

PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE: PREMISE AND HISTORY

Nazgul Kadrimbetova^{1,}, Kumis Seitova², Aydın Calmirza¹, Azhar Shaldarbekova¹, Zhazira Saiyn¹*

¹L.Gumilev Eurasian national university, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, n.kadrimbetova@gmail.com

²Ministry Culture and Sport of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

Corresponding author * e-mail: n.kadrimbetova@gmail.com

Nazgul Kadrimbetova, Kumis Seitova, Aydın Calmirza, Azhar Shaldarbekova, Zhazira Saiyn. Preservation of historical and cultural heritage: Premise and history. - Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(3) (2020), 1-20. ISSN 1567-214X. 20 pages + 13 figures, 3 tables + 4 frames.

Keywords: World heritage, historical and cultural heritage, monument preservation, celebration of historical and cultural heritage.

ABSTRACT

In the modern system of values, one of the main goals of the Kazakh society in the cultural field is spiritual renewal through effective preservation and active utilization of Kazakhstan's historical and cultural heritage assets. The history of Kazakhstan cannot be considered separately from the history of the world. In this article, authors consider the monument preservation premise and the history of the area based on historical data and facts. The authors describe the activities of the first public organizations for the monument preservation and protection in global practice, and analyse the historical significance of documents adopted by international organizations. In addition, the concept of historical and cultural heritage is analysed within the framework of theoretical and legal terminology. The existing Kazakh and foreign experience in the field of monument protection is conceptualized in this work. International and national legislation regulating the sphere is considered, and its foundations and principles rendered.

Key words:

INTRODUCTION

In the period of globalization, the historical and cultural heritage is the source of a nation's identity and the basis for preserving the cultural groups of any human civilization, people, nation or ethnic group. Regardless of the era or the country, the problem of preserving historical and cultural heritage has not lost its relevance. History has shown that monuments can be destroyed without a trace from the impact of natural and anthropogenic influences. Firstly, like any material objects, they deteriorate over time. Secondly, some of them are located on developed land plots. Thirdly, they are subjected to criminal attacks. Those serve as reasons for preservation, protection and restoration of historical and cultural heritage.

Goal of research is to analyse the existing historical experience in the field of preservation of historical and cultural heritage, as well as identify

priority areas in the context of modern requirements.

In accordance with the goals of the research work, the following tasks are to be solved:

- to consider the theoretical and methodological foundations of the research;
- to study the prerequisites and development of historical and cultural heritage preservation on the basis of historical data and facts;
- to compare foreign and Kazakhstan experience;
- to analyse the current situation in Kazakhstan and determination of the development dynamics.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

The article is based on the axiological method. Thus, the conclusions in the works of classics of ancient philosophy, theologians of the middle ages, thinkers of the Renaissance, scientists of modern and post-modern times and their according regularities in various forms were analysed.

The historical principle, which requires the study of a specific historical state and a phenomenon in the period of historical development, served as the basis for the application of the comparative method in research. In particular, the typological method was used to study the historical and cultural status of historical and cultural heritage monuments, classifying them as monuments of regional, national and international significance. Moreover, the diffusion approach, aimed at studying the phenomena spread in the process of communication, creates an opportunity to monitor the influence of the processes established by international and Kazakh normative acts in the practice of preserving cultural heritage.

The following method the research is based on is a functional method. Based on this method, the directions of activity and work of interested institutions and organizations related to the preservation and promotion of historical and cultural heritage were analysed.

RESEARCH AND RESULTS

Scientists have tried to determine the essence and purpose of culture across the ages. The history of world philosophy shows that at first there is a general idea of culture, only over time the cultural heritage is considered as an independent object of research.

The concept of culture begins from ancient philosophy. Ancient philosophers in their research equate the concept of culture with Paideia. In the modern sense, this is close to the concept of a child's growth, education, upbringing and culture. As a concept of ancient thinkers, Paideia is a versatile education (Solopova & Shichalin, 2001), the desire of the Greeks for culture and knowledge (Jaeger, 1997). French historian H.I. Marrou describes the Paideia as fulfilment of all the possibilities of a person's spiritual development, being absolutely worthy to identify oneself as a person, that is, a sign of culture in a productive sense" (Marrou, 1998).

Nevertheless, according to the conceptualization of ancient thinkers, culture was understood as a way of forming a person capable of fulfilling civic duties.

In the middle ages, a providential perception of the cultural and historical process developed and was understood as an eschatological path leading to the "The City of God" (Augustine of Hippo, Thomas Aquinas). Culture was understood only as a spiritual factor and was accepted as a deterministic substance of God (Kopsergenova, 2008).

In the Renaissance, culture entailed a variety and diverse development.

During this period, the ancient ideas about the human desire for a high level of development and active creativity were revived once more.

