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). See, e.g., Theodora Dragostinova and Malgorzata Fidelis, eds. *Beyond the Iron Curtain: Eastern Europe and the Global Cold War*. Spec. issue of *Slavic Review* 77.3 (2018). For a discussion of the impact of the Sino-Soviet split on Cold War relations, see, for example, Lorenz Lüthi, *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

35 For a general account of these relations, see Engerman; Andreas Hilger, ed., *Die Sowjetunion und die Dritte Welt. UdSSR, Staatssozialismus und Antikolonialismus im Kalten Krieg 1945–*

Against this background, the number of historiographies that include the region of the former Soviet Union in their analyses of global processes has expanded, and the field of Soviet history has increasingly engaged in an active exchange with the fields of global history.³⁶ Notably, this scholarship does not focus merely on the transnational but rather on processes that transcend the boundaries of the so-called Iron Curtain marking the ideological divide of the Cold War.³⁷ During the last decade, several publications have sought to analyse the exchanges and transfers that occurred across the Iron Curtain, coining new metaphors aimed at overcoming the common misconception of a static border existing between two blocs. Such metaphors include: György Péteri's 'nylon curtain' relating to consumer goods, 'airy curtains' formulated by Alexander Badenoch, Andreas Ficker and Christian Heinrich-Franke in relation to the history of broadcasting, and Yuliya Komska's 'icon curtain' that refers to a shared prayer wall located at the border between Czechoslovakia and West Germany.³⁸ These studies focus not only on how people, ideas and goods crossed borders, but they also highlight the impacts of these exchanges on ideas about the outside world and the respective economic and political system of the 'other' during the Cold War period.³⁹ More recently, studies have begun to contrast the Soviet version of globalisation processes with hitherto dominant accounts centring on capitalist states.⁴⁰

These studies have contributed to a re-centring of international relations within historical accounts relating to the latter half of the twentieth century. This re-centred perspective is vital for analysing the history of international cultural

1991, (München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2009). The relations between the Soviet Union and Latin America and between the USSR and Africa have been the subject of several recent publications, especially in relation to student exchanges. See, e.g., Rupprecht; Constantin Katsakioris, 'L'union soviétique et les intellectuels africains. Internationalisme, panafricanisme et négritude pendant les années de la décolonisation, 1954–1964', *Cahiers du monde russe* 47.1 (2006), 15–32; Svetlana Boltovskaja, *Bildungsmigranten aus dem subsaharischen Afrika in Moskau und St. Petersburg: Selbst- und Fremdbilder* (Freiburg: Springer, 2014).

36 See, e.g., Martin Aust, ed., *Globalisierung imperial und sozialistisch. Russland und die Sowjetunion in der Globalgeschichte 1851–1991* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2013); Martin Aust and Julia Obertreis, eds., *Osteuropäische Geschichte und Globalgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014).

37 David Fox, 'The Implications of Transnationalism' 885.

38 György Péteri, ed., *Nylon Curtain. Transnational and Transsystemic Tendencies in the Cultural Life of State-Socialist Russia and East-Central Europe* (Trondheim: Maney, 2006); Alexander Badenoch, Andreas Ficker and Christian Heinrich-Franke, eds., *Airy Curtains in the European Ether: Broadcasting and the Cold War* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2013); Yuliya Komska, *The Icon Curtain. The Cold War's Quiet Border* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2015).

39 See David-Fox, 'The Implications of Transnationalism' 904.

40 See, e.g., Oscar Sanchez-Sibony, *Red Globalization. The Political Economy of the Soviet Cold War from Stalin to Khrushchev* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

cooperation and that of international organisations that include both socialist and capitalist countries as their members, thus transgressing the ideological divide. Studies on expertise, cultural diplomacy and the organisation of international youth festivals and world exhibitions have demonstrated that international cooperation during the Cold War was not only characterised by conflict but also by joint initiatives.⁴¹ In a study on Soviet cultural diplomacy during the interwar period, David-Fox makes an argument for treating the international dimensions of the Soviet system 'not as a separate sphere but a central part of Soviet historical development' even at the height of Stalinist isolationism.⁴² This perspective can equally be applied to heritage conservation during the period between 1965 and 2000 when international heritage policies played a crucial developmental role within both the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation.

