

Kim H. Veltman

## **Towards New Cultural Histories in a Networked World**

*EVA Moscow*, Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow, 1-5 December 2003 (in press).

---

---

### **Abstract**

Cultural networks entail an implicit assumption that institutions/individuals wish to share their cultural expressions with persons around the world. Such networks bring obvious technological challenges with respect to interoperability of software and hardware and problems of languages. In addition, there are many more subtle challenges. To share there must be things in common: How does one reflect these things in common and at the same time adequately reflect cultural differences? This paper outlines some common frameworks to begin such sharing and explores implications for cultural history.

Russia offers a particularly interesting case in point because it clearly shares many cultural strands with Europe qua nature, religion, mythology, literature, and at the same time has a very distinct history that cannot be subsumed simply as another chapter of the European tradition. The need for a new framework to approach such cultural histories is outlined. Not considered in this paper are cases where cultural differences are so deeply rooted, that they require a much more complex approach.

---

- 
1. Introduction
  2. Centres and Peripheries
  3. Alternative Stories and Histories
  4. Shared Topics
  5. Static and Dynamic Expressions
  6. New Models of Culture
  7. World Networked Distributed Electronic Repository (WONDER)
  8. Conclusions
- 

---

### **1. Introduction**

In the past, local, regional and national cultural heritage typically proceeded in parallel with little interdependence and often with complete independence of and from each other. Cultural networks entail an implicit assumption that institutions/individuals wish to share their cultural expressions with persons around the world. Such networks bring obvious technological challenges with respect to interoperability of software and hardware. Such challenges are being addressed on a number of fronts such as the GEANT<sup>1</sup> network and

the grid initiatives<sup>2</sup>, which are linking with other networks around the world. There are also obvious problems of languages, which are being addressed by groups such as the International Standards Organisation (ISO),<sup>3</sup> the Unicode Consortium,<sup>4</sup> and newer bodies such as the Multilingual Internet Naming Consortium (MINC).<sup>5</sup> This infrastructure is essential but since such technological challenges are already the subject of large-scale projects they are not further considered in this paper.

Meanwhile, organisations such as CIDOC<sup>6</sup> and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) are addressing questions about how to share knowledge within one's own culture.<sup>7</sup> At the other end of the spectrum, there are very complex challenges that arise in trying to share expressions from profoundly different cultures, e.g. between sedentary and nomadic cultures, or between cultures where basic assumptions concerning the use of written communication, the role of theory or even the definition of original differ. Such cases require a complex approaches that will also be addressed elsewhere.<sup>8</sup>

In many cases there are clearly many common themes and at the same time differences of such an order that they cannot be seen as simply another chapter or application, where the inheriting culture has developed so profoundly that it needs to be treated at the same time as an autonomous culture in itself. How does one reflect these things in common and at the same time adequately reflect cultural differences? This paper outlines some common frameworks to begin such sharing and explores implications for cultural history.

Russia offers a particularly interesting case in point because it clearly shares many cultural strands with Europe qua nature, religion, mythology, and literature, and at the same time has a very distinct history that cannot be subsumed simply as another chapter of the European tradition. Although it had many contacts with Europe,<sup>9</sup> Russia was never a European colony. It was never part of the Grand Tour. Even genetically it is quite distinct.<sup>10</sup> The need for a new framework to approach such interdependent yet independent cultural histories is outlined. Not considered in this paper are cases where cultural differences are so deeply rooted, that they require a much more complex approach.

The paper has three parts, beginning with a review of developments in cultural history from the Renaissance to the present in order to understand historical dimensions that need to be integrated in future electronic systems. Part two considers possible examples from four areas of cultural expression, namely, nature, religion, mythology, and literature. Part three explores how dynamic models can help integrate such examples into a larger framework to enable multiple views of common heritage while maintaining the integrity of autonomous cultural systems.

