DISCIPLINED BODIES, ENLIGHTENED SOULS

A study of how 'a tourist' is made up and governed in the institutional discourse of Russian strict natural reserves (zapovedniki)

BY YULIA KISORA

WAGENINGEN UR
For quality of life

Disciplined bodies, enlightened souls

A study of how 'a tourist' is made up and in the institutional discourse of Russian strict natural reserves (zapovedniki)

2

Acknowledgements

Table of contents

Summary

Russian strict natural reserves (zapovedniki) as a special type of protected areas were established as scientific institutions aimed at nature protection and research in the beginning of 20th century. As such, they were officially open for public visitation, but goals of leisure and tourism were rarely set. In 2011 the situation has changed with introduction of educational tourism as one of the primary goals for reserves. Later this year, a state program for the development of tourism in zapovedniki was also launched.

By taking up a Foucaldian research tradition, this study treated both tourists and zapovedniki as discursive formations, entanglements of knowledge and power. In so doing, the study aimed to explore the workings of power concerned with the formation of 'a tourist' as a subject in zapovedniki and her/his governing. In the analysis of the genealogy of insitutional discourse of zapovedniki, four discursive formations were found to be historically present: nature preservation, nature transformation, nature utilization and nature demonstration. In the contemporary discourse a specific interplay of these power/knowledge formations created a specific set of subjects: a scientist and a teacher (experts), a disciple and a tourist (non-experts). In the logic of the institutional discourse experts possess knowledge, qualification and commitment, which give them the rights to speak for and act in zapovedniki and nature. Non-experts are denied these rights and therefore must be governed to be included in a zapovednik.

To grasp these exact mechanisms and justifications of power governing the subject in the present, I used the concept of governmentality, or 'government' of a tourist. Governing a tourist in zapovedniki is aimed at her/his transformation by regulating her/his behaviour, and 'turning' her/him into an active supporter of reserves' cause and a nature lover. Three mechanisms of disciplinary power were found to be at work to ensure the 'transformation' of a tourist. Examination positions a tourist in the zapovedniki system by means of applications and permits, and ensures that her/his intentions are aligned with reserves' aims. Tourism 'enclosures' isolate a tourist from what is believed to be a valuable core of zapovedniki. In 'the enclosure' a tourist is offered to enjoy imitations of zapovedniki's nature (pictures, recordings, stuffed animals etc.) in 'comfortable' conditions, where all her/his needs (toilets, mobile connection, parking, wooden deck for walking) are taken care of. Scripting the space is done in order to strictly define and limit the use of space, and makes the zapovedniki's rule on the territory materially/visually present. Through various observing subjects, authoritative and disciplinary power create a space where tourists can hardly be alone, and must be constantly disciplined.

The working of these techniques is double: first, they discipline the body of a tourist to make sure that s/he does not endanger the nature of zapovedniki, second, they aim to transform ('enlighten' in a term, inherited from the soviet project) her/his soul).

The study concludes by seeing zapovedniki as an institution involved in an environmentality project, aimed to eco-discipline people and in the same time limit their understanding of environmental issues to zapovedniki themselves.

1.

Tourists in zapovedniki

Introducing the research

What is a zapovednik, anyways?
What is so special about tourism in zapovedniki?
Why bother studying tourists in zapovedniki?

1. Tourists in zapovedniki

Rules of conduct on an ecological trail

1. A group must walk the trail one by one, with a guide walking in front of a visitors' column, and a teacher or a group senior bringing up the rear.

2. On stopping points listeners remain on the trail, the guide steps forward to an informational billboard next to a group

3. While on the move, and familiarising with see sights, it is necessary to watch one's feet not to step on a Nikolskogo viper. If the encounter occurs, one must not jump aside, but stand still and wait until the viper goes away.

4. While passing a precipitous shore of Voron river, one must not hustle, and keep the arm-long distance from her/him fellow excursionists

5. While passing by beaver lodges, one must carefully watch one's feet not to fall through ventilation openings of the constructions

6. While passing the bridges of Rzhavka river and a waterfall, excursionists must move one by one, one excursionist must start the passage only after the other one has finished.

7. When walking uphill, excursionists must not run and keep one-meter distance between each other

(Zapovednik Voroninsky, n.d.)

I
f one gets an itch to visit one of Russian strict natural reserves, zapovedniki, s/he is very welcome. Tourism in zapovedniki is open for everyone (The Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas of 14 March 1995, 1995). However, certain rules must be followed, as ones in the above quoted rules of conduct. The description of rules of conduct is featured on a website of one of zapovedniki and makes a reader wonder – what is so special about the territory that it requires visitors to be so careful? Reading the rules, one might also wonder – who are these people the rules are written for? Who is expected to run and hustle? Whose behaviour needs to be regulated in such a detailed and meticulous way? Who are they, these excursionists, walking one by one on a trail? Personally, after a visit to national parks in New Zealand, I couldn't help but compare the freedom of move and (at least seemingly) unsupervised experience of my visit with the supervision I experienced in zapovedniki. Is the nature there less valuable or less fragile? Are their ways of governing a tourist less obvious? Are people visiting reserves in New Zealand different, because the rules of behaviour are formulated only in terms of personal safety suggestions? Wondering all that, I realized that the way a tourist is governed in zapovedniki is very special. To understand, how special it is, let's step back in history and recall how national parks and zapovedniki were incepted.

In US, New Zealand, Australia, and many other countires national parks were organised for their citizens to get in touch with the nature, but also to save this very nature from exploitative economic activities (Mark, 2009). An idea of a national park as a protected natural area that belongs to and inclusive of the whole nation, was a breakthrough. First time in the history the areas were protected not only *from* people but also *for* them (Hall & Frost, 2009).

This revolutionary in a way concept gained enormous popularity, spreading from its American homeland to the rest of the world (Frost & Hall, 2009). From the very beginning conservation, science and tourism were walking hand in hand (Ostergren & Hollenhorst, 1999). This conservational spirit got even stronger in the last decades, when environmental problems are perceived as acute and threatening as never before (Doremus, 2000; Dryzek, 2005; Fisher & Hajer, 1999). Protected natural areas, and national parks amongst them, are now a '*mainstay*' of nature conservation (United Nations Environment Programme, 2014) 'recognized, dedicated and managed <…> to achieve the long term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values' (IUCN Definition 2008).

In 1917 a Russian geographer, professor Veniamin Tyan'-Shansky, presented his report called 'On typical landscapes in Russia that need to be protected by zapovedniki, analogous to American national parks', which laid the foundations for zapovedniki as an institution (Ostergren & Hollenhorst, 1999). Shortly afterwards, as communists came to power in Russia and antagonism to capitalist states kept growing, the part concerning similarities to American national parks was hastily abolished. It was not until 1982, when a first national park in Russia was created. Instead, scientific strict natural reserves (IUCN category 1a), called '*zapovedniki*', got established on the territory of the Soviet Union. In 2014 (the latest available official data) Russia had 103 zapovedniki covering the territory of 33.9 billions ha, which makes zapovedniki the most widespread type of specially protected natural areas in Russia (compare: national parks – 47, 12.7 billions ha) (The Ministry of Natural resources, 2015).

The word 'zapovednik' is derived from 'zapoved" meaning 'commandment' as it comes from the Bible (Shaposhnikov, 2010). Despite this 'sacred' connotation it is not religion that zapovedniki were originally established to serve, but science. Incepted as scientific and conservational institutions, zapovedniki have had an uneasy lifestory of shifts from one governmental body to another, from nature protection to nature tranformation and exploitation, from being recognised and appreciated by the state to being liquidated as 'useless' (Schtilmark, 2014; Weiner, 1999). In zapovedniki conservation and tourism have not had a 'happy marriage'. While the idea of developing tourism in zapovedniki came up from time to time in the legal framework throughout 20th century and also was implemented in some of them, it was not until 2011 that development of tourism in zapovedniki started to be seen as *the* way forward for the whole system. That year the amendments were made to a legal framework of zapovedniki to add ecological educational tourism as one of the new goals of the institution, in line with ongoing biodiversity protection and scientific research (Brinikh, 2014).

To sum up, being granted a status of a scientific institution from the very dawn of their establishment, zapovedniki were open for the public visitation, but not aimed at the attraction of a tourist. Today zapovedniki are claimed to be the pride of Russian conservation efforts and in the same time actively develop tourism on their territory. Purposeful introduction of tourism signified coming of 'a tourist', as a subject to be actively and intentionally included in what is claimed to be a historically scientific and conservation oriented space. Going back to the questions I posed in the beginning, it is specific historical, social and historical conditions that created zapovedniki as a place where such rules of behaviour could be called forth to govern a tourist. This, in turn, is connected to a way how a tourist, as an officially welcome addition to the system, is constructed in the discourse of zapovedniki.

1.1. Problem statement and research questions

Governing a tourist in protected areas has been traditionally a question of tourist management (Beunen, Regnerus, & Jaarsma, 2008; Cheung, 2013; R. Graham, Nilsen, & Payne, 1988; Jaarsma, Beunen, & de Vries, 2015; Stanford, 2014; Zelenka & Kacetl, 2013). Visitor flows, visitor concentration, visitor impacts (Zelenka & Kacetl, 2013) are amongst the most widely researched topics. Tourists as subjects are researched from a position of their motivations and attitudes (Ryan, Hughes, & Chirgwin, 2000), mostly for visitor segmentation purposes. Recently, some studies attempted to explore the ways to govern a tourist in order to make him/her to behave more environmentally sustainable (Packer & Ballantyne, 2013). Overall, the managerial perspective mostly treats tourists in protected areas as a mass, flow, driven by specific interests, and therefore an object to be steered in a desired direction.

In the wider perspective, the interrelation of conservation in form of natural protected areas and tourism have extensively been explored in ecotourism debate. Ecological tourism started to actively develop in 80s, together with the growing concern for the environment and environmental discourses (Weaver & Lawton, 2007). The optimistic discourse on ecotourism of the first years claimed it to be a solution for all the problems that mass tourism brought (Ryan et al., 2000). Small-scale would not disrupt the landscape, local (or at least participatory) ownership would prevent exploitation of locals and financial leakages for the local economy, educational component would enrich 'ecotourists' with knowledge (Orams, 1995). 'Taking only photographs, leaving only footprints' (Roe, Leader-Williams, & Dalal-Klayton, 1997) has been a powerful idea that still finds support in academia and guides the practices of ecotourism (Boley & Green, 2015; Hunt, Durham, Driscoll, & Honey, 2014).

In the last years, however, the optimistic discourse has been under the pressure of scrutiny, especially by critical scholars. They highlighted 'not that alternative' nature of ecotourism, claiming that its practices are failing to be good for locals, nature and educative and transformational for tourists (Weaver & Lawton, 2007; Zavitz & Butz, 2011). According to some scholars, guided by critical theory, commodification of nature and cultures is the main evil innate to ecotourism despite its good intentions (Castree, 2003).

In the Russian context, ecotourism concept quckly paved its way to the legal system of zapovedniki. It gained recognition on a state level, and was included in legal frameworks on functioning of specially protected natural areas. Notably though, the concept and its meaning have not really been debated, and practices scrutinized. Some bodies of literature are concerned with normative justification of the tourism (Basanets, 2002; Basanets, 2008; Buivolov & Basanets, 2007; Doronkina, Borisova, Malyutin, & Gazilov, 2014; Ledovskih, Moraleva, & Drozdov, 2002). Other studies (mostly coming from western academics) draw attention to processes of liberalization and neoliberalization, commodification of nature (Muller, 2014) and state the convergence of nature protection policies between national parks and zapovedniki (Fiorino & Ostergren, 2012; D. Ostergren & Hollenhorst, 1999).

Foucauldian studies, concerned with tourism in protected natural areas, are mainly located in the field of political ecology, specifically discourses of nature protection and environmental policy research (Hajer & Versteeg, 2005; Pochet, 2014). Applying Foucaldian theories and concepts to environmental issues has received elevated popularity in the last years, mainly in field of environmental governmentality, environmentality (Agrawal, 2006; Cepek, 2011; Hargreaves, 2010; Legg, 2005; Luke, 1997; Rutherford, 2007). So far environmentality studies have been mainly concerned with analysis of biopower/biopolitics (Cepek, 2011; Fletcher, 2010; Foster, 2011).

In other words, while the extensive amount of publications is devoted to tourism impacts, tourism benefits, tourism discourses, a tourist as a subject is seen as a pre-given entity/identity and remains relatively unexplored, with the exception of context-specific profiles for managerial goals. How tourists as subjects are represented and governed in discourses of protected areas seem to be missing in the literature.

Therefore, the objective of the study is to explore how tourists are talked about and dealt with in zapovedniki. I hope to get an insight in how the institutional discourse functions by creating its own subjects and prescribing ways to govern them. The institutional discourse is worth exploring because it represents not only the specificity of functioning of zapovedniki as a conservational and (lately) recreational organization, but also the way how zapovedniki address the public. As such, the study aims to give an account of one of the many different ways in how nature is discursively constructed and how human-nature relationship is governed and regulated in our society.

Research questions:
1. How is 'a tourist' governed within these institutional discursive developments of zapovedniki?
2. How did 'a tourist' as a subject emerge in the institutional discursive development of zapovedniki?

To answer these questions, the thesis is structured as follows: first, the theoretical lens of the research will be discussed, namely, the interplay of concepts *discourse*, *power* and *governmentality*. Then, the corresponding methodology will be elaborated upon. A special attention will be paid to genealogy, as the main guiding principle of the research.

Chapter 4 will provide a 'diagnosis' of the present: an exploration of how governmentality of a tourist presents itself in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki. Chapter 5 will broadly sketch the historical, cultural and social context of zapovedniki functioning over the century of their existence by outlining the main discursive formations in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki. This chapter will provide the necessary genealogical background to the governmentality techniques outlined before. Chapter 6 is devoted to the formation of subjects in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki.

Finally, Chapter 7 will shortly sum up the findings and provide concluding remarks, and Chapter 8 will touch upon some relevant points in the literature to discuss with my own findings. In the end, the limitations of the research and the theoretical prospects for the future research will be considered.

2.

Discourse, power and governmentality

Theoretical framework of the research

What is the theoretical lens guiding the research?
What is governmentality?
How power/knowledge come together to create subjects and the ways to govern them?

2. Discourse, power and governmentality

I begin with the ontological and epistemological assumption that 'Reality' is unknowable and no authoritative account can exist of anything. Since the 'true' essence of reality is always unknowable, all we have is the representation of reality. Social reality is only intelligible inside discourse and its representational practices. Thinking in terms of representations and discursive practices draws attention to the arbitrary and constructed nature of how we have come to 'know' the world and its inhabitants. While I accept the position that structures are unavoidable, we need to decentre them and problematize them for study, especially given that they are not neutral.

(Dunn, 2009)

The quote above gives a concise account of assumptions hold by the constructivist research paradigm. In line with them, as a researcher, I have to admit my inability to get to know how the world 'really' works in the material reality and limit my appetites to the exploration of constructions of this reality. The world gets constructed in discourses, with various meanings attributed, denied, shuffled and reshuffled by people (Howarth, 2000). In the same time, these constructions have a power to influence the material world and its practices (Graham, 2005a). Yet, focusing on the constructions, how can a researcher possibly get to know what is *true* and what is not?

Using a theory in a scientific research naturally narrows our path in search for truth. A truth revealed by a Marxist theorist will likely contain notions of class struggle, while a feminist scholar is more likely to discover gender inequality. Poststructuralist tradition doesn't offer its followers tight theories, but offers a certain way of looking at things (Torfing, 2004). To put it simply, the main idea could be formulated as: give up a quest for a single Truth and don't take anything for granted.

Giving up in a search for the Truth in following Foucauldian tradition has had a liberating effect on me. I abandoned willing to find out whether tourists *really* need to be edified by dozens of rules before entering a zapovednik. I am also not trying to reveal social identities of people who come to zapovedniki and people who manages them. It is not about attribution of good-bad categories, or finding out what is *actually* going on. From the other hand, it is not to fall into complete nihilism and deny existence of any truth, but to accept that truth is always a political enterprise:

'Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true' (Foucault, 1984, pp. 72–73).

Such a stance helps to acknowledge the possibility of multiple truths coexisting, evolving and engaging into productive struggles in so called 'truth games' (Foucault, 1994). Thus no knowledge or point of view can be seen as essentially 'truthful' or, on the contrary, 'untruthful'. Instead, all bodies of knowledge are laden with power bringing them into existence. Having said that, in this study I set off to explore the multiple truths, 'the messy politics of representation, (re-)articulation, essentialism and discursive construction' (Rutherford, 2007) that bring into life zapovedniki as cultural constructions and social institutions. Knowledge of such institutions is a reproduction of truth, but also a product of interaction between different discursive realities.

12

For my research it means that I am not setting off to describe a tourist that comes to zapovedniki, as s/he *really* is, her/him profile or behaviour. What I am interested in is to explore how a tourist as a subject becomes constructed in discourse related to zapovedniki, that is, in words spoken/written about her/him. Secondly, we can say, that it is pretty much in the material reality that some people are admitted to zapovedniki and given a guided tour. But this very practice is a result of a discursive construction justifying it. However, again, I am not going to describe how admission really works, or how people are *actually* dealt with on the territory of reserves. What I will do is looking at a discursive level of these practices as representing certain technologies of power, their descriptions and justifications. To get there, I will now expand on the notion of discourse as the theoretical lens through which zapovedniki, their people and practices will be observed in this study.

Discourse is a theoretical construct which has been widely applied in social sciences, including psychology, sociology, educational studies etc. (Cresswell, 2009). The popularity of the concept comes at the expense of multiple interpretations and applications which vary quite significantly amongst research traditions. Sociolinguistics, for example, analyses discourses to reveal universal patterns behind the language used by different social groups (Capone & Mey, 2016). It focuses on language and remains indifferent towards non-linguistic phenomena. The Foucauldian understanding of discourse is different from that of purely linguistic 'language in use' stance on discourse (Harrison, 2006). Discourse is *more* than language, speech and narrative (Foucault, 2011), it is 'a particular knowledge about the world which shapes how the world is understood and how things are done in it' (Rose, 2001, p. 136).