Within the second body of research that is of relevance to this study, the history of conservation has only recently been conjoined with the history of international relations.⁴³ Studies on the Soviet Union's international relations have largely focused on scientific and artistic exchanges. On the one hand, research exploring the involvement of the Soviet Union in international organisations still tends to focus on the hot issues of the Cold War such as security policies and peace treaties. In this context, scientific exchanges and transnational expert networks are also relevant, especially in the fields of nuclear power, aviation, arctic explorations and oil production, the development of technology and communication systems and the secret police.⁴⁴ On the other hand, research on culture constitutes a soft area of the Soviet Union's international collaborations that has focused on exchanges relating to the artistic production of literature, theatre, art and film.⁴⁵ Soviet international tourism has been the subject of increasing scholarly attention in relation to exchange processes ex-

41 Simo Mikkonen and Pia Koivunen, eds., *Beyond the Divide. Entangled Histories of Cold War Europe*, (New York: Berghahn, 2015); Sari Autio-Sarasmo and Katalin Miklóssy, eds., *Reassessing Cold War Europe* (London: Routledge, 2011).

42 Michael David-Fox, *Showcasing the Great Experiment. Cultural Diplomacy and Western Visitors to the Soviet Union, 1921–1941* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 314.

43 Cf. Melanie Hall, *Towards World Heritage. International Origins of the Preservation Movement 1870–1930* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 8.

44 See Jeronim Perović, *Cold War Energy. A Transnational History of Soviet Oil and Gas* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Martin Kohlrausch and Helmuth Trischler, eds., *Building Europe on Expertise. Innovators, Organizers, Networkers*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Christopher D. Hollings, *Scientific communication across the Iron Curtain*, (Cham: Springer, 2016).

45 See Cadra Peterson McDaniel, *American-Soviet cultural diplomacy. The Bolshoi Ballet's American premiere* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015); Peter Romijn, Giles Scott-Smith and Joes Segal, eds., *Divided Dreamworlds? The Cultural Cold War in East and West* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012); Simo Mikkonen and Pekka Suutari, eds., *Music, Art and Diplomacy: East–West Cultural Interactions and the Cold War* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2016).

tending beyond artistic production.⁴⁶ Insights emerging from these studies provide a framework for the analysis of exchanges in the field of heritage conservation.

In addition to studies in Soviet history, this study turns to general accounts of the international history of conservation that describe the post-war period as an era of international collaboration characterised by unprecedented global outreach and expanding standardisation.⁴⁷ In the 1950s and 1960s, new international organisations for cultural cooperation and heritage conservation proliferated, most notable among these being the specialised UN agency known as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) established in 1946. This new international organisation not only extended the field of activities of the interwar organisation that preceded it but it also included more initiatives emanating from non-Western states.⁴⁸ Other important organisations were the International Council of Museums (ICOM, established in 1946), the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM, established in 1956), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS, established in 1965) for cultural heritage and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN, established in 1948) for natural heritage. Though the institutional histories of these organisations are well documented, most accounts have tended to focus on the involvement of actors from Western states.⁴⁹ The involvement of the Soviet Union in these international organisations, particularly during the 1970s and

46 For a comprehensive account of Soviet tourism, see the monograph by Anne Gorsuch and the edited volume by Anne Gorsuch and Diane Koenker: Anne E. Gorsuch, *All This is Your World: Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane Koenker, eds., *The Russian and East European tourist under capitalism and socialism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006). The volume edited by Zuelow situates the Soviet Union in the broader context of European tourism. Eric Zuelow, ed., *Touring Beyond the Nation. A Transnational Approach to European Tourism History* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

47 Jukka Jokilehto, *ICCROM and the Conservation of Cultural Heritage. A History of the Organization's First 50 Years, 1959–2009* (Rome: ICCROM, 2011), 8.

48 Cf. Iriye 146–147.

49 For UNESCO, see Maurel, 'L'UNESCO de 1945 à 1974', Dissertation (2009); for ICCROM, see Jokilehto, *ICCROM and the Conservation*; for IUCN, see Martin Holdgate, *The Green Web. A Union for World Conservation* (London: Earthscan, 1999). Recent publications have been aimed at globalising the history of these organisations or at tracing connections within Europe across the Cold War divide. Poul Duedahl, ed., *A history of UNESCO. Global actions and impacts* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); Aigul Kulnazarova and Christian Ydesen, eds. *UNESCO without borders. Educational campaigns for international understanding* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017); Aurélie Elisa Gfeller, 'Preserving Cultural Heritage across the Iron Curtain: The International Council on Monuments and Sites from Venice to Moscow, 1964–1978', in *Geteilt – Vereint! Denkmalpflege in Mitteleuropa zur Zeit des Eisernen Vorhangs und heute*, edited by Ursula Schädler-Saub and Angela Weyer (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2015), 115–121.

