

Role and Functions of Humanity's Oral and Intangible Cultural Heritage Masterpieces in International Tourism (On Example of Russian Objects)

Oleg Evgenievich Afanasiev^{1*}

1. Russian State University of Tourism and Service (RSUTS), Moscow, Russia. Email: dneprgeo@gmail.com

Abstract: *The presence of a country's objects on various global ratings and lists of sights is currently a symbol of state prestige and significance. However, such lists affect the formation of tourist flows. One of these important lists is a list of Oral and Intangible Cultural Heritage masterpieces of the peoples of the world compiled under the aegis of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The Russian Federation is not a party in the Convention for the Safeguarding of this type of heritage, so the country is poorly represented on the list which does not reflect the role and importance of Russian culture in the global context. The experience of involving in the tourist industry even the two Russian objects from the Intangible Heritage List by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shows the significant potential for forming tourist flows and developing tourist complexes based on the flows. The author examines three types of transformation of Russian intangible cultural heritage into a tourism product: 1) museum facilities; 2) theme parks; 3) heritage sites in the natural environment. The author also distinguishes three forms of intangible heritage representation in the tourist industry. These forms allow tourists to visit and get acquainted with the site and landscape of intangible heritage, a certain type of culture wherein the heritage develops and a prominent person who is a bearer and custodian of the tradition. Moreover, the article deals with the threats that the objects of intangible heritage may face in the process of involvement in the tourist and hospitality industry. The conclusion to the article contains some relevant proposals for ensuring the sustainable development of tourism based on the Russian intangible heritage sites.*

Keywords: *masterpieces of intangible cultural heritage, role of intangible heritage in tourism, UNESCO intangible cultural heritage list, intangible heritage sites.*

INTRODUCTION

In the face of fierce competition, every country strives to make its destinations as famous, recognizable and popular as possible. This entails a lot of effort in various fields, primarily in country and region branding, promotion of tourist attractions, striving to organize and hold global and macroregional events, etc. One of the efficient ways to ensure the recognizability of a country's tourist centers is to promote them in various ratings and lists – in the so-called "Tops" that are often used by many potential consumers of tourist services to choose a holiday and travel location. Whereas the list of "Top 10 Best Beaches in the World" and the like compiled by a tabloid glossy magazine is bound to constantly change and is generally created according to questionable and subjective criteria (or without any) used by the author of a particular article ("list"), then the appearance on the list of a particular object from a particular country is desirable (as additional promotion) but not essential and the government of that country is

understandably unwilling to make every effort to achieve this. This does not refer to lists of a different kind that are truly representative, fully reflect the country on the international arena and are formed by the most reputable international organizations that have a system of criteria for evaluation and selection. The appearance of any country's objects on such lists is a matter of prestige on the global arena, the assertion of the country's importance and role in the global civilization and a certain guarantee that tourists will show sustained high and dynamic interest in visiting the objects on the list. The matter of including a country's objects in the list is curated on the highest state level and the promotion process is declared a priority goal of relevant ministries and bodies.

This refers to, the lists of objects formed under the aegis of primarily intergovernmental and, to a smaller degree, non-governmental international organizations. The most prominent examples include the list of historical cities of the world compiled by the League of Historical Cities, the list of cultural capitals of Europe, the Arab World and Latin America formed by the European Union, the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO) and the International Bureau of Cultural Capitals (IBOCC) respectively. One could also include numerous lists of the most interesting, popular and prospective cities and destinations formed by various non-governmental rating agencies and many others. However, the lists compiled by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) are universally known and popular as a guide for choosing travel locations. This primarily refers to the lists of World Natural and Cultural Heritage sites, objects of documentary heritage "Memory of the World", "UNESCO Creative Cities Network" and the list of Oral and Intangible Cultural Heritage masterpieces of the peoples of the world.

METHODS

The object of the study in this article is the list of humanity's oral and intangible cultural heritage masterpieces formed by UNESCO within the framework of the program of preserving global cultural diversity. The subject of the study is the involvement of objects of intangible cultural heritage in the tourist industry and the objects on the list that are located in Russia. The purpose of the study is to analyze the place and role of intangible heritage objects as tourist centers and draw the attention of the interested public to these issues.