## **2. Centres and Peripheries**

To understand the challenges for digital databases in the future it is useful to explore historical dimensions of the past that they need to reflect. Centre-periphery<sup>11</sup> is one of these crucial concepts. This has been used in cultural history from at least the time of the

Greeks:<sup>12</sup> e.g. Athens, Constantinople, Rome and Alexandria. For our purposes we shall review briefly two examples since the fifteenth century.

### **Rome**

Today the accomplishments of Renaissance Italy are frequently associated with centres such as Florence. From accounts at time,<sup>13</sup> however, we know that many of the Florentine pioneers, including Brunelleschi, and Donatello began their careers by going to Rome, which became a key centre for the revival in studies of classical architecture and culture. Throughout the fifteenth century, almost all the major artists went to Rome as part of their artistic and cultural development including Mantegna, Rosselli, Ghirlandaio, Botticelli, Perugino, and later Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael. While some artists such as Raphael simply stayed in Rome, most went back to other centres such as Florence, Siena, Padua, Mantua, Ferrara, and Milan, which in turn became centres from which cultural activities spread.<sup>14</sup>

As a major cultural centre, Rome is of particular interest for our purposes because the role it played in the dissemination of the Italian Renaissance spread to the entire European arena in the period 1500-1750. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, for instance, Netherlandish artists such as Martin van Heemskerck, Hieronymus Cock and Francisco d'Hollanda spread the Roman ideas to the Netherlands, Spain and Portugal. French artists such as Léonard Thiry and Androuet du Cerceau did the same for France. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Nicolas Poussin used the fruits of a long Roman sojourn to found the Académie des Arts et Sciences in Paris. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Englishman, Richard Wilson, worked in Rome and environs (1750-1757) and subsequently transformed the British countryside into Italianate landscapes. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century also, the long Roman stays of Winckelmann and Goethe had a profound impact on German art and aesthetics. Not surprisingly, Rome became one of the stops on the Grand Tour as it evolved in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>15</sup>

From 1750, onwards the role that Rome had played as a centre with respect to Europe as a periphery expanded gradually to include the whole world. For our purposes it is fascinating to note that soon after the opening of the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts (1757) in Saint Petersburg:

In 1760 Anton Losenko<sup>16</sup> became the first Academy student to be sent abroad (to Italy and France) to complete his training. In the nineteenth century the Russian Academy maintained its own campus in a historic building in Rome. The school was modeled on the Academy in Paris, and was created some time after those in Vienna and Berlin; but it was established a few years before the Royal Academy in London, illustrating the great cultural strides Russia was making in the eighteenth century.<sup>17</sup>

This began a tradition whereby major Russian artists stayed in Rome including figures such as Ivan Aivazovsky (1817-1900)<sup>18</sup> and Karl Briullov who died in Rome in 1852.

## **Paris**

The significance of Paris as a cultural centre began in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century with a political decision on the part of Francis 1<sup>st</sup> that he wanted to have a French equivalent of the Italian Renaissance. As a result he sent personal invitations to Michelangelo, who politely declined, to Leonardo da Vinci, who came to the Clos Lucé in Amboise, and others including Primaticcio and Sebastiano Serlio. The 17<sup>th</sup> century saw further influence from Rome on Paris via Lorenzo Bernini, Claude Lorrain and Nicolas Poussin, and influence from the North via Rubens.<sup>19</sup>

With the founding of the French Academy of Arts and Sciences (1649), Paris increasingly became an independent centre, which produced its own peripheries within France, Europe and, by the 19<sup>th</sup> century, around the world. This was particularly true in the latter 19<sup>th</sup> century as Paris became the informal centre of Impressionism.

