

"Human Component" in Urban and Architectural Heritage Management: Russian Context

by Daria A. Belova & Ludmila V. Gaikova
Siberian Federal University

Keywords: heritage management, democratization, Siberian heritage, human component, social science.

Abstract: The overall history of approaches to urban architectural heritage and the understanding of the notion fluctuates significantly in terms of attached meanings, justification and reasoning. Apparently, each of the approaches reflects the value system along with the socio-cultural situation of its period (Choay & O'connell, 2001). The history of attitudes in Russia illustrates this statement brightly (Deschepper, 2018; Ahmad, 2015). Currently, the human-values-oriented discourse dominates many scopes of academic and professional debates, and debates around "heritage management" are not an exclusion (Watson & Waterton, 2010). Stating heritage as a process, D. Harvey, among many other researchers, shifts the focus from the problem-solving paradigm to the identity-building potential of heritage (Harvey, 2010). Supposedly, the definition of such a controversial issue as the identity of the city through social narratives and connotations makes the notion more measurable and adds the degree of predictability to any operation within it. Following this logic, historical layers, embodied in the urban and architectural heritage of modern cities, include the particular "human component", both consciously and unintentionally, through the history of decision-making within heritage management. In this case, the certain "democratisation" of the decision-making process may ultimately lead to the positive feeling of attachment of people and their environments. The article examines the development and the state of the notion of "human component" in heritage management, focusing on Russian context, questioning the potential applicability of more "democratic" approach to heritage management, in particular case of Siberia, Krasnoyarsk.

1. Introduction

Over the past century, Russia has experienced two major political turning points, which among other factors led to the crisis of cultural identity, including the denial of past values and the rethinking of basic cultural norms and concepts. The architectural environment mirrored this process: for instance, cities in the Siberian region along the Yenisei river (Yenisey Siberia, see Figure 1) seem to have developed erratically, systematically destroying the historical heritage. Citizens do not feel an attachment to their environments (questionnaire, 2017). The recent

precedent of almost “silent” demolition of the significant historical quarter in the Krasnoyarsk centre seems the evidence of the loss of link between the social and physical context.

Generally, heritage as the theme in its new understanding a “collaborative, dialogical and interactive, a material-discursive process” in terms of “connectivity ontology” and “assembling” (Assembling Alternative Futures for Heritage) (Harrison, 2015) role is quite “young” and needs careful consideration, regional and national adaptations. Harvey claimed, “we should explore the history of heritage, not starting at an arbitrary date like 1882, but by producing a context-rich account of heritage as a process or a human condition rather than as a single movement or personal project” (Harvey, 2010). He proposes to investigate the “heritageisation” as a process into a broader time perspective, propagating the more in-depth consideration of socially, technologically and historically framed and influenced notion of heritage, and sees in this discourse a potential to understand and define the production of identity, power distribution, agency and authority in the field. Moreover, the term “discourse” for Foucault is “a set of practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak”, which emphasizes its importance (Foucault, 1972). The concept of process in relation to heritage could be found in the works of many authors (Caniggia & Maffei, 2001).

Thus, the chronological study of the history of thoughts, contexts and consequences may widely inform the understanding of relationships into the phenomenon and may ultimately lead to sustainable heritage process: “present tendency for nostalgia and finding solace in heritage is just the latest phase of a much longer trajectory” (Harvey, 2010). Starting from the nineteenth century, the amount of researchers, involved in Heritage Discourse has been expo-



Figure 1.

nentially growing, especially over the last years. However, in the international heritage discourse such remote and specific theme as the heritage of Eastern Siberia with Krasnoyarsk as a centre seems to have a limited presence, if not absent. Therefore, it seems particularly relevant to frame the heritage of Eastern Siberia and suggest the possible methods of its development.

Thus, the first aim of the article is the brief detection of preconditions and contexts for the development of human-values-oriented approach to heritage through the correlational analysis. The second aim is a suggestion of the possible methodology for the further search for possible sustainable heritage process in Siberia, relying on this detection. The third aim is the intensification of Siberian heritage discourse in the international science.