Due to the expansion of the original meaning of the term "cultura" in early XVI century, schools of thought in the cultural and philosophical course developed, and the study of valuable cultural codes took place. Therefore, pre-modern views and arguments became an impetus for the formation of an understanding of cultural heritage in the next historical period of development (Kudaibergenov, 2018).

For the first time in Modern European philosophy, the notion of culture's historical existence being ensured primarily under the influence of language and traditions was first brought to attention by J. Herder. G. Hegel theoretically considered the essence of cultural heritage and the subject of its continuity on the basis of the dialectical concept of development (Kopsergenova, 2008). The German philosopher understood cultural heritage as the soul of each generation, its wealth and principles, and its established substance. According to Hegel, cultural heritage is strengthened by the spirit of the generation inheriting it, thus forming the basic laws of cultural development. In other words, the cultural heritage transmitted from generation to generation undergoes changes, being multiplied and preserved in the process (Kudaibergenov, 2018).

Hence, culture is a system of material and spiritual values passed from generation to generation. This concept correlates with the principle of unity of culture and history. However, if we consider material values as part of a culture from the point of view of its functional specificity, then we notice a close connection between "material" and "spiritual" values, which they cannot exist separately as elements of the cultural environment. Their separation is possible only when analysing each, including as an integral part of the historical and cultural heritage.

Thus, if we take the culture of society as a whole, it simultaneously has two facets, material and ideal. These two facets are interconnected: the material is a fixed (natural) ideal, and the ideal is a defined material. The combination of material and ideal aspects of culture creates a cultural environment that shapes each individual. This cultural environment educates people to respect their ancestors and descendants, that is, to protect the past and to preserve the values of the past for future generations. As a result, the humane duty forms the social experience. Social experience is a historical product of the previous generation, which is a culture that ensures its designation, preservation, reflection in time and space in a certain material. In this regard, another aspect of culture is evident. It is a social experience and social memory that perpetuates and preserves the activities of people associated with the preservation, supplement and transfer of experience. Social memory can also be called collective memory. This is the experience of people in everyday life. Its functional purpose is to preserve the experience of ancestors and convey it to descendants.

Having studied the structure of social memory, the doctor of philosophy L. Logunova divides it into three levels: universal, collective and individual (Logunova, 2019). As universal conveys world memory, collective memory means the memory of ethnic groups and communities. And individual memory is a reflection in the memory of a person on an individual level in everyday life, in social space and time through the categories of political, ethnic, and historical memory. Therefore, over the past time, all materialized in the mind or as a result of human activity is stored in the memory structure and reaches the generation in the form of legends and material monuments. This is "cultural memory". The experience preserved in it goes beyond the

experience of individual social groups, forms and ritualizes its content, is protected by traditions and turns into the memories of the people.

The concept of cultural memory as a term is close to the concept of "monument". This raises the question of what is a monument. On this subject, I. A. Kiryanov defines two types of monuments. One is the "original monument", the second is the "symbol monument" (Kiryanov, 1979). O. V. Galkova writes in her research that both types of monuments mentioned above are part of the material (objective) world of culture and originals of different origin. The first (original monument) "has a history before the monument." That is, it is used for utilitarian purposes after formation, just like any substance. Though, this substance has an additional symbolic meaning in the course of historical development, revealing its second semiotic aspect (Galkova, 2009). P.V. Boyarsky proposed to consider historical and cultural monuments as material objects and formulated the concept of "monument" as: "A set of material objects and historical places that reflect all aspects of the historical development of human society in the biosphere system" (Boyarsky, 1990). In turn, I. Mikhailovsky divides monuments into "specially created" and "non-specially created" (Boyarsky, 1990), while A.M. Kulemzin further develops this topic and an original monument and a symbolic classified by the authenticity of information they provide (Kulemzin, 2001).

In particular, objects created as a result of historical events or justifying the true consequences of a historical event are original monuments. For example, the most often found in the Kazakh steppe monuments of the Turkic times were created as a tribute to of the philosophy of the Turkic tribes, namely ancestral spirits, its worship and for the performance of various rites. By studying them, we can obtain access to interesting historical information about the culture and worldview of our ancestors. This is an original monument. A symbolic monument is specially created memorial, monumental structures. They are monuments erected for a single historical event. They are a metaphorical sign, and their assessment prioritizes the aesthetic criteria.

As for the history of the preservation of historical and cultural heritage, the first data on the prerequisites for the preservation of monuments are found in the work of Herodotus. It states that the Saka, who lived in the 1st Millennium BC, had a tradition of honouring deceased ancestors, their belongings and burial places (Herodotus. History. - Moscow, 1972). These data reflect not only the intention to preserve the memory of the Saka's loved ones, but also their actions aimed at turning objects that arouse patriotic feelings into a sacred cult. Therefore, sacred objects revered by Saka tribes were not only a moral symbol, but also performed an ideological function.