RESULTS

The issues of the conceptual role and the possibilities of using the intangible cultural heritage in the tourist industry are not new in the global and Russian research space. Thus, B. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004) provides an interesting view on the intangible heritage as metacultural manufacturing by presenting the concept of intangible heritage as "cultural as material, alive as natural". M. Schuster's (2002) article deals with the list as a means of historical safeguarding. M. Gonzalez (2008), G. Georgiev and I. Terziyska (Georgiev, Terziyska, 2013) point out the importance of intangible heritage for the field of tourism. O. N. Truevtseva (2016), P. V. Glushkova (2015), T. S. Kuryanova (2012), O. E. Afanasiev and V. V. Volkhina (2015) and others have written about the vectors of interaction between intangible heritage and museums. We have earlier mentioned (Afanasiev et al., 2018) certain aspects of World Natural Heritage objects for the development of eco-tourism. Handicraft is the most researched field of

intangible cultural heritage explored from the position of developing tourism, especially ethnographic tourism. The body of academic publications in this field is considerable, for example, there are articles by E. V. and V. V. Katamashvili (2015), N. V. Yakovenko (2015), M. A. Sarancha (2015), etc. It is worth noting that the issues of developing tourism based on the intangible heritage sites are closely connected to the development of ethnographic, event, rural and, to a lesser degree, religious types of tourism. In general, there are a lot of publications in these fields. However, there are hardly any generalizing studies that duly examine all possible formats of using intangible cultural heritage objects, including the ones on the UNESCO list, in the tourist industry. Nevertheless, the potential of such objects for increasing tourist flows to the regions is inexhaustible which deserves closer attention from the academic community, professional tourism researchers, tourist land developers and tourism marketing specialists. One of the goals of the study is to draw the attention of potentially interested parties to the issues mentioned above.

The involvement of the intangible heritage of individual regions, countries and areas in the industry of tourist services remains relevant. Another pressing issue is the representation of countries and peoples in the masterpiece list and quantitative imbalance in the distribution of safeguarded objects between the Member States of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and, particularly relevant for Russia, the participation of individual countries and the ratification of the international document. According to G. Georgiev and I. Terziyska (2013), both tangible and intangible cultural heritage will play an increasingly important role in the contemporary information society as it is an area of human life that preserves memory which will more often attract the attention of ordinary people and the tourism industry and be the objects of promising investments. No less important for tourism is the role of intangible heritage objects, the involvement of which in the hospitality industry will strengthen intercultural dialogue, trans-ethnic communication and ensure the transmission of the people's cultural significance to the level of the international community.

However, it is important to remember that the opening of the national cultural market by increasing its role in tourism, especially international, can lead to the transformation of the intangible heritage objects, introducing new elements and influences that were previously unnatural for the objects and foreign to the tradition. For example, the automation of individual components of the production process can increase the competitiveness of a heritage domain, but, at the same time, leads to a distortion of its traditions and cultural knowledge. The tourist market of intangible cultural heritage isolates from the wide variety individual dominant expressive forms that are popular with tourists (for example, the production of popular souvenirs, adapted forms of dance and traditional theatrical art, transformed, as a rule, shortened, folk songs, etc.), and the rest, "less successful", are doomed to wither against the backdrop of "competition".

In the context of globalization, according to M. Gonzalez (2008), the connection between identity and a sense of being local is lost and "existential tourism" is possible based on intangible heritage, the essence of which is to form an image of the identity of a territory that is not linked to a specific place. A good example is the art of producing nesting dolls as a symbol of all of Russia, while the location of this craft is not important for a tourist; the nesting doll has become an "obligatory souvenir from Russia", it has long become mass-produced, and one can buy it either in Moscow or in Vladivostok. This shows the negative impact of the tourist industry on the tradition of creating intangible heritage masterpieces when the influence goes far beyond the development of culture and

instead leads to the distortion, decline and commercialization of the originality of tradition. Similar problems are inherent in most countries that develop tourism based on national identity factors (including intangible heritage). Therefore, to preserve the cultural identity and ensure its long-term sustainability under the influence of globalization, it is necessary to provide mechanisms for the identification, accounting, preservation and development of objects and bearers of intangible cultural heritage. This, among others, is a goal of UNESCO.