1980s, has received considerably less scholarly attention. The first important contributions were made by Nelly Bekus on the involvement of the USSR within ICOMOS and by I. V. Gaiduk, Louis H. Porter and S. F. Svilas, who focused on the involvement of the USSR and the Belarusian SSR within the UN, more generally, and specifically within UNESCO in the 1950s and 1960s.⁵⁰

The histories of international conservation tend to depart from European discourses and practices during the nineteenth century.⁵¹ In the context of national parks and the protection of nature, the United States featured prominently as well and, more recently, the history of African national parks has received increasing attention.⁵² Despite the globalising trend in historical accounts of conservation, such accounts continue to frequently exclude the region comprising the Russian Empire as well as the Soviet Union.⁵³ For example, in pub-

50 Nelly Bekus, 'Transnational circulation of cultural form: multiple agencies of heritage making', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (2019), Web; Louis H. Porter, 'Cold War Internationalisms: The USSR in UNESCO, 1945–1967', Dissertation (2018); S. F. Svilas, *Deiatel'nost' Belorusskoi SSR v IuNESKO (1954–1964 gg.)* (Minsk: BGU, 2013); Ilya V. Gaiduk, *Divided Together: The United States and the Soviet Union in the United Nations, 1945–1965* (Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2012); Ilya V. Gaiduk, 'L'Union soviétique et l'UNESCO pendant la guerre froide', in *60 ans d'histoire de l'UNESCO. Actes du colloque international, 16–18 novembre 2005*, edited by UNESCO (Paris: UNESCO, 2007), 281–285; I. V. Gaiduk, 'Sovetskii Soiuz i IuNESKO v gody "kholodnoi voyny". 1945–1967', *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia* 1 (2007), 20–34. More recently, Kulnazarova has provided more insights into the involvement of the USSR in UNESCO during the same period, with a particular focus on educational policies. Aigul Kulnazarova, 'Debating International Understanding in the Eastern World: UNESCO and the Soviet Union', in *UNESCO without borders. Educational campaigns for international understanding*, edited by Aigul Kulnazarova and Christian Ydesen (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), 256–274, here especially 264–265. Surguladze focuses on the present-day cooperation of the Russian Federation with UNESCO. V. Sh. Surguladze, 'Rossiia v programmakh IuNESKO: opyt i potentsial sotrudnichestva', *Problemy natsional'noi strategii* 5 (2015), 85–104.

51 Astrid Swenson, *The Rise of Heritage: Preserving the Past in France, Germany and England, 1789–1914*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

52 The United States have played a leading role in historical accounts on the development of international nature conservation policies. See, e.g., Holdgate; Anna-Katharina Wöbse, *Weltnaturschutz. Umweltdiplomatie in Völkerbund und Vereinten Nationen 1920–1950* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2012). Gissibl, Höhler and Kupper provide a contrasting historical account relating to African national parks among others. Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler and Patrick Kupper, eds., *Civilizing Nature. National Parks in Global Historical Perspective* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012).

53 A representative example is: Jukka Jokilehto, *A History of Architectural Conservation* (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999). Other publications on global and transcultural heritage have focused more on developments in the Global South. See Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, eds., *Heritage and Globalisation* (New York: Routledge, 2010); Michael Falser and Monica Juneja, eds., *Kulturerbe und Denkmalpflege transkulturell. Grenzgänge zwischen Theorie und Praxis* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2013). Among more general overviews, notable exceptions include Stubbs and Makaš, as well as Glendinning, both of which feature a chapter on conservation in Russia and Eastern Europe. John Stubbs and Emily Makaš, *Architectural*

lications dealing specifically with the emergence of the concept of world heritage and the history of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, there are only minor references, if any, to the Soviet Union.⁵⁴ This perspective is reinforced by some historical accounts that discuss Soviet involvement in international conservation, which is described as an initiative ‘that wasn’t there in the USSR’.⁵⁵ By contrast, in particular, the international relations of the People’s Republic of Poland have received considerable scholarly attention.⁵⁶ Beate Störckuhl and Per Brodersen present the international dimension of heritage conservation by means of examples of former German territories in Poland and in the Soviet Union.⁵⁷ This research has also entailed the notion of ‘common heritage’ in the

Conservation in Europe and the Americas. National Experiences and Practices (New Jersey: Wiley, 2011), 271–295; Miles Glendinning, *The Conservation Movement. A History of Architectural Preservation, Antiquity to Modernity* (London: Routledge, 2013), 359–389.