This tradition also exists in the history of the great steppe among Turkic tribes. On this, M. Zholdasbekov writes: "Gifted Turkic dynasties, Turkic people of Orkhon, Selenge, Togula/Tula", built cities, elevating the Khan's Horde, built temples for worship, cut images of heroes and leaders, ancestors and priests in stone, wrote thousand-year chronicles dedicated to descendants, historical carving its historical manifesto into granite, the 'stone of eternity'." In addition, Turkic complexes are known as "holy places" (Zholdasbekov, 2005). In terminological dictionaries, there is a correlation of the meanings of the terms "holy" and "cult". From Latin "cultus" means "prayer, worship, care" (Efremova, 2000). In English, the term "cult" was first used in 1617, indicating loyalty to a person or object. In the definition dictionary of the Kazakh language, the word "holy" depicts the meaning of old and sacred, honoured and respected (Efremova, 2000).

According to the philosophy of the ancient Turks, the prime gods were considered to be the Heavenly-Father (Tengri) and Earth-Mother, the environment - the spirit of mountains, springs, trees, animals and all else. Thus, they became cult objects. The main gods were the great ancestors, the leaders of tribes, the masters of the house and land, in other words, the defenders of their hearth and land (Efremova, 2000). Therefore, the native Turks worshipped their ancestors, erected monuments in their honour, turned these lands into holy places, protected and valued them. Rites and ceremonies were performed in sacred places, while people ensured their safety and protection.

According to experts, the sacredness of such places can be proved by rock paintings, burials and other ritual monuments (Maryashev, Goryachev, 1998).

This encourages us to consider the international historical experience. In the history of Russia, the first facts related to the preservation of monuments are found in the Laurentian chronicle. According to data, the preservation of monuments in ancient Russia began with the era in which the Christian religion was adopted, and the process was started by Prince Vladimir of Kiev. After conquering the city of Korsun in 988, the Prince married the sister of the Greek king and adopted the Christian religion. The Prince returned the city and brought to Kiev Church dishes and icons, two copper idols and four horse statuettes. To this day, these artefacts have been stored in the Church of the Holy Virgin (Maryashev & Goryachev, 1998). This church was built in 996 and is known as the repository for relics. In the history of Russia, there is evidence that restoration work was carried out to preserve the old church buildings. For example, in XV, V. Ermolin restored the Church of Voznesensk and St. George's Cathedral. In XVII, P. Mogila restored a number of monuments, including the Church of the Tithes (Mikhaylovsky, 1971).

Before the era of Peter I in Ancient Russia, rarities and holy objects were considered sacred. At the time, the preservation of monuments was not carried out purposefully, it was spontaneous. Churches played an important role in preserving ancient artefacts. Historical relics associated with the names of the king or his representatives were preserved in churches and monasteries. For example, St. Sofia in Novgorod contains the cane and clothing of Bishop Nikita (XII century), while the Pechersky monastery in Pskov is known to preserve personal belongings of Ivan the Terrible and Boris Godunov (Polyakova, 2005). In 1707-1716, an oral imperial Decree on the Collection of Ancient Artefacts was issued. On its basis, archaeological finds from Kiev and Siberia were delivered to Peter I. In 1714, Peter I opened the first Museum, the *Kunstkamera*. In 1720, the Emperor examined all the monasteries, etc., and issued an order to collect the originals of books, letters, and letters of historical value stored in them. In order to implement this order, a Decree of the Senate on Maintaining a Register of These Values was published in 1720. Peter I also drew attention to the preservation of immovable monuments categorized as ancient monuments. In 1722, The remains of a medieval Bulgarian (Bulgar) settlement in Kazan inspired the replication of several inscriptions. The Kazan Governor was entrusted to work on the restoration of the city, as well as annually monitor the further state (Zhukov, 1985).

In general, the cultural policy of the state based on the realities of socio-political life that existed in Russia at the beginning of the XVIII century began to form. Restoration of the past, reliance on the experience of the ancestors was considered one of the most relevant state tasks.

As a result of events held in Russia throughout many years, in 1918, The Council of People's Commissars adopted a decree "On the Registration, Account and Protection of Art Monuments and Old Monuments under the Jurisdiction of Individuals, Societies and Organizations". In accordance with the resolution of the all-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of March 8, 1923, items of museum significance were included in the Museum Fund, preserved at the expense of the state budget and were the value of the state (World Cultural Heritage: Guidelines for the Organization of Independent Work of Students on Internal Training / comp. Belyaeva, T.A. Vologda: VSU, 2016).

However, in the thirties there was a mass destruction of religious architecture monuments based on the ideology of "military atheism". During the Great Patriotic War, unfortunately, many historical and cultural monuments were also destroyed. Only after the end of the war the destroyed monuments were under restoration for many years. In the years of 1948, 1951, 1955, 1960, 1963 and 1965, a number of normative legal documents aimed at regulating this sphere were adopted, and appropriate measures were taken.