For our purposes these developments are of particular interest because, in addition to Rome and Bologna, Paris was one of the favourite cities for Russian artists visiting Europe, a tradition which continued into the 20<sup>th</sup> century with famous examples such as Vasily Vasilyvich Kandinsky (1866-1944),<sup>20</sup> Alexandra Alexandrovna Exter (1882-1949),<sup>21</sup> and Ivan Albertovich Puni also known in France as Jean Pougny (1894-1956).<sup>22</sup>

While Rome and Paris are possibly the most famous modern examples of the centre-periphery model for dissemination of culture, clearly cities such as Florence, London, Berlin, Vienna and more recently New York, San Francisco, Tokyo, Rio de Janeiro, Sydney and Beijing have played similar roles.

## **Implications**

This centre-periphery paradigm has at least four fundamental implications. First, it reveals that profound cultural creativity as reflected in a major artistic movement typically begins in a major centre and that there are a relatively small number of these centres from which these new stimuli emanate. Second, it shows that this phenomenon is ultimately independent of scale: namely, that the principle of diffusion within a country, such as the Renaissance art within Italy; within a continent, such as the spread of the Baroque movement in Europe or worldwide, such as the spread of Impressionism, is essentially the same.

Third, and perhaps most significantly, it confirms that these centres typically serve as magnets with respect to the world beyond: i.e. it is not they that seek to convert others: it is others who come to them to be converted. It is the outside world that comes to the centres to learn the new techniques and methods that ultimately determine new artistic and cultural movements of enduring significance.

This could well seem a trivial insight were it not for the fact that a whole school of post-colonial<sup>23</sup> authors including the late Edward Saïd have argued the reverse, namely that Europe, especially in its colonial and imperialist phases, consciously, single-mindedly

and irreparably set out to change, transform, dominate, and control other cultures. To be sure such tendencies have existed and continue to exist through cultural bodies such as the British Council, Goethe Centres, French and Italian Institutes of culture and the like. The question is whether such bodies, which export carefully pre-packaged version of national cultures, are synonymous with the deeper influences which artists and creative individuals choose to receive from such countries.

Related to this is a fourth implication concerning challenges for future historiography. We may accept the centre-periphery model of cultural diffusion as a reality: i.e. that it was Russia and other countries from around the world that came to Rome, Paris and other centres to learn about new cultural techniques and movements. Hence the converse claim that they had this imposed upon them is untrue. Nonetheless, if the history of a movement such as Impressionism were written solely from a centre such as Paris, then it would need to look as if there were some covert or subtle attempt by the centre to determine and control the history of impressionism.

At the same time, any attempt to tell this story strictly in terms of a national or regional history of art, while useful in its own right, has at least three problems:

- a) if it remains in its native language, in this case Russian, it will typically not be accessible beyond a handful of European specialists;
- b) it cannot hope to appreciate deeper connections between these national versions and the source of the movement
- c) it often remains unaware of parallels between developments in a given country and those elsewhere. To overcome these limitations there is a need for new co-operative approaches. Herein, lies also an important argument why networks for digital culture have a vital role to play.

### **3. Alternative Stories and Histories**

Landscape offers a fascinating case in point. The Odyssey Landscapes (Vatican) remind us that this theme was already well established in Greco-Roman art. Even so, landscape became a significant aspect of Italian Renaissance art through painters such as Piero della Francesca, Bellini and Leonardo da Vinci, maturing into an independent theme through painters such as Salvatore Rosa. By the seventeenth century, French artists (e.g. Nicolas Poussin and Claude Lorrain) drew on these traditions to create a French landscape style. Similarly in the Netherlands, artists such as Pieter Post and Thomas Wijck adapted an Italianate style,<sup>24</sup> which soon matured into an independent Dutch landscape school (e.g. Cuyp, Ruysdael). In Britain, this process occurred later through painters such as Richard Wilson.

This spread of landscape within Italy and within Europe was recapitulated at the global level. During the colonial period, British colonies such as the United States, Canada, and Australia typically began by sending their painters to London or Edinburgh to master techniques. Not surprisingly, the early colonial landscapes were often scarcely distinguishable from what a British artist of the period might have done. But in the

generations that followed, a subtle transformation occurred as artists began the capture the unique features of American mountains, Australian deserts, Canadian forests. Although Russia was, of course, never a colony, there are surprising parallels there as its painters slowly captured the uniqueness of its vast spaces, forests and lakes ( e.g. Ivan Ivan Shishkin, Nicholas Roerich or even local artists such as Alexy Lieberov)<sup>25</sup>.