2. Methodology

At first, the brief correlational "timeline" of development of heritage discourse could be constructed, using the chronological dive into the correlational development of the field of heritage with the focus on the international and local levels along with the development of scientific thought. The location of the theme of the Yenisei Siberian heritage on the general genealogical timeline of heritage research would help to define how Siberia have been reacted to world trends, find ongoing tendencies, and define to what extent the tendencies could be applied locally. The methodological strategy of correlational research is employed (Groat & Wang, 2013).

Attempts to determine the "earliest" period of heritage concept researchers deemed "a daunting task" (Waterton & Watson, 2015). The emergence of science also has not been described systematically (Stepin, Gorochov & Rozov, 1999). Arguably, it is also challenging to identify the solid concept of heritage for a certain period, even in European culture. (Jokilehto, 2002) However, it seems possible to extract the brief common tendencies on the general level, which may help to construct the overall specificity of development, relying on the well-documented facts and literature. The critical literature review is divided into the widely recognised time segments, following the dominating models of thinking of each period. For each time segment, the correlation of trends in three fields are provided: the development of science, the development of heritage concept in the European (later – international) area, and the development of heritage concept in Russia and Eastern Siberia.

3. Analysis

3.1. *Ancient period*

It seems logical to limit this research: the social heritage connotations earlier than the Ancient period are rarely mentioned in literature. In antiquity, knowledge became systematic, theoretical and rational, had a significant humanitarian component both in form and in content. Humanities in the ancient period were developed on the base of philosophy (Solomatin, 2002). The early inherited amateur interest in heritage manifested itself in collecting the artefacts of past societies (Waterton & Watson, 2015). Heritage served the purpose of material evidence or sacred memorial. It is widely known that the Greeks, for example, occupied by the Romans, built their national consciousness on the glorified past, referring to the period before occupation. However, people widely used the stones from ancient ruins for new construction, doubtfully appealing to other than material reasons or attaching specific cultural values to the materials,

borrowed from the ruin; “the aim in this ‘restoration’ seems to have been mainly aesthetic” (Jukka Jokilehto, 1986). The territory of contemporary Russia was settled by the ancient tribes. Indeed, they left certain artefacts, but it is hard if not impossible, to find their particular attitudes to heritage and attached values in literature.

3.2. *Medieval period*

The development of religions is deemed a natural reaction to the decline of the Ancient world. For many centuries Church had a monopoly on culture and knowledge. Western Europe had risen to a relatively high intellectual level, during the period from the collapse of the Western Roman Empire to the beginning of the Renaissance (Solomatin, 2002). Harvey states: “Certainly the early Church always appeared very concerned with maintaining a symbolic link through the re-interpretation of pre-Christian sites [...] This idea of continuity, and control over a specifically presented heritage, is echoed in St Gregory the Great’s instruction which called for Christian missionaries to “cleanse heathen shrines and use them as churches” (Harvey, 2010). However, some British medieval churches were built with reference to former structure or footprint of the place. Such researchers as Lowenthal support the opinion that the importance of sight itself caused the reuse of materials or building on the particular place (Lowenthal, 1998). Generally, basic heritage ideas and the particular local cause-effect relationships between heritage and society continued to appear. Medieval Europe was inhomogeneous: the end of the Middle Ages is associated with different periods in different locations. The emergence of the Russian State is linked with the IX century, and the Medieval period here lasted up to the XVII century. It was no known traces of conscious heritage values in Russia of that time. The Medieval territory of Siberia was still inhabited primarily by nomadic tribes.

3.3. *Renaissance*

In the Renaissance, a new method of thinking, free, liberated from dogmas and scholasticism, was born, creating the prerequisites for the advancement of science to the forefront in spiritual culture, and the emergence of many scientific areas in the humanitarian sphere. The spirit of art left an imprint on the nature of scientific research: a broad intellectual and cultural movement of humanism along with “Classical natural science” were formed. This was linked with the creation of the system of ideals and norms of research (Stepin, Gorochoy, & Rozov, 1999). In the early period stones of the Coliseum were still taken for new construction. Regarding the heritage concept, the remarkable date for the creation of the bill on the protection of the Roman ruins is 1462. At first, ruins became the physical evidence for the research in the architecture of the past. However, the possibility to restore or rebuild monuments illustrated the absence of priority of authentic value or shared concept of heritage. Heritage became romanticised: aristocrats built artificial ruins in the gardens, painters used motifs of ruins (Bush, 2017; Jokilehto, 2002). Renaissance, inspired by the ancient monuments and ideas of antiquity, brought the increasing interest to ancient heritage. Thus, the ideas of heritage started to penetrate deeply into the minds of Europe, linking heritage with national identities. Russia of that time still experienced the Medieval period. In Siberia, the first Russian stockade-towns (so-called “ostrog”) were created. It is still too early to introduce heritage concept of Russia and Siberia.

