

WHICH HERITAGE? WHICH LANDSCAPE? DEFINING THE AUTHENTICITY OF CULTURAL HERITAGE IN KARULA NATIONAL PARK¹

KRISTEL RATTUS
MA, researcher
Estonian National Museum
Veski 32, 50409 Tartu, Estonia
kristel.rattus@erm.ee

ABSTRACT

The article focuses on the conflict between Karula National Park in South-Estonia and a local tourist entrepreneur, caused by restrictions due to the heritage protection of the national park. The conflict is regarded as a dialogue between different ways of interpretation of cultural heritage or heritage representations in which different ideological contexts, convictions and coping strategies are intertwined. The article describes the representational practices of both dialogue partners or the implementation of conceptual worlds through concrete behaviour and demonstrates how such actions can express certain social relations, as well as the use of the notion authenticity as an ideological argument in order to legitimize specific heritage representations or, on the contrary, prevent them.

KEYWORDS: heritage protection • national parks • tourism • representational practice • power

The article focuses on the conflict between the former administration² of Karula National Park in South-Estonia and a local tourist entrepreneur, caused by restrictions due to the heritage protection of the national park. The conflict is regarded as a dialogue between different ways of interpretation of cultural heritage or heritage representations in which different ideological contexts, convictions and coping strategies are intertwined. The article describes the representational practices of both dialogue partners or the implementation of conceptual worlds through concrete behaviour and demonstrates how such actions can express certain social relations, as well as the use of the notion authenticity as an ideological argument in order to legitimize specific heritage representations or, on the contrary, prevent them.

I learned about the conflict between the former administration of the Karula National Park and a local entrepreneur calling herself Metsamoor (Woods Crone) in the summer of 2004, doing fieldwork in the park³ as well as in the autumn of 2005, participating in discussion meeting on the draft regulation for protection. The conflict was due to the fact that the administration of the National Park had tried to prevent Metsamoor from designing the buildings in her farmyard according to her fantasy, because, according to them, the Metsamoor's "landscape design" harmed the local heritage under protection. For example, the national park has forbidden to build a lawn roof for the reason that it has not been traditional on the territory of the national park. However, according to Metsamoor the stories of the national park were not better grounded than those of

herself and the administration of the national park interfered into her personal life and business. Both viewpoints were local, because both Metsamoor and the officials of the national park were local inhabitants.

What made me take interest in the conflict was, at first sight, a contradictory situation where the administration of the national park on the one hand advocated the incorporation of traditions into tourist as well as, through it, into wider everyday activities of the local population, the use of natural materials for building, but on the other hand disapproved the activities of Metsamoor who seemingly followed these principles. How had such a situation come to be? Which arguments were used in the discussion?

LIVING IN THE NATIONAL PARK

Karula National Park, converted in 1993 from a landscape reserve area, is located in South-East Estonia. The territory of the National Park coincides with the eastern part of the historic Karula parish. The majority of villages are located in hilly northern part of the National Park. The southern part of the National Park is covered with forests, with few settlements. People in Karula parish have throughout history mainly dealt with land cultivation and also forestry, bee-keeping, fishing and gardening.

Being situated in both geographical and economic periphery, employment opportunities for the local people are of great importance. In the whole of Estonia extensive migration from countryside to the cities has taken place in the 20th century. Likewise in Karula, compared to pre-World War II times, the number of households has decreased considerably. There are no major industrial undertakings in the National Park. Most people work in bigger local centres of Antsla, Võru and Valga. Today, the main areas of activity, left for the inhabitants of the region, are agriculture, forestry and tourism.

For local people, living on the territory of the national park means restrictions in many fields. According to the main regulation of the administration of Karula National Park⁴ the aim of the national park is the protection of local natural and cultural heritage. In practice the main emphasis was laid on the observation and protection of nature, but, since one third of the park's territory is covered with man-made landscapes, the activities of nature protection also included the caretaking of landscapes and supervision over building and mining.