In 1976, Russia adopted the law "On the Protection and Use of Historical and Cultural Monuments". The legislation was intended to preserve monuments for modern and future generations, as well as regulate scientific research and propaganda within the framework of "Communist education". The law sets out the principles and procedure for state registration of monuments, categories of historical and cultural significance, their types and forms. Thus, these documents contain the composition of monuments and their inclusion in the list of historical and cultural monuments and issues of their preservation being related to ideological, economic and social responsibilities in accordance with the requirements of the Soviet system of the state.

As for the history of European countries, the preservation of monuments began to take shape in ancient times. For the first time, ideas about the need to preserve monuments as a universal cultural value were voiced in the ancient world by Polybius and Cicero. Both Herodotus and Pausanias expressed interest in the monuments. The Roman Emperor Majorian also issued a decree strictly punishing violations of ancient structures (Kulemzin, 2001). Interest in the preservation of ancient monuments in Greece developed in the ancient period, in which there was a long-term preservation and restoration of the destroyed part of the monuments. The Olympian temple of Hera originally made of wood (VI BC) is a prime example of this.

Moreover, people created warehouses that ensured the safety and security of their valuables in ancient times. This was how the first "treasure storerooms" in Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome appeared (Griffen, 2012). However, valuable items were not perceived as historical and cultural value at the period. Only in the Middle Ages were they recognized as cultural monuments of the past, raising interest of the scientific and creative community and creative schools.

The state protection of the territory locating cultural monuments in Europe began to form. During this period, monuments were considered state property and a process of their legislative preservation was established.

Sweden is the first state in Europe to regulate the protection of historical and cultural heritage. In 1660, The State Council of Sweden adopted the law "On the Protection of Cultural Monuments" (Griffen, 2012). According to this law: "1) fortresses, stone castles, stone graves, mounds, ruins of ancient houses and small forts, border signs; 2) battlefields; 3) church art; 4) rune

and monastic books, books with saga and law records; 5) epic poems, legends, which require to be recorded, were all to be taken under state protection. All the archaeological sites located in Sweden became the private property of the king in 1666.

In 1738, The Kingdom of Naples obtained ownership of archaeological sites, and the same occurred in Denmark in 1807 (Cleere 2001).

France is one of the first countries to accept state responsibility for the study and preservation of historical and cultural heritage. Commission for the Preservation of Monuments and Strategy for the Preservation of Monuments in the State in France were formed in 1791. General Inspectorate for the protection of historical monuments was established in 1830, and Committee on Art and Monuments in 1837. According to one of the main purposes, this Committee was engaged in the development and publication of an illustrative register of all historical and cultural monuments on the territory of France (Current Problems of the Economy of Cultural Heritage / Ed. Rubinstein, A.Y. - Moscow: State Institute of Art Studies. – 2016). The fundamental law "On Historical Monuments" regulating the preservation of monuments in France was approved on December 31, 1913. Later (1927, 1941, 1943, 1966, 1967, 1970, 1976, 1980, 1983), changes and additions were made to the law and the foundations of the code of the national heritage were laid (Pilipenko, 2005).

In the late XVIII and the early XIX century, Denmark, Belgium, Prussia and Saxony were also involved in the preservation of historical and cultural heritage, and the first normative legal documents regulating this area were adopted (Zhukov, 1983).

In 1844, Norway created the world's first national public organization for the preservation of heritage. 45 years later, such an organization called the National trust of Massachusetts was created in the north-east of the United States. This organization stated claimed to implement the trust method in the practice of protection and utilization of heritage. However, it is known from history that the basis of this method was laid in Europe. The first organization in the UK engaged in the protection and restoration of architectural heritage, "Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings" was formed in 1877 (Mazurov, 2006). And in 1895, the British fans of historical attractions, R. Hunter, O. Hill and H. Rawnsley created the English National trust, as well as its two regional committees in Scotland and Ireland. This organization, reliant on the support of the state for a short time, became the most authoritative organization in the British Isles (Mazurov, 2006). A specialized Law on the First Ancient Monuments in the UK was adopted in 1882.

In the United States, the law "On Antiquities" aimed at protecting historical monuments was first approved in 1906. In accordance with this law, the President of the United States is authorized to insert objects located on the territory of the Federal administration into the category of protected monuments (Domrin, 2005).

Italy was the first European country to develop the concept of protecting the national cultural heritage. The law "On the Protection of Objects of Artistic and Creative Interest" was adopted in 1939 (Paliy, 2018).