3.4. Enlightenment

The idea of objectivity of scientific knowledge became the basic idea of classic natural science. The mind deemed sovereign and distanced from objective things. The procedures were universal and unchangeable. The idea to build an absolutely accurate and objective picture of nature, along with the search for evident, visual, experience-based ontological principles, dominated. A mechanical picture of nature was developed as a worldview, and as a General scientific picture of the world. (Stepin, Gorochoy, & Rozov, 1999). Logically, the authentic value of “truth” in architectural heritage, as physical evidence witnessing the original history, became the natural part of its worldview. “Growing access to ancient monuments in the eighteenth century, especially through the Grand Tour, popularised the practice of collecting antiquities but also led to a greater understanding of medieval monuments in Britain, and subsequently their protection” (Orbaşlı, 2017). Heritage awareness also aroused in Russia: Peter I was interested in the preservation and collection of “curious things”. The common term for monuments did not exist in Russia (“curious things”, “ancient rarities”, “monuments of antiquity” etc). “Antiquity” was associated with the old “movable” valuables, older than 100 years (Burdin, 2013). The Northern war and following exaltation of the Russian State led to the prioritised attitude to the reconstruction of the past: the formation of Russian history as science began. The object of antiquity became a source of historical information. Decree of Peter I led to the emergence of archaeology. However, during the implementation of regular city planning, the choice between the old and the new buildings were made in favour of the new ones. Significant expansion of Russian borders and the development of new territories led to the emergence of scientific interest to monuments in the periphery. Siberia was the region where forts and mounds, “curious things”, rarities and historical documents became extensively studied (Poliakova, 2005). Thus, Russia started to join European interest in heritage, with a noticeable delay. The first cities grew in Siberia. However, fires here frequently destroyed cities almost entirely, as buildings were primarily wooden, stone-made architecture appeared rarely.

3.5. XIX century

The science became disciplinary-organised. Specific disciplinary worldviews were formed (Stepin, Gorochoy, & Rozov, 1999). The epoch of contrasting Positivism and subjective perspective of Idealism: “positivism was characterised by what many would describe as a ‘naive’ belief in a reality ‘out there’ that can be fully known” (Groat & Wang, 2013). Romantic Classicism, National Romanticism and the love to antiquity characterised architecture and literature (Glendinning, 2013; Jokilehto, 2002). Ruins were excessively studied, depicted, described by travellers, philosophically reconsidered, etc. Euphoria, caused by their philosophical, meditative state, intensified the use of ruins in parks (Bush, 2017). “Scientific approach”, dominating the worldview, continued to influence heritage, advocating “material honesty”, authenticity in conservation. “John Ruskin’s romantic views of ruins and the patina of age were combined with recommendations for minimal intervention and the notion of trusteeship – that heritage is passed down through generations” (Orbaşlı, 2017). This core principle for SPAB: “it is better to repair than to restore, better to restore than to rebuild, better to rebuild than to embellish; in no case must anything be added and, above all, nothing should be removed” (Jokilehto). The basic approach, “philosophy of minimal intervention and ‘honest repairs’ that were clearly legible and discernible from the original historic fabric”, has been dominated in the conservation

since then (Orbaşlı, 2017). Generally, the heritage concept became an ode to the beauty of “pure science”, search for honesty, purity and authenticity, supported by scientific knowledge.