One of the understandable problems of art history has been a tendency for scholars to discuss only that which they are familiar. For instance, the late Sir Ernst Gombrich, who was born in Vienna and moved to London, tended to use works from the Kunsthistorisches Museum and the National Gallery (London). Similarly, French historians favour the Louvre and so on.

One of the unexpected potentials of networked digital collections is that they offer a framework for going beyond these traditional limitations. As a result, Russia's vast collections, which have hitherto remained unknown, could greatly enrich many chapters in the history of European and world art. There are fascinating parallels to be made, for instance between Richard Wilson's stay in the Roman countryside and Fyodor Matveyev's sojourn a half century later; between the storm scenes of William Turner and those of Ivan Aivazovsky; between Canadian and Russian landscapes especially in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century;<sup>26</sup> between French, Russian<sup>27</sup> and other Impressionists.

In all this are many unwritten histories of art, which were not possible earlier as long as there were physical limitations of geography and psychological limitations of nationalist schools of historiography emphasizing only country-specific dimensions.

In time, it will be useful to develop alternative histories of the same corpus of paintings. For instance, one might have one history, which accounts for the development of Russian landscape painting from a Russian point of view, while a second history looks at this same development from a European base and a third comparative history attempts to explore parallels happening in different landscape schools around the world.

A similar comparative approach offers itself in the realm of portraits. Here again is a subject where many Russian artists were influenced by European traditions (e.g. Dmitrii Grigorevich Levitskii, Vladimir Lukich Borovikovskii, Ivan Petrovich Argunov, Aleksei Petrovich Antropov, Fedor Stepanovich Rokotov, Ivan Firsov, Ivan Nikitin, and Andrei Matveev),<sup>28</sup> and yet at the same time went on to develop their own, unique traditions of portraiture.

While landscapes and portraits are perhaps the most obvious examples, the same principle can clearly be extended to cover the whole range of art involving the natural and the man-made world: e.g. still life, town views, interiors, etc.

#### **4. Shared Topics**

Culture is, of course much more than representations of the outer, physical and man-made world. Some are direct attempts to visualise dimensions of the inner world of

imagination and phantasy. Meanwhile, many of the richest examples of culture are second-hand, inasmuch as they are expressions of images described in religious and mythological texts, epic and great works of literature. Here again, new kinds of history of art and culture are needed.

### **Religion**

The *Bible* is a central book in Christianity. It is a truism to say that there are considerable differences between its use in European Catholicism or Protestantism and its use in the Russian Orthodox tradition, which owes much to the influence of Byzantium. Yet, paradoxically, if we ask precisely about what the differences are with respect to choice of themes, narrative cycles, treatment of individual subjects, very little indeed has been done.

There are many reasons for this discrepancy between what is possible and what has been done. One is the obvious barrier of language. Another lies in ideology whereby most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was spent in trying to deny the existence of a common Christian heritage and whereby most of these works were kept hidden for several generations (cf. section 6 below). As a result most Westerners, including learned Europeans, have no idea of the rich Christian heritage of painters such as Ivanov and Buinov, which readily equal the greatest achievements of the Pre-Raphaelites. Needed is a new era of comparative sharing, independent of religious proselytizing, whereby this common tradition and resulting variant expressions are studied in their own right.

### **Mythology**

That which applies to religion applies equally to those dimensions of Western mythology, which Europe and Russia have in common in the form of Greco-Roman myths and their artistic expressions as paintings and sculptures of gods and goddesses and other mythical creatures.