As such, discourse in Foucauldian Theory (FT) embraces both social practices and language connected to them (Howarth, 2000). This doesn't assume a one-folded way of social practices finding an expression in language, as discourse is not 'a phenomenon of expression - the verbal translation of a previously established synthesis' (Foucault, 2011, p. 55), but implies that language itself is able to produce practices. Due to the performative nature of discourses, ways of talking and thinking about any object bring into life ways of acting (Graham, 2005b). This makes it feasible to recognise discourse not only as an assemblage of concepts, assumptions about their connection to each other, but also as a set of practices and institutions. Discourse is where knowledge and power come together (Foucault, 1984) to define the permissible ways to speak about something of interest:

> 'At any given historical period we can write, speak or think about a given social object or practice only in certain ways and not others. A discourse is whatever constraints and enables writing, speaking, thinking within such historical limits' (McHoul & Grace, 1993, p. 31).

Having outlined the conceptual understanding of discourse at work, it is important to distinguish between a discourse of an institution and a discursive formation. Speaking about institutional discourse (ID), I don't take up an ethnographic perspective treating ID as 'assumptions, concerns, and vocabularies of members of socially organized settings, and the ways in which they interact' (Miller, 1994, p. 280). Instead, I opt for the expanded understanding which includes not only discourse within professional community of an institution, but also discourse related to governing of the institution by directly responsible external actors (a state), in other words, everything that *creates* institution the way it is. In this meaning institution it is treated not as a pre-given formation to be described in anthropological terms of values, worldviews and norms of their members (Mayr, 2008), but as an institutional site

13

which ensures the legitimation of a discourse and also serves the point of its application (Foucault, 2011). Discursive formation, from the other hand, represents the way meanings are connected together in a particular discursive logic (Foucault, 2011). It is a consistent set of concepts, assumptions and both their language representations and inherent practices/institutional arrangements. As such, discursive formations are highly selective in what to make present or absent and they have a power to pronounce or silence realities in question.

Thus, the first concept brings in the unity of the topic, limits the object of the study and refers to the source where the data comes from. The second emphasizes the consistency of discursively expressed ways of thinking, talking and doing: 'permissible modes of being <…> that disqualify and even make others impossible' (Escobar 1994:5 cited in Cepek, 2011). An institutional discourse can be therefore seen as a historically changing and context-specific combination of various discursive formations.

Discourse is a specific tie-up of power/knowledge that can be researched to access how the latter functions in out society. Power/knowledge is a central concept in Foucault works and rests itself on the two main assumptions about its nature: power is productive and power is fluid. I will consider them in turn in relation to object/subject formation and governmentality.

2.1. Power is productive: on subject formation

The body is a site where regimes of discourse and power inscribe themselves, a nodal point or nexus for relations of juridical and productive power'
(Butler, 1989, p. 601).

14

Despite the long dominating tradition of seeing power as negative and oppressive, Foucault conceives power as a productive force: 'power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production' (Foucault, 1995, p. 194).

'Nature', for instance, does not exist 'out there' in a vacuum, independently of us, but is constructed in many related discourses, bodies of knowledge and related performances, such as economics, ecology, biology, tourism scholarship etc. (Escobar, 1996). Every one of these bodies of knowledge work 'as a power/knowledge regime, producing the truth about nature, the way it can be told, and by whom' (Rutherford, 2007). In turn, the way, in which an object is constructed, shapes practices that are deemed appropriate (Graham, 2011). For this reason, the link can be traced between constructions of nature in discourses and respective environmental policies (Pochet, 2014).

Human beings are made up as subjects by culturally and historically specific workings of power (Foucault, 2000). In regard to subjects of discourse, two notions can be made. First, a subject does not exist *before* discourse in the material reality in the unity of her/his pre-given characteristics. This notion got extensively elaborated upon by gender theorists. As Butler argued,

'The culturally constructed body would be the result of a diffuse and active structuring of the social field with no magical or ontotheological origins, structuralist distinctions, or fictions of bodies, subversive or otherwise, ontologically intact before the law' (Butler, 1989, p. 607)

Secondly, a subject, being then merely a construction of a discourse, can not be attributed a role of an author of a discourse, s/he cannot produce a discourse:

> 'Discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing, speaking subject, but, on the contrary, a totality, in which the dispersion of the subject and his discontinuity with himself may be determined' (Foucault, 2011, p. 55).

Opposing the understanding of discourse as something produced by individuals or institutions, Foucault nevertheless recognised that reproduction of discourse occurs through specific subjects:

> 'Medical statements cannot come from anybody; their value, efficacy, even their therapeutic powers, and, generally speaking, their existence as medical statements cannot be dissociated from the statutorily defmed person who has the right to make them, and to claim for them the power to overcome suffering and death' (Foucault, 2011, p. 51).

In other words, subjects in FT are attributed no more value than merely 'talking heads' of a discourse, but these talking heads are far from being random or incidental. On the contrary, they are subjugated to the internal logics of discourse which grants them a right to speak or a prohibition to do so. A subject, then, emerges not only as a construction but also as a site to speak from:

> 'The genealogy of the subject as a critical category, however, suggests that the subject, rather than be identified strictly with the individual, ought to be designated as a linguistic category, a placeholder, a structure in formation. Individuals come to occupy the site of the subject (the subject simultaneously emerges as a 'site'), and they enjoy intelligibility only to the extent that they are, as it were, first established in language. The subject is a linguistic occasion for the individual to achieve and reproduce intelligibility, the linguistic condition of its existence and agency' (Butler, 1997, p. 10–11 cited in Borgerson, 2005, p. 68).

To sum up, subjects are neither producing discourses nor they are present outside the discursive borders. It is through discourses that subjects come into being (Graham, 2011). In his works Foucault elaborated on how subjects of a criminal, a madman, a sexual pervert are produced by respective discourses on crime, medicine and sex (McHoul & Grace, 1993). Insitutions concerned with these subjects can then be see as 'functional inverted' as they not only physically accommodate such subjects, but also create them by this very accommodation:

> 'From the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, abnormal or deviant subjects were removed from society and placed in spaces in which they would supposedly be reformed, like the asylum, the prison, the lock hospital or the school. Here, the insane, the criminal, **the sexually diseased and the uneducated were not only enclosed but also created**, marking the 'functional inversion' of institutions whose physical barriers were overcome by their epistemological effect '(Legg, 2005).

2.2.   Power is fluid: on governmentality

> 'Power bleeds across the social body in such a way that governing occurs in multiple sites and through a myriad of techniques'
>
> (Rutherford, 2007, p. 294).

Perceiving power as something unevenly distributed in our society and almost exclusively assigned to a state seems to come naturally. Those at the top rule and oppress those at

the bottom, isn't that the most obvious thing to conclude? Following this, critical theory attributes power to a dominating social group (class, gender, race) and calls to resistance (Sim, 2004). Emancipatory how it may sound, it happens that an oppressed discourse after gaining power becomes an oppressing one (the Russian history of XXth century is probably the most painfully prominent example here) (Dunne, 2011). Power is therefore seen as a one-dimensional construct fashioning a society in a top-down direction. To unveil its oppressive character critical streams of discourse theory are concerned with how the domination is exerted through language (Howarth, 2000; Waugh et al., 2016). Framing theory also posits that power is fixed (Borah, 2011; Chong & Druckman, 2007; Gray, Purdy, & Ansari, 2015). It distinguishes between 'elite' actors, who have significantly more power to change and impose frames, and lower-power actors (interactants). Though there is certainly quite some truth in these standpoints, an inclination to look behind the oppressive/oppressed categories might bring in new insights.

Foucault in his works offers a conception of power, which is at pains with this stiff hierarchized division. He argues that power, of course, resides within a state, but is not exclusively attributed and confined to it (Foucault, 1978). This allows for a significantly more open outlook to analyse social relations. Power as 'the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization' (Foucault, 1978) can be therefore discovered in many areas of social life, starting from a family. The analysis then shifts from investigation of power structures and domination to analysis of power relations (Foucault, 2000). It means stopping asking *who* has the power and *how much* and question 'the how of power' instead to consider 'the ways in which it operates through people to create them and the world they experience' (Hargreaves, 2010, p. 6).

A concept that has been used in later works of Foucault to refer to the workings of power is governmentality. Governmentality can be understood as the internalisation of the government, a process of subjectification, but also as 'the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, reflections, calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power' (Foucault 2007, p.108). *Government* then is understood as 'the way in which the conduct of individuals or of groups might be directed' (Foucault, 2000, p. 341).

Governmentality might include application of different technologies and 'kinds' of power, such as sovereign/authoritative power (a power of law, a power of Prince), disciplinary power (Foucault, 1995), pastoral power (Foucault, 2000) and biopower (power over life and death) (Foucault, 1978). In analysing how the power works in our society Foucault calls to 'cut off the head of the King' (Foucault, 1978, p. 89), or, in other words, divorce with the idea of overwhelming and all-explaining role of authoritative power based on a figure of a sovereign and logics of laws and prohibitions. Instead, he offers to streamline the attention towards how power works in more subtle ways to discipline and normalise individuals, having in mind

> 'a conception of power which replaces the privilege of the law with the viewpoint of the
> objective, the privilege of prohibition with the viewpoint of tactical efficacy, the privilege
> of sovereignty with the analysis of a multiple and mobile field of force relations, wherein
> far-reaching, but never completely stable, effects of domination are produced' (Foucault,
> 1978, p. 130).

Exploring the workings of disciplining power in 'Discipline and Punish' Foucault distinguishes between several mechanisms/technologies: the play of spatial distribution, the

coding of activities, the accumulation of time and the composition of forces (Foucault, 1995). Their interplay regulates the use of space, the flow of time and the way activities are performed in order to produce 'docile bodies' in schools, prisons, hospitals etc. Broadly using them as a framework for the analysis, I will look for mechanisms of power contextually and genealogically specific to the institutional setting of zapovedniki.

3.

Studying discourse and power relations

Methodological framework of the research

Which methodological principles guided the research?
How the data was collected?
How the data was analysed?

3. Studying discourse and power relations

> 'If Foucault had 'prescribed' (as in systematised) a way in which one must go about doing genealogy in order for it to be authentic, then I agree that this would be hypocrisy of the highest form. This is different from being explicit about what one is doing though, and Foucault is very precise and specific (one could even say methodical) in, for example, The Archaeology of Knowledge or The Order of Things' (Graham, 2005a, p. 5).

Foucault and those who use his theories are often criticised for the vagueness of their methodological procedures (Graham, 2005). However, the absence of five-, eight-, ten- steps plans for doing research and analyse one's data does not necessarily mean that *anything goes*. Therefore, I will try to make my methodological principles open in order to avoid ambiguity as much as possible.

#1 Beware of knowledge taken for granted

The importance of being reflexive about researcher's own positionality is now something widely recognised in studies employing qualitative methods (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Rose, 2001; Waitt, 2005). This means not merely being aware of researcher's own culture, society, status, gender etc., but also of assumptions about how the world works that come with them. Despite the fact that I had been reading poststructuralism theory famous for its plea for deconstructing 'the obvious' well before I came to do my fieldwork, it was only after a few days that the understanding of importance of this plea came to me. After the first interviews I was dogged by an uneasy feeling that 'there is nothing to study'. Everything that people were saying to me seemed to be obvious, logical and truthful in light of coherent constructions of reality. I perceived power relations and how subjects were constructed as *the truth*, not being aware of power relations innate to me as a receptive absorbing member internalized into this society. It took a conscious and purposeful attitude to be aware of knowledge that I had been taking for granted in order to be able to step out of the discourse and be a 'second-order observer' (Fuchs, 2009).

#2 Look for the history of the present, not of the past

Discourses on zapovedniki are laden with rich administrative, social and cultural backdrop, and thus can hardly be analysed without regard to their historical formation. A historical orientation of research allows to account for political and cultural conditions under which the discourses became shaped. Discourse theory allows for a consistent historical orientation of a research (Howarth, 2010) without posing a quest for the 'historical accuracy'. For the discourse theory the focus falls not on the accurate chronological attribution of the authorship, agency or delineating 'hard' facts (how it is in historical writings about zapovedniks) but on how objects and subjects of knowledge came to be in relation to each other (Foucault, 1994).

However, it is important to highlight how *the history of the present* as a focus of attention of Foucault's genealogies is different from the traditional historiography. In words of Foucault himself: 'I set out from a problem expressed in the terms current today and I try to work out its genealogy. Genealogy means that I begin my analysis from a question posed in the present' (Kritzman, 1988, p. 262 cited in Garland, 2014, p.368). To keep up with this stance, precautions must be taken not to read 'present-day social arrangements or cultural

meanings back into history or claim to discover phenomena in earlier times with the same significance and character they have today' (Garland, 2014, p. 368). Genealogy begins not with an itch to write a historical narrative at the expense of omitting ruptures and inconsistencies (Foucault, 1971), but with a 'diagnosis' of the present, the conceptualization of the present day situation. For example, in his genealogy of the contemporary penal system in 'Discipline and Punish' his goal might have been

> 'to reveal something important – but hidden – in our **contemporary experience**; something about our relation to technologies of power–knowledge that was more clearly visible in the prison setting than elsewhere but which was nonetheless a general, constitutive aspect of modern individuals and their experience' (Garland, 2014, p. 368).

Therefore, if I am to try tracing the genealogy of a tourist as a subject in zapovedniki discourse, I have to start with a present day 'diagnosis'. In order to do so, I will begin with an exploration of how a tourist is governed in zapovedniki. By showing the way it is and by tracing the way how it came to be it can be demonstrated that the alternatives to the present state can be possible:

> 'Genealogical analysis traces how contemporary practices and institutions emerged out of specific struggles, conflicts, alliances, and exercises of power, many of which are nowadays forgotten. It thereby enables the genealogist to suggest – not by means of normative argument but instead by presenting a series of troublesome associations and lineages – that institutions and practices we value and take for granted today are actually more problematic or more "dangerous" than they otherwise appear' (Garland, 2014, p. 372).

#3 Distinguish between the context-specific and general in data collection

Zapovedniki as an institution are non-homogenous in terms of history, landscape and accessibility (Schtilmark, 2014). This results in variation in tourism attractiveness and tourism development (Muller, 2014). Thus, it is hard to draw conclusions on all zapovedniki based on one, two or ten of them. The study therefore used two bodies of data – general to all zapovedniki and specific to some of them.

To get an insight in the contemporary ways of governing a tourist in zapovedniki I used context-specific data sourced from the current policy regulations on zapovedniki, websites of zapovedniki, corporate newspaper articles written between 2009 and 2016 concerning tourism in zapovedniki and fieldwork data.

The fieldwork was performed in May 2016 in Irkutsk and Tankhoy in two zapovedniki of Baikal lake region (Baikalsky and Barguzinsky). The choice of these zapovedniki is underpinned by the following rationale. Firstly, Baikal region is both a hotspot of conservation efforts (UNESCO World Heritage site since 1996) and tourism development (1.5 billion visitors annually), which mirrors the focus of the research on tourism in zapovedniki. Secondly, the mentioned zapovedniki of Baikal region embody representative of other reserves recent pathways. Baikalsky zapovednik entered the state program of tourism development in 2012, which makes it a standard-bearer of tourism development in zapovedniki, while Barguzinsky zapovednik was united with a national park under one direction in Zapovednoe Podlemorye.

18 interviews were conducted with zapovedniki employees from different departments and tourism professionals (see the full list of the interviews in Appendix I). The interviews were semi-structured and lasted mainly around 1 hour. The institutions I wanted to contact were defined in the beginning, but to actually contact people in zapovedniki and arrange the interviews snowballing technique was employed, which eased the procedure. The interviews

took place in respective organizations' offices. Most of interviewees were reluctant to be tape-recorded[1] so I was primarily taking notes. Only two interviews[2] were recorded and transcribed. One week of the fieldwork was spent directly in Baikalsky zapovednik. Being included in an everyday life of educational department, I was present at managerial meetings, got an opportunity to familiarise myself with the spatial arrangements of the zapovednik and have informal talks with employees. All translations (ru-eng), both of interviews and documents were made by the author (unless stated otherwise).

To provide triangulation to these findings, and due to time and financial limitations constraining me from visits to more zapovedniki, additional data on how tourists are governed was sourced from zapovedniki's websites. Approximately 50 websites (sections on ecotourism, rules of admission and education) were analysed.

Overall, due to heterogeneity of zapovedniki system, the case of these zapovedniki cannot be generalised to the rest of the system, but can be seen as an *illustration* of how tourists are steered.

The genealogical part is informed by the general background and history of zapovedniki as an institution. To elaborate on formation of subject and object in the institutional discourse I used: historiography of zapovedniki, articles in peer-reviewed journals, policy documents from 1917 till 2016, as well as corporate newspapers articles. The variation in sources is explained by a genealogical requirement to step outside of the dominating discourse. Therefore, I looked for inconsistencies and silences in the discourse by juxtaposing different sources – that written by Russian and foreign scholars, that written by scholars within the zapovedniki system and outside of it, that written by Russian scholars during soviet time and after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The interviews provided bits of additional information, but were more focused on the present time. Therefore, it can be expected that the discoursive formations revealed by this analysis are 'valid' for all zapovedniki.

#4 Be open and reflexive about the procedures in data analysis

The expanded understanding of a discourse on zapovedniki employed in the study includes not only legal documents regulating zapovedniki, an array of scientific works authored by zapovedniki employees but also authorities in charge, practices allowed on the territory and their justification. The functioning of an organization in this case is seen as a discourse, where some practices are deemed possible and some are not in line with an internal logic. It is important to draw a line between practices as represented in discourses and practices as they function in the real world. The former can be researched by analysing texts, while the latter would demand etnogrpahical methods with long-term participant observation etc. In this study I focus on the former.

