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Abstract

The processes of globalization, integrating the development of culture, generate a kind of planetary culture, the displays of which don’t have neither territorial nor national belonging. It is unusual to find a community, where the ancient way of life and old cultural traditions are still stored. Such communities are not rare in the Ukrainian Carpathians. The subject of this article is the state and status of their cultural legacy. Thus we take the ideas of Carpathians Convention [1], as a point of view in our reasoning.
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Introduction

One of the features, almost every traditional ethnic culture has, is its territoriality. Territorial locality of traditional cultures often depends on the territorial conditions, which make the preserving and maintenance of traditions possible. Geographical isolation or other environmental conditions often are the reasons of restraining the stormy displays of technical progress and industrialization in certain locality. Usually we can find such places in the mountains or on the islands. In these places we can find also the transmitters of the discussed traditional cultures. They are mostly local peasant communities of farmers or hunters, and also inhabitans of nearby small towns. Displays of local culture can be even clearly noticeable in the nearby big cities. In particular cases the features of local traditional culture can be distributed all over the political state, and even become a sign of national culture at an international level.

Nevertheless, certain geographical connection remains the one of the main distinctive features of the discussed object. It is very important to count with that condition, when decisions about a preserving and management are made. It is appropriate to outline a territory which the present article concerns to: according to the official information, Ukrainian part of Carpathians has an area of 22109 km 2 and population 1.98 million persons [2]. The Legal instruments of maintenance of cultural legacy of Ukrainian Carpathians The Ukrainian state cares in a certain way about the cultural legacy in general. Still, the local nature of legacy, geographical connections and territoriality of traditional cultures has never found an appropriate reflection in the Ukrainian laws and other legislative documents. The Government program of Protection and Maintenance of non-material cultural heritage in 2004-2008 was adapted in 2004. [3] This program approaches the problem in dry academic way. Ethnos appears here as an out-of-body subject for museum research. Even that program is not executed. In 2007, the charges of 2686, 2 thousand of Uah (532000 USD) for maintenance of only non-material and only ethnic cultural legacy are foreseen by the program. The state budget of Ukraine in 2007 foresees only 300 thousand of Uah (59000 USD) for the preserving of the whole cultural legacy of Ukraine. [4]

Discussion

We find the similar situation in other special legislative documents, concerning management of culture or mountain regions. Laws of Ukraine «About Stimulation of regional development» and «About status of mountains settlements in Ukraine» do not mention problems, related to the traditional culture of regions. Therefore, acceptance of the Convention about a preserving and sustainable development of Carpathians in 2003
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(Carpathians Convention), and its ratification by Ukraine has become a very important event for us.

Carpathians Convention has become part of Ukrainian legislation, and now the subject discussed here is regulated by its Article 11 - Cultural heritage and traditional knowledge.

As a result, The Ukrainian State undertook an obligation to maintain special policy, related to Carpathians, which will be directed on the preserving and support of cultural legacy and traditional knowledge of local population, production and sale of local wares, articles of art and folk creativity, on the maintenance of traditional architecture and ways of management.

Regarding cultural legacy, Carpathians Convention contains the following conception: steady development of the region of Carpathians, which doesn't exhaust the natural resources, is possible only through the maintenance of local communities, their traditional culture and management methods.

1. Categories of subjects - creative sources of cultural legacy of Ukrainian Carpathians

Discussing such a delicate question, let’s separate those displays of culture, which belong to Carpathians, though do not have territorial specificity of Carpathian region, for example, displays of soviet house building standards in architecture of Carpathians towns, the monuments of non-Carpathians historical events, which were initiated from outside. These displays of culture can deserve support and maintenance. However, they are not what the article 11 of Carpathians Convention is about.

The displays of culture of historical residents of Carpathians are more important in this case. In this sense, the cultural legacy of native ethnic people is the subject of primary consideration. There are Hutsulian, Boyko’s, and Lemko’s population which, usually, consider themselves the title nation of the state.

Then, it is necessary to pay attention to autochthonic ethnons of other identity. We mean representatives of title nations of the contiguous states (Hungarians, Poland, Slovaks, and Romanians). Other important groups are Jews, Armenians, Gypsies and representatives of other ethnical groups which constantly exist in Ukrainian Carpathians and provide a substantial contribution to the forming of cultural legacy of the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of autochthonic?</th>
<th>Creators/heirs</th>
<th>Index of present self-organization</th>
<th>Declaration of identity with the cultural legacy of Ukrainian Carpathians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native ethnic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutsuls</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemkos</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boykos</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autochthonic non Ukrainian population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarians</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other autochthons</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intruders, residents during a short time historically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial administration agents</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrating intellectuals, architects, scientists, doctors, artists, e.c.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other short time intruders</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Categories of objects of cultural legacy of Ukrainian Carpathians

Now we can outline the circle of objects which the eleventh article of Carpathians Convention may concern. We divided the whole legacy in several different categories.