### **Literature**

In the realm of literature, Europe and Russia have produced many works, which do not intersect in the neighbouring culture. On the other hand, a number of Russia's greatest authors such as Chekov, Dostoyevsky, Gogol, and Tolstoy have become an integral part of European and world literature, just as a handful of Europe's greatest authors such as Shakespeare have had their impact on Russian literature and culture. Once again it is important that these common strands of experience be rediscovered and shared.

## **5. Static and Dynamic Expressions**

As McLuhan noted, the advent of print media brought many advantages and, at the same time, imposed unexpected limitations on communication. It imposed a new, linear approach to knowledge. It reduced the fluid dimensions of oral communications into a

fixed form that gave official editions both new degrees of authority and static rigidity. As a result any change in a text required a new edition.

By contrast, the new media allow changes to be made much more easily such that the notion of static editions is being replaced by a more dynamic notion of versioning. Moreover, whereas a printed edition typically gave the status of scholarship at a given time, digital media can combine a number of these editions in database form to permit diachronic presentations that permit us to trace developments over time.

Earlier breakthroughs also tended to replace their predecessors: i.e. the shift from oral to written communication in 5<sup>th</sup> century Athens at the time of Plato and Aristotle meant that to a certain extent writing replaced conversation. Similarly the advent of printing at the time of Gutenberg tended to replace written manuscript culture with print culture. These earlier revolutions were one-way translations: i.e. in the printing process a handwritten manuscript became a printed text, but once in this printed form, a return to handwritten form would have required re-writing the whole text.

The advent of digital media is fundamentally different than these earlier shifts because it entails much more than a simple replacement of an earlier mode of communication. Once a medium has been rendered into digital form it can be translated interchangeably into other forms: as a printed text, as an oral statement or potentially even as a handwritten 'manuscript.' Implicit in all this is a long-term reorganisation of all knowledge.

## **6. New Global Models of Culture**

In this essay we have focussed on some topics and themes of culture that Europe and Russia have in common. It would clearly be naïve to assume that these intersections with the West are sufficient to define Russian culture. Tolstoy taught us long ago in *War and Peace* that there are two Russias,<sup>29</sup> indeed that there are multiple versions of these two Russias: a Russia (as in *Rus*) of the the people (peasants) and a Russia of the aristocracy; a Russia that looked inward and a Russia that looked outward; a Russia that looked Eastwards to the Steppes with all the superstitions and mystery of the shamanic traditions and a rationalistic Russia that looked Westwards to the ideals of Rousseau and Voltaire. In a sense, Saint Petersburg and Moscow as two capitals epitomize those two souls.

Yet the greatness of Russia lies not in some dichotomous schizophrenia but rather in a spirit of eclectic syncretism, that allowed very different traditions to develop, often in harmony, side by side, such that Russian orthodox churches, European baroque style churches, synagogues and even mosques can exist together. The West has often been too eager to publicize the moments when Russia was intolerant, moments of which the West has all too many examples at home, and yet we still know far too little about the spirit that happily allowed Italian Renaissance architects to rebuild the walls of the Kremlin the same years that they were rebuilding the walls of the Castello Sforzesco in Milan.

We need new models of global cultural history, which reveal our shared traditions and at the same time make us more aware of the unique expressions of every great and even



every tiny culture. This impulse cannot come from Europe alone. It must be a reciprocal quest, departing from a basis of mutual respect.

## **7. World Distributed Electronic Repository (WONDER)**

In Antiquity, the Library of Alexandria introduced the dream that one might collect all existing knowledge of the world in a single building. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century this vision was revived by Panizzi, when he became the founding director of the British Museum. The idea spread quickly to the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Louvre in Paris and thereafter to the major national libraries and museums of Europe. In the latter 20<sup>th</sup> century there was replay of this vision in the rebuilding of the British Library and the Bibliothèque Nationale de la France which, ironically, were already faced with limitations in space even before the new buildings were finished.