Humanist N.K. Roerich realized the importance of historical and cultural monuments in the development of mankind and concluded the Treaty "On the Protection of Cultural Values during Military Operations and in Peacetime" in 1929 (signed in 1935). This Pact was supported by such States as France, Belgium, the United States, and India (Roerich, 1974). However, the world was not yet ready to accept such a humanistic concept that

symbolized historical and cultural heritage as a phenomenon of civilization. As a result, the Roerich Pact was not able to become a universal legal act. This document still left its historical mark in the formation of the further ideology of cultural heritage.

In 1954, The Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in Armed Conflict was adopted (The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (Electronic resource) <http://www.centre.smr.ru/win/books/pakt2.htm> (review date: 28.04.2020). This document was based on the ideas and principles of the Roerich Pact. This Convention is the first international agreement that combines many previously existing norms for the protection of cultural property. Officially, the term "cultural value" was first introduced in this Convention.

According to the definition given in the Hague Convention, cultural property is movable or immovable property that is a monument of architecture, art or history that has significance for the cultural heritage of each nation... museums, large libraries, archives intended for the storage or display of movable cultural property, as well as places for storing cultural property in the event of armed conflicts, "centres with the accumulation of cultural property" where most of the cultural property is concentrated.

As can be seen from this definition, the category of cultural property includes not only objects of cultural significance, but also entire territories or areas, where buildings and cultural values intended for their storage, are concentrated. It should be borne in mind that the particularity of the Convention was emphasized. From the name of the Convention itself, the document was designed to protect cultural property in situations of armed conflict to both cultural property and its storage sites.

In the 70s of the XX century, the world society faced serious obstacles in ensuring the protection of historical and cultural heritage. Such obstacles had been caused by natural and artificial factors. In this regard, there was a need to develop common international legal standards for the protection of historical and cultural values. This function was given to the authoritative organization of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

On 14 November, 1970, UNESCO adopted the Paris Convention "On the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property" (Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. (Electronic resource) // <http://portal.unesco.org/> (review date: 28.04.2020). The Convention was aimed at preventing theft of cultural property and illegal actions. This Convention is the only document that fully defines the concept of cultural property. According to the document, cultural values are the values of each state of a religious or secular nature that are important for archaeology, prehistory, history, literature, art and science, and they are divided into several categories.

However, the "Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage" Convention, adopted in 1972, is an important international act that considers the General rules for the protection of the cultural heritage of mankind and is aimed at the comprehensive preservation of historical and cultural heritage (Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. (Electronic resource) // <http://portal.unesco.org/> (review date: 28.04.2020). Its perception aroused particular interest in some cultural and natural heritage values, which gave an impetus to preserve them as part of the world heritage

of all mankind. In accordance with article 1 of the Convention, the concept of "cultural heritage" is equivalent to monuments, ensembles and attractions. Given that the document uses the criterion of "visible universal value", the existence of this criterion makes it possible to classify various objects as objects protected under the provisions of the Convention. This criterion is based on the "uniqueness" and "irreplaceability" of cultural values, regardless of which nation they belong to.

In order to implement the 1972 Convention, the World Heritage Committee was established and the World Heritage List was published in 1978. Currently, the list includes 1121 objects all over the world: 869 cultural monuments, 213 natural and 39 intermediate objects. This document was approved by the world's 185 countries. Kazakhstan ratified this Convention in 1994.

The results of the study of international experience in the field of historical and cultural heritage preservation indicate that today in European countries, including France, Italy, Germany, and the United Kingdom, this action is established on a regular basis. It is worth noting that 2018 was declared to be the year of "Cultural Heritage" in Europe. The main goal is to attract public attention to the rich cultural heritage of Europe and its role in shaping the image of European States.

The experience of European countries in the field of preservation of historical and cultural heritage is found in the research of K. Paliy (Roerich, 1974), O. Litvinova (2010), E. Yatsenko (Roerich, 1974), E. Khaunina (<http://hraniteli-nasledia.com>), V. Muzychuk (2016). According to research, the systems developed in these states are quite similar. Incitement for this industry is based on tax incentives, subsidies, and grants. Still, there are differences. For example, in France, attention is paid to reducing the total income tax for the costs of reparation, operation and restoration of a monument to the owner of historical heritage. The main condition for obtaining such a discount is that this monument must be publicly accessible. In addition to tax incentives, France provides grants aimed at encouraging rehabilitation and reconstruction projects. This type of financing is usually provided by regional and municipal authorities, and the amount of funds allocated depends on how effective the project is for commercial purposes. At the same time, the state allows simultaneous participation in several programs in the proposed projects to effectively encourage the preservation of historical heritage.

Germany has the same tax benefits as France, but the benefits are determined according to total income. In other words, the interest rate is set for the first ten years in accordance with the income. There are two separate funds for the maintenance and restoration of monuments. In other words, the difference between expenditures is regulated by the approved maximum amount of project proposals and planned expenditures controlled by the executive power. The country's economic system provides subsidies, grants and tax incentives to individuals for projects aimed at preserving and restoring historical and cultural heritage. Monument owners can receive 60% of tax subsidies, including tax incentives, under the project. To do this, the object must be available to scientists for research at any time. However, the implementation of the project must be coordinated with the Department of Cultural Affairs.