First of all - it is an aggregate of cultural legacy of historically expressed old groups of Carpathians habitants, mentioned in a previous section.

The following important category of legacy is monuments of local historical events: fortress, necropolises, and religious buildings. Often the source of their creation is identified not only by ethnic features, but also by religious or the class, or political features.

(Examples: wayside crosses, necropolis of general Emmanuel or Austrian soldiers’ cemetery near the Tatarov village and others.)

And finally, we suggest considering the displays of global industrial culture as an important category also. Roads, bridges, mines, water engineering constructions and oth. are specifically attached to the Carpathians landscape.

We will not discuss the monuments of nature in this article. We realize though: some of them are equated with the monuments of culture. (For example, Rocks of Dovbush in Bubnische village)

The classification of subjects and objects of cultural legacy is presented in the tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Material Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy of autochthonic population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments of history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacral monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering monuments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Non-Material Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy of native ethnic groups, Hutsuls, Lemkos, Boykos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy of autochthonic nonukrainian (non rusin) population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification can be useful to bring the objects in order for the advanced studies, administration and management of heritage, and for the implementation of Carpathians Convention.

**Maintenance: indisputable positions.** It is the shortest part of the article. Almost all of the interested sides agree that the maintenance of cultural legacy and traditional knowledge of Carpathians is necessary, as also its study, description and drafting of registers.

**Maintenance: questionable positions and difficulties**

**Ukrainian difficulties**

We present this part as theses:

From high-cube expound this section as theses.
- Interruption of normal economic public relations in the years of soviet period.
- Considerable harm to the ethnic identity awareness of society.
- Outflow of active part of mountain population because of poverty.
- Weakening of local self-government, weakening of local budgets.

Chaos, which came after the culture management system of the previous excessively centralized state, was disintegrated.

Rudimentary post soviet mentality of state leaders: treating culture as an unprofitable branch of economy.

Global difficulties and differences in reading

Protocol «Population and Culture» within the framework of Alpine Convention has a difficult history. [5] His acceptance has been put aside for a long time. His substitute - declaration of "Population and Culture" was finally accepted. This history witnesses: there are difficulties in other countries as well. Here are two common conceptions, which, from our point of view, are not absolutely right. They restrain the progress in task of the maintenance of traditional culture of Carpathians.

1. Museum approach to the maintenance.

Cultural displays, which need to be maintained, are the product of public relations. An attempt to save a cultural legacy without these relations leads to dead collection, suitable for the big city’s cabinet of curiosities. Obviously, that kind of preserving doesn’t fulfill the tasks of sustainable development of Carpathians.

2. Conflict between tasks of preservation and the tasks of progress.

The task of preserving of ethnic culture can look like a task of stopping progress and saving archaic public relations. Such understanding creates a conflict with the natural and indisputable tasks of development. [6] The weak link of such conservative conception is its economic disadvantage. Highlanders who aspire to welfare often have to loose their own cultural identity. As a result, we have a huge economic outflow of mountain population.

There is successful practice of maintenance in the world, when an ethnic culture becomes the natural component of social (and economic) development of the region. Ethnically identical products and services become a popular, and are well sold. At the same time, commercialization causes the reasonable fears. Prominent Hutsul, Igor Pelipeyko, warns us in his deathbed article “How to save Hutsuls”: a test by a market can be destructive for an ethnic culture.

Unthinkable, that on the opening day of artist N. clever fellows can sell false imitations of the pictures of that artist. But at this time on the territory of hutsul'schina on hutsul markets authentic hutsul wares are pressed aside by the stream of similar wares from China. Using the name Microsoft with ought an authorization is considered a crime. At the same time the great number of people is using a brand «Hutsul» in their wares and services, without any punishment. Mighty external powers aggressively burst in space of the unformed Carpathians market. They exploit the cultural environment, created by aborigines and destroy them economically. We possess legal instruments to protect a copyright of a physical person or firm. Ethnical groups rights for an own cultural legacy remain without legislative defense. This problem is one of major international problems.

A discussion about it will be continued in July of this (2007) year on the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental committee of Worldwide Organization of Intellectual Property. A discussion will be continued.

Decisions

The state should guarantee the savings of a cultural heritage. The state should remain the main patron of culture; the state should create conditions for independent management of culture at a local level.
In the conditions of Ukrainian Carpathians it is necessary to strengthen the role of local self-government in a management a culture, to support cultural and economic initiatives of ethnic cultural associations and local business.

It is necessary to complete the creation of international agreement, fastening rights of ethnos for the displays of their own culture.

It is necessary to create economic and legal instruments for defense of economic interests of aborigines at the market of their own ethnic wares and services.

Regional international agreements, similar to Alpine Convention and Carpathians Convention of can be the effective instrument of economy of cultural legacy transnational spaces, including Mediterranean.

The regional international agreements similar to the Alpine Convention and the Carpathian Convention can be the effective tools in case of the savings of a cultural heritage on transnational spaces, including Mediterranean.
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