- 54 Swenson briefly alludes to the Russian Empire and its role in heritage conservation in her account of the earlier discourse of world heritage at the turn of the nineteenth century. Astrid Swenson, ‘The Law’s Delay? Preservation Legislation in France, Germany and England, 1870–1914’, in *Towards World Heritage. International Origins of the Preservation Movement 1870–1930*, edited by Melanie Hall (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 139–154, here 139. Accounts of the history of UNESCO World Heritage do not delve into the role of the Soviet Union apart from providing context relating to the Cold War conflict. Lynn Meskell, *A Future in Ruins. UNESCO, World Heritage, and the Dream of Peace* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018); Christina Cameron and Mechtild Rössler, *Many Voices, One Vision: The Early Years of the World Heritage Convention* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); Sarah M. Titchen, ‘On the construction of outstanding universal value. UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention (Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972) and the identification and assessment of cultural places for inclusion in the World Heritage List’, Dissertation (1995); Sophia Labadi, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value. Value-Based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention* (Plymouth: AltaMira Press, 2013).
- 55 Mărtiņš Mintāurs, ‘European Architectural Year 1975: A Year that wasn’t there in the USSR’, in *Eine Zukunft für unsere Vergangenheit. Zum 40. Jubiläum des Europäischen Denkmalschutzjahres*, edited by Michael Falser and Wilfried Lipp (Berlin: Hendrik Bäßler, 2015), 367–375.
- 56 This can probably be attributed to the fact that Polish experts were very active within the international community associated with ICOMOS and ICCROM. ICOMOS was founded in 1965 in Warsaw and its inaugural session was co-funded by the Polish Ministry of Culture. In addition, Andrzej Tomaszewski, a Polish art historian, was ICCROM’s Director-General between 1988 and 1992. For a discussion of the international relations of selected socialist countries, including the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Estonian SSR, see also Michael Falser and Wilfried Lipp, eds., *Eine Zukunft für unsere Vergangenheit. Zum 40. Jubiläum des Europäischen Denkmalschutzjahres (1975–2015)* (Berlin: Hendrik Bäßler, 2015); Riin Alatalu, ‘Estonia and International Heritage Protection’, in *Estonian Cultural Heritage – Preservation and Conservation Vol. 1 2005–2012*, edited by National Heritage Board of Estonia (Tallinn: National Heritage Board of Estonia, 2013), 156–158.
- 57 Per Brodersen, *Die Stadt im Westen. Wie Königsberg Kaliningrad wurde* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 144–168; Beate Störckuhl, ‘Sprechende Steine, belehrende Bilder – Kunstgeschichte, Kunstkritik und Denkmalpflege und die Konstruktion von Ge-

context of Polish-German cooperation in former German territories in Silesia.⁵⁸ In the case of Russia, the discussion on world heritage and international cooperation relating to the UNESCO World Heritage programme has so far been limited to analyses of the current post-Soviet situation.⁵⁹ Several studies have adopted a comparative perspective on both Russia and China.⁶⁰

The two research fields of international cooperation and international heritage conservation, described above, are integrated with a third body of research that discusses heritage practices and policies within Russia. Most of this literature is only available in the Russian language, though there are also some recent contributions in English, French and German. Several anthologies, special journal issues and dissertations have examined and attempted to present overviews on the topic of cultural heritage conservation in Russia.⁶¹ A. S. Shchenkov provides a comprehensive account of the history of restoration in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union.⁶² The history of heritage conservation has also been addressed in publications dealing with urban planning and historic cities as well as the emerging Russian nationalist discourse in the late Soviet

schichtsbildern', in *Deutsch-Polnische Erinnerungsorte*, edited by Hans-Henning Hahn and Robert Traba (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2013), 289–300.

58 Beate Störckuhl, 'Geschichte der Baudenkmalpflege: zwischen Wissenschaft und Ideologie', in *Architekturgeschichte und kulturelles Erbe. Aspekte der Baudenkmalpflege in Ostmitteleuropa*, edited by Beate Störckuhl (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2006), 9–56, here 45–46.

59 For a discussion of the role of ethnic nationalism and federalism in World Heritage in the Russian Federation, with a particular focus on the Republic of Tatarstan, see Gertjan Plets, 'Ethno-nationalism, asymmetric federalism and Soviet perceptions of the past: (World) heritage activism in the Russian Federation', *Journal of Social Archaeology* 15.1 (2014), 67–93. For a discussion of the role of UNESCO World Heritage in post-Soviet nation-building, see Gabriele Mentges, 'The Role of UNESCO and the Uzbek Nation Building Process', in *Heritage Regimes and the State*, edited by Regina F. Bendix, Aditya Eggert and Arnika Peselmann (Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2012), 213–226.