From the one hand, discourse analysis in Foucauldian tradition breaks off from strictly textual orientation (Waitt, 2005). From the other hand, the analysis still boils down to work-

---

1 This seem to be connected to the fact that the position of tourism in zapovedniki is still highly contested by the scientific community and therefore dangerous to openly talk about, especially in negative terms. Several interviewees mentioned, that those who express their (negative) opinions too harsh can be forced to leave a workplace.
2 In Baikalsky zapovednik, one of the pioneer zapovednik in tourism development. The director of zapovednik and the head of educational and tourism department, both holding pro-tourism stance, agreed to be recorded.

ing with words and texts. However, the focus here falls not on the language structures, stylistics, word use etc., but on effects on reality that these words may have. Rose (2001) describes this approach as

> 'working with texts and images, <which> is much more concerned with their production
> by, and their reiteration of, particular institutions and their practices, and their production
> of particular human subjects' (Rose, 2001, p. 164).

Discourse is more than language, but it can be *accessed* through language. Hereby, in the study I:

a) Looked at words, phrases used
b) Located sections of texts and statements that seem to be regular in a discursive field
c) Looked at how the sections of texts are connected to each other
d) Looked for 'effects in reality' that were brought up by discursive elements, i.e. resulting practices, governmental affiliations etc.

While working with these textual materials, I consistently asked myself the following questions to ensure the focus of the research on the power tecnhiques and discursive formations:

a) How power relations are working in institutional arrangements of zapovedniki? How power operates through space and subjects?
b) How different subjects in the discourse are constructed? What features are attributed to them? What is seen as a (coherent) norm, or desirable condition, and what is judged? What subjects emerge here, and who possesses the right of speaking for what, fo zapovedniki? How is this right justified?
c) What discourses create truths about zapovedniki? What is hidden in this process?

4.

Governing tourists: a diagnosis of the present

Power techniques in governing a tourist in reserves

How a tourist gets steered in a zapovednik?
How is a power of space is enacted?
How is a power of a gaze enacted?

4. Governing tourists: a diagnosis of the present

I 'Our society is one not of spectacle, but of surveillance; under the surface of images, one invests bodies in depth; behind the great abstraction of exchange, there continues the meticulous, concrete training of useful forces; the circuits of communication are the supports of an accumulation and a centralization of knowledge; the play of signs defines the anchorages of power; it is not that the beautiful totality of the individual is amputated, repressed, altered by our social order, it is rather that the individual is carefully fabricated in it, according to a whole technique of forces and bodies' (Foucault, 1995, p. 217).

'We are doing our best so that everyone could easily get in touch with an amazing nature of Baikal lake. Nevertheless, one should not forget that a zapovednik is a territory with a special regime and special rules. Our goal is to ensure the absence of disturbance for the inhabitants of the zapovednik and save this unique natural monument for the future generations. This is why every visit must be agreed upon with an Administration <of the zapovednik>' (Zapovednik Baikalsky, n.d.).

n the very beginning of the thesis I quoted rules of conduct from one of zapovedniki's websites to introduce peculiarities of governing a tourist in zapovedniki discourse. To explore this further, the following chapter will present power techniques used to govern a tourist on zapovedniki's grounds.

In so doing, it will virtually 'follow' a tourist, how s/he gets in a zapovednik (admission procedure) and what happens next on zapovedniki's grounds (spatial mechanisms and observation). In defining the mechanisms, I make use of Foucault's 'Discipline and Punish', so further references will be provided in order to conceptualise the mechanisms. Before, I start, it is necessary to provide the background information about zapovedniki's current administrative structure. Aside from administrative department, zapovedniki include department of protection, employing state inspectors (somehow similar to national park rangers) to protect the territory, department of science (scientists/researchers) and department of education (educators/teachers). Sometimes a separate department of tourism is present as well, and sometimes its functions are fulfilled by the education department.

4.1. Examination

'The examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them. That is why, in all the mechanisms of discipline, the examination is highly ritualized. In it are combined the ceremony of power and the form of the experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth' (Foucault, 1995, p. 184).

An admission procedure, which every tourist must accomplish before s/he enters a reserve (Federal Law on SPNA, 1995), can be conceptualised as examination: a ritual that acquires and uses knowledge about an individual to figure out the best way to apply power on

him. The ritual involves identification of a tourist, examining her/his intentions and knowledge and, upon the results of this, a permit, that embodies the power regime for an individual tourist.

Identifying a tourist

The admission procedure starts with filling in an application form, either online or at an administrative office of a reserve. As an overview of application forms on reserves' websites has shown, application forms of reserves differ in terms of amount of information about an applicant to be included. Generally, personal data including first and second name (often with an identification document number), goal of the visit, time and a route in a reserve ought to be stated.

Examining intentions of a tourist

Most reserves provide prompts for a goal of visitation. For example, in an online application form of Kronotsky zapovednik, an underline with the only possible goal, namely, *educational ecological tourism*, is given (Zapovednik Kronotsky, n.d.). Similarly, the website of Altaysky zapovednik claims that the visitation of the reserve is only allowed when *scientific or educational goals* are pursued. The united direction of several SPNA in Baikal region (Zapovednoe Podlemorye) specifically states that visitation of specially protected zones with a goal of recreation and tourism is prohibited ("Zapovednoe Podlemorye," n.d.-b). This necessity of being goal-oriented when applying for a permit to visit a zapovedniki was mentioned by several interviewees:

> <People visiting reserves are> interested, goal-oriented, they are not coming to merely have some leisure time to relax, without any purpose. They are organised, responsible, purposeful (#5).

> Tourists are visit reserves not simply for leisure time and barbeques, they want to get information about a place they visiting (#6).

An application form is usually demanded to be submitted long time before a visit would take place. The timespan indicated by different zapovedniki varies from 1 week to 2-3 months. This can be interpreted as working towards including a tourist who is not just stopping by, but planning a visit in advance. Of course, as fieldwork observations showed, 'random' tourists are also admitted upon filling out an application form in an office of a reserve. However, an admission procedure as presented on reserves' websites supposes that a tourist has to plan her/his visit well before the actual date and be familiarised with the territory.

Examining knowledge of a tourist

Not only a prospective tourist is expected to have certain goals of visitation in mind, s/he is also expected to have a knowledge about a territory, as an application form section about a route implies. Many reserves present available routes online on their websites with the description of duration, stopping points and main attractions. It is expected then that a tourist would get familiarized with them and opt for one (or several) of them:

> An ideal tourist knows where he is going to. He visits <a reserve's> website and gets familiarized with the territory (#5).

While the website materials create an impression that only officially defined routes are possible, the interviews have shown that the system is more flexible. The strict route-based

visitation is not the only option. In some cases, a route proposed by a tourist can be also considered and approved. An education officer of one reserve mentioned that tourists often contact a tourism department looking for an approval on rafting routes for a river located on the territory of the reserve, and sometimes are granted with such (#6). Similarly, an education department senior of other reserve provided several accounts of negotiations taking place over a visitation route:

> "People are not always aware (and it is our goal to enlighten them) why they can walk one route but not another. 'I want to go there, I want to climb that mountain' - <they say>. 'Simply because I've read that it is the highest mountain'. Then I start to discuss it with them and explain that there is nothing to be seen, only a plateau and a few hills. But they have an image <of the mountain> embedded in their head. Or they say, 'I want to raft down Temnik river'. Temnik is included in the strictly protected zone, so it is only possible to raft down outside of its borders. <…> 'But we want to raft down, because we've read in the Internet somewhere, that someone else has done that. We want it too. He <who rafted down> hadn't asked your permission, just rafted down'. I say, 'Yes, he didn't ask for a permission, but if he had, we wouldn't have given it.' <…> It is just a stereotype. <They> want to go to a place, where no one else is around" (#14).

Another illustration can be a negotiation of providing an admission to a group of pilgrims.

> '<Another question is> if we should give a permission to a group of pilgrims to visit a place in a reserve where sacred stones are located. They used to pray there for rain even before the reserve was established, and it helped. They also came last year, we permitted them, and it rained afterwards. But first they went with three people. Now they want to go with nine. The idea is good, but they need to be accompanied. <I say> 'You cannot go all by yourself, you have to be accompanied by the reserve's employee because it is a protected area and according to its regime you have to be accompanied' (ibid).

As we can see from the stories above, in case if a tourist possesses some knowledge acquired beforehand, a zapovednik might be willing to talk it over (of course I cannot generalise it to other zapovedniki as this flexibility was only observed in one of them). In other words, zapovedniki encourage their visitors to seek out for the information about the landscape, nature and places to see. However, this information must only come from the zapovedniki websites. Zapovedniki strive for being the only authority to give out the knowledge because then this way they can make sure the tourists do not know more than they are supposed to know:

> 'Please be advised that all cartographic publications (guidebooks, atlases, maps) by Ural cartographic factory and other factories contains wrong information about the borders of the zapovednik. Some of these publications contain information about touristic trails on the territory of the zapovednik, which caused many conflicts between tourists and the zapovednik' (Zapovednik Denezhkin Kamen', n.d.).

When tourists know their way around the territory they can escape patrols and 'sneak' on the territory they are not supposed to be. As a state inspector of one zapovedniki commented with an obvisous irritation towards both tourists who sidewalk the protection regime and locals, who help them to do so by the local knowledge:

> 'Protected area is protected, because it is prohibited to enter it. But tourists still sneak inside. Locals help them out to sniff the ways out' (#3).

Using knowledge to exercise power

To interpret admission procedure as examination, it is important to pay attention to the following. The goal of the examination is to collect the information, acquire the knowledge about a tourist, to identify her/him. S/he is not incognito anymore, s/he is in the system, with his ID number imprinted in the paperwork of zapovedniki, s/he is made *visible* and therefore, discipline-able.

Her/his intentions and knowledge get examined. Is s/he aware that zapovedniki can only be visited with educational and scientific goals? Does s/he know anything about the territory of a zapovednik? Or maybe s/he knows more than s/he is supposed to know? In this case, this knowledge must be revealed and might be prohibited to use (as in the above-mentioned case with group who wanted to raft down the river as someone else did). The procedure informs a tourist that zapovednik is not a place where one can wander around, free to come and go as s/he pleases. There *are* right and wrong answers, but the extent to which their acceptability might be a subject to change, remains open in case of each zapovednik.

If an application is approved and payment of an entrance fee is completed, a tourist is granted a permit, or a ticket, to enter a reserve. While most of reserves stick to 'a permit' to visit, others, mainly those who is collaborating with tour operators, offer 'a ticket', or a tourist voucher. The outcome of the examination process is a permit. The power of permit is double. From the one hand, it grants a right to enter a zapovednik's premises. From the other hand, it also limits this right by openly and directly stating the places where a tourist is allowed to be. Getting a permit does not mean, however, that a tourist is allowed to wander freely on the territory of reserves. In most cases, a permit is only valid for the routes mentioned in it. It makes a tourist manageable by including it in a system of authoritative power of state inspectors. If a tourist is met on a territory, her/his papers are examined. If s/he has none (no permit), s/he is obliged to leave, if s/he has a permit, but is caught to be outside of the place mentioned in it, s/he must leave (#5).

To sum up, the examination procedure collects the knowledge about a tourist (personal data, ID, intentions, knowledge of zapovedniki's territory) and provides an adequate response in terms of disciplining power – a permit, prescribing time and place of a visit.

4.2.   Tourism spatialities in zapovedniki

'Segments of our reserve where a tourist can appear, are limited. They are mapped and documented. There are places where tourists are allowed and there are places where tourists will never ever be present' (#13).

For a long time, reserves didn't have any trails except for ones being used by inspectors for patrols and scientists for animal counts. They also didn't have any places to stay overnight except for wooden huts used by employees performing their duties. The architectural constructions most often mentioned as symbolically representing the regime of protection of reserves in the past are watch towers and fences (#13, #14). Nowadays these old spatialities of a zapovedniki, conceived as specific sets of spatial arrangements and use, are being pressed by the new ones, where tourism has to play an important role. To understand the specifics of this change, it is important to pay attention to territory zoning as applied in zapovedniki.

The space of reserves is not homogenous in regard to permitted practices and a corresponding protection status, both of which are determined by the 'value' of the territory (The

Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas of 14 March 1995, 1995). The core area accommodates most valuable ecosystems. It is surrounded by a buffer zone, where the valuable ecosystems are believed to be absent (#13). While the core zone is supposed to be preserved under the condition of the least interference, the buffer zone generally allows the management techniques in relation to animals, plants and forest. The buffer zone also allows establishment of employees' housing and patches or land for their individual agricultural use (gardens, farms).

Based on this distinction, fixed in policies of each individual zapovednik, two ways of organising new tourism spatialities can be distinguished: creation of tourism 'enclosures' in the 'valueless' buffer zone of zapovedniki or scripting spatial use as a consequence of functional sites in the 'valuable' core zone.

Creating tourism 'enclosures'

> 'The specificity of zapovedniki is such that tourists are not allowed to enter the protected area directly, so a museum plays a role of a window to zapovedniki nature. Here you can join an excursion to learn about animals and plants, or just wander independently to admire the expositions and listen to recordings of birds' voices'
> (Zapovednik Voronezhsky, n.d.)

Development of tourism in the buffer zone, and, even better, outside of zapovedniki's borders, is widely supported by the professional community, as my interviewees acknowledged (#9, #12). To satisfy the requirement to include a tourist, but in the same time do not let her/him in the core zone of a zapovednik, tourism 'enclosures' outside of the valuable core of a zapovednik are created.

An illustration here could be an ecotrail 'Cedar Alley – Raised bog' constructed in a buffer zone of Baikalsky zapovednik. It is a trail of 2.5 km in length, with a deck flooring. The trail do not demand special physical preparation or experience. The director of the zapovednik commented on the content of the trail:

> **Typical** landscape, typical species mix with all these chipmunks, bears. But what is **convenient** is that the infrastructure of the trail fits a **touristic product** we sell. People exit the central office <where permits are issued>, where they have mobile connection, toilets, parking, and immediately get to the trail (#13).

Similar examples of trails can be found in (Zapovednik Bolshaya Kokshaga, n.d.; Zapovednik Bryansky les, n.d.-a). Zapovednik Bryansky les offers its visitors an ecotrail on a wooden base, equipped with billboards, mannequins of mammals and birds, birds' houses etc. Astrakhansky zapovednik also offers a new wooden-decked ecotrail that take visitors to 4 artificially constructed islands, each of them is imitating one of four biotopes typical for the zapovednik and featuring typical inhabitants (Zapovednik Astrakhansky. N.d).

Another way to keep the tourists out by officially allowing them in – a museum of nature. Visitation of nature museums under science departments of zapovedniki was a historically approved way of doing tourism in zapovedniki (#14). Lately, visit centres were introduced. While visit-centres and museums of nature in reserves often share the character of an exposition, the former are deemed to be open for contact to a general public, while museums have been seen as a place to visit for scientists, students or schoolchildren. A visit to a museum or a visit center can be used as a substitute for a visit to reserve grounds. The expositions of museums and visit-centres include stuffed animals, examples of rocks and herbariums.

By arguing that ecotrails similar to described above and nature museums constitute tourism enclosures, I make use of Foucault's definition, claiming that an enclosure is 'the specification of a place heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself. It is the protected place of disciplinary monotony' (Foucault, 1995, p. 141). Therefore, it is important to define how exactly these places are heterogenous to, or different from the rest of a zapovednik.

Unlike core territories of zapovedniki which are attributed value of natural ecosystems, tourism enclosures do not inherently have 'natural' value, the value is created within by informational billboards, stuffed animals, accesible flooring etc. For example, a value of 'Cedar Alley – Raised bog' trail in Baikalsky is created with numerous informational boards presenting the environment around as an example of typical for a region ecosystem.

The enclosure also creates conditions to meet all needs a tourist might have:

> From the one hand, we create all conditions for the **comfortable**, interesting stay. From the other hand, we **minimize the harm** that a tourist brings. In fact, a tourist means 'eat', 'drink', 'visit a toilet', 'talk', 'use transport'. It's not only about walking. The presence of people requires numerous conditions (#13).

Within enclosures nature of zapovedniki is present in an artificial way (stuffed animals, birds' voices recordnigs). To this 'nature' no harm can be possibly caused (#14).

To sum up, tourism enclosures are places, significantly different from the rest of zapovedniki. They are located outside of the valuable core of a zapovednik. Within their borders, value is created by imitating and interpreting nature. In the same time, a tourist is isolated from the real nature in a way, that s/he cannot harm it.

Scripting the space

> It is highly recommended to use for leisure and educational excursions existing guardposts and control checkpoints, where you will be provided with information about the territory and guided around ("Zapovednoe Podlemorye," n.d.-b).

No matter how 'comfortable' and 'educational' the tourism enclosures are, tourists still want to see the rest. 'They are not satisfied with the trail <'Cedar Alley – Raised bog' trail>, everyone wants to go further', as one of the interviewees commented (#14).

Then, zapovedniki (as many other protected areas) is faced with a dilemma: they need to preserve the naturalness of the landscape while allowing tourists in the most precious parts of zapovedniki. In the Foucaldian studies it is mainly spatialities of closed-up organizations such as schools, hospitals, prisons which are analysed from the position of how space creates the order (Graham, 2005b; McHoul & Grace, 1993; Moon, 2000; Wilton, 1998). But how to discipline in an extremely 'open' space, in nature? Zapovedniki do so by creating functional sites. Foucault specifies that the rule of functional sites works by coding 'a space that architecture generally left at the disposal of several different uses' (Foucault, 1995, p. 143). As one of the examples he describes a 'medically useful space' of hospital, scripted for examining, registering, providing care and medicines. Benches, firepits, animal observation points, gazebos, trails – all these objects of tourism infrastructure provide functional designation to zapovedniki's space.