The bad news was that, at a practical level, we learned the hard way that the world's knowledge cannot be reduced to a single building or building complex. The good news is that the world's knowledge is so rich that it cannot be reduced to such confines. The new electronic media offer us an alternative. Instead of centralised collections dominated by centralised bureaucracies, we can have distributed networks that make digital versions of these collections available to all. In Europe there is now an emerging E-Culture Net.<sup>30</sup>

Whereas the present day Internet has obvious limitations qua connectivity and further limitations qua copyright, the E-Culture Net is beginning as a voluntary group of trusted scholars and institutions who wish to share resources for research and teaching, without interest in financial gain. In the future, the network aims to create a Distributed European Electronic Dynamic Resource (DEER) with three basic components:

- a) distributed repositories
- b) virtual reference rooms and
- c) a forum for collaborative research and creativity.

There are many obstacles to this vision, there are many problems, as is always the case with worthwhile ideas. There is also a clear awareness that even the DEER will not be enough, that it needs to be a first step towards something much larger, that will eventually become a World Distributed Electronic Repository (WONDER).

As the Annales School made clear, historical events are but little dots in something much larger that they called the long duration (*la longue durée*). Printing offers a striking example. It was invented around 804 AD in Korea, moved to China where it was used to control persons, and was eventually taken up almost 650 years later by Gutenberg whose innovation lay not so much in the technology as in the idea that this medium could be used for sharing information. It then took about another 150 years before a major portion of existing knowledge had been transferred to print. Hence the printing revolution took some 800 years to mature.

## 8. Conclusions

In a world where all too many decisions are based on results over the past or coming fiscal quarter any suggestion that it could take 800 years for a new medium to mature is likely to be as welcome as the proverbial lead balloon.

Yet the full import of cultural history is an even more shocking message, namely, that our richness as a culture lies in our collective memory that goes back to the first moments of recorded history. The markets may crash, stocks and bonds may figuratively and sometimes even literally burn, yet the value of culture, of the past is that there is something enduring that transcends both the tragedies of daily life and frivolities of present fashion. In these enduring values and expressions are the bonds that can make us feel unique, while at the same time helping us to recognize our common humanity. If we use culture only to forge narrow identities that emphasize differences, it will lead us to new tensions and conflicts. If we use culture to discover what we share, to recognize our common humanity it will become an asset much more profound than the mightiest weapons we could hope to build. For then the potential clash of civilisations can become a meeting of minds and spirits, respecting and discovering differences and uniqueness.

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my colleague Johan van de Walle for kindly reading the manuscript and making helpful suggestions. Special thanks go to Nadeszdha Brakker for her patience in arranging a translation of this paper. Finally, I thank Dean Paul Tummers of the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Maastricht, for providing me with time to write this article in peace.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> See: [http://www.dante.net/geant/Global\\_connectivity08\\_021.jpg](http://www.dante.net/geant/Global_connectivity08_021.jpg). This effort is but one of a number of initiatives aimed at solving challenges of high performance computing which will increasingly involve grid architecture. Cf. next note.

<sup>2</sup> Also important is the Gridstart initiative.

See: <http://www.gridstart.org/>. Especially:

[http://www.gridstart.org/CM\\_documents/cm\\_one/plenary/GRIDSTART%20Roadmap%20&%20Inventory%20-%20M%20Parsons.ppt](http://www.gridstart.org/CM_documents/cm_one/plenary/GRIDSTART%20Roadmap%20&%20Inventory%20-%20M%20Parsons.ppt)

See:

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/k.veltman/Local%20Settings/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.IE5/FVX37L4K/281,1,European Grid Programme Update](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/k.veltman/Local%20Settings/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.IE5/FVX37L4K/281,1,European%20Grid%20Programme%20Update)

<sup>3</sup> See: <http://xml.coverpages.org/languageIdentifiers.html#iso639>.