Since opportunities for agriculture or forestry are limited due to the valid restrictions, the local development programmes primarily emphasize the importance of developing tourism.⁵ The folklorist Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett has referred to the fact that both developing as well as developed countries experiencing a decline of their agricultural and industrial economies also turn to tourism. The shift here parallels transitions elsewhere to a service-based economy, since tourism is a service industry (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1997). In Karula many local inhabitants have already started or plan to start a tourist enterprise (there are already 12 active tourist farms in the area) or regard it as a potential perspective for the future. The administration of the national park has also approved of developing tourism as a local development perspective. One opportunity to attract tourists is the local cultural heritage. According to Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, tourism and heritage are collaborative industries, heritage converting locations into destinations and tourism making them economically viable as exhibits of themselves. The her-

itage industry “exports” its product through tourism. To compete for tourists, a location must become a destination, and heritage is one of the ways locations do this. Heritage is a way of producing “hereness” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995: 371, 373).

However, the question of preserving the man-made landscape picture in the national park has brought several issues of cultural heritage⁶, for example the preservation of ancient buildings and network of roads, to the attention of the park’s administration. Likewise one looks for opportunities to preserve the local võru dialect and the permanent population speaking the local dialect. Karula National Park was one of the first national parks in Estonia where one started to pay systematic attention to questions of cultural heritage. In the interests of preserving the landscape picture the administration of the national park has passed a regulation for protection on the basis of which new building activities are also regulated, for example, recommendations are given on the size, proportions and materials to be used. The settlement and building picture of late 19th-early 20th century (in the terms of the regulation for protection⁷, the time of pre-industrialization and buying farms for perpetuity) is preferred. The proportions of buildings, planning of the yard and building materials are especially emphasized (Regulation for protection: 26, Building heritage: 1).

Thus, in Karula National Park cultural heritage is under particular attention proceeding from two viewpoints – first, as an object under protection, and, second, as a means for economic growth through tourism.

The second side of the conflict analysed in the article is a local tourist entrepreneur who calls herself Metsamoor (Woods Crone) in her tourist activities and whose undertakings are largely based on experiencing and interpretation of cultural heritage. Metsamoor is a woman in her thirties who, together with her husband, co-ordinates and heads the local network of tourist farms – the so-called Metsamoor Family Park – and is also herself actively involved in it. In the summer of 2004 ten farms belonged to the family park⁸. In the farms both ancient farmwork, largely not practiced any more nowadays, as well as contemporary farm activities were demonstrated to tourists. For example, one farm that belonged to the family park had concentrated on bee-keeping, another cooked bread in the traditional way, the third bred horses and offered the opportunity to ride on a sledge, the fourth kept leeches, the fifth grew strawberries, in the sixth one could go to smoke sauna etc. Often the ancient origin of a phenomenon was emphasized (going to smoke sauna, sledging, domestic bread-baking or bee-keeping are certainly old local customs). As a rule, tourism gave additional income for those belonging to the family park. The family of the Metsamoor was the only one subsisting on tourism only.

According to Metsamoor her aim is to offer an experience to her visitors. All the activities going on in her farm are presented as the everyday life of a botanist living in a faraway forest and knowing nature well. Although the stories of Metsamoor who has studied folklore at the University of Tartu referred to local landscape as well as folk characters and legends from all over Estonia, they also contain a lot of Metsamoor’s own fantasy and reflect her experience. In Metsamoor’s activities the immediate surroundings of her home – the farmhouse, other buildings, the yard – that had been designed according to her “story”, hold an important position. So, besides swings, scaling ladders and other playground equipment meant for children, one could see conical tents made of poles, little cottages with turf roofs as well as various sculptures made of natu-

ral materials in Metsamoor's farmyard. The latter depicted various fantastic creatures whose names were very often derived of their appearance – material, looks or location, for example, Root Devil, Tree with a Skirt. Some sculptures also depicted Metsamoor herself. At the events for tourists Metsamoor also daringly used elements of contemporary popular culture (for example, suggestive synthesizer music on the celebration of All Souls' Day⁹). Thus, on the one hand, Metsamoor's activities are subjective culture building, personal interpretation of the environment and traditions, and on the other hand a coping strategy to attract customers.

From the pragmatic viewpoint Metsamoor's activities should be acceptable for the national park. Although thousands of people have passed through Metsamoor's yard in the tourist season, this has not harmed the natural environment, because in Metsamoor's Family Park tourist activities are kept within certain limits. However, the way how Metsamoor designs her farmyard has arisen indignation in the former administration of the national park, because, according to them, it was too voluntaristic and harmful to local cultural heritage. For example, for many years Metsamoor tried to get leave of the park's administration for putting a lawn roof on her stable that in her opinion would have gone well with the landscape as well as with Metsamoor's "story". The national park refused to give the permission for building because this would have contradicted the regulation for protection that serves as a basis for the park's heritage protection activities.¹⁰ Metsamoor has also criticized the wish of the park's administration that she would have site plans drawn for the attractions and sculptures in her farmyard.