Amogst these functional sites to be established on zapovedniki's grounds, trails have the biggest disciplinary capacity. They regulate tourists' mobility in otherwise unregulated space,

and function to both guide a tourist and control her/him. The rules of conduct explicitly mention that no straying from a trail is allowed:

> Don't step outside a trail – you can accidentally disturb a hiding animal, or scare a bird off its nest and step on an insect (Zapovednik Basegi, n.d.)

> Ecotourism is all about not causing harm, trying to behave without leaving any trail of your presence. You have to follow the rules and walk the trodden trails (#4)

> A trail controls tourist – they don't go places where they don't need to be (#6)

> 'A trail is not intended for long-term stops and campfires, so there is no spots equipped for bivouacs and firepits. Therefore, you can only settle a camp with a special permission of an administration' (Zapovednoe Podlemorye, n.d.-a).

According to an admission procedure, a trail is discussed, agreed upon and stated in a permit. The function of a trail is to pave a secured, expert-approved way to the valuable protected territory. Following a trail secures that a tourist is spending his time rationally, not just 'wandering all over the place':

> 'One girl developed a touristic trail in the area. She saw to tourists not to dangle around, but to walk a specific trail and learn something' (**#14).**

> 'We have to make tourist not to cause harm. We have to manage the tourist, so that s/he doesn't make campfires, cut trees, wander all around the place' (#13).

> 'A trail intended for
> - Learning about rare and relic plants
> - Learning about natural complexes
> - Educational excursions
> - Monitoring of the natural environment' (Zapovednik Bolshaya Kokshaga, n.d.).

Aside from paving the 'approved' way to the territory and ensuring the 'rational' use of time, a trail renders tourists visible to zapovedniki's employees. If a tourist follows a trail, even without an accompanying person, it is easy to locate it and make sure that the rules of conduct in a zapovedniki are followed (#15).

Summing up, in order to govern behaviour of a tourist, zapovedniki designate otherwise open and seemingly 'wild' space with functional features. Trails, firepits, campsites are constructed to regulate where a tourist can do what. By doing so, a spatial script is created, in which time of passing a trail, moments of rest are calculated.

4.3. Observation, education and punishment

> The exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation; an apparatus in which the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power, and in which, conversely, the means of coercion make those on whom they are applied clearly visible (Foucault, 1995, p. 171).

According to legal regulations of reserves (Federal Law on SPNA, 1995), a tourist is not allowed to be on a territory of a reserve without a reserve's employee accompanying him or her, even with a permit. An accompanying employee might belong to all three departments of a reserve: protection department, science department and education department. It is never fully clear from websites' materials how an accompanying person is chosen, which

probably hints on the informal mechanisms that come into play. In this part I will describe how power is working directly through observation by different subjects.

A scientist gaze

As my interviewees acknowledged, zapovedniki scientists rarely directly interact with a tourist, only when guiding a tour for ornithologists, visiting scholars or students (#11,#12,#14). A science gaze seems to be directed inwards, on observing natural processes, not outwards, watching over behaviour of people.

An inspector gaze

State inspectors are employees whose function is to secure protection of a territory. Their main tasks include patrolling the territory, being present on checkpoints, fighting with forest fires, preventing and eradicating poaching and all kinds of 'unsanctioned' activities. They have a right to enter all the territory of a reserve, they stay on guard-posts system. They know the territory the best since they collect data for scientists about the weather, plants and do animal countings. Inspectors in reserves are those who ultimately is 'keeping the order' (#14).

An inspector gaze is fashioned from the position of authoritative power (an inspector is a state inspector, after all), that watches over use and misuse of governmental property. They are the holders of the 'real', physical power in this case, power over the bodies and life (Foucault, 1995). They have a right to apply physical force and carry weapons:

> The most effective way to prevent violations of the regime is to work in brigades. The method can be characterised by **strong psychological influence** on trespassers, **supression** of their desire to resist and misbehave in any other ways (Stepanitsky, Kreyndlin, & Kuksin, 2006)

> While performing a **body search**, one should **fix** a trespasser in such a way that the opportunitites for resistance would be limited. Depending on the situation it can be a kneeled posture with hands behind a head. (Stepanitsky et al., 2006)

The disciplining power exercised by state inspectors works both through observation (seeing while being seen) and surveillance (seeing without being seen). In the first case, they explicitly present themselves on guard-posts to claim the space and provide the necessary control:

> In summer state inspectors are keeping their watch at the guardpost, checking permits of tourist ascending and descending the river. To assure that all vessels dock, booms are placed across the river (Zapovednik Vishersky, n.d.).

A controlling and regulating function of the gaze also becomes obvious from the following examples. In continuation of a story about a group of pilgrims asking for an access to sacred stones in a reserve, an interviewee justified the need for accompaniment in the following way:

> 'Our inspector will walk with them and watch them so that they don't encroach on the reserve's inhabitants. <Because> they will carry weapons with them being afraid of bears. It's a mating season, so they need the weapons, <they think>. But being on the territory with weapons is not allowed, prohibited by a Charter of the zapovednik' (#14).

> For the surveillance, they use patrol and ambushes.

> Usually ambushes are set next to bridges, crossroads on pathways, when there is the only road to zapovedniki's grounds, regularly used by violators. Given the good knowledge of

the area and most common types of violations, this protection procedure might be more effective than patrols (Stepanitsky et al., 2006, p. 104).

Tourists are not present in the punishment system unless they violate some of a zapovednik's regulations. For example, the cited above Handbook of a state inspector contains detailed and thorough account of how to deal with poachers and locals illegally harvesting wild-growing herbs, but no instruction on how to manage a tourist who dropped a can. However, it seems that tourists are gradually entering the trespassers category, even though they are not treated seriously yet.

> If we catch a tourist for the first time, we let him/her go. If we see that the tourist didn't do anything wrong yet, we let him/her go. But if they misbehave, we make up a record (#3)

State inspectors are the only ones who can regulate and bring to punishment to violators of the regime. The punishment comes from state inspectors in form of a protocol. Upon the protocol the juridical system is called into force, and the responsibility can be either administrative or criminal.

> Your actions and behaviour must not lead to negative changes and consequences for the natural environment. Obey the nature protection legislation. Familiarise yourself with individual Charters [3] of SPNAs you are going to visit. Violators are brought to administrative and criminal responsibility (Bogdinsky-Basunchaksy zapovednik, n.d.).

State inspectors are not seen as qualified enough to guide an excursion (Naumkin, 2016). Inspector's gaze is assigned to long-term overnight visitors, who do not really need to be educated, since they are more independent and knowledgeable and therefore might be interested in trespassing the borders, looking for the unknown (#11).

To sum up, state inspector exercises on a tourist an authoritative and disciplinary power. S/he posesses control over the bodies of tourists and brings in punishment according to 'an 'artificial' order, explicitly laid down by a law, a programme, a set of regulations' (Foucault, 1995, p. 179). S/he sees without being seen. S/he makes sure, tourists are behaving.

A teacher gaze

> Come visit us! Not only you will enjoy being in nature, seeing flora and fauna of Usman forest, but you will also learn to be responsible for your environment!
> (Zapovednik Voronezhsky, n.d.)
> If you will take all our recommendations into account, your stay in a zapovednik will not harm nature!
> (Zapovednik Kaluzhskye zaseki, n.d.)

It is on the educational department to comprise the code of conduct, create content for the billboards on the territory. They are those who now speak on behalf of zapovedniki with the general public, and tourists specifically. Excursions are seen as the most important form of environmental enlightenment. This is perhaps due to the fact that an excursion always presupposes that there is a gaze of a guide and a strictly defined route.

A presence of a tourist is regarded as apriori harmful. Following the Code of conduct promises the salvation from this harm. A code of conduct is virtually and materially present in zapovedniki. A tourist encounters it on a zapovednik's website when (if) s/he uses it to

---

[3] a set of zapovednik-specific rules regulating its regime etc.

find information about a prospective visit. The tourist is familiarised with the code of conduct in a zapovednik's administrative office, when he applies for a permission to visit. S/he is asked to sign a paper that s/he has been familiarised with the code of conduct. In the beginning of a guided tour a tourist is once again instructed on the code. Finally, when a tourist steps on a zapovednik's grounds, the code of conduct is materially present on billboards located at the entrance and on the territory.

The code of conduct works as a mechanism of limitation and control as it prescribes the appropriate behavior. However, not only it is based on the legally defined prohibitions of the regime, but also it expands further, to the supralegal area of regulating behaviour of a tourist. The code of conduct refers to 'the *regular* rules of *proper* behaviour' (Zapovednik Darwinsky, n.d.), but this proper behaviour is discursively constructed as a norm.

A tourist becomes involved in a project of environmental enlightenment (education). Later I will constextualise the environmental enlightenment as an educational project aimed at the improvement of environmental consciousness, culture and ethics. In reserves' discourse these high goals are believed to be achieved by teaching people how to 'behave in nature', 'treat nature in the right way'. An enlightened tourist is seen as a disciplined tourist:

> 'A person can be uneducated in regards to details such as quantity of legs of a spider or a difference between a mouse and a rat, but he can be enlightened and know that it is prohibited to throw waste paper, step on certain patches of land' (#14).

As the analysis of codes of conduct of zapovedniki's websites has shown, the code of conduct rationale can be traced down to the twofold construction of nature in zapovedniki. From the one hand, it is presented, and sources its value for tourism from being a natural space. After all, as the Federal Law on SPNA 1995 claims, 'within the borders of reserves the natural environment is preserved in its non-disturbed condition'. Reserves are seen as baselines of 'true nature' as opposed to culture of cities:

> 'Reserves must exist. Because they represent the models of undisturbed nature. People can come and see, that's how nature is supposed to look like! Unlike the cities where landscapes are cultured, no native forests, everything is touched by a man' (#14).

The corresponding rationale is based on what is good or bad for nature as interpreted by zapovedniki experts. Zapovedniki's experts are in this case speaking for nature and in the name of it. From the other hand, zapovedniki are clearly presented as cultured landscapes, customised for tourists to safely enjoy the nature (#6) and behave in the limits of the allowed. This justifies the parts of conduct which might not be particularly harmful for ecosystems (for example, vandalising billboards etc.), but prohibited due to the fact a reserve is a governmental institution. However, this disctinction is not made in the code itself. The only rationale that explicitly informs the rules – is a concern for nature:

> 'We would like to remind you about the rules of conduct: you have to be quiet, behave with a maximal tenderness to nature and, of course, don't litter' (Zapovednik Bryansky les, n.d.-a)

> 'Walking on the trail, be quiet, don't scream, don't turn on radio. Better listen yourself and give others the opportunity to listen to the music of the forest: birds singing, leaves shaking gently, a creek murmuring' (Zapovednik Baikalsky, n.d.)

> 'Treat all animals that you might meet on a trail with respect, be it a little lizard or a big bear. Don't scare them with your screams and don't try to catch them. Remember, that it

is their protected territory, not yours, so let them live in peace' (Zapovednik Baikalsky, n.d.; Zapovednik Kaluzhskye zaseki, n.d.)

'Stepping on a trail, remember, that you are a guest of the wild animals, and not the other way round' (Zapovednik Darwinsky, n.d.)

'Dear friends! You are stepping in nature's world! Think of it as if the nature invited you. Try to express all your love and gratitude by your exemplary behaviour. To do so, please follow our rules of conduct to keep nature healthy and beautiful' (Zapovednik Kaluzhskye zaseki, n.d.)

Nature and animals are 'spoken for' by a teacher, acting in their interests.

To sum up, a teacher's gaze posits a tourist as a necessarily harmful element. To minimize the potential harm, the rules must be followed. Zapovedniki nature is presented as a very special type of nature, which justifies the strictness of behavioural rules. The rules are based on what is interpreted to be good for nature by a teacher and can be interpreted in terms of setting the Norm. Teacher's gaze is aimed to discipline; it doesn't need to apply physical power to enforce the regulations (as a state inspector would do).

'It is opposed, therefore, term by term, to a judicial penalty whose essential function is to refer, not to a set of observable phenomena, but to a corpus of laws and texts that must be remem- bered; that operates not by differentiating individuals, but by specifying acts according to a number of general categories; not by hierarchizing, but quite simply by bringing into play the binary opposition of the permitted and the forbidden; not by homogeniz- ing, but by operating the division, acquired once and for all, of condemnation. The disciplinary mechanisms secreted a 'penality of the norm', which is irreducible in its principles and functioning to the traditional penality of the law' (Foucault, 1995, p. 183)

A teacher does not only seek to instruct people on how to behave but also change their attitudes and even conscience as part of a project of environmental enlightenment.

'We have to make people if not to value and love nature, but at least its supporters' (#14)

'Upon your arrival home formulate for yourself what have you gained in ecological and cultural aspect from your visit to a zapovednik. Share your insights with the direction of the zapovednik and with directions of organizations concerned with your visit. Of course, also share your impressions with your nearest and dearest' (Zapovednik Leopard Land, n.d.)

5.

Zapovedniki: the history of the present

Reserves, tourism and tourists over the years

How has the concept of a zapovednik emerged, and under which historical conditions?
Which discursive formations characterised the zapovedniki's discourse over the years?
Which subjects were historically constructed in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki?
Amongst these subjects, how a tourist as a subject entered the institutional discourse?

5. Zapovedniki: a history of the present

'For what remains of the moral and historical 'necessity' of the categories with which we understand ourselves and the techniques developed to change our behavior if they are the product of historical contingencies and struggles for power?'
(Dix, 2016, p. 24).

In the previous chapter I've provided an extended 'diagnosis' of the present by outlining disciplining techniques that are applied in zapovedniki to deal with a tourist. These techniques, for sure, cannot be seen as unique, as many of them might be used to various extents in other protected areas (admission procedure and ecotrails can hardly be considered a novelty). However, it was not my goal to introduce new techniques or make them look as new. Instead, by consistently asking myself – how exactly this or this works to steer a tourist and what is a direction s/he is steered, - I aimed to conceptualise the management mechanisms as disciplining techniques laden with power. It gave me an understanding that a tourist in zapovedniki is constantly and meticulously disciplined:

S/he is identified and examined if her/his knowledge is absent or superfluous, and intentions fitting to goals of reserves.

S/he is governed by space: spatially excluded from what is seen of value, free to roam in valueless 'enclosures'. If admitted to the valuable territory, s/he is placed under observation/surveillance and controlled by functional sites designating the use of otherwise 'wild' natural space.

S/he is contstantly observed. Authoritative power indulges her/him, but disciplining gaze of a teacher is eager to normalise her/his behaviour by what is seen as 'proper behaviour in nature'.

Therefore, it is important to see these procedures not as obvious management techniques but as ways how zapovedniki exercise their power on a tourist.

As we can see, these disciplining tecnhiques, their intensity and concentration seem to be quite special. In the future chapters I will provide the history of the present by showing how zapovedniki actually came to be the way they are to accommodate such rules, and also how a tourist as a subject emerged as someone to whom these rules can be applied.

To trace how zapovedniki and their subjects came to be the way they are, it is necessary to contextualise research historically and culturally by taking into account events, storylines, practices from the past. The legacies of the past are important to discover the well-trodden paths of power and trace them in the present. Having said that, in the chapter to follow I aim to sketch zapovedniki history and its main struggles.

As nothing exists outside discourse (Foucault, 1994), I attempt not to treat history as succession of 'hard' facts, underpinned by reasons and followed by consequences. Thus, it is important to clarify, that the goal of the chapter is not to present the thorough historical outline of zapovedniki's development (for this see Muller, 2014; Spetich, Kvashnina, Nukhimovskya, & Rhodes, 2009; Weiner, 1999), but to sketch the main ideas underpinning their change and struggle and show how they brought about certain subjects and ways to govern them. The history of zapovedniki has been constructed in discourses of those writing/speaking about it. From this position I look and explore the facts, but treat them as discursive elements. I do so by looking at the institutional discourse of zapovedniki and exploring four discursive formations inherent to it: nature preservation, nature transformation,

nature utilization and, finally, nature demonstration. I do not pretent on the exhaustive description of these formations, their role is merely to provide the context and genealogical underpinning of subject formation and governmentality.

5.1. Conservation and science in zapovedniki: a discourse on nature preservation

> Thus in the organization of the zapovednik system forces of many different specialists were joined: soil scientists, botanists, game managers and zoologists'
> (Dr. Naumkin, 2016)
>
> Prominent native natural scientists and ecological activists were at the outset of the establishment of the unique system <of zapovedniki>, one of the most significant conservational achievement of our fatherland
> (On definition of the main directions of development of the system of zapovedniki and national parks in Russian Federation in the period till 2020, 2003)

The institutional discourse of zapovedniki claims that the origins of the system were connected to ideas of nature conservation circulating in Russian scientific community in the end of XIXth century. In 1894 V. Dokuchaev, a soil scientist, expressed his concerns on disappearance of steppes in the black earth region of Russia (Spetich et al., 2009). To deal with the problem, he proposed to put remaining plots of pristine, intact land in the area under protection regime. He also proposed to build research stations next to them to conduct research and monitor the changes. These plots, which he suggested to call zapovedniki, were aimed to preserve the 'natural' state of the land and serve as baseline models ('etalony') of *healthy* nature for comparison with other lands, disturbed by human activities (Weiner, 1999). Dokuchaev also proposed a principle for the organization of new zapovedniki in the future – biogeographical zoning. According to this theory, every natural zone in Russia was to be represented by a zapovednik (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978).