Relations between Russia and UNESCO in the field of safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage are thoroughly considered in the article by S. A. Demina and R. M. Valeev (2015). However, the issue of the need for ratification by the RF of the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage remains relevant. The fact that Russia has not yet officially joined the Member States of this convention hinders the process of expanding the representation of Russian objects on this list, forms the unreasonably low representation of Russian civilization against a global background, and prevents the formation of an efficient mechanism for the timely detection of rare and endangered elements of intangible heritage for their further protection and development. The experience of Russia's neighboring countries, including the CIS, shows that many of them are significantly ahead in this matter. Thus, since 2009, the objects of Azerbaijan and Mongolia have been annually included in the list, since 2012 – the objects of Kyrgyzstan, etc. The representation of cultural objects in the heritage list in Armenia and Estonia is twice higher than the corresponding indicator in Russia, in Azerbaijan – four times, and the leading country in the number of objects included in the list – China – exceeds Russia by 19.5 times in this respect! Russia, like several other countries of the world (the USA, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, South Africa, etc.) is not a party to the Convention but, unlike these countries, two Russian objects are included in the UNESCO list of intangible heritage. At the same time, it is worth noting that such Member States of the Convention as Germany, Poland, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark, Israel and some others do not have a single object included in this list. The reason that the list of intangible heritage objects includes two Russian objects is the complexity of the concept formation of intangible heritage and international principles and approaches to its protection. Russia took an active part in the development of international standards for the identification, protection, preservation and development of intangible masterpieces of mankind until the adoption of a new version of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage dated 17 Oct. 2003 (entered into force on 20 Apr. 2006) that the RF signed but did not ratify formally due to the ambiguity and vagueness of the criteria for assigning objects and phenomena to this type of heritage. However, before that moment, the oral traditions of the Semeiskie, Old Believers from the Transbaikal, and the Yakut heroic epos "Olonkho" had been included in the initial list. The same objects were also transferred to the new list that has been kept since 2008. However, since then, due to the fact that Russia is not a Member State to the Convention, not a single object from its territory has been included in this list.

UNESCO supports the Member States in safeguarding and promoting the intangible cultural heritage with the emphasis on strengthening the public awareness of the need to preserve this heritage for transmission to future generations (RUSSIA – UNESCO: history and cooperation prospects (Background), n.d.). In 2003, the Russian Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage was created under the Commission of the RF for UNESCO. Work was carried out to develop an experimental (pilot) version of the digital Register of intangible cultural heritage objects (IHOs) of the peoples of the RF

(Digital Register of IHOs of the peoples of Russia, n.d.). Moreover, a collection of methodological recommendations "Instructions on the formation of the Russian Register and regional databases (catalogs) of IHOs" has been compiled. The Register of IHOs is formed according to five thematic blocks and 19 types. This is a much more detailed classification than the classification adopted by the UN Convention (Table 1).

UNESCO does not aim to promote IHOs as possible centers of tourism development but local authorities often define tourism as an effective means for the conservation, development, promotion and funding of IHOs. The experience of China shows that a thorough tourism development strategy based on IHOs allows one to turn their heritage sites into attractive destinations for foreign tourists where one can get acquainted with the thousand-year-old traditions of Chinese civilization "live". Today China is the leading country in terms of the number of intangible cultural heritage sites included in the UNESCO list, and it is in China that efficient mechanisms of public-private partnerships have been developed based on a combination of tourism and IHO interests.

Table 1. Comparison of the classification categories of intangible cultural heritage adopted by UNESCO and operating in the RF

CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO THE UNESCO CONVENTION	CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO THE DIGITAL LIST OF IHO OF THE PEOPLES OF RUSSIA	
1. Oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of intangible cultural heritage; 2. Performing arts, including acting, music, singing, dance, etc. 3. Social practices, rituals, festive events; 4. Knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; 5. Knowledge and practices concerning traditional craftsmanship	ORAL TRADITIONS 1. Tales 2. Epic songs 3. Legends 4. Epic poems 5. Folklore prose	CULTURE OF RITUALS AND FESTIVE EVENTS 1. Festive events 2. Ceremonies 3. Rituals
		PLAY CULTURE 1. Festive-ceremonial 2. Everyday
	PERFORMING ARTS 1. Art of singing 2. Art of dancing 3. Music art 4. Theatrical art (folk theater, folk circus, etc.) 5. Narration	TECHNOQUES AND TECHNOLOGIES ASSOCIATED WITH: 1. Traditional crafts 2. Folk musical instruments 3. Traditional folk clothing 4. Traditional household and everyday culture

Russia also has a significant number of IHOs in each federal subject, many of which are involved in the tourism and hospitality industry to a degree. There are three formats for transforming the intangible cultural heritage of the RF into a tourist product:

1) *a museum facility* representing the heritage in a static state, often presenting the stages of its development in chronological order. As a rule, these are numerous museums of local history little known to the general public but often preserving unique examples of intangible heritage including and the heritage that, unfortunately, is irretrievably lost today;

2) *a theme park* often designed as an open-air museum (Skansen) where bearers of traditions representing the heritage during events, high travel season, etc. are accumulated. There genuine forms of heritage are transformed according to the interest and demand of the tourist into workshops, quests, art festivals and other forms of visualization. Among the variety of Skansen-type institutions (Afanasiev, Volkhina, 2015),

ethnographic complexes – museums of wooden architecture, architectural and ethnographic, folk everyday life, etc. are the most aligned with the uniqueness of IHOs;

3) *heritage sites in a natural environment* where there are no artificial "sets" and one can observe the traditions in their natural manifestations. This is the most original format that simultaneously ensures the preservation of authentic heritage and its presentation as a tourist product. A tourist visiting such a "pristine landscape" can directly immerse into the environment of thoughts, understand their nature, essence, cause and effect relationships, technologies, etc. This is the most favorable environment for transmitting and perceiving the experience and production technology of IHOs. A similar format, if it is used to study the experience of reproduction of a heritage element, naturally, cannot be short-term and occasional and then it can even be considered a kind of educational tourism.

There are also different forms of intangible heritage representation in the tourist industry that involve the possibility of visiting and acquaintance of tourists with the site, the IHO landscape (a); a certain type of culture in which the IHO develops (b); with a famous person – the bearer and custodian of tradition (c). In Russia, there are only two sites with the highest international conservation status as they are included in the UNESCO World Heritage List. Let us briefly examine these objects from the perspective of the current level of their involvement in the tourism industry and the prospects for their further development in this direction.

"The cultural space and oral culture of the Semeiskie – the Transbaikal Old Believers" represents the culture and life of the Old Believers sent by the government of the Russian Empire to the Transbaikal region in the 18th century. The people were sent from Vetka which is now a city in the Gomel region of Belarus, during the partition of Poland. The first devastation of Vetka took place in 1735 – 40 thousand people were relocated to Eastern Siberia and the Transbaikal region. These events were called the "First Banishment". In 1765, a second forced relocation took place, and later a third. The last group of Old Believers was delivered to the Transbaikal region in 1795. The resettled Old Believers were called "Semeiskie" by local residents due to the arrival of large families with property, unlike single convicts. The Semeiskie brought with them advanced agricultural practices. The settlers grew rye, wheat, barley, buckwheat, oats, potatoes, vegetables and hemp. Cattle breeding played an auxiliary role. In the 19th century, Verkhneudinskii district became the most developed in the Transbaikal region in agricultural terms. Hard work and ancient Orthodox faith allowed the Semeiskie to carry to the present the spirit of their people, the uniqueness of the culture founded back in the pre-Peter era. Thus, for example, differing from the clothing of the local population, the Semeiskie clothes preserved and developed the features of the Belarusian, Ukrainian and Polish traditions. A characteristic feature of the Old Believers' villages in the Transbaikal region is colorful houses, ornaments and drawings on gates, shutters and fences. The traditions of carving, painting, dress, icon painting are a recollection of Little Russia, the image of the Garden of Eden, brought to their new Homeland. The Semeiskie's choral traditions are connected with polyphony – simultaneous reading and singing of liturgical texts and the "drawl" singing that is mysterious to us.

"The Semeiskie space" is currently actively involved in the tourist industry. The main tourist agency is "Tsentr Staroobryadtsev" LLC with the logo "Visiting the Semeiskie" (LLC "Tsentr Staroobryadtsev", n.d.) was founded in 2002. The agency currently provides a range of services: tourist, sightseeing, cafe, hotel. There is a gift shop and a Russian steam bath. The bakery manufactures up to 18 types of products following

the old Semeiskie recipes. The company has contracts with the folklore groups from the villages of Tarbagatai, Bolshoi Kunalei, Desyatnikovo and with folk ensembles "Sudbinushka", "Bylina" for meetings with tourist groups. There are also contracts with the owners of guest houses for guests and travel agencies of Buryatia. Eight thematic year-round tourist routes have been developed, the annual tourist flow is about 12 thousand people, with 30-40% of which being foreign tourists. These indicators of tourist flow are, essentially, quite optimal both for preserving the traditions in an unchanged form and for the representation through the tourism industry. The event "Visiting the Semeiskie" is part of the range of the largest travel companies in Russia, Germany, the USA, France, Italy, China, Japan and the Republic of Korea.