60 Joana Breidenbach and Pál Nyíri, 'Our Common Heritage. New Tourist Nations, Post-"Socialist" Pedagogy, and the Globalization of Nature', *Current Anthropology* 48.2 (2007), 322–330; Sanami Takahashi, Noriko Maejima, and Hiroshi Kobayashi, 'UNESCO World Heritage and the regional powers. Changing representations of religious cultural heritage', in *Eurasia's Regional Powers Compared – China, India, Russia*, edited by Shinichiro Tabata (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 222–239.

61 See, e.g., L.V. Karpova, N. A. Potanova and T. P. Sukhman, *Okhrana kul'turnogo nasledii Rossii XVII–XX vv.* (Moskva: Ves' Mir, 2000); Andreas Schönle, ed., *Heritage Matters: (De-)Mobilizing Monuments and (Mis-)Shaping Identities*. Spec. issue of *Slavic Review* 71.4 (2012); N. V. Mikhailova, 'Gosudarstvenno-pravovaia okhrana istoriko-kul'turnogo nasledii Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XX v'. Dissertation (2003).

62 A. S. Shchenkov, ed., *Pamiatniki arkhitektury v dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii. Ocherki istorii arkhitekturnoi restavratsii* (Moskva: Terra-Knizhnyi klub, 2002); *Pamiatniki arkhitektury v Sovetskom Soiuze. Ocherki istorii arkhitekturnoi restavratsii* (Moskva: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2004).

Union.⁶³ Other publications have sought to delineate the socialist conception of heritage, with a particular emphasis on the changed perception of time that followed the October Revolution.⁶⁴ Furthermore, historical accounts of nature conservation often paralleled those of cultural heritage, thus providing further insights.⁶⁵ Additional studies on specific issues in the history of Russian heritage practices and policies during the Soviet period that have been published in English, German and French can be loosely categorised within three groups. The first group examines the foundation of the Soviet state and the establishment of new institutions dealing with heritage conservation. The second group focuses on increased public interest in cultural heritage in the 1960s, and the third group addresses the political transition after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Within the first group, Ekaterina Pravilova provides a detailed account that traces the discourse on common property to its emergence in the Russian Empire, thus laying the foundation for the formation of national property that was later adapted by the Soviet Union.⁶⁶ Richard Stites discusses the tension between iconoclasm and anti-iconoclasm in the course of the Russian Revolution, and Odom and Salmond as well as Semyonova and Iljine provide an account of international art sales following the revolution.⁶⁷ Susan Smith's account of the foundation of the museum in Vladimir after the Civil War complements

63 For urban planning, see Thomas Bohn, *Minsk – Musterstadt des Sozialismus. Stadtplanung und Urbanisierung in der Sowjetunion nach 1945* (Köln: Böhlau, 2008); V. R. Krogius, *Istoricheskie goroda Rossii kak fenomen ee kul'turnogo nasledii* (Moskva: Progress-Traditsiia, 2009). For Russian nationalism, see Yitzhak M. Brudny, *Reinventing Russia. Russian Nationalism and the Soviet State, 1953–1991*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); Nikolai Mitrokhin, *Russkaia partiia. Dvizhenie russkikh natsionalistov v SSSR 1953–1985* (Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2003).

64 Pablo Alonso González, 'Communism and cultural heritage: the quest for continuity', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 22.9 (2016), 653–663; Julie Deschepper, 'Between future and eternity: a Soviet conception of heritage', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 25.5 (2018), 491–506.

65 Douglas R. Weiner, *A Little Corner of Freedom. Russian Nature Protection from Stalin to Gorbachëv* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Laura A. Henry, *Red to Green. Environmental Activism in Post-Soviet Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010); F. R. Shtil'mark, *Istoriografiia Rossiiskikh zapovednikov (1895–1995)* (Moskva: Logata, 1996); Laurent Coumel, 'A Failed Environmental Turn? Khrushchev's Thaw and Nature Protection in Soviet Russia', *The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review* 40 (2013), 167–189.

66 Ekaterina Pravilova, *A Public Empire. Property and the Quest for the Common Good in Imperial Russia* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014).