The beginning of XXth century saw the bursting development of the idea by the scientific community, which resulted in the project of a first regulatory statute in 1909, where conservation and long-term scientific research were set as a priority of zapovedniki (Spetich et al., 2009). Justifying the need for establishment of zapovedniki, A. Kozhevnikov, a Moscow-based entomologist, argued:

> 'To have an opportunity to study nature, we must strive to save it in its **primordial inviolability** in the appearance of its most typical formations. What is a goal of these inviolable territories? First of all, <the goal is> purely scientific, then, of course, practical. Only scientific study of nature gives a prompt foundation for any practical activity' (Kozhevnikov 1909 cited in Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978).

First zapovedniki were established shortly before the Russian Empire was overthrown by the October revolution in 1917[4]. Later communist Russia adopted the idea, and proceeded to create new zapovedniki (with few created earlier being closed) under the jurisdiction of the State Committee of Nature Protection of scientific department of the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment ('*Narkompros*' - a department for education/enlightenment of masses). Zapovedniki were supposed to be staffed and managed by scientists. As such, they

---

[4] Kitoiskiy in 1914, Syanskiy in 1915, Kedrovaya Pad' in 1916

had a core department – a scientific one, and a department of the forest guard, aimed at to prevent policy violations, such as poaching, logging, etc. They would also help with census of animals and plants.

Under the significant influence of the scientific community in the first years of communist regime, an understanding of nature to be protected as pristine, 'composed of geographically bonded closed systems (biocenoses) that existed in state of equilibrium and harmony' (Weiner, 1999, p. 3), was dominating. The exceptional qualities of pristine nature in zapovedniki were used to justify the strictness of the protection regime, called 'absolute inviolability' ('absolyutnaya zapovednost'). The condition of absolute inviolability required that territories of reserves were excluded from *all* activities (except for some scientific ones) *forever.* As natural territories in an undisturbed (inviolable) condition, zapovedniki were protected from encroachments of forestry management, agricultural projects and hunting (Narkompos, 1921). In line with this understanding of zapovedniki and their mission, the legislation documents prohibited all economical activities, such as hunting, logging, any other natural resource exploitation (including tourism seen as such) or disruption of reserves' landscape or ecosystems[5] (Narkompros, 1925).

The exception made for the scientific research sheds some light on the ultimate importance of science for zapovedniki in their early days. In the first soviet legal document on zapovedniki, they were defined as scientific and educational institutions (Narkompos, 1921; Narkompros, 1925). Reymers and Schtilmark (1978) actually argue that zapovedniki had been *the* first scientific institutions of the Soviet Union, before any other state organizations devoted to scientific research emerged. With this status, they enjoyed the right to organize museums, research stations, libraries, laboratories, experimental farms for wild animals, issue its own scientific periodic, organize scientific discussions, public lectures, workshops, conferences etc. (Narkompros, 1925). In 1925, a first zapovedniki-based periodic, *The Efforts of Zapovednik Studies*, was issued, accommodating a growing body of research of zapovedniki on zoology, plant science, enthomology etc.

Science, according to the scientific community, could be happily wed to conservation interests in general, and inviolability principle, in particular. Reserves were claimed to provide unique opportunities for field-based, long-term and non-invasive studies of nature, which would not disrupt 'the natural flow of life': 'nowhere but in zapovedniki, with the opportunity they give of continuous years-long observations of nature <…> it is possible to acquire such diverse, truly complex and therefore most trustworthy geographical data' (Solovyev, 1951, p. 5). With time the methods of research acceptable in zapovedniki were developed and refined to produce a report of a desirable format, prescribing categories to look at. The first issue of this standardised report, given a name of "Chronicles of Nature", was delivered in 1945. Ideally, this report has had to be based on 'collection of data on a year-round schedule by a permanent scientific team, creation of repeatable study lots and techniques, and the accumulation of long-term data' (Spetich et al., 2009).

Both Dokuchaev and Kozhevnikov belonged to pre-revolutionary scientific intellectual circles. Weiner (1999) exploring the connection of identity formation of scientific intellectual community with zapovedniki as an institution, argues that the 'tribe' of scientific intellectuals that contributed to zapovedniki development in the beginning of XXth century had a special ethos inherent to them as a community. The ethos included 'connotations of activism, service

38

---

[5] The exception was only made for reserves' employees who could keep the households on the territory and use small amount of resources, for example, pick berries, to feed themselves and their families.

to Science, broad erudition, scientific autonomy, individual responsibility and collective action' (Weiner, 1999, p. 5). Not surprisingly then, these scientific circles hold an elitist stance towards those who they believed were 'foreign to the idea of the protection of nature' (Weiner, 1999, p. 175), both a ruling class ('incompetent and selfish') and masses ('having vulgar values').

The tribe incepted the idea, and naturally strived to assume the expert position in zapovedniki system: 'they averred that they only, through their expert study of long-term ecological dynamics of pristine natural communities, could determine appropriate economic activities for specific natural regions' (Weiner, 1999, p. 3). The expert position implied the mission to persuade and enlighten the bureaucrats. The scientists regarded leviathan state with a greater power to impose their understanding of nature protection on the lay people. They wanted to use this power to impose their own ideas based on their knowledge and moral superiority.

Zapovedniki were (and, as we will see later, still remain to the certain extent) more than employment possibilities for the scientific community. They were even more that baselines models of nature or laboratories in nature. They were the embodiment of Nature, the spiritual foundation of humanity (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978), which needed to be protected from those with 'greedy, lustful hands':

> Zapovedniki is the supreme form of nature protection, never and nowhere else in the world to be seen! It is precisely the strategy of absolute inviolability, that of establishing plots of land, which people could not lay their greedy lustful hands on, was safeguarding the nature of Russia, while the functioning of zapovedniki as scientific institutions served as a disguise for this project of saving the nature 'from people for people' (Schtilmark 1972 cited in (Buntovskaya, 2012)

> Europe, America, Africa – none of them have anything similar to zapovedniki, because <in these countries> they were guided by market considerations, and not spiritually-scientific <as in Russia> (Schtilmark, 2005).

Building on an idea of service to Science and the spiritual understanding of pristine nature, zapovedniki became abstracted within the discourse from being an organization to being a common, just Cause. The Cause of zapovedniki ('zapovednoe delo') became greater than the system of zapovedniks itself. People foreign to the idea of nature protection could come and work in reserves, and could change them, but they could not alter the Cause.

The storyline above presents the nature preservation discourse treating zapovedniki as a scientific and conservational institution with the highest degree of land/water protection. However, the naturalists-fathered preservationist conception of zapovedniki as scientific institutions and baseline models of undisturbed nature kept in the condition of inviolability had been questioned right from the first years of zapovedniki existence.

In the next chapters I will describe the main discursive formations that were historically present in institutional discourse of zapovedniki: nature transformation, nature utilization, and, finally, nature demonstration. These discourses were contingently in conflict with the preservationist theory.

5.2. Zapovedniki vs nature transformation

'We cannot wait for favours from Nature. To take them from it – that is our task'.
Ivan Michurin, a Russian practitioner of selection (1895-1935)

'Man, in changing Nature, changes himself'
Maxim Gorky

The changes happening in the Soviet Russia with Stalin coming into power, have not left zapovedniki system unconcerned. Nature Protection Congress in 1929 inaugurated a new era in the reserves' history. Back then, an overall orientation of the country's nature-related policy was proclaimed to be changing from nature protection to nature utilization and transformation. Nature transformation embodied an overall state orientation unique for Stalinism period. The country was forced to rapid industrialization within consequent Five Year Industrial Production Plans (literally 'five-year-ers' - 'pyatiletki')[6]. Soviet people were demanded to work to the fullest to achieve a bright future that communism and industrialization would bring them. Nature was demanded to keep up with the super productive standards pursued by men. The existing nature was regarded as 'backward, unplanned, and not having reached its productive potential' (Weiner, 1999, p. 202). To improve the existing nature meant to turn it into 'super productive communist nature of the future' (ibid).

In 1930 the change of focus gained its institutional support: a governmental body, that had been in charge of the most zapovedniki from the beginning, The Committee of Nature Protection of Science department of the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment, was transformed into the Committee of facilitation of development of atural resources of RSFSR[7] (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978). Correspondingly, in 1930 statute on 'Protection and Development of natural resources in RSFSR' zapovedniki were positioned not only to protect natural areas, but also 'include natural areas, especially those untouched by men, in economical use' (Narkompros, 1930). Thus zapovedniki were in fact being forced to give up their inviolability ideals. The role of science had also been reconsidered. While the preservationist understanding of science implied non-invasive methods mainly aimed at observation of natural processes, Stalinism-inspired science held a much more proactive stance. A whole array of nature management techniques ('biotechnics') was put into practice. Predators, mainly wolves, were 'controlled' (exterminated), hooved animals were provided with supplementary feeding and lick salts to increase their population, existing vegetation was removed to be replaced by 'better' species, and application of pesticides got widespread.

Perhaps, the most environmentally 'notorious' practice amongst biotechnics was acclimatization of species. That was a large-scale project of introduction of non-native species to reserves to 'improve' ecosystems. Hundreds, thousands of beavers, spotted deer, red deer were extracted from their native habitats in one zapovednik and transferred to another. Non-native to Russian territory species, such as raccoon dog, muskrat, American minks were

---

[6] First plan, 1928–1932; Second plan, 1933–1937; Third plan, 1938–1941; Fourth and fifth plans, 1945–1955 etc.

also released. Explaining the rationale for acclimatization of species, E.Markov, one of the commited to acclimatization projects scientists of that time, wrote:

> 'a Man, as a master of nature, might and must interfere in the flow of nature, regulate it and reorganize it in desirable ways' (Markov, 1937, cited in Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978).

Some zapovedniki managed to accept the new rules of the game, and others failed. In 1951 Stalin signed a decree to liquidate 88 zapovedniki out of 128[8] and to transfer their lands to resource extraction ministries (Resolution on liquidation of the Commitee on zapovedniki and liquidation of individual zapovedniki, 1951). Zapovedniki were found to be 'redundant' and not effective enough in 'managing' their forests:

> 'In some regions a network of zapovedniki has expanded **unreasonably** <…>. Forestry in zapovedniki is in **unsatisfactory** condition. Forests of many zapovedniki are encumbered and **infested with pests**' (Stalin, 1951 cited in Chestin, 2012).

To put it shortly, within discourse of Nature transformation pristine nature in zapovedniki was regarded as backward and in an urgent need for improvement. Following this internal logic, management practices, such as acclimatization of species, active regulation of populations 'useful' animals and pests were employed.

5.3. Zapovedniki vs nature utilization

As historiography of zapovedniki is aminly an embodiment of a preservationist discourse, it obscures how zapovedniki concept, being so strictly scientific and conservational, happened to be used to name hunting reserves. As the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment created scientifically-oriented reserves in 1917-1929, the People's Commissariat of Land use ('Narkomzem') established few zapovedniki with the practical goal to restore certain species of economic interest (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978). In 1917 Barguzinsky zapovednik was established to restore the population of a small carnivore valued for its high-quality fur, called 'soft gold of Russia' – sable. These zapovedniki were organised for a reasonable (from a position of population restoration) timespan to allow more sustainable explotation in the future (Muller, 2014). In general, they had an applied goal and a research agenda: scientific departments of these zapovendiki were busy evaluating hunting resources and studying valuable species. The latter would often include quite invasive methods, such as extracting animals from the wild and keeping them in captivity on experimental farms. As this example shows, the scientific and the applied conception of zapovedniki coexisted in the beginning of the institutional history.

After the majority of zapovedniki ceased to exist in 1951, the functioning of the rest was faced with a new legal framework. According to the new regulations (Resolution on the ratification of a statute on the Main Agency for hunting and zapovedniki, 1956), economical value of zapovedniki superceeded their scientific and cultural significance. Thus, the research agenda of zapovedniki was significatly moulded to fit the interests of the national economy, i.e. to solve applied problems of forestry and agriculture, hunting and fisheries (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978). In 1955 zapovedniki were transferred under the jurisdiction of The Hunting Committee of the Russian Federation (Glavokhota), which supported the applied outlook. Under a banner of developing national economy, zapovedniki system started to expand again. Some zapovedniki closed in 1951 were re-opened, and new ones were established.

---

[8] The overall territory covered by zapovedniki was thus reduced from 12,5 billion hectares to 1,465 billion hectares (0,56 % of the territory of the Soviet Union and 0,06 %, respectively)

Nevertheless, some years later zapovedniki system 'failed' to keep up with the expectations of the state again. The following excerpt from a speech of a Russian leader, who sanctioned the second wave of zapovedniki closures, N. Khruchev, might be useful to illustrate that zapovedniki were still managing to stick to their 'observational' science:

> 'I've seen a documentary recently. A very good one. In the documentary a healthy strong man was lying down on a stone and observing with binoculars a squirrel cracking nuts…It must have been a scientist. What kind of reserve is that? It is a reserve for people who work there. Even if these people were not there, the squirrel would be cracking the nuts anyways. It doesn't care if there is a scientist or not. But the difference is, that the squirrel is cracking its nuts being observed by the scientist, and the scientist is getting good money for that. We need to sort these things out' (Zapovednik Kronotsky, n.d.)

'To sort the things out' 16 zapovedniki were liquidated, 9 transformed to filials, and 8 got territorial cuts (Chestin, 2012).

Discourse on nature utilization has been persistent over the years, as the country always needed an astonishing amount of natural resources, and an idea of fully inviolable territories of no entrance has been hard to grasp both for the state and for the wider public. It treated zapovedniki as experimental fields for the solution of economically handy issues, and, of course, as places for extraction of natural resources.

5.4. Zapovedniki vs nature demonstration

"Views of native nature shape the feeling of homeland, cultivate citizenship, facilitate a proper way of socialization of a personality and shape communistic worldview'
(Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978)

'All year round European and American bourgeois are hunting for 'bright' impressions, exotics and adventures. They are making entertaining visits in the most luxurious conditions to various countries of the world. This is so called tourism…Amusement, an attempt to run away from a tiresome routine of parasitic life – this is the content of this bourgeois travels, bourgeois tourism. <…> Soviet tourism, on the contrary, is a part of a culture, and a deeply political phenomenon. It is a new form of class struggle and socialism development'
(Antonov-Saratovsky, 1930 cited in Sokolova, 2000)

Originally zapovedniki were defined not only as conservational and scientific institutions, but also as educational ones (concerned with enlightenment of masses) (Narkompros, 1925). As such, they were allocated under the jurisdiction of the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment. The Commissariat was a soviet governmental body which, being in charge of cultural and educational policy, supervised art, literature, museums and science.

People's enlightenment was a Soviet educational and political project, an endeavour 'to free the masses from darkness and ignorance' (Khodorovsky, 1926). The system of formal education (schools, universities etc.), but also libraries, local clubs, reading houses (special types of village mini-libraries) and other governmental establishments opened their doors and were newly established for soviet citizens regardless of their age or financial status (all education was free). The project was aimed to bring 'the light of knowledge' to 'masses', that had had limited access to education in tsarist Russia (farmers, workers etc.). Heavily laden with ideology in following Lenin's commandment that 'a school outside of life and politics

is lies and hypocrisy' (Lenin speech on the first All-Russian Congress on Enlightenment, 26 august 1918, cited in Khodorovskiy 1926), the enlightenment project aimed to bring up a new type of a soviet man and promote the ideals of soviet society.

Being under the jurisdiction of the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment, reserves were entitled to play an important role in the project. Zapovedniki as a part of the enlightenment project were also mentioned in consequent documents regulating zapovedniki functioning (Narkompos, 1921; Narkompros, 1925, 1930; Resolution on ratification of statute on state zapovedniki RSFSR, 1962) In the first decade after the revolution Narkompros actively engaged in organizing workshops, lectures to train guides for cultural, natural, but mainly 'socialistic' excursions. Excursion trips, the promoted type of touristic activity, were sought to demonstrate the achievements of socialism in the country by taking excursants to the monumental buildings, factories, collective farms etc. Zapovedniki in this case were used as an educational venue – it was mainly children and students who were guided on their territory and taught about natural sciences. Museums of nature and experimental farms, established as venues for scientific undertakings, were targeted as the main spots in zapovedniki to visit.

The activities under the banner of enlightenment in reserves included 'familiarization with natural complexes of zapovedniki and results of zapovedniki-based scientific research with the purpose of enlightenment of masses and training of research specialists' (Narkompros, 1925). In fact, this 'familiarization' included visits to zapovedniki by schoolchildren, students and scholars.

The practice of having internship students from related study fields (biology in general, zoology, plant sciences etc.) got widespread in reserves. Students were welcome as reserves' employees saw them as disciples and followers (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978). Some students were also connected to a volunteer movement of nature protection brigades. The first brigade was established in 1958, and brought together students striving for 'active efforts, for struggle and not for the meditation on nature protection themes' (Weiner, 1999, p. 313). Solidarity and a strict sense of civic responsibility while preserving the conditions of voluntary enrollment were seen as crucial for students united in brigades. The brigades patrolled reserves in order to prevent poaching and helped out with other everyday tasks in a reserve (Schtilmark, 2014).

Alongside students, schoolchildren were also seen as a target group for enlightenment. The schools paid visits to reserves as a part of their educational program, and the most motivated children could join clubs of young naturalists (Khristoforova & Bisikalova, 2007). Young naturalists could contact a reserve to ask for a visit to write a school research paper, ask for a supervision of reserves' employee and use reserves' libraries (ref)

In 1930s tourism in zapovedniki received a state-inspired boost. This time it was not excursion tourism, implying the absence of overnight stay, that was brought to the fore, but nature-based sport tourism of a soviet 'model'.