CULTURAL HERITAGE AS REPRESENTATION

The folklorist Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett has defined heritage as a process: heritage is not lost and found, stolen and reclaimed, but it is a mode of cultural production that has recourse to the past (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995: 369–370). Neither is heritage industry anything else than a contemporary mode of cultural production that produces something new, adding value to a phenomenon that has gradually perished or, as the folklorist Regina Bendix puts it: "heritage puts everything into a collective pot of "culture" and "past", possibly adding the adjective "important" to it" (Bendix 2000: 42). Once sites, buildings, objects, technologies, or ways of life can no longer sustain themselves as they once did, they are made economically viable as representations of themselves. They have a value of exhibition (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995: 371). A key characteristic of the heritage concept is its timelessness, it is static and not punctual and transformative in the way we treat historical facts (Bendix 2000: 44).

At the same time, the process of adding value suggests that the value is not inherent, but values are defined by people depending on a specific social context. According to Kirshenblatt-Gimblett the means of the heritage industry like landmarking, historic recreation, cultural conservation and heritage tourism, are also instruments for adding value to the cultural forms they perform, teach, exhibit, circulate and market (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995: 374). Such a process can be called representation building, because usually a representation refers to the presentation in one form or another (texts, images, maps, speech, land, objects) of an interpretation of the world. Any representational practice, therefore, becomes a practice of translation from terrain to map, or from lived

experience to text and speech or from sketch to land shape (Mels 1999: 201–202). In the case of the conflict studied in the present article we actually have to do with the opposite process if interpretation where the text served as the source of representation and one tried to adapt it to people's experience.

The creation and use in practice of various representations is characterized by the process of reinvention that refers to a concrete (conceptual or ideological) emphasis in the process shaping the representation and presupposes an inherent social power aspect (See Mels 1999: 2, 28). According to the French philosopher Michel Foucault "power is neither given, nor exchanged, nor recovered, but rather exercised, and that it only exists in action" (Foucault 1980a: 89). In order to understand the working mechanism of power we have to investigate the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives (Foucault 1980b: 39).

On its homepage Karula National Park regarded itself as a trademark directed to tourists and derived from the reputation of the local area. As was mentioned above, tourism is seen as a suitable employment opportunity for the periphery that would increase the preservation potential of the local community. A systematic implementation of a uniform heritage representation – under the name of (the preservation of) the local landscape picture was indeed carried out in the interests of creating the trademark. Therefore the administration of the national park tried to guarantee that no unsuitable or, using the terminology of the park's administration, non-traditional elements would not appear in the local landscape picture.

Former director of the national park: If you do this thing according to the current legislation in Estonia, you are prescribed quite a lot. (...) And the whole society has agreed that it is necessary to do it. And here simply you have to face a few other things. Because the society has agreed that there is such a valuable landscape here, that a national park has been set up here, in order to preserve it here and so some things are so-to-say put to you like in Kalamaja or Kadriorg¹¹.

In order to preserve this landscape picture, the park accepted the entrepreneurship of local people, as well as their attempts to cope, but also tried to shape their taste preferences. The national park has arranged annual courses on traditional building techniques and preservation, as well as other events (for example, study days) and renovated the buildings of value according to its capabilities. Whole projects were initiated in order to protect the cultural heritage. First of all attention was paid to the proportions and materials of the buildings. The aim was to take into use the objects with old appearance (mainly, but not only buildings) in new functions, to integrate them in people's everyday life or, as Graham puts it, to create phenomena that would simultaneously be "modern but authentic" (Graham 2001: 70).

Former director of the national park: The main thing with new buildings is the general proportions that work in this landscape picture. Because we are not preserving this landscape picture if we build or permit to build some very peculiar-shaped buildings here besides the caretaking things. Like the number of storeys and such. But I think that within these limits there is enough space for development and individuality as well, so that will not suffer.

On the other hand, Metsamoor has reproached the administration of the national park an interference into her personal life as well as that, although the restrictions of the park make the life of local people more difficult and more expensive, the discomfort is not compensated in any way. In her opinion the cultural heritage at the national park is defended at the cost of the local people (including herself).