In the UK, most of the subsidies for historical monuments are provided to favourable tax policies, but unlike many other countries, these subsidies are not focused on tax credits and deductions from income. Instead, tax incentives are most effectively used by easing basic and value-added taxes.

Generally, tax benefits are provided to public and trust organizations that are exempt from corporate tax, income insurance and additional burdens. The system of partnership in the conservation of monuments functions through large foundations in the UK. Projects that affect private sector investment in cities, towns and villages are mainly financed.

Italy has sufficient legal capacity to encourage private investment in the preservation of cultural heritage, and there are several types of incentives in place. Firstly, in accordance with a legislative decree called "Art Bonus", a system of tax incentives for individuals and businesses is provided for the purpose of charitable support and restoring historical and cultural heritage. Every individual and legal entity who wants to use this benefit can get access to this opportunity by going through certain procedures on the "Art Bonus" website. Secondly, the capital attracted from abroad is of great importance for the preservation of monuments. For instance, Japanese textile magnate Yuzo Yagi sponsored the restoration the Pyramid of Gaius Cestius (Piramide di Caio Cestio) in Rome at a cost of 2 million euros. Another example of patronage and partnership is the fact that the American philanthropist David Packard provided \$ 16 million euro for the conservation of the ancient city of Herculaneum. Thirdly, the commercialization of monuments. At first, large companies were granted the right of visual utilization of famous monuments. Photos with monuments were used by companies for advertising and commercial purposes. Later visual commerce was used only for advertising charitable organizations with the utilization of entrance tickets and posters. The Roman Colosseum is an example. Fourthly, the preservation of historical and cultural monuments is also carried out through the source of income from lottery games. Since 1996, there is a legislative norm in Italy, which regulates the course of Saturday lottery winnings into the cultural sphere. In 1998-2003, over 1 billion euros was spent on the preservation and restoration of Italian architecture and artistic heritage (more than 300 objects).

In addition, traditional and important sponsors of cultural heritage can be called Italian savings banks, credit organizations and banks. Under current Italian law, savings banks are required to divide 50% of their profits for public and social needs. The most important part of the funds is used to support historical and cultural monuments on the regional level. The total funding for this area amounted 83 million euros in 2013 and 81, 3 million euros in 2014.

In conclusion, implementation of the relations system "State as a private and corporate sector" in preserving the security of historical and cultural heritage by European countries have turned this sphere into both state and public task.

Preservation of historical and cultural heritage in the history of Kazakhstan began in the 30s of the 19th century. As the ancient Kazakh culture and history aroused the interest of the Russian intelligentsia at the time, various organizations organized expeditions to the Kazakh steppe. It was decided that all of the material collected in the process should be preserved and scientifically processed in a museum. Thus, in 1831, the first Museum in Kazakhstan was opened in Orenburg province on the basis of Neplyuyev's military school. Furthermore, this activity continued within the framework of the policy of the Russian Empire, and then the Soviet government.

After gaining independence, Kazakhstan began to shape its path in the history of preserving historical and cultural heritage. In 1992, the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On the Protection and Use of Objects of Historical

and Cultural Heritage" was adopted. It should be noted that many issues remain open in this law and there have been obstacles to the development of the industry. In this regard, this law was re-approved in a new version on December 26, 2019 on the basis of the World heritage Convention and ICOMOS recommendations concerning legislative and institutional activities by the Advisory Mission.

In addition, 1998 was declared "the Year of National Unity and National History", 1999 - "the Year of Unity and Continuity of Generations" and 2000 - "the Year of Support for Culture". In 2004, the program "Cultural Heritage" (Madeni Mura) was adopted, historical and cultural monuments and objects on the territory of Kazakhstan were reconstructed. The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Culture" was adopted in 2006, settling public relations in the state's sphere of creation, revival, preservation, development, promotion and utilization of culture. The legal, economic, social and organizational bases of the state policy in the field of culture were defined. Within the framework of the new laws, a number of legislative regulations addressing the main issues of use, protection, preservation and management of historical and cultural monuments of various status were adopted. In 2013, the program "People in the Flow of History" was launched, and documents from the world's leading historical archives were systematically collected and studied. In 2017, the national state program "Orientation to the Future: Modernization of Public Consciousness" was adopted. It based on the preservation of the national code, which is the main condition for creating a single nation with high responsibility, changing mass consciousness and modernizing the society. Within the framework of the program, places of national and regional significance known as "Sacred Geography of Kazakhstan" or "Holy Places of Kazakhstan" were studied, and encyclopaedias under the name "Sacred Kazakhstan" were developed. In 2018, The article "Seven Facets of the Great Steppe" was published, its main goal preserving the historical and cultural heritage of the country.