The Soviet tourism aimed to create a physically strong, healthy[9] individual with a 'proper' communistic worldview. Alongside, it was a mean of military training (physical training, spatial orientation, scouting), a source of volunteer labour (helping farmers with harvesting etc.),

43

---

[9] Could nails from such people be fashioned, you'd see
That no tougher nails in the world would there be
Nikolai Tikhonov. Ballad of the Nails, 1920. Translation by Peter Tempest

and a way to conduct scientific research (exploration of mineral deposits). Tourism was recognised as an ideological tool of the highest importance, a 'rational use of free time', concerned with improving the cultural and ideological education of masses:

> 'It is necessary to use the opportunities of tourism and excursions to improve ideological, political, labour and moral education of the working class and the younger generation; < It is necessary to use the opportunities of tourism and excursions > to facilitate the educational process of learning about history, nature and culture of the fatherland, to strengthen health of the population and ensure rational use of free time' (Usyskin, 2000)

As tourism was seen as a part of physical education, it had an achievement system, based on mastering oneself and nature. In 1940 a badge 'Tourist of USSR' was introduced with 'a purpose of development of independent tourism, as one of the best forms of active leisure, by which the working class can combine physical training with enhancing its culture, learning about the homeland and acquiring defense skills necessary to every defender of our country' (Charter on a badge Tourist USSR cited in Sokolova, 2002). To be granted with a badge, a tourist had to

- meet physical norms GTO[10]
- accomplish a touristic trip of 6 and more days' long
- know how to read a map, orient oneself in space by a compass, Sun, stars
- know how to set up a tent, a camp, make a firepit, cook on fire
- know the proper regime of physical activity, leisure, food and water intake
- know one's local region (nature, landscape)
- have elementary knowledge in geography and geology (Usyskin, 2000)

44

After acquisition of the badge, the tourist could partake in routes of frowing complexity and difficulty and earn points to become recognized as a Master in tourism.

As we can see, tourism was based on the proactive attitude of a tourist. Nature was not for passive enjoyment, but for education: 'People who live far from nature should from time to time get in contact with nature, because nature is an limitless and necessary source of energy and life-giving forces' ('Vsemirnyi tourist', 1928, cited in Sokolova, 2002)

In 1930s mass tourism development was recognised as a part of zapovedniki agenda (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978). In 1935-1937 Kavkazsky, Ilmensky and Teberdinsky zapovedniki were annualy visited by 40000 tourists, zapovednik Stolby by 30000 tourists, Krymsky zapovednik – by 10000 tourists (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978). To guide the development of mass tourism, 'The Guidelines for touristic camps and tourists on the territory of zapovedniki' were published (ibid.) Tourist trails crossing the territory of several zapovedniki (Astrakhansky, Kavkasky, Teberdinsky etc.) were published in widely distributed maps for tourists. 'Recommendations on tourist maps" mentioned tourism in zapovedniki in terms of propaganda and necessity of limitations:

> 'Taking into account the necessity of propaganda of the mission of zapovedniki to the tourists, the importance of zapovedniki and code of conduct on the territory must be explicitly stated in a textual supplement to a map' (Recommendations on tourist map design, 1985, p. 45)

---

[10] Unified soviet system for assessment of personal fitness 'Gotov k trudu I oborone' ('Ready for labour and defence') – a set of physical condition norms prescribed for different ages and sexes (for example, 11 push-ups for girls aged 6-8, 17 push-ups for boys of the same age etc.). Recently (in 2014) the system was brought back to life by the initiative of V.Putin.

In the Handbook of zapovedniki of USSR (1951) zapovednik Stolby, located in the mountainous area in the close proximity of Krasnoyarsk, was referred to as 'a national park of Siberia, where numerous visitors every year are enjoying the wonders of nature' (Solovyev, 1951, p. 134). The handbook proceeded with stating that 'after the overcoming of difficulties of climbing the peaks of Stolby mountains, tourists acquire unforgettable impressions from the amazing views of mountainous taiga'. The impatcs of tourism was not seen as a problem. Reporting that the number of visitors raised from 3000 people in 1922 to 36000 in 1947, the handbook assured that this did not disturb the fauna of the reserve.

Stolby was the only zapovednik promoted in the terms of tourist attractiveness in the Handook. Calling it a 'national park' might be then interpreted as a way to distance the zapovednik developing tourism practice from all others, by actually stripping off (at least in the publication) the zapovednik status. The coexistence of tourism and science in zapovedniki was in most cases found *unjustifiable* (Schtilmark, 2014).

Overall, the perception of excursions in zapovedniki by the scientific community seemed to be double. In 1978 Reymers and Schtilmark were expressing their regrets on the amount of time and human resources being spent on educational activities: "Unfortunately, the development of excursion practices and tourism (even educational) occasionally harms natural complexes and scientific research" (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978, p. 45). In the mean time, they proceeded to acknolwedge, that 'the role of zapovedniki in the cause of fostering love to nature and popularization of nature protection amongst the widest segments of the society must not be underestimated' (ibid). Weiner argues that a soviet tourist was seen by the scientific community more as an ally than as an enemy in a fight for zapovedniki, since s/he was potentially interested to tramp upon natural landscapes, not agricultural or industrial lands (Weiner, 1999).

45

The promotion of zapovedniki by means of publications, photoalbums and postcards was also attributed a double meaning. From the one hand, the authors express their satisfaction with the popularity of these materials, as the evidence of the popularity of zapovedniki themselves. From the other hand, they believe that 'these publications cause harm to the zapovedniki cause, attracting masses of people to zapovedniki, which are not prepared for that' (Reymers & Schtilmark, 1978, p. 48).

The collapse of the Soviet Union brought the population close to and sometimes below the poverty line, and resulted in massive restructurings of the system and loss of power centralization. As a result, zapovedniki' financing more than significantly cut, while the local population struggling to survive started to actively encroach zapovedniki's borders to turn their resources into cash (Wells & Williams, 1998). In this situation, Russia opened up for incoming grants from the international governmental and non-governmental nature protection organizations aimed at the development of environmental education (WWF, US Forestry Service, Dutch government to name a few) (Wells & Williams, 1998). In 1990s enlightenment in reserves was no longer framed as enlightenment of masses, or cultural enlightenment, but got assigned a strong environmental dimension.

Before the collapse of the USSR educational activities in zapovedniki (mainly excursions, visitation of nature museums) were performed by science departments. In 1990s enlightenment in reserves got institutionalized by establishment of separate departments, which meant coming of new specialists. These specialists generally come from schools and other educational institutions and mostly have educational or social sciences background. In 1993-1996 and later departments of EE started to appear in many reserves:

'A conception of environmental enlightenment, methodical recommendations were developed, where it was described what the departments were supposed to do. <We have had to> work systematically with all sectors of the society. Not only education. Not only with schoolchildren. Communicate with mass-media, publish in newspapers and magazines, we had no Internet at the time. Cooperate with museums, art galleries to set up exhibitions. Work on the territory <of the reserve> with visitors, because even though there was no tourism, but there were visitors. Work with children because, fair enough, it has been a must' (#14).

At that time environmental enlightenment paved its way into the officially stated goals of zapovedniki. In 2010 V.Putin, being a Prime Minister at the time, articulated a new agenda for zapovedniki:

'One cannot be taught to love and value the natural world if it is only experienced in books and pictures. People should have direct contact with nature, to see it and touch it themselves, if possible' ("Prime Minister Vladimir Putin holds a meeting on developing the system for specially protected natural areas," 2010).

So, tourism stepped out of a shadow (or a protective wing) of environmental enlightenment in 2011, being explicitly mentioned as one of the goals of reserves' development. The definition that is given for this specific type of tourism goes as follows: 'is a type of tourism that involves familiarisation with natural and cultural monuments' ("Ministry of Natural Resources," 2013). In fact, ecotourism is used as an umbrella concept to cover a whole array of activities (ornitological, archeological, etnoghraphical, adventure tours, student internships, weekend trips) (Zapovednik Verhne-Tazovsky, n.d.-b), or even dog-sledging, horse-riding and winter trips on snowmobiles (Press-service MNR, n.d.). 'Educational ecological tourism' is consistently mentioned in the policies and press-releases of the ministry as the type of tourism that must be developed in protected areas as 'traditional and a highly effective kind of environmental enlightenment activities' (Federal Law on SPNA, 1995).

This ambitious definition of ecotourism in zapovedniki is fully backed by the newest Strategy of tourism development in Russian Federation (2014). The document states that the mission of tourism is to contribute to social culture, education and enlightenment of society. Educational tourism is seen as a prioritized direction of development, as 'the most competitive and prospective type of tourism, aligned with the overall state politics and national interests of Russian Federation' (Strategy of tourism development in the period till 2020, 2014) , playing an important role in enlightenment, health improvement and education of society. It might be of interest to compare some lines from documents of two epochs:

'It is necessary to strengthen the role of tourism in ideological education and propaganda of benefits of socialist lifestyle' (Resolution on means of tourism development in USSR in the period till 2000, 1985).

'The role of tourism is to rise cultural level and improve consciousness in society, as well as environmental responsibility and patriotism' (Strategy of tourism development in the period till 2020, 2014).

As we can see, a soviet inclination to improve people with by virtue of 'proper' tourism might still be present in the contemporary Russia, even though socialist lifestyle is replaced by patriotism.

Therefore, reserves were not isolated from tourism and a tourist in the soviet period of their existence. The discourse on nature demonstration originated from practices of excursions in the first years of zapovedniki's existence. Nature in this case was treated as an

educational facility. As such, it created a subject position of a disciple – someone who comes to a zapovednik with an open heart and ears to absorb the knowledge, but also can be easily disciplined by seniors. This subject position was occupied by schoolchildren and students. Later, with a development of nature-based sport tourism, a tourist as a subject appeared. Due to almost total absence of tourism in zapovedniki-related literature, I see it as an example of silencing the tourism in the zapovedniki's institutional discourse. At that time, discourse on nature preservation prevailed, so a tourist as a subject was unimaginable. This was contested by publishing maps for tourists, handbooks etc. to guide them through zapovedniki. In these publications, the issues of extreme importance of zapovedniki for nature protection and rules of conduct were foregrounded, which can also be seen as an influence of the nature preservation discourse. Lately, nature demonstration discourse accommodated a new storyline of environmental enlightenment, which has a strong legacy in the soviet project, but also was influenced by the western ideas of ecotourism and environmental education. A tourism storyline, as presented in nature demonstration dsicourse, also bears a significant trace of soviet enlightenment project.

5.5.   Contemporary institutional discourse of zapovedniki

In the previous chapters I've outlined four discursive formations that shaped the institutional discourse on zapovedniki in the past years: nature preservation, nature transformation, nature utilization and nature demonstration. As I see the contemporary discourse on zapovedniki, it embodies a complicated mesh of all four discourses.

In line with the nature preservation discourse, the contemporary reserves aim to protect their lands and waters 'to save the biodiversity and keep the protected natural complexes in their natural (undisturbed) condition' (The Federal Law on SPNA, 1995). The concept of a reserve as a baseline model of natural complexes still retains its significance, as became clear from conducted interviews, but also from a website analysis.

Zapovednik accommodates rich wildlife, its territory is pristine (#4)

The main goal of zapovedniki is protecting the baseline models of nature (#9)

It is important to mention though that absolute inviolability have proved to be nearly impossible to keep up to. Zapovedniki were closed and re-opened, and their borders re-designated which significantly undermined the pristine character of the majority of reserves (Weiner, 1999). However, the condition still persists as an ideal every reserve should strive for (#13, Schtilmark 2015).

The scientific work in reserves also retains its status as a foundational activity of zapovedniki. The main directions include:

'fundamental scientific research, aimed at acquiring new pieces of knowledge regarding regularities of natural and anthropogenic processes; and applied scientific research directed towards development of scientific means of nature protection and environmental monitoring' (Scientific research in zapovedniki, 2011).

The Chronicles of Nature are maintained as a scientific report format in zapovedniki, even though some flaws associated with differences in methodology etc. have been pointed out (Ostergren & Hollenhorst, 2000; Spetich et al., 2009). Many zapovedniki publish volumes of efforts of individual zapovedniki, devoted to census of biodiversity, environmental monitoring and case studies research. The changing role of science in zapovedniki deserves a

special attention, but for now it might suffice to say that there is a tendency to more of problem-driven research which can be used to solve environmental problems (#13).

The most environmentally aggressive practice inherent to the nature transformation discourse, acclimatization of non-native species is now prohibited. Some other biotechnical means are, however, used to deal with forest fires, manage populations of animals to demonstrate them to tourists (#13). In line with earlier preservational traditions, most economic activities are prohibited at the territory of zapovedniki (such as hunting, logging etc.).

However, zapovedniki increasingly get framed in terms of recreational services they can provide and infrastructure they have to develop:

> 'Unfortunately, in many zapovedniki tourism is still small-scale, and the huge tourist potential is used ineffectively (Press-service MNR, n.d.).

Reserves are not seen as barriers to economic development anymore due to their protection regime (Press-service MNR, n.d.). Tourism is expected to bridge the system of zapovedniki and the society and in the same time contribute to the system's financial viability. In line with this commercialization of their existence, an entrance fee was introduced (Federal Law on SPNA, 2012). However, the financial benefits of the tourism by fees tend to be downplayed by reserves themselves. For example, Basegi zapovednik presents the payment as a 'gratuitous help' to a reserve (Zapovednik Basegi, n.d.). Generally speaking, the understanding of payment as an entrance fee is avoided. Tourists are not paying for being admitted to the territory, but for a service that they are being provided with (#14).

Reserves are governmental organizations, fully owned and managed by the state. The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), a governmental body concerned with 'rational and safe natural resources use', oversees most of them[11]. The difference can be explained by the open and straightforward route for development of tourism in reserves encouraged by the MNR. Few reserves are managed by the Russian Academy of Science (Ilmensky zapovednik, Dalnevostochny morskoy zapovednik, zapovednik Kedrovaya Pad'). The difference can be visually spotted when visiting the websites of the reserves managed by the two organizations. While most of the MNR's reserves struggle to promote environmental enlightenment and ecological tourism, and therefore have well-developed and visitor-friendly websites, the Academy of Science's reserves remain unengaged in these activities.

In line with traditions of nature demonstration discourse in the soviet time, the contemporary institutional discourse presents environmental enlightenment (EE) as concerned with the 'developing of ecological culture', teaching people 'ethics of treating nature' and making people 'better and more responsible' ("Ministry of Natural Resources," 2013).

> 'The top priority of environmental enlightenment is to develop ecological culture of people, shape a feeling of personal responsibility for behaviour of self and others in the conditions of wild nature in every visitor, as well as instruct the visitors on the main rules of conduct in zapovedniki nature' (Zapovednik Verhne-Tazovsky, n.d.-a).

> 'by improving the quality of environmental enlightenment, it is necessary to foster respectful and caring attitude to the value of living nature' (Zapovednik Baikalsky, n.d.)

Taking into account the history of zapovedniki as a scientific institution, it is not surprising that the goal of EE is partly framed as the distribution of knowledge.

---

[11] http://www.mnr.gov.ru/mnr/missiya/

'Environmental enlightenment is a distribution of knowledge about ecological balance, interconnection of everything on the Earth, sustainable development and human-nature relationship. Environmental enlightenment shapes worldview of a person, shapes consciously kind, assiduous, responsible attitude to the environment' (Zapovednik Bryansky les, n.d.-b).

'Our mission is not to replace the education system but to tell people about nature in nature by using nature' (#14).

The descriptions of guided tours on reserves' websites provide an overview of what one could see during an excursion: flora, fauna, geological formations etc. In general, natural elements are framed not in terms of nature attractions to gaze upon, but as natural phenomena to get educated about. For example, a designated purpose of one trail in Taymyr zapovedniki (as described on their website) is to 'educate visitors about the following phenomena: canyon, couloir, waterfall, perennial icing' (United direction of Taymyr zapovedniki, n.d.).

EE also focuses on establishment and justification of reserves as a gatekeeper between public and nature:

'We want people to say 'I am going to Baikalsky zapovednik' and not 'I am going to this and this part of Baikal' (#14)

A significant goal of excursions is to demonstrate the value of reserves:

"Zapovedniki must be treated with respect. All environmental enlightenment is focused on this" (#14).

What zapovednik is doing and why it is needed? This stance on self-promotion of nature demonstration discourse is totally different from that of nature preservation discourse, claiming that 'We must know everything about zapovedniki, but only few must possess this knowledge' (Schtilmark, 2005).

A way to address tourism can provide a good example of how discourse in nature demonstration and nature preservation collaborate. In the official documents regulating the functioning of zapovedniks tourism as an activity is never mentioned separately. It either is defined as 'educational' or 'ecological', sometimes both in the same time ('ecological educational tourism'). Also, tourism is inescapably mentioned in the context of control, limitations and regime-compliance. 'Wild', unorganised tourism is opposed to the organised, educational, controlled and limited forms of tourism. While the first is strongly associated with dangers of pollution and forest fires, the second is seen as a 'safe' and desirable option (Press-service MNR, n.d.). In other words, we can see as a practice inherent to nature demonstration (tourism) gets discursively moulded by limitations of nature preservation discourse.

The variety of tourism framing in regard to individual interplays of discourses can be visible from two examples below aimed at promoting tourism. Compare:

Dear friends! How could it happen that many Russians know nature and geography of foreign countries better, than the most beautiful places of their own country? In our zapovednik you will see natural, cultural and historical attractions of the region, visit a camping ground of reindeer breeders, try national cuisine, dive into the world of taiga romantics and adventures (Zapovednik Verhne-Tazovsky, n.d.-b).

An ecological trail 'Davshinskaya buhta' crosses a bear trail. Thus it is possible to see bear marks: marks of its claws on tree trunks, chunks of molting pelt and excrements on the most visible spots. Soon a trail enters a cedar forest. Indescribable feeling! From the one

side of the trail, a dark dense forest, from the other – vastness of a lake. <…> Here you can see a squirrel, a chipmunk ("Zapovednoe Podlemorye," n.d.-b).

While the first promotion text promises popular and commercial attractions, well beyond natural conditions of a zapovednik, the second sticks to presenting zapovednik as the territory of wild nature, probably dangerous and interesting for those who is inclined to appreciate bear 'excrements on the most visible spots'.