In Russia, the first official decision of heritage protection appeared in 1826, during the period of Tsar Nicholas I, in some projects of laws, and associations (Kropotkine). Until the first quarter of the century, the government played a leading role in the preservation of monuments. With the emergence of civil society and the growth of national consciousness, the initiative to protect heritage passed to the scientific community. In the history of the heritage, the 19th century occupies a special place: the process of purposeful study and preservation of heritage began. The interest in the ancient heritage and Slavic monuments largely influenced the national culture. However, many unique monuments become the victims of amateur restoration; most scientists have not yet fully realised the value of authenticity. The initial appearance of the monument was deemed “truth”. Thus, “purifying” often led to freeing from later historical layers, the lost fabric was often rebuilt. The connection of object with history or a particular era was the most critical criterion for valuation, the place and condition were important. Attention to old architecture was associated with the search for a national style (Poliakova, 2005). Siberia was a growing region with an increasing amount of stone-made buildings. In 1845 the Governor, who obliged to collect information about ancient buildings in one of the first Russian cities of Siberia, Yeniseisk, was selected in Siberia. Yeniseisk was rich in buildings of the XVIII century, which at that time were not considered monuments: only buildings erected before 1725 were listed (Tsarev, 2014). Description and listing became the immature primary tools for young heritage protection in Siberia.

3.6. The end of the XIX century- the beginning of the XX century

“Non-classic science” was formed. In contrast “the only one true” approach of first positivism, several descriptions of the same reality became allowed since each of them might contain elements of objectively “true” knowledge. Correlations between ontological postulates of science and characteristics of the method were comprehended. The new system of cognitive ideals and norms provided a significant expansion of the potential field of studied objects, starting the development of complex dynamic self-regulating systems, the idea of historical variability of scientific knowledge along with the relativity of truth in ontological principles dominated. The mind was no longer seen as distanced from the studied phenomenon, but being within and determined by it (Stepin, Gorochov, & Rozov, 1999). The Ancient Monuments Act of 1882 became the first substantial document, which marked the new level of importance of heritage preservation (Chippindale, 1983). This process has become conscious, relied on historical knowledge and numerous archaeological discoveries (Jukka Jokilehto, 1986). Active interest in the study and preservation of national cultural heritage was detected: “writing, rewriting and implementation of a suite of national and international heritage policies” (Waterton & Watson, 2015). The selection was most likely “to favour the spectacular over the mundane, the large over the small, the beautiful over the ugly and the unusual over the commonplace” (Ashworth, 1997, p. 97). The possibility of plurality in approaches started to affect also the field of heritage. Authenticity became not the only truth, taking into account multiple cultural layers of monuments and their correspondence to different political and cultural states of society.

In 1909, a “Society for the Protection and Preservation of Monuments of art in Russia” was founded (Koshman, 2011). The policy of preservation was defined by scientists, museum and cultural workers. At the turn of the century, the question of heritage protection received a public response, as evidenced by many publications. Heritage process was driven by societies:

any person could come to the meetings. Scientific activities in art, archaeology and history of architecture resulted in methods of protection. Aesthetic and historical values started to dominate the heritage process. Two complementary approaches, archaeological and artistic, were formed without confrontation. The attention was paid to the later historical layers (Poliakova, 2005). 1917 – 1927 was the time of formation of new directions and methods of heritage protection, changes in the perception of space and time: “the October Revolution was also a heritage revolution” (Deschepper, 2018). The heritage decrees of 1918-1920-is contradicted to the position of the Proletkult, which demanded the elimination of pre-revolutionary monuments as ideologically harmful (Burdin, 2013) “Conception of heritage clearly shifted from a vision of a heritage constituted from the past to a conception focused on newly built monuments and undeniably oriented towards the future” (Deschepper, 2018). Generally, the heritage policy was contradictory: “preservation and destruction took place concomitantly” (Deschepper, 2018). Heritage became the active conscious tool for political propaganda to control meanings and beliefs. The Soviet period was a brilliant example of the politicisation of the heritage concept. Radical heritageisation or deheritageisation of objects were linked with the ideological and political changes, switching the orientation of heritage concept from authentic value to historical: firstly “futurism”, later “eternalism”: “The government aimed to immediately create not only its own heritage but new cityscapes that were intended to last for eternity” (Deschepper, 2018).