67 Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams. Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Anne Odom and Wendy R. Salmond, eds., *Treasures into Tractors. The Selling of Russia's Cultural Heritage, 1918–1938* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009); Natalya Semyonova and Nicolas Iljine, eds., *Selling Russia's Treasures. The Soviet Trade in Nationalized Art, 1917–1938* (New York: Abeville Press Publishers, 2013).

this picture by showing how the early Soviet government had already appropriated the pre-revolutionary past in the 1920s.⁶⁸

Because of significant differences between the early Soviet Union and the post-Stalinist Soviet Union, the findings of the second group of studies dealing with heritage in the 1960s provide further detailed insights into the subject matter of this study. These articles highlight processes whereby the revival within the academy of *kraevedenie* (local studies) as well as the development of tourism contributed to a reappraisal of cultural heritage within Soviet public discourse.⁶⁹ Research on the participation of the Soviet public in conservation and heritage activism is ongoing.⁷⁰ Of particular interest to researchers studying this period in Russian history has been the question of how sacral architecture such as buildings of the Russian Orthodox Church were integrated into the canon of national heritage, thus becoming subject to conservation measures through secular museum displays in a state that persistently persecuted religious organisations.⁷¹ Some studies have explored this question with respect to the entire Soviet period, with the revival of religion in post-Soviet Russia being a particular focus of attention.⁷² The interest in revival connects with the last and

68 Susan Smith, 'The Accidental Museum: Expropriating and Appropriating the Past', *Russian Review* 67.3 (2008), 438–453.

69 Victoria Donovan, "How Well Do You Know Your *Krai*?" The Kraevedenie Revival and Patriotic Politics in Late Khrushchev-Era Russia', *Slavic Review* 74.3 (2015), 464–483; 'The "Old New Russian town": Modernization and Architectural Preservation in Russia's Historic North West, 1961–1982', *Slavonica* 19.1 (2013), 18–35; Katharina Haverkamp, 'Heute auf den Solovki – morgen in Russland. Die Spurensuche des Fotografen und Regionalhistorikers Jurij Arkad'evič Brodskij', in *Sowjetische Verbrechen und russische Erinnerung. Orte – Akteure – Deutungen*, edited by Jörg Ganzenmüller and Raphael Utz (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2014), 161–176. Anne Kropotkine, 'Les ambiguïtés du Dégel. Que faire du patrimoine culturel?', *Cahiers du monde russe* 47.1 (2006), 269–301.

70 Katharina Schwinde's dissertation titled 'Der sowjetische Denkmalschutz am Beispiel der Solovecker Inseln 1958–1982' explores the involvement of Soviet society in the conservation of the Solovetskie Islands. See also Olga Sezneva and Eszter Gantner, 'Heritage Activism in Cities of Eastern Europe and Russia from 1968 to the Current', in *Herder Institute for Historical Research on East Central Europe* (2018), Web.

71 Catriona Kelly, 'From "counter-revolutionary monuments" to "national heritage". The Preservation of Leningrad Churches, 1964–1982', *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 54.1 (2013), 131–164; Sanami Takahashi, 'Church or Museum? The Role of State Museums in Conserving Church Buildings, 1965–1985', *Journal of Church and State* 51.3 (2009), 502–517.

72 Catriona Kelly, *Socialist Churches: Radical Secularization and the Preservation of the Past in Petrograd and Leningrad, 1918–1988* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2016); Stephen A. Smith, 'Contentious Heritage: The Preservation of Churches and Temples in Communist and Post-Communist Russia and China', *Past & Present* 10 (2015), 178–212. The re-evaluation and reconstruction of the Cathedral Christ the Saviour in Moscow during the post-Soviet period is of particular interest. See Konstantin Akinsha, Grigorij Kozlov and Sylvia Hochfield, *The holy place. Architecture, ideology, and history in Russia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Ekaterina V. Haskins, 'Russia's Postcommunist Past. The Ca-

third group of studies that deals with heritage in post-socialist states located in Eastern and Central Europe.⁷³ This group of studies conceptualises socialist heritage as contested heritage, thereby exhibiting strong links to studies on post-socialist memory.⁷⁴

In sum, with reference to the three bodies of research outlined above, this study seeks to situate Russian world heritage in the following contexts: international cultural cooperation during the Cold War, the initiatives of international organisations and the development of the system of heritage conservation in the late Soviet Union and early Russian Federation. Heritage conservation in Russia is considered as an area of cultural policy and development that has so far been explored only marginally by studies dealing with culture more broadly.⁷⁵ By bridging the research fields of Soviet and Russian history and international history, a historical account of world heritage in Russia provides new insights for both fields. On the one hand, it offers an account of the internationalisation of Soviet activities that complements their domestic histories. On the other hand, it

thedral of Christ the Savior and the Reimagining of National Identity', *History & Memory. Studies in the Representation of the Past* 21.1 (2009), 25–62.

73 See, e.g., Taline Ter Minassian, ed., *Patrimoine et architecture dans les États post-soviétiques* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2013); Marina Dmitrieva and Alfrun Kliems, eds., *The Post-Socialist City. Continuity and Change in Urban Space and Imagery* (Berlin: Jovis, 2009).