Metsamoor: This is not founded on any legislative acts, because this has not been regulated anywhere that there must not be a turf roof or there has to be a shingle roof. This is just recommended. And at the same time they do not compensate the difference. They kind of have no right to demand when they do not compensate what they demand. I live in my own home, I am not building somewhere outside.

Since both sides tried to achieve their aims, they came back to the problem from time to time. Sometimes the negotiations gave no results; at times minor concessions were made.

COMPETING HERITAGE REPRESENTATIONS. IDEOLOGY-AUTHENTICITY

Ideology plays a key role for the legitimation of a representation¹². In the present case the notion of "authenticity" was determined as ideological. The demand for authenticity was the core idea of the cultural heritage protection based on the principles of heritage protection of the former administration of Karula National Park: only authentic (or traditional, according to the term they themselves used) heritage could be valuable.

In their attempts to define authenticity different scholars have picked out different aspects. Bendix has called it "the façade vs the real thing"-dichotomy (Bendix 1994: 67). Golomb argues that authenticity "calls for no particular contents or consequences, but, rather, focuses on the origins and the intensity of one's emotional-existential commitments" (Golomb 1995: 9) and points out that the self is at the centre of authenticity. Bendix also emphasizes that, at heart, authenticity is a way of experiencing or being. However, he recognizes that it is hard for humans to grasp something merely mental or experiential as a value, and thus we search for symbols or objectifications of the authentic. But as soon as we create material representations of authenticity, they are subject to the principles of the market, demanding scales of lesser and higher value (Bendix 1994: 68).

The authors generally agree that authenticity is a dispute over possible truths. Since authenticity does not emerge out of the characteristics of a thing or an object, but is socially constructed, its social connotations are disputable. But how did the sides of the Karula conflict understand authenticity?

Although the former administration of the national park wished to preserve the "authentic" heritage, protecting the cultural heritage, they have had few instructions as for the definition of cultural heritage and they have done it mainly by themselves.

Former director of the national park: To be honest, nobody has given us an adequate answer to the question of what and how. And so we have tried to give and look for the answer ourselves with those projects.

In 1999 an order was placed for an expert opinion on the local cultural heritage (Eller 1999) drafted by an autodidact close to the park's administration. For compiling the ex-

pert opinion, he described and photographed all the dwellings and outbuildings on the territory of the national park. That document became the basis for working out the first regulation for protection according to which mostly wooden buildings from early 20th century and (some) late 19th century. At the same time stone buildings from the same period and single examples of stylistic innovations – the latter were even named curiosities in the expert opinion¹³ – were left without attention (Eller 1999: 10). Soviet-time architecture that is quite common in Karula as well as elsewhere in Estonia was considered unauthentic as well. It has to be mentioned, though, that this opinion is shared by many local inhabitants and such attitude is characteristic to Estonia after the regaining of independence. Following the regulation for protection, one preferred to renovate and build log houses with shingle roofs with characteristic declination like they were built in the early 20th century. Lawn roofs that were probably built on the Estonian territory, but have not occurred in Karula National Park in the 20th century, have been considered unsuitable for the local landscape picture¹⁴. Even if we leave aside the fact that the author has no special training in the field which may not be of primary importance, the document is quite vulnerable for two reasons – first, because it is explicitly a vision of just one author and, secondly, because the approach of the expert opinion is not flexible and does not take into account the local specific conditions. At the same time – at least on those cases that I have been involved – the discussions on the cultural heritage of the national park have been open, local people have been invited to participate in them. That gives out the message that a dialogue is going on in which other opinions are welcome as well. The opinion of the national park has supporters among the local people (for example, people who have settled in the area of the park within the past few years, either working for the park or simply those who have escaped the rush of citylife; also several elderly people whose nostalgic childhood memories this might awake¹⁵). However, a remarkable number of local people have remained passive bystanders in this dialogue. Metsamoor and her husband have been among the few who have argued with the park over the issue of authenticity of cultural heritage.