Siberian authorities did not fully realise the importance of heritage: in 1901, the Minister’s of Internal Affairs commanded to provide information about the monuments of antiquity from provinces, which resulted in completely inaccurate data. The attention of researchers of antiquity turned to the Eastern outskirts of Russia: they published scientific works on the monuments of the Siberian architecture, which marked the beginning of Siberian heritage. Members of the provincial branches of the Russian geographical society were active participants in the study of heritage; they did not stop their scientific research even during the civil war and during the post-war restoration of the economy of the Siberian provinces. The particular attention was paid to wooden heritage. Denike advocated the creation of the Siberian Institute of Art and the “catalogue” of all objects (Tsarev, 2014). The ideology of “alienation of the old world” influenced Siberia: the old buildings were opposed to the new ones, for which they became “annoying common background”. Designers of the new generation in their creative effort to “create the picture of the future of the socialist city” entirely rejected the former artistic elements, recognising them as “typical low-quality background”. In many projects of the 1930s, the town-planning activity was associated with the gap in the continuity of the formation of cities, which slowed down the heritage activities for several decades, leading to significant losses of the national historical and cultural heritage of Siberia (Tsarev, 2014).

3.7. The middle of the XX century

World War II, with its massive destruction of heritage, significantly influenced mindsets worldwide. For many researchers it was the time when the “conventional” concept of heritage was formed: “a time in which public memory was transformed and institutionalised” (Harvey, 2010; Jokilehto, 2002). The modernist “conviction that the untried is markedly superior to the familiar” (Peter Gay) with the affection to new technologies, contained the belief in material “honesty”, echoed in conservation. The modernist hegemonic position of the architect was changed by the participatory, more emphatic approach with the attention to “ordinary” people. The Soviet concept of heritageisation changed significantly, shifting the focus from monuments of revolution to monuments of the past (Brandenberger, 2002). 1938-mid-1950s was the time for Creation

of Central and local authorities for the protection of monuments of architecture (Burdin, 2013). The hegemony was also partly shifted towards a more nuanced attitude to heritage. In 1947 the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR adopted the resolution “On the protection of monuments of architecture”: “Consider historical and artistic heritage of national culture and the property of the Republic, the subject of state protection, works of ancient architecture” (Burdin, 2013). As Soviet Russia became overcentralized, the Siberian trends echoed the all-Russian ones, with some delay (Slabuha, 2014).

3.8. *The last third of the XX century*

The post-non-classic science with the radical changes in the scientific basis was born, postpositivism started to dominate the scientific world. Interdisciplinary and problem-oriented forms of research were exponentially growing. The specificity of modern science became determined by comprehensive research programs (Lakatos), in which various specialists participated, increasing interactions between parts of the open, self-developing systems and worldviews. Ideas, transmitted from other sciences, provoked changes in worldviews, the rigid lines between the worldviews were erased. Worldviews became interdependent fragments of the General scientific picture of the world. The variability in the behaviour of complex systems resulted in scenarios of possible development at the points of bifurcation (Stepin, Gorochoy, & Rozov, 1999). Globalisation and market economy reinforced the necessity to clarify the differences between localities in order to provide survivability. In heritage “Emphasis has undoubtedly changed from a concern with objects themselves – their classification, conservation and interpretation – to the ways in which they are consumed and expressed as notions of culture, identity and politics” (Smith & Waterton, 2013). “The language of the 1964 Venice Charter, by comparison, is more cautious but also introduces the idea of the conservation professional making balanced judgments” (Orbaşli, 2017). An exponentially growing amount of heritage and intensive funding illustrated the growing interest: “1960s, 1970s and 1980s as timeframes that seemed to trigger a proliferating interest in the past – academically, politically and publicly” (Waterton & Watson, 2015). Postmodernism provoked the pluralism in approaches, “celebration of the regional, local and particular”, the coexistence of multiple narratives of the place (Jencks, 1992). “Judgments about values attributed to heritage as well as the credibility of related information structures may differ from culture to culture” (Nara, 2016). Controversies within the field uncovered the oversimplified approaches to the complex phenomenon (Harvey, 2010). Harvey suggests: “development of the heritage process from the medieval world to the (post)modern, can be characterized in part by an increasing symbolic value”. Heritage studies became a complex, interdisciplinary field.