Cf. <http://xml.coverpages.org/multilingual.html>

<sup>4</sup> On Unicode See: <http://www.unicode.org/>

<sup>5</sup> On MINC See: <http://www.minc.org/>

<sup>6</sup> E.g. the Conceptual Reference Model of CIDOC (Commission Internationale pour la Documentation de l'Art). See: <http://www.rlg.org/events/metadata2002/gill/gill.PPT>.

Cf. also the work of CIMI (Consortium for the Computer Interchange of Museum Information).

See: [http://www.cimi.org/old\\_site/](http://www.cimi.org/old_site/)

---

<sup>7</sup> For the World Wide Web Consortium See: [www.w3.org](http://www.w3.org)

<sup>8</sup> This topic is addressed in the author's "Methodological Challenges for Sharing in International Networks," Second UNESCO Digital Silk Roads Conference, Nara, 7-9 December 2003.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Francesca M. Wilson, *Muscovy: Russia through foreign eyes, 1553-1900*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1970.

<sup>10</sup> For genetic trends in Europe,

See: [http://www.mcrit.com/SPESP/genetic\\_trends\\_in\\_europe.htm](http://www.mcrit.com/SPESP/genetic_trends_in_europe.htm)

Cf. Steve Jones, *In the Blood. God, Genes and Destiny*, New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1996, p.164. See: [http://www.mcrit.com/SPESP/SPESP\\_SpatialVisions.htm](http://www.mcrit.com/SPESP/SPESP_SpatialVisions.htm)

<sup>11</sup> We are not concerned directly in this paper with the way in which the last three decades have introduced a centre-periphery paradigm which builds particularly on the work of David Keeble: e.g.

Keeble, David; Offord, John and Walker, Sheila (1986) *Peripheral Regions in a Community of Twelve Member States*. Commission of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Cf. Bryson, J, Henry, N, Keeble, D and Martin, R (1999), *The Economic Geography Reader: Producing and Consuming Global Capitalism*, Chichester, Wiley.

This has led to important policy approaches qua European structural funds:

See: <http://www.nordregio.se/EJSD/refereed/refereed3.pdf>

And has led to new methods of Infographics visualisation to reflect spatial policy. Building on the centre-periphery work of Keeble and Reclus

See: <http://www.nordregio.se/spespn/Files/chapter%204%20-%20april.PDF>

Wendy Gibbons, "Critical of What?": Past and Current Issues in Critical Human Geography," *History of Intellectual Culture*, 2001.

See: [http://www.ucalgary.ca/hic/2001articles/gibbons\\_body.html](http://www.ucalgary.ca/hic/2001articles/gibbons_body.html).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Tom Stevenson, University of Auckland, review of: Margaret C. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, in: *Scholia Reviews*, ns 7 (1998), p. 15.

See: <http://www.classics.und.ac.za/reviews/98-15mil.html>

<sup>13</sup> E.g. Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori : nelle relazioni del 1550 e 1568*. Vol. 3. Testo. Indice / Giorgio Vasari ; a cura di Paola Barlocchi, Giovanna Gaeta Bertelà, Firenze: Studio per Edizioni Scelte, 1997.

<sup>14</sup> André Chastel, *Grand Atelier d'Italie: 1460-1500*, Paris: Gallimard: 1965, Translated into English as: *The studios and styles of the Renaissance: Italy, 1460-1500*, London: Thames & Hudson, 1966.

<sup>15</sup> See: [http://www.wwnorton.com/nael/18century/topic\\_4/tour.htm](http://www.wwnorton.com/nael/18century/topic_4/tour.htm)

<sup>16</sup> 1769 Academy: On return from Rome, Losenko, *Kain (Cain)*, *Avel' (Abel)*, and *Pravosudie (Justice)* (copy of Raphael)

<sup>17</sup> See: <http://www.academicart.com/vision.htm>

<sup>18</sup> See: <http://stpetersburg-guide.com/people/aivazovsky.shtml>

<sup>19</sup> See: [http://www.kfki.hu/~arthp/tours/french/17\\_cent.html](http://www.kfki.hu/~arthp/tours/french/17_cent.html)

<sup>20</sup> b. Moscow-d. Neuilly-sur-Seine, Fr.