Thus, the attitudes of the administration of the national park concerning cultural heritage have been quite static, corresponding to what the Swedish ethnologist Jonas Frykman has described: nowadays cultural heritage means a collection of stories and objects, but how it is constantly recreated and reshaped and given meanings escapes attention (Frykman 2003: 170). The park's administration has also been rather rigid, defining "authenticity", using the notion of "traditional"- "untraditional" (according to the terms of this article, "authentic"- "non-authentic") as a critical-appreciative term¹⁶. When the new draft regulation for protection was compiled in 2005 the administration of the national park admitted, though, that their approach had been too limited and that they had adopted a broader approach for the new draft. However, they felt a need – partly due to practical needs of protection activities – to define in quite a precise manner what the Karula cultural heritage actually comprised. One has proceeded from general heritage protection principles or, in other words, tried to restore the old landscape picture as it had "actually" been once. This attitude can be seen in relation to Hermann Lübke's idea of "musealizing": a process which takes place in contemporary culture in relation to history as well as in relation to nature. With regard to history, "musealizing" means the rapid growth of the number of "relics" or "museum items"; it means the accumulation of our past into our present as a result of the rapid progress brought

about by modernity. This type of historical consciousness is expanded to nature as well. Today's environmental consciousness is, according to Lübbe, a result and part of the "musealizing" of nature, of the effort to preserve (or rather, to construct) an authenticity of nature in the same way in which local traditions have been constructed and cultural heritage invented (Lübbe 1987: 157, cit. Koleva 2004: 71–72).

Issues of personal taste also played a role in the attitudes of the administration of the national park:

Former director of the national park: And at the same time I feel myself that I would like to see such a cosy farmyard, so to say.

Question: What does a cosy farmyard look like?

Answer: Such as it has been.

However, in Metsamoor's opinion the lawn roofs would go well with her "story".

Metsamoor also had her own interpretation of cultural heritage. Whereas the administration of the national park preferred the "musealizing"-principle, Metsamoor's wish was to explain the so-called old folk religion and old way of thought as well as how those old nice customs could be used today. Metsamoor has acquired her knowledge of *old folk belief* and *way of thought* through her studied of folkloristics at the University of Tartu and production at the University of Tartu Viljandi Academy of Culture. She mentioned that she had also read a lot and studied these issues. Hereby explaining is an important keyword.

Metsamoor: I kind of try to explain, the connections of man with the natural world in general, trees and plants and, let's say, living nature, how to understand it, how to let it into yourself. (...) I don't tell them (fairy-tales), I try to explain them. How they have emerged and who is actually the snake king, how were the snake spells made, you see, they all actually exist, the snake spells. Pain spells. Those stomach ache spells are such spells that people specially come back here for. Because actually those spells have great power in them, if one uses them, they are not just empty words. But quite practical, usable things, then...

Metsamoor also wishes to pass on her own cognition of nature, what she herself experiences living in the middle of nature.

Metsamoor: That the old thing, not the old thing, but how one once lived or might have lived, we actually don't know how he lived. One has studied this way and another, that we only know a history which is a hundred years old. But as I live here twenty-four hours a day, well, so I have to know the environment where I live. I am not like going to work in the town or like that. I have my job and my life and my holidays all here in this environment. And from here come all my own explanations to the theories of how man might have thought and how he might have felt. That is of course not such absolute knowledge that so it must have been. But this is just my explanation.

In Metsamoor's opinion the administration of the national park was not competent to say which elements were traditional from the viewpoint of the local culture.

Metsamoor: According to them maybe this is right that was a hundred years ago. This is the very right thing, although I don't understand why it should be that way.

That what existed a hundred years ago is right and what existed a thousand years ago is not right.

For example, Metsamoor in her turn criticized the activities of the national park, taking the use of contemporary electric fences or not-local Hereford cattle as an example:

Metsamoor: It seems to me that those electric fences and the Herefords that are moving around here should not be suitable for a national park. Here you even cannot turn away from a road, there are electric fences everywhere, such plastic ribbons... I really don't know... In my opinion this does not match at all with the thing that we should have here.

The national park has approved of raising Hereford cattle, because besides the meat of high quality that it gives, their grazing is also important from the viewpoint of landscape care – it helps to maintain semi-natural communities. For example, in Karula they help to prevent overgrowing with bushes in small pasturelands and preserve the open views that are considered to be characteristic of the local area¹⁷. For the local farmers the fact that the farms breeding meat cattle in an ecological manner are qualified for some additional benefits besides regular agricultural supports also speaks in favour of breeding the Herefords (Vessart et al. 2005: 5)

For these reasons the administration of the national park does not have enough authority in the sight of university graduate Metsamoor.