Currently, the total number of historical and cultural heritage monuments in Kazakhstan is 25 thousand. These include 244 historical and cultural monuments of national significance, over 11 thousand historical and cultural monuments of local significance, and 10 historical and cultural monuments of international significance.

Today Kazakhstan is renowned for two unique monuments included in the world space in separate categories. They are the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi and archaeological petroglyphs in the Tamgaly Tas Tract.

In 1994, Kazakhstan undertook a number of obligations in terms of the protection, management, use, research, legislative support and administration of world historical and cultural monuments through the ratification of the Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. The state of these monuments is monitored annually, and appropriate funds are allocated from the national budget in case there is a necessity for it.

CONCLUSION

This article discusses the history of formation and the first steps of preserving historical and cultural heritage monuments. The first legislative acts were studied, theoretical and methodological concepts before the formation of cultural heritage or monument concept were analyzed. The emphasis on the issue preserving historical and cultural heritage, along with its management process, are similar in European countries if we compare them. The main advantage is that the industry established relations between

the state and the private sector, and had an effective financial policy. A system of economic incentives for the restoration of monuments was formed.

In the history of Russia, there are about three centuries of history of preserving historical and cultural heritage. During this time, legislation regulating the sphere, the state system, schools of national restoration were formed, and the main methodological principles were clarified. Yet the diversity of monuments and the scale of the territory on which they were located caused difficulties in controlling and preserving all monuments. Unique monuments were succumbed to theft attempts and vandalism as a result. In Soviet times, the preservation of monuments was hindered by ideological pressures, atheism, and strict party demands. Therefore, there are still unresolved issues in Russia.

Kazakhstan is going through the second stage in preserving its historical and cultural heritage. The first phase was implemented in the framework of the program "Cultural Heritage". The state is currently undergoing the second phase of the programme "Modernization of Social Consciousness". Today, special attention is paid to the preservation of monuments, and appropriate measures are being taken. In 2020, funds from the national budget (135 million) are provided for the reconstruction of the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi in the city of Turkistan. Furthermore, the preparation of the management plan for the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi for 2020-2025 (5.0 million) has begun. In 2019, scientific and restoration work was carried out on the Tamgaly petroglyphs, and a new visitor center was built in order to create optimal conditions for tourists.

Within the framework of the transnational nomination "Silk Road: Chang'an-Tianshan Corridor", 8 sites from Kazakhstan were included in the world heritage list: Talgar, Koylyk, Karamergen, Kulan, Kostobe, Ornek, Aktobe and Akyrtaş Palace complex. Archaeological research and scientific restoration works are carried out on these objects based on scientific projects.

REFERENCES

- Boyarsky, P.V.(1990). Introduction to the Study of Monuments. - M., 218 p., pl. ref. to ill. 21.
- Cleere H. (2001).Preserving Archaeological Sites and Monuments // Archaeology. Vol. II. – C.1-24.
- Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property. [Electronic resource] // <http://portal.unesco.org/> / (review date: 28.04.2020).
- Current Problems of the Economy of Cultural Heritage / Ed. Rubinstein, A.Y. - Moscow: State Institute of Art Studies. - 2016. - 108 p.
- Domrin, A. N. U.S.(2005). Legislation on the Protection of Monuments of National significance // Legal Protection of Monuments of History and Culture in Foreign Countries: collection of scientific works. Tr. - Pp. 119-134.
- Dosymbayeva, A.M. (2007).The Western Turkic Khaganate. Cultural Heritage of the Kazakh Steppe. - Almaty, 168 p.
- Efremova, T.F. (2000).New Dictionary of the Russian Language. Definition and Word-formative. - Moscow: Russian Language, 1222 p.
- Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Language/ editor-in-chief K. Volume 2. - Almaty: Rauan, 1971. - 956 p.