In USSR, “heritage years” brought new conceptualisation, legislation and movements. Conservation finally became institutionalised, formalised and politicised. USSR was gradually opening to worldwide after the long period of isolation. Influenced by international charters, it intensified the protection and rethinking the heritage concept. In 1987, the Avant-garde buildings were “heritagised”. The first official social union for heritage, VOOPIK, being created in 1965, provoked an increasing interest in society. The first search in attracting citizens to urban reconstruction unfolded in the USSR in the 80s. Over the next decade, Russian architects and sociologists created urban environmental research (Gutnov and Lezhava, Kaganov, Schenkov) and introduced the limited forms of participation, acceptable in Soviet conditions (Burdin, 2013). Since the 1970s, heritage occupied an essential role in urban policy and became a key component of broader strategies for renewal with a value beyond intrinsic, symbolic, societal

and cultural significance. The “partnership” of heritage and culture-led regeneration, emerging in the 1980s and 1990s reflected this. (Poliakova, 2005) In 1960s-1970s in Siberia, the questions of preservation in relation to the design of new large objects on the historical sites were raised. However, the heritage concept remained “conventional”, based on historical and authentic values. The Central Governmental organisations in the identification and certification of monuments relied on the local research groups, busy with listing and describing (U. I. Greenberg group). Since the beginning of the 1990s, works on the identification and state protection of monuments has been paused. In the Eastern Siberia, heritage dramatically reduced its status. A number of monuments and memorial places were lost (Slabuha, 2014).

3.9. The current state of the field

The researcher now has to solve ethical problems, defining the boundaries of possible intervention. The internal ethics of science, which stimulates the truth and increment of new knowledge, continuously correlate with General humanistic values. Scientific knowledge is considered in the context of the social conditions and its social consequences, determined by the General state of the culture, its value-based orientations and worldviews. Historical variability of not only ontological postulates but also ideals and norms of knowledge is comprehended (Stepin, Gorochoy, & Rozov, 1999). Heritage concept changed significantly: the shift towards human-values-based approach seems inevitable (Riegl, 2011). Araoz: “the core values of heritage are now increasingly deemed to reside in the cultural meanings and values humans invest in monuments and landscapes, not their physical substance” (Araoz, 2011). The concept enshrined in conventions and widely published (The Australia ICOMOS, 2013; Drury & McPherson, 2008; ICOMOS, 1999). However, the concept brought rather controversies and debates than particular approaches and doctrines. “The heritage debate has continued to flex and flow since the 1980s and has gained considerable momentum over the past three decades” (Waterton & Watson, 2015) Orbaşlı claims “SHIFT FROM THE CONSERVATION OF TRUTH TO THE CONSERVATION OF MEANINGS”. “Conservation is increasingly becoming a process of negotiation, as the management of cultural heritage becomes based on models of consultation and participation, that are intended to give those ‘affected’ by a site a ‘voice’” (Orbaşlı, 2017). Heritage is “judged under ethical and moral criteria” (Munoz-Vinas, 2012). “More recently, heritage scholars have also started to concern themselves with processes of engagement and the construction of meaning” (Waterton & Watson, 2015). The ongoing obsession with democratisation, human rights and social justice, so active in Europe and relatively silent in Russia, inevitably turned the field of heritage studies towards the questions of control, power, decision-making, ethics, etc. Slabuha A. V., one of the most influencing professors in Siberian heritage, claims that the criteria valuation in Russian and Siberian heritage are vague and depend primarily on the views of particular experts. (Slabuha, 2014). The overall dominating concept of heritage and attached values in Russia and Siberia are not explicitly formulated in literature, nor practice. In heritage academic literature, the studies remain predominantly technical or descriptive.

Methodologically, Waterton and Watson separate the “operational issues” (technical issues and operations management), and critical analysis (sociological, cultural, social geographical and anthropological thought) in heritage research (Waterton & Watson, 2015). Two strands seem complementary and may ultimately result in the comprehensive heritage process in practice. For architectural research, Groat and Wang proposed the epistemological continuum with three primary positions: positivist/postpositivist tradition, constructivism, intersubjective position. (Table 1) (Groat & Wang, 2013). The continuum, proposed by Groat and Wang for archi-

tectural research and strands, suggested by Watson and Waterton for heritage studies, seem to have much in common and complementary, being mutually applied to the field of architectural heritage.