CONCLUSIONS

The present article focused on the conflict between the administration of Karula National Park and a local tourist entrepreneur over the issue of cultural heritage that was interpreted as a dialogue between competing versions of heritage.

Mediating itself to the outside world, the administration of Karula National Park has created representations of nature as well as of heritage. Although the heritage representations are in the focus of interest of this article, the presentation of natural and cultural heritage has formed one whole in the activities of the national park. On one hand, this is connected to the wish to preserve the local landscape picture, largely shaped by human activity through thousands of years. On the other hand, one has tried to give the national park a shape of a uniform trademark for the outside world that would help to enliven the local economy mainly through tourism, avoid the emigration of local permanent population and strengthen the local community with its particular language, customs and traditions.

Actually regarding itself as heritage protection area, the former administration of the national park has tried to regulate the forms of appearance of the elements under protection quite precisely which means that the experiences of nature and landscape have become increasingly managed and mediated by the representational means provided by official park planners. Doing this the history of the area has been taken into account and it has been presumed that there would exist some kind of reference to a phenomenon seen as cultural heritage in the local environment – that something would be preserved, somebody would remember, one presumed the existence of recordable material. This is an approach practiced by heritage protection authorities, primarily

emphasizing the spectacular aspect of the landscape. The protection of cultural heritage preferred by the administration of the national park meant new contemporary contents mould into old form. Issues of personal taste also played a role here.

Metsamoor's improvisational approach to the heritage emphasized personal cognition of nature and the importance of her own experience. Although her stories were based on traditions and popular legends – though not only those about Karula parish, but about the whole of Estonia – in her case personal relationship with heritage was on the forefront. She also used her own fantasy and daringly mixed folklore material from different parts of Estonia as well as elements of contemporary popular culture. Metsamoor also rather considered her own business needs than those of the community.

In the conflict the wish of the national park's administration to legitimate its representation became evident. Metsamoor, on the contrary, stressing that the park's representation is just one possible viewpoint among many others, questioned the official representation and pointed to the possibility of a multitude of representations and also tried to achieve the legitimation of her own version. On one hand, the version of the administration of the national park is certainly negotiable, because it was founded on a weak basis – there were no concrete prescriptions and the draft regulation for protection that served as a basis to the protection of cultural heritage was easily vulnerable due to its limited viewpoint. On the other hand, the representativity of Metsamoor's personal interpretation of cultural heritage for the whole area is easily questionable as well.

It is likely that in the future the principle of complex protection of natural and cultural heritage probably increases the number of situations in which the concerns of many interest groups collide. It also became evident during the fieldwork that the phenomena important for the national park are not always significant for the local people. Although the local population values the preservation of elements of ancient peasant culture in the landscape picture, because they consider it beautiful and, for example, participates in the preservation and restoration of old architecture, one criticizes the turning of the area into a museum and finds that even on the protection area of cultural heritage it should be possible to live a life considering contemporary demands and opportunities. It is also in the interests of the national park to develop the park as a trademark, according to the "right" representation of heritage (or, to be more precise, landscape picture). Therefore the spectacular aspect of the local landscape has been on the foreground and the national park has sometimes ejected social relationships from the appearance of countryside.