- Galkova, O.V.(2009). "The Concept of 'Monument of Culture': Modern Approaches to Interpretation // VESTNIK MGUKI March-April. №2 (28). Pp. 182-187.
- Griffen, L.A. (2012).Theoretical Foundations of Monument Studies. - K., 82 p.
- Herodotus. History. - Moscow, 1972. - 600 p.
- Jaeger, W. (1997).Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture (the Era of Great Educators and Educational Systems). Volume 2 / Jaeger, W. - Moscow: Greco-Lati Cabinet of Shichalin Y.A. Moscow, 336 p.
- Khaunina, E.A. Cultural Heritage Can Hit the Jackpot // Khraniteli Naslediya. URL: http://hraniteli-nasledia.com/articles/paralleli/kulturnoe-nasledie-mozhet-sorvat-dzhekpot/?sphrase_id=3533 (review date: 06.04.2019).
- Kiryanov, I. Y.(1979). Selection and identification of Monuments of Labor Glory of the Soviet People: Classification and Principles // Monuments of Labor Glory of the Soviet People: the. rep. to the regional scientific-methodical conf. Gorky, Pp. 5-7.
- Kopsergenova, A.A. (2008).Cultural Heritage: Philosophical Aspects of the Analysis. Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Ph. D. - Stavropol, 23 p.
- Kudaibergenov, S.E. (2018).Theoretical and Methodological Approach to the Study of the Phenomenon of Cultural Heritage // Bulletin of the Al-Farabi KazNU. Philosophy series. Cultural studies series. Political science series. No. 2 (64). pp. 73-86.
- Kulemzin, A.M. (2001).Protection of Russian Monuments as a Historical and Cultural phenomenon: dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Cultural Studies. - Tomsk, 403 p.
- Litvinova, O.G.(2010). Foreign and State Experience of Preserving the Historical and Cultural Heritage in the Late XX-early XXI cent. // Vestnik TGASU № 4, Pp. 46-62.
- Logunova, L.Y.(2019). Historical and Social Memory: Paradoxes and Meanings // Ideas and IdealsVol. 11. № 1, part 2. - Pp. 227-253.
- Marrou, H.I. (1998).History of education in the Ancient World: (Greece): [Trans. fr. Fr.] / Marrou, H.I. - Moscow: Greco-Latin Cabinet of Shichalin, Y.A., 425 p.
- Maryashev, A.N.; Goryachev, A.A. (1998).Rock Images of Zhetysu. MES RK. Institute of Archaeology named after A.Kh. Margulan. - Almaty. 206 p.
- Mazurov, Y. L. (2006).Natural and Cultural Heritage as a Factor in the Development of Environmental Management: Issues of Methodology and Management Practice: dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Geographical Sciences. - Moscow, 403 p.
- Mikhailovsky, E.V. (1971).Restoration of Architectural Monuments (Development of Theoretical Concepts). - Moscow, 1971. - 190 p.
- Mikhaylovsky, E.V. (1971).Restoration of Architectural Monuments (Development of Theoretical Concepts). - Moscow, 190 p.
- Muzychuk, V. Y.:(2016). Khaunina, E.A. Institutional Innovations in the Financing of Culture (scientific report). Moscow: Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 66 p.
- Ottenson, A. (1985).Cultural Monuments as the Object of State Protection at All Times. // Sovietskoe Pravo. № 3. - Pp. 192-198.
- Paliy, K.R.(2018). Implementation of the Policy in the Field of Preservation of Tangible Cultural Heritage: European Experience // Management Consultation. - Moscow, № 12 - Pp. 142-153.

- Paris Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. [Electronic resource] // <http://portal.unesco.org/en/> / (review date: 28.04.2020).
- Pilipenko, A.N. (2005). Protection of Cultural Monuments in France // Legal Protection of Monuments of History and Culture in Foreign Countries: collection of scientific works // RAS. INION, Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government of the Russian Federation. pp. 135-143.
- Polyakova, M.A. (2005). Protection of Russian Cultural Heritage: study guide for high education. Moscow: Drofa, p. 271.
- Primary Chronicle/tr. by Likhachov, D.S.; Tvorogova, O.V. St. Petersburg: Vita Nova, 2012 - - 512 p.: 186 ill.
- Roerich, P. K. (1974). From the Literary Heritage. Moscow, 360 p.
- Solopova, M.A.; Shichalin, Y.A. (2001). Paideia // New Philosophical Encyclopaedia: In 4 vols.; edited by Styopina, V.S. / Solopova, M.A.; Shichalin, Y.A. - M.: Mysl, 911 p.
- The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. [Electronic resource] <http://www.centre.smr.ru/win/books/pakt2.htm> (review date: 28.04.2020).
- World Cultural Heritage: Guidelines for the Organization of Independent Work of Students on Internal Training / comp. Belyaeva, T.A. Vologda: VSU, 2016, 16 p.
- Yatsenko, E.P. (2013). Problems of Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Italy [Electronic resource]. URL: [http://infoculture.rsl.ru/NIKLib/althome/news / KVM_archive/articles/2013/04/2013-04_r_kvms13.pdf](http://infoculture.rsl.ru/NIKLib/althome/news/KVM_archive/articles/2013/04/2013-04_r_kvms13.pdf) (review date: 06.04.2019). <https://artbonus.gov.it/cose-artbonus.html>.
- Zholdasbekov, M.; (2005). Sartkozha, K. Complete Atlas of Orkhon Monuments. – Astana. Kultegin, 360 p.
- Zhukov, Y. N. (1985). Saved by the Revolution. - Moscow: Moskovsky Rabochy, 207 p.
- Zhukov, Y.N. (1983). The Role of Law in the Protection of Cultural and Historical Heritage in the First Year of Soviet Power // Soviet State and Law. № 11. - Pp. 117-122.