"Olonkho – the Yakut heroic epos" is epos the ancient epic art of the Yakuts, a combination of recitative and varied singing. The tales convey ideas about the origin of the world and man, about gods and heroes and belong to the monuments of Turkic-Mongolian culture. Olonkho epos consists of many legends that are close in terms of plot and style; their volume varies – 10-15, and sometimes more than thousands of poetic lines interspersed with rhythmic prose and prosaic inserts. The epos is performed by folk storytellers – the olonkhusut. Characters' speeches are sung, the rest of the text is performed in a specific recitative manner, often without instrumental accompaniment.

At the initiative of the Government of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), a national innovative project "Olonkholand" was developed and adopted for implementation. The project should be implemented from 2012 to 2022. The innovative cluster "Olonkholand" in Yakutsk is a combination of the infrastructure of the territory of the innovation complex and the mechanisms for the interaction of people involved in the implementation of the project. The cultural foundation of the cluster is the Yakut heroic epos Olonkho. In the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), within the framework of the state target program on olonkho, the following tasks are being accomplished: the creation of the International Olonkho Center, the scientific research of the epics by the peoples of the Republic is being intensified, the preservation, storage and safeguarding of the epic heritage, the preservation and revival of the authentic oral epic tradition, the creation of the Olonkho educational system as means of education, development of children and young people, the creation of the Olonkho Theater as a special phenomenon of the Yakut artistic culture. The purpose of the "Olonkholand" project is to create a technologically advanced cluster of the creative industry using the unique capabilities of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) – the spiritual, cultural, scientific and technical potential and natural and climatic factors for the efficient preservation, promotion and transmission of Olonkho values to future generations (The Land of Olonkho – Olonkholand, n.d.).

RESULTS

As one can see from the provided descriptions of Russian objects from the World Intangible Heritage list, the objects exemplify two models of transforming IHOs into tourist products: the Semeiskie space represents *a heritage site in a natural environment*, whereas the Yakut heroic epos "Olonkho" is a *theme park* of the latest organization type. Both models show their efficiency in preserving and promoting heritage and attracting tourists' attention.

Going forward, it seems relevant to examine in detail the experience, models and forms of tourism organization based on the IHOs in certain countries and use this as a foundation for the appropriate variable models of involving Russian regional intangible

heritage sites in the tourist industry. This is particularly relevant in light of the urgent challenges in the Russian tourism for the solution of which close cooperation of the business and academic communities and government authorities of all levels is required:

1) the optimization of the use of tourism resources and the problems of humanitarian security as new dimensions of intercultural and interethnic interaction in Russia;

2) the study of the role and potential of cultural and religious diversity as vectors of sustainable development of domestic tourism in Russia;

3) the development of the domestic tourism concept as a factor in the sustainable development of small ethnic groups and a means of harmonizing interethnic relations in Russia;

4) the development of the ethnocultural component of tourism in the national natural and historical-cultural parks of Russia;

5) the development of mechanisms to increase the ethnic and ethnocultural component in the cultural, cognitive, religious, and environmental forms of Russian tourism;

6) the transmission of successful practices of using domestic tourism to harmonize interethnic relations in Russia.

CONCLUSION

Based on the study, it is possible to state some important challenges faced by Russian tourism based on intangible heritage. A pressing task is the need to develop the National marketing strategy for the development of tourism on an interethnic basis according to the principle "Unity in diversity, diversity in unity". This will become the foundation for the mechanisms of the public-private partnership in the field of tourism and the IHOs, ensure the involvement of small ethnic groups in the tourist industry and allow regional communities to obtain a source of income due to preserving their identity. It should become profitable and promising for representatives of various Russian peoples to preserve the ancestors' traditions and culture.

It is necessary to develop the structure of the Tourist passport of the IHO that is potentially ready to be involved in the tourist industry. Moreover, the work on filling out the passports should be organized on the state level (following the example of the campaign to create Standardized tourist passports of the regions of the RF (Working party for the development of Standardized regional tourist passports, n.d.). An urgent challenge is the comprehensive study of possible options of compromise between the interests of the tourist industry, tourists' modern needs and familiar way of life and the need to preserve the authenticity of IHOs, the sites and the environment. The construction of a major tourist complex on the folk-art site will not always promote its development and could have a reverse effect. That is why it is crucial to develop efficient tools and methods of assessing the risk factors and possible prospects of "touristization" of individual domains of intangible heritage.