74 Georges Mink and Laure Neumayer, eds., *History, memory and politics in Central and Eastern Europe. Memory games* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Matthew Rampley, ed., *Heritage, Ideology, and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe. Contested Pasts, Contested Presents* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012); Arnold Bartetzky, Christian Dietz and Jörg Hapsel, eds., *Von der Ablehnung zur Aneignung? Das architektonische Erbe des Sozialismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa* (Köln: Böhlau, 2014).

75 Though several studies aim to provide an overview of late Soviet cultural policy, their focus is limited to the sphere of high culture. See, e.g., Karen Laß, *Vom Tauwetter zur Perestrojka: Kulturpolitik in der Sowjetunion (1953–1991)* (Köln: Böhlau, 2002); Dirk Kretzschmar, *Die sowjetische Kulturpolitik 1970–1985. Von der verwalteten zur selbstverwalteten Kultur. Analyse und Dokumentation* (Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer, 1993). Contrasting with these studies, a contemporary overview of Soviet cultural policy by Anweiler and Ruffmann included educational and research policy, foreign policy and policy towards national minorities. Oskar Anweiler and Karl-Heinz Ruffmann, eds., *Kulturpolitik der Sowjetunion* (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1973). Further studies show how Soviet policymakers were inspired by cybernetic theories and provide accounts of post-Soviet cultural policy, focusing in particular on the promotion of the arts. Egle Rindzeviciute, *Constructing Soviet cultural policy: Cybernetics and governance in Lithuania after World War II* (Linköping: Linköping University Press, 2008); Guido Houben, 'Kulturpolitik und Ethnizität in Russland. Föderale Kunstförderung im Vielvölkerstaat in der Ära Jelzin', Dissertation (2002); Maria Davydych, *Transformation der Kulturpolitik. Kulturpolitische Veränderungen nach dem Zusammenbruch des sozialistischen Systems in Mittel- und Osteuropa* (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2012). For a discussion on cultural heritage as part of cultural policy in post-Soviet Russia, see E. N. Selezneva, *Kul'turnoe nasledie i kul'turnaia politika Rossii 1990-x gg. (Teoretiko-metodologicheskie problemy)* (Moskva: Rossiiskii Institut Kul'turologii, 2003).

focuses on actors who have so far been largely ignored within accounts of international history.

1.3 Analysing Transformation

Given their membership comprising both socialist and capitalist states, international organisations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS had to constantly mediate between different and, at times, conflicting political interests. International exchanges were regulated and international cultural policies were formulated in alignment with the interests of member states that maintained distinct sets of international relations within and beyond the two ideologically divided blocs. Miles Glendinning distinguishes a Western, a socialist and an internationalist narrative within the heritage discourse of the post-war period that mediated between these blocs. He argues that in spite of these divisions, the core values were shared, especially the fundamental notion of progress, thus facilitating an ever expanding engagement of both sides in international cooperation.⁷⁶ The processes described in this study entailed these common efforts undertaken during the second half of the twentieth century. Just three years after joining UNESCO in 1954, the Soviet Union ratified the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and actively participated in consecutive international programmes dealing with heritage conservation. Despite the fact that the Soviet Union did not ratify the World Heritage Convention until 1988, the discursive formation of world heritage manifested itself within several Soviet initiatives commencing from the 1960s. Most notably, the first all-union law on the protection of cultural heritage enacted in 1976 not only elaborated on the Marxist-Leninist understanding of historical monuments and sites; it also emphasised that they ‘constitute an integral part of the world cultural heritage [*mirovogo kul'turnogo nasledii*], they bear witness to the huge contribution of our country to the development of world civilisation’.⁷⁷

This study traces the trajectory of the discourse of world heritage in Russia covering the period of its inception in the 1960s, its re-interpretation as UNESCO World Heritage in the late 1980s and its re-integration within a new international setting following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in the 1990s. Thus, the periodisation of this study deliberately extends beyond the traditional caesura

⁷⁶ Glendinning 259.

⁷⁷ ‘Sostavliaiut neot’emlemuiu chast’ mirovogo kul'turnogo nasledii, svidetel'stvuiut ob ogromnom vklade narodov nashei strany v razvitie mirovoi tsivilizatsii’. USSR, ‘Law of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. On the Protection and Use of Historic and Cultural Monuments’, in *Vth General Assembly of ICOMOS. Moscow/Suzdal, 21/27 May 1978*, edited by Soviet Committee of ICOMOS (Moskva: Sovetskii khudozhnik, 1978), Preamble.

that occurred in 1991 with the Soviet Union's disintegration and legal succession by the Russian Federation. It adopts this timeline in view of the fact that the demise of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the Russian Federation did not entail a rapid shift in the discourse on Russian cultural heritage, or, more specifically, world heritage. The relevant shifts in this discourse occurred at a different time and developed gradually, beginning in 1965 and gaining impetus in 2000, thus concluding the phase marked by earlier developments. The late 1970s, which was the period when Soviet involvement in this international field peaked, were pivotal and, most importantly, the spotlight falls on the year 1988, considered as a major turning point, when the World Decade for Cultural Development (WDCD) was launched, prompting the Soviet Union to ratify the UNESCO World Heritage Convention.