4. Conclusion

The history of the heritage concept fluctuates significantly: each of the attitudes reflects the value system and the state of scientific development of its period along with the socio-economic situation generally, and at the specific location in particular. The ideas of heritage have been informed by the trends in scientific knowledge throughout history. The current physical environment is the record of these ideas. Currently, heritage professionals almost unanimously consider architectural heritage process to be a powerful tool to influence the identity of a city with its ability to remove/reinforce specific memories and messages from the past, providing continuity. Indeed, architectural legacy contains essential national and cultural narratives to use. Generally, the history of experiences, in heritage, have the potential to widely inform current practice, being added into the framework of social, cultural and political connotations for architectural heritage. Such a framework for Siberian heritage would become an ultimate clue to the sustainable heritage process, serving the purpose of preconditions to heritage management.

Heritage concept in Russia and Siberia is relatively young; the concept of Siberian heritage has a minimal presence in the international literature. This relative isolation makes the implication of international scientific achievements quite limited. Theoretically, the heritage concept with valuation system and criteria in Russia generally and Siberia particularly is not formulated explicitly in the literature, which is visibly resulted in conservation practice. Yenisey Siberia stays practically far from participatory approaches to heritage. Thus, it is worth studying intensely the literature, law and precedents in Siberian heritage to formulate the current concept of Siberian heritage. The extensive studies of internationally recognised approaches and criteria should widely inform the research. For the architectural research, authors proposed the epistemological structures, which, being combined, might help to systematise the existing heritage

	Positivism/Postpositivism		Intersubjective	Constructivism	
Epistemology	Knower distinct from object of inquiry	Knowing through distance from object	Knowledge framed by understanding sociocultural engagement	Knowledge co-constructed with participants	Knowledge perpetually provisional
Ontology	Assumes objective reality	External reality revealed probabilistically	Diverse realities situated in socio-cultural context	Multiple Constructed realities	Infinite realities

Table 1.

concepts, define the state of Siberian heritage process in relation to international achievements in the field and suggest the possible methods of its development (Waterton & Watson, 2015; Groat & Wang, 2013).

Practically, the role of the Russian State in the protection of cultural heritage has always been significant in comparison with many European countries, where the priority to a greater extent belonged to scientific societies and private initiative. However, the international tendencies, discoveries and policies influenced heritage concept and conservation practice, with some exclusions. Thus, being influenced by the global trends, such remote, specific, though dramatically growing regions as Yenisei Siberia tend to react to these trends with some delays: region had always been developed primarily according to the inner logic of socio-political and economic conditions. The sphere of heritage protection remains regionally-specific. However, globalisation with its current obsession to regional identities started to influence Russian practice: the request for a more participatory approach to urban projects recently appeared in Siberian reality both in governmental circles and among social activists, while the successful precedents, and established methods of inclusive approaches seem missing. Therefore, it seems impossible to directly apply successful international or even central Russian practices to the sphere to the Siberian territory. The changes in heritage process should be gradual and iterative, require careful consideration and testing to release its identity-building potential, restore the lost continuity and connection with the society naturally at the points of bifurcation (Stepin, Gorochov, & Rozov, 1999).

Thus, in addition to the theoretical framework, which explains the theoretical connotations for heritage management, the set of practical methods and experiments, which would help to extract the existing senses, meanings and moods of heritage places should be developed in order to fulfil the practical gap and adjust methodology to local conditions.

References

- Ahmad A.S.R. (2015), *Architecture of Buildings and Structures. Creative Conceptions of Architectural Activity Approaches of Handling Architectural and Urban Heritage of Soviet Era in Russia*.
- Araoz G.F. (2011), *Preserving Heritage Places under a New Paradigm*, in *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 1(1), pp. 55-60.
- Brandenberger D. (2002), *National Bolshevism: Stalinist Mass Culture and the Formation of Modern Russian National Identity, 1931-1956*, Harvard University Press.
- Burdin E.A. (2013), *Ohrana Objektov Kulturnogo Nasledii v SSSR (1917 – 1991)[Preservation of the Objects of Cultural Heritage in USSR (1917 – 1991)]*. FGBOU VPO 'UlGPU im. I.N. Ulianova'.
- Bush P. (2017), *Integratsiia Ruinirovannyh Obiektov Istoricheskogo Nasledii v Sovremennyi Arhitekturnyi Kontekst*, [Integration of Ruined Objects of Historical Heritage into Contemporary Architectural Context.].
- Caniggia G., Maffei G.L. (2001), *Architectural Composition and Building Typology: Interpreting Basic Building*, Alinea. Retrieved June 25, 2019, from https://books.google.ru/books?id=doggTlYc4rWC&dq=g+caniggia&lr=&hl=ru&source=gbs_navlinks_s.
- Chippindale C. (1983), *The Making of the First Ancient Monuments Act, 1882, and Its Administration Under General Pitt-Rivers*, in *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 136(1), pp. 1-55.
- Choay F., O'Connell L.M. (2001), *The Invention of the Historic Monument*. Retrieved January 10, 2019, from <http://www.cambridge.org>.
- Deschepper J. (2018), *Between Future and Eternity: A Soviet Conception of Heritage*, in *International Journal of Heritage Studies*.
- Drury P., McPherson A. (2008), *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance*, (April).
- Foucault M., Trans. A.M.S. (1972), *The Archaeology Of Knowledge And The Discourse On Language*, Tavistock Publications, London.