To sum up, the contemporary institutional discourse of zapovedniki enmeshes different historically developed discourse formations. Nature preservation discourse is visible in an overall conception of zapovednik as an etalon, in how tourism is limited and sometimes promoted. Nature transformation discourse informs practicalities of wildlife and forestry management, partly for tourist consumption. Discourse on nature utilization is present in form of framing tourism in terms of infrastructures and services, which tightly connects it with the discourse on nature demonstration. This specific interplay of discourses can also be traced in subject formation. In the next chapter I will elaborate on how subjects of zapovedniki emerged in the discourse.

6.

Of experts and tourists

Subject formation in the institutional discourse of reserves

What constitutes a speaking subject of the institutional discourse?
What makes a subject eligible for this role?
How is tourist as a subject constructed in the discourse?

6. Of experts and tourists

In Chapter 4 we saw that tourists in zapovedniki are governed in a very meticulous way, aimed to eco-normalise them by space and gaze. Chapter 5 provided an overview of discursive formations which can be used to genealogically explain this way of governing. The disciplining techniques can be seen as standing on the borderline of the preservationist discourse and the nature demonstration discourse. The old spatialities of protection and scientific research, the strictness of examination procedure, acquiring a permit can be attributed to the preservationist discourse. The new spatialities of tourism (tourism enclosures, trails as functional sites), when the need to demonstrate and include clashes with the need to protect and exclude can be seen as characteristical of the contemporary institutional discourse. The logics of preservationist discourse can also be traced in the way how visitors get disciplined by the Norm of nature and in the name of it. Interestingly though, it is a teacher as a subject, and not a scientist, who is imposing these rules on a tourist.

Therefore, subjects of zapovedniki discourse have been already touched upon in the previous chapters: we saw how they are involved in workings of power, and how they historically started to emerge in zapovedniki. Scientists and students, schoolchildren were always welcome in zapovedniki and justified by the preservationist discourse. Tourists even though being present, were part of nature demonstration discourse, and mostly silenced in the dominating preservationist discourse. Teachers as subjects emerged only lately with the institutionalization of environmental enlightenment, an immediately got granted the right to speak for zapovedniki. In the chapter to follow I will deepen the analysis of subject formation.

6.1. A right to speak: making up the Expert subject

'First question: who is speaking? Who, among the totality of speaking individuals, is accorded the right to use this sort of language (langage)? Who is qualified to do so? Who derives from it his own special quality, his prestige, and from whom, in return, does he receive if not the assurance, at least the presumption that what he says is true? What is the status of the individuals who - alone - have the right, sanctioned by law or tradition, juridically defined or spontaneosly accepted, to proffer such a discourse?

(Foucault, 2011, p. 50)

'Zapovednik is untouchable, protected, sacred. <…>Zapovednik is a cradle of life, treasure of sacral knowledge. Those who protect the cradle – Nature – are keepers, watching over how the commandments are followed. He, who works in a zapovednik, is a chosen one and possesses the sacred knowledge'

(Kalmykov cited in Buntovskaya, 2012).

The discourse on nature preservation attributes an enormous role in the development of the system to the community of natural scientists. History of reserves is rich with names and deeds of scientists. The reading of historical accounts of zapovedniki also shows that most of them were established due to active lobbying of scientific community and specific scientists. The author of historical books and articles devoted to the development of reserves, Shtilmark, is mentioned as a person who personally contributed to establishment of 20 reserves. It is a figure of a Scientist who stands at the origin of every one reserve (Zapovednaya Rossiya, n.d.). In the historiography of zapovedniki the meaningful shift in the line of development of the system is often attributed to one or another important figure, voicing up some concerns, proposing an establishment of a new reserve or filing a state with

an angry letter (Weiner, 1999). Their portraits are featured in history books, on reserves' websites and in special sections of reserves' related Internet-sources or publications under the heading 'zapovednye lyudi' ('protected people' – people from zapovedniki) (Zapovednaya Rossiya, n.d.). Their life-long commitment was sometimes not even interrupted by death as their graves would be located on the territory of zapovedniki (Zapovednoe Podlemorye, n.d.-a). These people are granted in the discourse with an agency to change and a right to speak for reserves. So what features this subject is attributed to?

The One, who follows one's true calling:

There are poets, who cannot stop writing. In zapovedniki there are also similar people, who cannot live without zapovedniki. For them it is a purpose of life (#14).

The One, who has knowledge of natural sciences

Let's just have a look at how the scientists are referred to in the literature and on websites: Naturalists, self-educated naturalists, experienced naturalists, leading biologist, zoologist.

The One, who has a fitting professional background

The right to judge the effectiveness of SPNA have only experts-ecologists, but not lawyers or businessmen (Chestin, 2012)

The One, who has a respect and love for nature

A zapovednik's employee is someone who treats nature in a very good way. I cannot say that s/he must love it, love is a complicated issue after all, but s/he must respect the nature. S/he must value it irrespectively of what it can give in a practical sense. Yes, respect to nature must go first. (#14)

The One who is commited to the Cause of Zapovedniki beyond practicalities:

'People from zapovedniki are enthusiasts, they are above money. They see their mission in helping to protect zapovedniki's nature in its pristine condition by serving the Cause of Zapovedniki' (Naumkin, 2016)

'They really believe in zapovedniki and raise their children to believe' (#14)

'He could never be stopped from working in a zapovednik – neither by an empty fridge, nor an absence of salary. This is the man who has chosen his life path' (#9)

'With a rare exception zapovedniki employed devotees of the Cause, who were ready to buy necessary scientific equipment for their own scarce money' (Buntovskaya, 2012).

The preservation discourse produced a subject of a natural scientist, who is commited beyond limits, knowledgeable, professionally fit, follows one's true calling and loves nature. This subject has been granted a right to speak for zapovedniki in the discourse, so can therefore be seen as occupying an expert position in the discourse.

As within the preservational discourse science is the top priority, a subject of a scientist has a right to rule over the other subjects in zapovedniki:

'Science department tells a protection department what to protect, and environmental enlightenment department what to tell about' (#11).

The scientists represent a model for all others to comply, as other employees get compared to them. State inspectors, for example, are not qualified enough compared to them, as they do not possess enough knowledge (Naumkin, 2016). Education specialists generally come from schools and additional education institutions and mostly have educational or social sciences background, which is regarded negatively by science community of reserves. They are seen as not possessing the 'true' knowledge about nature and, specifically, reserves, which creates inner tensions (#9). However, it is them who are know speaking on behalf of zapovedniki, as enlightenment project was transferred under their jurisdiction.

As I mentioned before, discourse on nature preservation produced a subject position of a disciple, which was historically occupied by schoolchildren and students.

The websites of reserves give an overview of how the subject is constructed with today. Several zapovedniki explicitly mention the main target audience of the environmental enlightenment project as schoolchildren and students (Belyh, 2016; Makaseeva, 2016; Zapovednik Baikalsky, n.d.; Zapovednik Belogorye, n.d.; Zapovednik Kronotsky, n.d.) In the way students are framed traces of soviet brigades are visible:

> A student is a non-indifferent soul! Helping nature for him is a matter of honour! (Makaseeva, 2016).

Zapovednoe Podlemorye acknowledges the priority of working with children and proceeds to explain the content and goals of this work:

> '<Work with children> is aimed at shaping their understanding of unique value of specially protected natural areas, to foster caring and responsible attitude to the living nature, to widen their environmental outlook, to develop corresponding knowledge and skills' (Zapovednoe Podlemorye, n.d.-a)

Overall, 'the younger generation' is seen as the main auditory for the environmental enlightenment. Students and schoolchildren are organised in groups, controlled, and obliged to be interested. Preservationist discourse constructs them as interested, docile souls to be enlightened, occupying a historically settled subject position of *a disciple*.

The abovementioned construction of subjects is inherent to the discourse of nature preservation. In the contemporary institutional discourse, the power interplay has been changing due to the nature demonstration discourse gaining power. While the discursive construction of a zapovedniki scientist is preserved and still widely present in the discourse, its role in the institutional discourse seem to be changing. The one, who is now granted the right to speak for zapovedniki, is a teacher. Interestingly though, the construction of this subject in the discourse is absent. They possess the right to speak, but they seem to owe it to a scientist as a subject. They are only visible by disciplining tecnhiques that I've described before.

6.2. All tourists are equal (but some are more equal than others)

> 'The majority of people who come to us are progressive, interested in nature. However, sometimes there are also few random people' (#14).
>
> 'Recommended target audience: nature lovers'
> (Zapovednik Baikalsky, n.d.)

Despite the target audiences mentioned on zapovedniki's websites, tourism in zapovedniki is open for everyone. According to the legal regulations, everyone is welcome. However, in the quote above, the division of tourists in 'those interested in nature' and 'random ones' hints that 'a tourist' is in fact a non-homogenous entity, but a multiplicity of different subjects, each of whom is included somehow differently in a reserve. The complexity of discursive relations produced a dual construction of a tourist as a subject, that is now visible in the institutional discourse on zapovedniki.

One side of a coin named tourist is produced within the nature demonstration discourse. As such, a tourist is someone who is:

Interested in active forms of tourism

'Ecotrail filters tourists. It is mainly environmentally-friendly tourists who walk by feet and with a backpack. They like hiking. When one hikes, s/he forms a special connection to her/him environment' (#6)

'They come to a zapovednik not to lay down and warm they bodies in the sun, but to walk a trail, elarn about birds, make pictures of landscapes' (#5)

Physically able, experienced in hiking or other forms of tourism

Many routes in zapovedniki would take several days to walk, while sleeping in tents or huts. Therefore, a tourist has to be ready to deal with the lack of physical comfort. Zapovedniki's websites occasionally present their trails as having special requirements to physical fitness of visitors, including:

Physically able, some training is required, basic hiking experience, absence of medical contra-indications (from the descriptions on various zapovedniki websites).

Someone who is able to enjoy the beauty of nature and understand the value of it

'One enters the world of nature not to master it but to feel one's connection to the living world, distract oneself from life routine and dive into silence and harmony' (Zapovednaya Rossiya, n.d.).

'You can see many other animals, if you are open for it, and know how to communicate with nature, see it and listen to it' (Zapovednoe Podlemorye, n.d.-a)

This construction of a tourist somehow resonates with how scientists themselves are addressed in preservationist discourse: hiker, traveler, alpinist (Schtilmark, 2014).

The darker side of a tourist comes from a preservationist discourse. A subject of 'a tourist' is seen as a part of a mass (which does not have positive connotations unlike in soviet

tourism discourse). These tourists are spoken of as an 'elemental force' (#4), 'human locusts' (#9, #13). They are associated with all the dangers that a reserve may face –forest fires, biodiversity loss and vandalizing of reserves' property (#6, #3). Overall, a 'tourist' is someone who:

wanders all over the place by himself and is not aware of rules, or does not find them important (even worse):

'These people <who entered a zapovednik's territory without a permit> were aware of the existence of a zapovednik on the territory, its protection regime, they saw informational billboards and signs <informing about the regime> and they even **imprudently** took pictures with them!' (Gorelovskaya & Samuleeva, 2012)

is not aware of the value of nature:

The key problem is that many visitors lack the understanding of nature as a national property, they are not aware of the role that the zapovednik plays in nature protection (Zapovednik Verhne-Tazovsky, n.d.-a)

is interested in sun-bathing, having rest.

'They come by cars, they don't need anything, they throw a tent and sunbath' (#7)

'Tourists, they have a primitive desire to relax' (#8)

In short, under the influence of nature preservation discourse, a tourist is constructed as an idle careless vacation-taker.

In the soviet time a tourist as a subject was active, knowledgeable, healthy, non-idle. A strict opposition to a capitalist tourist, hunting for impressions in comfortable conditions (Antonov-Saratovsky, 1930 cited in Sokolova, 2000). Surprisingly similar features can be in the double-sided vision of a tourist in the institutional discourse. The subject of a nature-loving hiker reminds of an ideal type of a soviet tourist, physically strong and ideologically just. The bad tourist, however, seems to remind an idle, careless figure of a capitalist tourist.

So then we have a double-sided construction of a tourist: on the websites the expected visitors are nature-lovers, able to appreciate the landscapes, recognise birds and plants. Physically able and even experienced, trained. From the other hand, the interviews revealed a dark side of a tourist, constructed as non-caring, idle, not knowing how to behave.

7.

Disciplined bodies, enlightened souls

Concluding the research

How a tourist as a subject is governed as presented in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki?

How did 'a tourist' as a subject emerge in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki?

7. Disciplined bodies, enlightened souls

Research questions

How a tourist as a subject is governed as presented in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki?

How did 'a tourist' as a subject emerge in the institutional discourse of zapovedniki?

This research started off with the exploration of how tourists are governed in contemporary zapovedniki, a diagnosis of the present. By applying the wide theoretical frame of governmentality to be able to see governing techniques in use, I wanted to make visible the power mechanisms in zapovedniki. I found that governmentality in zapovedniki boils down to disciplining tecnhiques. From the one hand, it is concerned with spatial and behavioural limitations imposed on a tourist (disciplining a body), from the other – with introducing a norm of 'proper behaviour' in nature and encouraging a supportive of zapovedniki attitude (enlightening a soul). Exploration of the history of the present of zapovedniki revealed discursive formations which explained this way of governing by the clashes of discourses.

The institutional discourse of zapovedniki embodies an on-going productive conflict between discoursive formations (DF), namely, nature preservation, nature transformation, nature utilization and nature demonstration. Each of these discursive formations accommodate specific constructions of objects, subjects and practices, arranged according to an internal logic of the formations. It proved to be important not only analyse the discourse itself but also trying to figure out who is speaking the words of discourse. Nature preservation DF constructed its object – zapovedniki nature - as a fragile pristine model of nature, which must be kept under the condition of absolute inviolability, and its speaking subject – as an expert, a natural **scientist**. The subject of an expert possesses knowledge, qualification and commitment which gives him/her a right to speak for, be and act in zapovedniki and nature. Another subject position that got constructed within the DF – a **disciple**, someone who is open and ready to be educated by a zapovedniki scientist. This position was historically occupied by schoolchildren and students, visiting zapovedniki with an excursion or performing their own first scientific undertakings.

The contemporary institutional discourse shows an interplay of all four discourses. Nature demonstration DF, unlike 'aggressive' discursive formations, aiming to transform or use nature, partly shares with nature preservation DF a conception of zapovedniki nature as a pristine natural area in need of protection, but it also constructs nature as a beautiful landscape to be gazed upon. In the same time, the institutional discourse absorbed elements from nature transformation DF (managing the nature to improve it – now for tourism display or environmental problems solution) and nature utilization DF (framing nature as a resource, this time recreational). This interplay of discursive formations produced a new type of a speaking subject – a **teacher**. In the same time, a scientist as an expert subject looses its power to speak for zapovedniki, and doomed to be a part of the history. A teacher is taking its place.

A Tourist is the institutional discourse is constituted dually. From the one hand, within the nature demonstration discourse s/he is constructed in positive terms – as someone, who is able to value the beauty of nature, someone, who is physically fit, trained, knowledgeable,

but willing to know more. In this construction, the legacy of soviet sport tourist comes back, which was believed to be physically fit and ideologically just. On the other hand, under the influence of nature preservation discourse, a tourist is constructed as an idle careless vacation-taker. The project of governing a tourist has its purpose to shorten the distance by transforming a tourist and moving it a bit closer to a disciple to be 'admitted' to a zapovednik.

Nature preservation discourse, has demonstrated an enormous viability and persistence over the years. Despite several drastic shifts in zapovedniki's agenda, be it nature transformation or nature utilization, it bounced back, and in the long run managed to monopolise the historiography of zapovedniki. Resistance of discourses has been productive and might be the reason why the preservationist conception survived for so long. The contemporary institutional discourse is building up its claims to truth on the authority of 'endangered species' of zapovedniki scientists, and its value on the construction of nature from the same discourse, but in the same time replaces scientific gaze directed at nature with a disciplinary gaze at people coming to visit this nature. This allows us to conclude that zapovedniki are involved in environmentality project, governing in the name of nature.

8.

Zapovedniki multiple and dangers of environmentality

Discussing the research

How was research able to provide a new insight to the body of literature concerned with zapovedniki studies?

How different is environmental governmentality on zapovedniki from that explored in other contexts?

What are the weaknesses of the research and how they can be made up for in the future research?

8. Zapovedniki multiple and dangers of environmentality

Prologue

Driven by a desire to see a much-spoken about waterfall, I was walking through a spatious and seemingly lifeless plateau. Finally, at the end of it, where a path to the waterfall started, I was greeted by four men wearing military jackets and protective coloration pants. They were preparing to have lunch and overall seemed to be very joyful. They informed me that I was about to enter the territory of a zapovednik. I didn't know that. They asked for a fee to enter, and I paid, because even though they didn't come across as someone having a right to get an entrance fee, I didn't want to argue. After that I started my mountaneous journey to the waterfall. It took me 6 hours of walking to get there, I had to walk on very narrow paths, climb mountainous areas and use ropes to get from one side of the mountain to another. That was much more risky, than ever expected from myself to have guts to do. On my way back it started to rain, and all soil under my feet turned in slippery mud so I could hardly walk. I took me 9 hours to get back. The firepit was cold, and the guards were gone.

Recently, while writing my thesis, I've encountered the description of this exact trail on the zapovednik website. It turned out to be, I failed to follow almost all the rules of conduct prescribed for the trail. I was not supposed to go alone without an employee to accompany me, I was not instructed on the safety and conduct, I was not supposed to go in the rain, I was supposed to have a hiking experience. Indeed, I was more adventurous than I ever thought of myself.