In some sense the ideological principles of the park have contradicted its explicit purposes. Although the policy of developing the national park as a trademark prefers the preservation of local permanent population (speaking the võru dialect), in practice this has meant little consideration of the contemporary socio-cultural context and rather favored the emergence of a new community. For example, restrictions to agriculture and afforestation and paying primary attention to the spectacular aspect favor the working of the local people outside the national park and the development of the region into a recreational area where townspeople like to build their summer cottages. But this is already a new topic to be analyzed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Interviews conducted in Karula National Park during 2003–2004. (In the possession of the author.)
- Homepage of Karula National Park. <http://www.karularahvuspark.ee> .
- Adorno, Theodor W. [1964] 2003. *The Jargon of Authenticity*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bendix, Regina 1994. The Quest for Authenticity in Tourism and Folklife Studies. – *Pennsylvania Folklife*, Winter 1993–94, Vol. 43, No. 2, 67–70.
- Bendix, Regina 2000. Heredity, Hybridity and Heritage from One Fin de Siècle to the Next. – Pertti J. Anttonen et al. (eds.). *Folklore, Heritage Politics and Ethnic Diversity: a Festschrift for Barbro Klein*. Botkyrka, Sweden: Multicultural Center, 37–54.
- Building heritage = Ehituspärandi kaitse üldised põhimõtted Karula rahvuspargis. Koosoleku materjal 28.–29. 03. 2006. <http://www.karularahvuspark.ee/index.php?nodeid=167&lang=et>.
- Dijk, Teun A. van 1998. *Ideology: a Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- Eller, Kalle 1999. Karula rahvuspargi piires asuva arhitektuuri, ajaloo- ja kultuuripärandi inventeerimise aruanne. Alusuuringud Karula Rahvuspargi kaitsekorralduskava ettevalmistamiseks. Karula. Manuscript.
- Foucault, Michel 1980a. Two Lectures. – Colin Gordon (ed.). *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 78–108.
- Foucault, Michel 1980b. Prison Talk. – Colin Gordon (ed.). *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 37–54.
- Frykman, Jonas 2003. Between History and Material Culture. – Jonas Frykman & Nils Gilje (eds.). *Being There. New Perspectives on Phenomenology and the Analysis of Culture*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 169–191.
- Golomb, Jacob 1995. *In Search of Authenticity. From Kierkegaard to Camus*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Graham, Colin 2001. “Blame it on Maureen O’Hara”: Ireland and the Trope of Authenticity. – *Cultural Studies* Vol. 15. No. 1. Routledge, 58–75.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 1995. Theorizing Heritage. – *Ethnomusicology*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (Autumn), 367–380.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 1997. Afterlives. – *Performance Research* 2, 2 (Summer), 1–10. <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/tourist/wales.dos>.
- Koleva, Daniela 2004. Narrating Nature. Perceptions of the Environment and Attitudes towards it in Life Stories. – Stephen Hussey & Paul Thompson (eds.). *Environmental Consciousness: the Roots of a New Political Agenda*. Transactions Publishers: New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (U.K.), 63–75.
- Lübbe, Hermann 1987. *Fortschritts-Reaktionen. Über konservative und destruktive Modernität*. Graz: Styria.
- Maran, Timo 2002. Ecosemiotic Basis of Locality. – Virve Sarapik, Kadri Tüür, Mari Laanemets. (eds.) *Koht ja paik. Place and Location*. II. Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Arts 10. Tallinn, 60–80.
- Mels, Tom 1999. *Wild Landscapes. The Cultural Nature of Swedish National Parks*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- MTÜ Karula Hereford juhatus 2003. Asutati lihaveise kasvatamise ühing. – *Tarupettäi*. Karula rahvuspargi infoleht. Nr 15, suvi, 2.
- Nepal, Sanjay K. 2000. Tourism, national parks and local communities. – *Tourism and National Parks. Issues and Implications*. Ed. By Richard W. Butler & Stephen W. Boyd. Chichester (etc.): John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., 73–94.
- Orlove, Benjamin S., Stephen B. Brush 1996. Anthropology and the Conservation of Biodiversity. – *Annual Review of Anthropology*. Vol. 25, 329–352.

- Parts, Priit-Kalev 2002. Ehituslikud piirangud ja kaldakaitsevööndite ulatuse määramine Karula rahvusparkis. Soovitused Karula rahvusparki kaitse-eeskirja koostamiseks. Liivakingu-Haapsalu. Manuscript.
- Peegel, Henno 2004. Veetka hobusetalli restaureerimine – *Tarupettäi*. Karula Rahvusparki infoleht nr 21. Talv, 2.
- Regulation for Protection = Karula rahvusparki kaitsekorralduskava 2001–2005. <http://www.karularahvuspark.ee/files/doc/Kaitsekorralduskava.pdf>.
- Vessart, Leino, Airi Vetemaa, Merit Mikk (eds.) 2005. Mahepõllumajanduslik lihavede kasvatamine. Ökoloogiliste Tehnoloogiate Keskus. www.agri.ee/link.php?id=12098&filename=lihavede_kasvatamine.pdf.
- Zhou, Andréa 2004. Pathways to the Amazon. British campaigners in the Brazilian rainforest. – Stephen Hussey & Paul Thompson (eds.) *Environmental Consciousness: the Roots of a New Political Agenda*. New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (U.K.): Transactions Publishers, 174–199.

NOTES

1 The article is based on the author's paper Personal interpretation of tradition on a protection area of traditional culture at the 46th annual conference Culture and power of the Estonian National Museum. The grant No. 6687 of the ESF supported the completion of the article.