- Glendinning M. (2013), *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation*, Routledge. Groat L.N., Wang D. (2013), *Architectural Research Methods*, Wiley.
- Harrison R. (2015), *Beyond "Natural" and "Cultural" Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of Anthropocene*, in *Heritage & Society*, 8:1, pp. 24-42.
- Harvey D.C. (2010), *Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scope of Heritage Studies*, in *International Journal of Heritage Studies*.
- Icomos T.A. (1999), *The Burra Charter*.
- Jencks C. (1992), *The Post-Modern Agenda*, in *The Post-Modern Reader*. St. Martin' Press.
- Jokilehto J. (2002), *History of Architectural Conservation*.
- Jokilehto J. (1986), *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Retrieved March 11, 2019, from https://www.iccrom.org/sites/default/files/ICCROM_05_HistoryofConservation00_en_o.pdf
- Koshman L.V. (2011), *Kulturnoe Nasledie Kak Faktor Istoricheskoi Pamyati. [Kultural Heritage as a Factor of Historic Memory]*, in *Vestnik Mosk. Universiteta*, 5, pp. 7-15.
- Kropotkine A. (2019), *Les Ambiguïtés Du Dégel: Que Faire Du Patrimoine Culturel?*, in *Cahiers du Monde russe*, 47, pp. 269-301.
- Lowenthal D. (1998), *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, Cambridge University Press.
- Munoz-Vinas S. (2012), *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*, Routledge.
- Nara (2016), *Nara + 20: On Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity*, in *Heritage & Society*, 8:2, pp. 144-147.
- Orbaşlı A. (2017), *Conservation Theory in the Twenty-First Century: Slow Evolution or a Paradigm Shift?*, in *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 23(3).
- Poliakova M.A. (2005), *Ohrana Kulturnogo Nasledii Rossii. [Preservation of Cultural Heritage of Russia.]*, Drofa.
- Riegl A. (2011), *Der Moderne Denkmalkultus Sein Wesen Und Seine Entstehung*. Pubmix.com, Book Renaissance.
- Slabuha A.V. (2014), *Voprosy Istorii Izuchenii i Sohraneniia Arhitekturnogo Nasledii v Prieniseiskoi Sibiri. [Questions Of History Of Studying And Preservation Architectural Heritage In Siberia Round The Yenisei River]*.
- Smith L., Waterton E. (2013), *Heritage, Communités and Archaeology*.
- Solomatin V.A. (2002). *Istoriia Nauki. [History of Science]*. Moscow: Per Se.
- Stepin V.S., Gorochov V.G., Rozov M.A. (1999), *Filosofia Nauki i Techniki [Philosophy of Science and Eechnics]*, Gardariki.
- The Australia ICOMOS (2013), *Charter for Places of Cultural Significance Australia ICOMOS Incorporated International Council on Monuments and Sites*.
- Tsarev V. (2014), *Reglamentatsiia i Metody Deiatelnosti Po Sohraneniuiu Drevnih Pamiatnikov Sibiri v XIX – Nachale XX Neka. [Regulation and Methods of Activities for Preservation of Ancient Monuments of Siberia in XIX – the Beginning of the XX Century.]*.
- Waterton E., Watson S. (2015), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*.
- Watson S., Waterton E. (2010), *Editorial: Heritage and Community Engagement*, in *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1-2), pp. 1-3.