It is also essential to develop research mechanisms to study the influence that the consequences of globalization have on intangible cultural heritage, including in the field of tourism, create the principles of organic, sustainable and preserving development of tourism on the sites of folk art, traditions, ceremonies, when the profitability of the tourist business based on IHOs is not be the determining factor, and the primary goal is the transmission of folk experience, the traditional environment of heritage bearers and its

conservation and preservation. A crucial challenge for the RF is to ratify the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and to add to the international list the most valuable objects that are under threat of loss. Full participation in the UNESCO programs as a Member State will enable Russia to use the experience of the Organization to develop creative potential, will foster the mutual enrichment of cultures, will make it possible to use best modern practices in the interest of protecting and preserving intangible cultural heritage, promote the creation of mechanisms that raise extra-budgetary funds for these purposes on the international level.

REFERENCES

1. Afanasiev, O., Afanasieva, A.V., Seraphin, H., Gowreesunkar, V.G. (2018). A critical debate on the concept of ecological tourism: The Russian experience. In book: Korstanje M. (Ed.). *Critical Essays in Tourism Research. Series: "Hospitality, Tourism and Marketing Studies"*. Chapter 6. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 129-147.
2. Afanasiev, O.E., Volkhina, V.V. (2015). The role, significance and functions of skansen as a tourism resource of territory and representants of national traditions of nature-use. *Sovremennye problemy servisa i turizma [Service and Tourism: Current Challenges]*, 10(3), 12-22.
3. Demina, S.A., Valeev, R.M. (2015). Interaction of the Russian Federation with UNESCO as one of the foreign policy priorities in the sphere of international cultural and humanitarian cooperation. *Vestnik Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta kultury i iskusstv [Bulletin of Kazan State University of Culture and Arts]*, 1, 110-113.
4. Digital Register of IHOs of the peoples of Russia. Retrieved from: <http://www.rusfolknasledie.ru/>.
5. Georgiev, G., Terziyska, I. (2013). Masterpieces of intangible heritage in the countries of Southeast Europe and tourism development. *MakeLearn 2013: Active Citizenship by Knowledge Management & Innovation*. Zadar: University of Zadar, 1279-1285.
6. Glushkova, P.V. (2015). Classification of open-air museums in terms of updating the intangible cultural heritage. *Vestnik Kemerovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Bulletin of Kemerovo State University]*, 1(1), 59-63.
7. Gonzalez, M.V. (2008). Intangible heritage tourism and identity. *Tourism Management*, 29, 807-810.
8. Katamashvili, E.V., Katamashvili, V.V. (2015). "Golden ring of national artistic trades in Nizhny Novgorod" – a new image of region and driver of tourism development. *Sovremennye problemy servisa i turizma [Service and Tourism: Current Challenges]*, 10(3), 51-61.
9. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004). Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International*, 56(1-2), 52-64.
10. Kuryanova, T.S. (2012). Museum and intangible cultural heritage. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Tomsk State University Journal]*, 361, 55-57.
11. LLC "Tsentr Staroobryadtsev". Retrieved from: <http://www.starovery-pro.ru/>.
12. RUSSIA – UNESCO: history and cooperation prospects (Background). Retrieved from: <http://russianunesco.ru/rus/65unesco.html/>.
13. Sarancha, M.A., Yakimova, S.L. (2015). Center of national artistic trades as the basis of tourism route network in Moscow and Moscow region. *Sovremennye problemy servisa i turizma [Service and Tourism: Current Challenges]*, 10(3), 44-50.

14. Schuster, M.J. (2002). Making a List and Checking it Twice: The List as a Tool of Historic Preservation. CPC [Cultural Policy Centre at the University of Chicago]: Working Paper, 14, 21.
15. The Land of Olonkho – Olonkholand. Retrieved from: <http://olonkholand.ru>
16. Truevtseva, O.N. (2016). Intangible heritage and museum of local history. Vestnik Altajskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta [Bulletin of Altai State Pedagogical University], 26, 36-40.
17. Working party for the development of Standardized regional tourist passports. Retrieved from: <http://utp.nbcrs.org/>
18. Yakovenko, N.V. (2015). National artistic trades as a special brand of cultural tourism in the depressive region (experience of Ivanovo region). Sovremennye problemy servisa i turizma [Service and Tourism: Current Challenges], 10(3), 62-71.