2 In connection with the restructuring of nature reserves the administration of the Karula National Park ceased its activities on 31 December 2005. Its duties were taken over by the Põlva-Valga-Võru regional office of the State Nature Protection Centre.

3 The fieldwork focused on the specific way of life in a protection area (coping with the restrictions that the inhabitants of the protection area have to face, as well as the opportunities it offers). I was invited to participate in the discussion meeting on the draft regulation for protection with my colleague as a cultural heritage specialist.

4 See the main regulation of the administration of Karula National Park. Regulation of the Minister of the Environment No. 63 of 11 October 2000. <http://www.karularahvuspark.ee/?nodeid=95&lang=et>.

5 In many places over the world tourism has been acknowledged as the preferable activity. Through tourism one tries to create a positive connection between the reserve areas and the local communities. On one hand, tourism creates opportunities for economic coping; on the other, it is supposed to increase the feeling of attachment to the place and shape a positive attitude of local inhabitants towards the protection activities. The reserve areas prefer sustainable tourism that would exert as little influence on the environment as possible. Likewise, it is generally acknowledged that all kinds of tourism inevitably influences the environment and therefore compromises have to be made between protection activities and the aims and needs of tourism. However, this remains unsettled and ongoing dispute involving different social and political positions, often concerning the voicing of and tension between the issues of "biodiversity" and "social justice". (See Nepal 2000; Zhou 2004).

6 The intertwining of local culture and local environment is a widespread understanding in ecophilosophy. The term bioregionalism has also been used, emphasizing the connection between local culture and local natural environment (Maran 2002: 77). According to such a way of thought one also has to protect the local cultural tradition, supporting and valuing the natural environment, in order to protect the latter. Hence the interest of the protectors of heritage culture in, for example, traditional crafts, buildings, food or landscapes. The protection of natural and cultural heritage also means keeping together the local community, since the change of population increases the loss of (cultural) diversity – for example traditional (environmental) knowledge and skills disappear (See Orlove and Brush 1996: 329).

7 The first regulation for protection entered into force in 2001 and defined the valuable buildings on the territory of Karula National Park and enacted activities to be undertaken in the framework of protection. In 2006 a new regulation for protection was passed.

8 Only two of the twelve tourist farms in the territory of Karula National Park worked independently and did not belong to the Metsamoor Family Park.

9 A festival of folk calendar on November 2 when, according to the Estonian tradition, one lights candles on the windows so that the ghosts of relatives could see their way home. Sometimes a table is laid for the ghosts as well.

10 See Peegel 2004: 2.

11 Historical quarters of Tallinn under protection.

12 I hereby proceed from the multidisciplinary definition of ideology by the cultural scientist and discourse theoretician Teun A. van Dijk, according to which ideologies are systems of abstract ideas and values shared by members of a group and organizing or legitimating the group's activities. It is the social function of ideologies to define the social identity and interests of the group (van Dijk 1998: 3, 314).

13 The oldest buildings preserved in Karula National Park at the end of the 20th century mostly came from early 20th century and, in some cases, from an earlier period. At the same time the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries was a period of modernization in Estonian folk culture when many elements characteristic of traditional peasant culture, including rural architecture, changed and altered quickly. In Karula parish one started to build new contemporary dwellings besides barn-dwellings (and, in connection with that, the building of new outbuildings – drying sheds) with centuries-long history even earlier than it generally happened in Estonia. So, the architectural picture dated to the early 20th century is quite varied as well.

14 Besides Eller's expert opinion, another expert opinion of almost the same period is worth mentioning (Parts 2002) also placed by Karula National Park. The expert opinion of Parts also supports the rigid policy of building recommendations, but at the same time suggests introducing lawn roofs.

15 In the territory of Karula National Park the building of log houses following the building traditions of the early 20th century, continued until at least the 1960ies (Parts 2002: 52).

16 See Adorno, *The Jargon of Authenticity*: „Inauthentic“, where something broken is implied, an expression which is not immediately appropriate to what is expressed...“Inauthentic“...becomes a critical term, in definite negation of something merely phenomenal. (Adorno 2003: 5).

17 In 2003 it was agreed at the foundation meeting of the non-governmental organization Karula Hereford, considering different breeds of meat cattle and their breeding conditions that Hereford is most suitable for the local landscape (MTÜ Karula Hereford juhatus 2003).