As the starting point of this study, the year 1965 marks the onset of intensified international cooperation and domestic action in the field of heritage conservation as a result of the establishment of two organisations: the All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments (VOOPIiK) and ICOMOS. The mid-1960s were generally characterised by increasing public interest in cultural heritage, with the introduction of mass tourism and the establishment of museum-institutions providing a framework for the subsequent nomination and inscription of UNESCO World Heritage sites. As the end point of this historical account, the year 2000 represents an impending shift in the progression, thus far, of the world heritage discourse. Specifically, during this year, the Kazan' Kremlin was inscribed as the first cultural heritage site in Russia that comprised of an Islamic architectural complex in the UNESCO World Heritage List. In 2002, shortly after this inscription, new Russian heritage policies entailed in the first post-Soviet federal law titled 'On Objects of Cultural Heritage (Monuments of History and Culture) of the Peoples of the Russian Federation' were adopted, replacing earlier Soviet laws enacted in 1976 and 1978. These more recent developments are briefly addressed but not integrated within the analysis presented in this study.

There are three reasons for considering the year 2000 as a turning point that signalled new trends in the World Heritage programme in the Russian Federation. First, the inscription of Kazan' Kremlin as an initiative of the Tatarstani authorities was a reflection of efforts directed at regional development and decentralisation in the 1990s and of the intention to broaden them after 2000. Second, the focus in the World Heritage programme was now geared towards developing international cooperation in new regional contexts. In 2002, the UNESCO Moscow Office that had been established to promote cooperation with the Russian Federation in 1994 was expanded to incorporate a cluster of five member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). This expansion paved the way for intensifying international relations with the post-

Soviet region, culminating in the establishment of the International Foundation for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation (IFESCO) in 2006. Third, by this time, the Russian Orthodox Church had been recognised as the sole proprietor of some of the UNESCO World Heritage sites and sought UNESCO's support in the early 2000s in order to play an integral role in the management of these sites. Although these three issues had loomed on the horizon prior to 2000, they only gained momentum after 2000, thus shifting the world heritage discourse in the Russian Federation beyond the scope of this study.

Russia's positioning as the focus of this study stands in contrast to the existing historiography of heritage conservation during the second half of the twentieth century that continues to largely focus on Western European and North American states in the development of international cooperation or on post-colonial critiques that have amplified since the 1980s. Based on its own request, the Soviet Union was included in both of the designated UNESCO regions of Europe and Asia and Oceania in 1974.⁷⁸ Thus, the state consciously and actively positioned itself between East and West, which complicated efforts to overcome Eurocentrism and consequently the Soviet Union's stand related to the reforms of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. Though the Soviet heritage discourse had been clearly influenced by the European heritage discourse of the nineteenth century, the Soviet discourse subverted the Western understanding in the process of appropriating it.⁷⁹ By centring on the Marxist-Leninist understanding of culture, it fostered an interpretation of heritage that was geared towards the building of communism. As highlighted in the second chapter, differences in the heritage discourse also entailed a divergent approach to world heritage. During the second half of the twentieth century, the differing ideological bases and political concerns of socialist countries manifested in the emphasis on national cultures and the pronounced interest in issues of cultural development in relation to the notion of world heritage. In the global arena, the Soviet authorities perceived their struggle against imperialism, represented by the capitalist West, as a struggle that they shared in common with former European colonies.

The analysis presented in this study pays particular attention to the transformation of this Soviet world heritage discourse during the late 1980s and early 1990s when a selection of museum-institutions established by the Soviet authorities in the 1960s were nominated and consecutively listed as UNESCO

78 USSR Permanent Delegation to UNESCO, Press-release 'UNESCO aujourd'hui'. Published in *Pravda* 10 Dec 1974. X07.21(470) (Part 3), *Relations with U.S.S.R. – Part. Progr. from 1/1/74*, UNESCO Archives.

79 For a more general discussion of this process of subversion in relation to Russian culture, see Boris Groys, 'Russland auf der Suche nach seiner Identität', in *Die Erfindung Russlands*, edited by Boris Groys (München: Carl Hanser, 1995), 19–36.