<sup>21</sup> b. Belostok, near Kiev – d. Fontenay-aux-Roses, near Paris.

<sup>22</sup> b. Kuokkala, Finland (now Repino, Leningrad District)- d. Paris.

---

Cf. Constructivists and others... See: <http://www.geocities.com/Paris/8182/artists.htm>

Cf. the Russian artists living abroad exhibition featuring N. Altman (1889-1970); Yu. Annenkov (1889-1974); B. Anisfeld (1878-1973); N. Goncharova (1881-1962) and K. Korovin (1861-1939). See: <http://www.newhermitage.ru/index.phtml/eng/rz/1/>

<sup>23</sup> For the enormous debate on Imperialism and Postcolonialism in culture. Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Knopf, 1993. Peter L. Berger and Samuel P. Huntington, *Many Globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. See: <http://www.geneseo.edu/~bicket/panop/poco/index.htm> See: <http://www.boondocksnet.com/cb/said.html>. For critiques of Postcolonial cf. Donna Landry, Gerald MacLean, ed. *The Spivak Reader: Selected Works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. New York: Routledge, 1996. See: <http://www.cddc.vt.edu/feminism/Spivak.html> See: [http://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n10/eagl01\\_.html](http://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n10/eagl01_.html) See: [http://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n10/eagl01\\_.html](http://www.lrb.co.uk/v21/n10/eagl01_.html) See: <http://www.emory.edu/ENGLISH/Bahri/Spivak.html> For wider Critiques of Post- and -isms, cf. Hilton Kramer, Roger Kimball, ed., *The Survival of Culture: Permanent Values in a Virtual Age*, 2003; David Stove, *Anything Goes: Scientific irrationalism: origins of a postmodern cult*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001; Roger Kimball, *Experiments against reality: The fate of culture in the postmodern age*, Chicago : I.R. Dee, 2000; Keith Windschuttle, *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists are Murdering Our Past*, Paddington, NSW, Australia : Macleay Press, 1996 1st paperback ed. San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2000; Terry Eagleton, *The Illusions of Postmodernism*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, December 1996; Howard Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, New York: Simon and Schuster, c1987. <sup>24</sup> See: <http://www.hoogsteder.com/landscapes/index.html> <sup>25</sup> See: [http://www.univer.omsk.su/students/sidelnikova/my\\_en~2.htm](http://www.univer.omsk.su/students/sidelnikova/my_en~2.htm) <sup>26</sup> In Canada, the Canadian Heritage Information Network (CHIN) has created a Virtual Museum of Canada (VMC). A project called Horizons announced at CIDOC 2003 in Saint Petersburg will link 250 Canadian and Russian landscapes in a virtual exhibition. As a next step this approach could be extended to include other countries such as Australia, South Africa and the United States, which have developed their own schools of landscape painting Cf: [http://www.virtualmuseum.ca/English/index\\_flash.html](http://www.virtualmuseum.ca/English/index_flash.html) <sup>27</sup> V. Borisov-Musatov (1870-1905) is but one example. <sup>28</sup> See: [http://www.rollins.edu/Foreign\\_Lang/Russian/18intro.html](http://www.rollins.edu/Foreign_Lang/Russian/18intro.html) Cf. <http://www.abcgallery.com/B/briullov/briullov.html> <sup>29</sup> Cf. Orlando Figes, *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia*, New York Metropolitan Books, 2002. See: <http://www.yalereviewofbooks.com/archive/spring03/review19.shtml.htm> <sup>30</sup> See: [www.eculturenet.org](http://www.eculturenet.org). E-Culture Net received support from the European Commission in 2002-2003 as a Thematic Network but has not received funding in the first call of the Sixth Framework Programme.