This study attempted to employ genealogical approach to look at the subject and object formation in the institutional discourse in the history of zapovedniki. Genealogy stands on the point that the historical background is important, and has effects in the present, but in the same time does not represent a neat and clean narrative to be told (Foucault, 1971). If the second occurs, one must be aware of *'analytic purchases'* (Brady, 2014) that must have come with the reducing of complexity and silencing the alternative stances. The dominating in the literature approaches to see the past, present and future in zapovedniki, however, lie in two dimensions, each of them seems to be laden with such purchases.

By researchers in the first group zapovedniki are treated as a pre-given institutional entity with preservationist scientific spirit. Then, all the shifts in their agenda are framed as attacks on zapovedniki, while proponents of this stance are engaged in the constant and sacral fight for zapovedniki (for this see Brinikh, 2014; Parnikoza, Burkovskiy, & Boreiko, 2013; Spetich et al., 2009; Schtilmark, 2005). When I started this research, I myself saw zapovedniki as a scientific institution faced with a dramatically sudden change of agenda towards tourism. No wonder, because this point of view was dominating within academic literature on reserves, available to me at the outset of the research. This sudden change is attributed to neoliberal tendencies acquired specific strenght in the last years. Muller, for example, argues that by introduction of tourism as one of the main goals zapovedniki have been forced to turn themselves from sacred cows to cash cows (Muller, 2014). Commercialization, neoliberalization characteristical of the new times of zapovedniki, are seen as evil. The rigour of this stance to deny any other conception of zapovedniki, except for a scientific one, being

ruined by commercial interests, lies within preservationist discourse and bears quite some traces of marxist hatred to the market economy.

Genealogical approach helped me to break free from the dominating discourse, looking at discoursive formations and their interplay instead. Thus I was able to see that zapovedniki had a long tradition of conceptual shifts, and tourism in fact is not a novelty, but a long tradition, whole-heartedly despised and therefore silenced by scientists.

The second group of researchers see zapovedniki as remnants of totalitarian society as opposed to democratic national parks. A totalitarian state is seen as evil and the new market-oriented order as good, if managed correctly:

> 'The Russian scientific/preservationist community worked within a totalitarian, corporatist state, which resulted in the research-oriented zapovednik system of preserves. The American romantic/preservationist movement worked within the confines and liberties of a democratic, pluralist society, which resulted in the recreation-oriented wilderness system' (D. Ostergren & Hollenhorst, 1999, p. 293).

> 'The failure of legislation and decrees to adequately protect the environment and provide for effective conservation of natural resources in the Soviet Union is well documented' (Ostergren, 2001, p. 128)

These scholars greet coming of tourism as a sign of democratization (Wells & Williams, 1998) and observe convergence of zapovedniki with national parks (Ostergren & Hollenhorst, 1999). They also acknowledges the market influence on the newest zapovedniki history, but attribute to it positive connotations of democratization. This body of literature is mostly optimistic about ecotourism and devoted to the normative justification of the tourism (Basanets, 2002; Basanets, 2008; Buivolov & Basanets, 2007; Doronkina, Borisova, Malyutin, & Gazilov, 2014; Ledovskih, Moraleva, & Drozdov, 2002).

Foucauldian studies in the field of political ecology, specifically discourses of nature protection and policy research (Hajer & Versteeg, 2005; Pochet, 2014) have demonstrated the importance of discoursive approach. Both of these stances do not account for the complexities and legacies, rather falling into 'polemic generalities' (Brady, 2014). By using the genealogical approach to discourse theory, it became clear to me that zapovedniki got constructed in a variety of discursive formations embodying the unique interplays of power/knowledge regimes.

Zapovedniki in fact are not a sinlge entity, but a changeable and flexible zapovedniki multiple, with a high adaptability to new challenges, whichever come their way. And if we strive for understanding this complexity, we have to see these struggles not in simplified oppositions of sacred cow/cash cow, but in terms of context-specific interplays of power embodied in discursive formations. State as an actor promotes tourism in national parks which can indeed be seen as sign of neoliberalism and commodification of nature, but it uses rhetorics of preservationist discourse and an authority of a scientist to do so. Zapovedniki are indeed open for visitation and promoted sometimes in boisterous commercial terms, but they also employ disciplining techniques to the extent of almost nowhere else to be found.

8.1. Zapovedniki environmentality

Environmentality research paradigm, being only about 20 years old, is based on 'the idea that environmentalist programs and movements operate as forms of governmentality in Michel Foucault's sense' (Cepek, 2011). Environmentality is seen as deliberate project aimed to create environmentalised citizens, as subjects for whom 'the environment is the axis

around which much of their thought and action revolves, including their beliefs, desires, interests, and agency' (Cepek, 2011, p. 504). They are mainly interestred in how an environmental citizen is made up, but remain indifferent to the power effects that come with such a citizen (Adams, 2015; Agrawal, 2006; Fletcher, 2010). The research projects associating themselves within environmentality paradigm, tend to focus on NGO's involvement (Luke, 1997) and other ways to govern people, which are commonly seen as traces of neoliberalism (Rutherford, 2007). Environmentality studies look into how a new subject is governed to be created, but they seem to be missing what are the initial assumptions about the nature of this subject, as well as what is the position of power from which this governing occurs. Who is defining what is an environmental citizen? How pre-environmental citizens are portrayed?

This research provided answer to these questions in a very specific context of Russian zapovedniki. It has shown that environmentality, if conceived as the rule in the name of nature, can be accomplished in ways far from neoliberal. While it is mainly explored how environmentality targets populations (Rutherford, 2007), I looked into how disciplining tecnhiques are worked upon individuals. Here, environmentality operates in two ways – it subsumes a visitor to the norms of behaviour in nature and in the same time make them 'environmentally' useful citizens. Comparing it with Foucault stance on docile bodies for the use of capitalism, it is hard not to see similarities:

> 'The growth of a capitalist economy gave rise to the specific modality of disci- plinary power, whose general formulas, techniques of submitting forces and bodies, in short, 'political anatomy', could be operated in the most diverse political regimes, apparatuses or institutions' (Foucault, 1995, p. 221).

Environmentally useful citizens in contemporary Russia are not those who stand up for nature and join NGOs (as the recent wave of forced by the state closures of environmental NGOs has shown), but those who love nature according to their rules, loving nature safely.

As Gruenewald argues in his analysis of environmental education (EE) in US, with getting institutionalised, EE loses its power of reflection as a critical tool (Gruenewald, 2004). It seems that in Russian zapovedniki this tendency has reached its peak. As EE in Russian reserves is embedded in the institutional context of zapovedniki, many environmental problems are backgrounded, while not littering in a park seems to be the most important thing one can do to help saving the native nature. The nature outside zapovedniki is ignored, and the nature protection foregrounds zapovedniki as the main conservational effort. Rutherford (2007) argues that environmentality projects are dangerous because they shift the responsibility from the state to individuals:

> 'Rather, the responsibility for the environment is shifted onto the population, and citizens are called to take up the mantle of saving the environment in attractively simplistic ways'. (Rutherford, 2007)

Indeed, the government seems to be less concerned with managing big corporations and levels of emissions[12], but more about making the citizens more responsible and kind to nature,

---

[12] An infamous case illustrative of the point – Baikalsky cellulose paper factory, which for many years dumped polluted wastewaters in Baikal. In 2011 Putin personally supported the re-opening of the factory: 'There is a problem that we should not forget, cellulose is needed for rocket industry <…>. There was nothing good about the functioning of the factory, but no significant harm was caused by the functioning of the factory'. Later, in 2012, the factory was nevertheless closed.

just by not littering in zapovedniki. In the same time the waste disposal in the scale of the country still remains far from solved.

To conclude I would like to parafrase Luke (1999), who stated that 'Environmental subjects are people who care about the environment' (Luke, 1999 cited in Fletcher, 2010, p. 176). Bearing the findings of my research in mind and risking to overinterpret, I can say, that environmental subjects aimed to be created in zapovedniki are people who care about *the limited environment* in the *limits*, set by the state and *ways approved* by it.

8.2. Study limitations and recommendations for future research

Governmentality research is sometimes a subject to critique for the focusing on the government as an institution disregarding whatever comes from the sides, which contradicts the idea of Foucault about the distribution of power (Rutherford, 2007). Partly this critique can be attributed to this research because I've focused on those who rule. Even though I did not take for granted that the state imposes its vision and zapovedniki as an institution simply follows, I was concerned with how power operates from a specific point – in this case, from zapovedniki professional community. I describe a tourist as a subject but in fact treat her/him as an object. A part of governmentality which is concerned with 'mentality' – or internalisation of the government (Foster, 2011) is absent in this research.

Therefore, it is important to see this study not as a stand-alone and finished project, but as a first step towards analysing governmentalities of Russian zapovedniki. Thus, by the first step I tried to recreate power techniques that are used to discipline tourists in regard of how they are seen. The second part of the research then should be concerned with the performative effects of discourses and how tourists actually internalise the techniques. In the disciplining mechanisms I draw an 'ideal' – how rule is supposed to be accomplished. It is important to acknowledge, that it is not always the case, as illustrated by my personal experience in the prologue.

In so doing, etnographical methods that have been used for analysis of governmentalities, might be of use.The etnographies of governmentalities stem from the awareness of analytical engagement of seeng everuthing as apart og neoliberal project and a plea for not falling into 'a set of polemic generalities', opting for 'nuanced descriptive investigation instead' (Brady, 2014, p. 5).

> These accounts seek to be attentive to the multiplicity and dynamics of social life, and the
> use of ethnographic, or quasi-ethnographic methods help to foreground the presence of
> non-liberal rationalities, as well as the dynamics of social life, including dynamics of political
> alliances, and resistances and failures, and the actual pro- cesses and forms of subjectivity
> formation over time. (Brady, 2014, p. 9)

Secondly, a point of generalization of findings must be touched upon. In this study, I've used sources related to zapovedniki in general, such as policy documents, historical accounts, as well as sources, concerned with specific context of two zapovedniki on the Baikal lake, where my fieldwork was accomplished, and of 50 zapovedniki websites. The latter was specifically used to get an insight in how zapovedniki are spatially organised to govern a tourist. To expand it, I've also analysed the websites in how they presented their spatial arrangements. While in the borders of this research this has not been the focus, it would not be enough to rely on observation of one zapovednik to make conclusions about all the rest. Therefore, while there is a relatively large probability that discursive formations, such as

discourses on nature or zapovedniki subjects, are characteristical of all the system, the disciplining techniques serve more as an illustration of how the governmentality project can be accomplished in the specific conditions and do not pretend to be generalisible or exhaustively described. Thus, it is important to suggest the broader research on how governmentality is employed in space.

Epilogue

    As a concluding remark, by stressing the disciplinary tecnhiques I do not claim that they are bad for zapovedniki andpeople. My personal experience, told in prologue, prevents me from that. I ask myself - would I benefit from not going to the waterfall alone, being accompanied by a person who would tell me about the nature around me and also watch out for my safety? Most likely. But would I benefit from not being able to form an emotional connection with the nature by experiencing the grandeousness of the waterfall and feeling alone in the whole world? Most likely not. Could I fit in an expected 'good' tourist profile (experienced, knowledgeable, non-idle)? No, I wanted to gaze and was not looking forward to be lectured. Could I fit in the 'evil' tourist profile – definitely not. Therefore, this thesis must not be seen as a critique on zapovedniki who try so hard to enlighten people, but a claim to more complex, flexible and inclusive framing of a tourist, as well as more inclusive framing of environment to be protected. Because, after all, if the silent spring might indeed be coming, everyone counts.

9. References

Adams, R. T. (2015). Neoliberal Environmentality among Elites: Becoming "Responsible Producers" in Santarém, Brazil. *Culture, Agriculture, Food and Environment*, *37*(2), 84–95. http://doi.org/10.1111/cuag.12055

Agrawal, A. (2006). Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects, (October), 325. http://doi.org/10.1093/envhis/11.4.858

Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology. New vistas for qualitative research*. Sage Publications.

Basanets, B. L. P. (2002). Russian protected areas of Russia as part of the world ecotourism system, (3), 1–4.

Basanets, L. (2008). Potentsial, sostoyanie i problemy razvitiya ekoturizma na Severnom Kavkaze v kontekste strany [Potential, current state and problems of development of ecotourism in North Caucasus region]. In *Perspectivy razvitiya osobo ohranyaemyh prirodnyh territoriy i turizma na Severnom Kavkaze: materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii [Perspectives of development of protected natural areas and tourism in North Caucaus region:proceedings* (pp. 188–194).

Belyh, L. (2016). Tourists and rocky steppes of zapovednik. Retrieved August 3, 2016, from http://www.zapovednik-belogorye.ru/node/238

Beunen, R., Regnerus, H. D., & Jaarsma, C. F. (2008). Gateways as a means of visitor management in national parks and protected areas. *Tourism Management*, *29*(1), 138–145. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.017

Bogdinsky-Basunchaksy zapovednik. (n.d.). Code of conduct in zapovednik. Retrieved August 3, 2016, from http://www.bogdozap.ru/index.php/ekologicheskij-turizm/pravila-povedeniya-v-zapovednike

Boley, B. B., & Green, G. T. (2015). Ecotourism and natural resource conservation : the " potential " for a sustainable symbiotic relationship. *Journal of Ecotourism*, *4049*(March). http://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2015.1094080

Borah, P. (2011). Conceptual Issues in Framing Theory: A Systematic Examination of a Decade's Literature. *Journal of Communication*, *61*(2), 246–263. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01539.x

Borgerson, J. (2005). Judith Butler: On organizing subjectivities. *Sociological Review*, *53*(SUPPL. 1), 63–79. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00541.x

Brady, M. (2014). Ethnographies of Neoliberal Governmentalities. *Foucault Studies*, (18), 5–10.

Brinikh, V. (2014). Commentary to federal law «Amending the Federal law «On specially protected natural areas» and some legislative acts of Russian Federation» dated 28 December 2013 № 406-fz. *Astrakhansky Vestnik of Ecological Education*, *1*(27), 23–31. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Buivolov, Y., & Basanets, L. (2007). Ekologicheskiy turizm v natsionalnyh parkah i zapovednikah Rossii: tendentsii razvitiya i problemy upravleniya [Ecological tourism in national parks and zapovedniks in Russia: deelopment and management problems]. *Ekologicheskoe Planirovanie I Upravlenie [Environmental Planning and Management]*, *4*(5).

Buntovskaya, S. (2012). Attack on zapovedniki's borders. *Zapovednoe Bratstvo*, p. 6.

Butler, J. (1989). Foucault and the Paradox of Bodily Inscriptions. *The Journal of Philosophy*, *86*(11), 601–607.

Capone, A., & Mey, J. L. (Eds.). (2016). *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society*.

Castree, N. (2003). Commodifying what nature? *Progress in Human Geography*, *27*(3), 273–297. http://doi.org/10.1191/0309132503ph428oa

Cepek, M. L. (2011). Foucault in the forest: Questioning environmentality in Amazonia. *American Ethnologist*, *38*(3), 501–515. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2011.01319.x

Chestin, I. (2012). Fighting zapovedniki. *Zapovednoe Bratstvo*, p. 2.

Cheung, L. T. O. (2013). Improving visitor management approaches for the changing preferences and behaviours of country park visitors in Hong Kong. *Natural Resources Forum*, *37*(4), 231–241. http://doi.org/10.1111/1477-8947.12025

Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *10*(1), 103–126. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054

Cresswell, T. (2009). Discourse. In *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography* (pp. 211–214). Oxford: Elsevier.

Doremus, H. (2000). The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse. *Washington and Lee Law Review*, *57*(1), 11–73.

Doronkina, I., Borisova, O., Malyutin, G., & Gazilov, M. (2014). Ecotourism in community environment. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, *30*(30), 35–36. http://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2014.30.mett.18

Dryzek, J. S. (2005). The politics of the earth, 288. http://doi.org/10.1057/9781137336101.0008

Dunn, K. C. (2009). Contested State Spaces: African National Parks and the State. *European Journal of International Relations*, *15*(3), 423–446. http://doi.org/10.1177/1354066109338233

Dunne, L. (2011). How Applying a Discourse-Based Approach to Investigate Inclusion Changed a Research Project and a Way of Thinking. In *Applying Theory to Educational Research: An Introductory Approach with Case Studies* (pp. 123–144). Wiley-Blackwell.

Escobar, A. (1996). Construction nature. *Futures*, *28*(4), 325–343. http://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(96)00011-0

Fiorino, T., & Ostergren, D. (2012). Institutional Instability and the Challenges of Protected Area Management in Russia. *Society & Natural Resources*, *25*(2), 191–202. http://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2011.603142

Fisher, F., & Hajer, M. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Living with nature*. Oxford University Press.

Fletcher, R. (2010). Neoliberal environmentality: Towards a poststructuralist political ecology of the conservation debate. *Conservation and Society*, *8*(3), 171. http://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.73806

Foster, E. A. (2011). Sustainable Development: Problematising Normative Constructions of Gender within Global Environmental Governmentality. *Globalizations*, *8*(2), 135–149. http://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2010.493013

Foucault, M. (1971). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. *Hommage a Jean Hyppolite*, 145–72.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1*.

Foucault, M. (1984). Truth and Power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 51–76). Pantheon books, New York. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison* (Vintage bo).

Foucault, M. (2000). The subject and power. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 326–348). New York: The New press.

Foucault, M. (2011). *the Archaeology of Knowledge*.

Foucault, M. (under a pseudonym M. F. (1994). Foucault, Michel, 1926. In *The cambridge companion to Foucault*.

Frost, W., & Hall, C. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Tourism and national parks*. Routledge.

Fuchs, S. (2009). *Against essentialism: A theory of culture and society*. Harvard University Press.

Garland, D. (2014). What is a "history of the present"? On Foucault's genealogies and their critical preconditions. *Punishment & Society*, *16*(4), 365–384. http://doi.org/10.1177/1462474514541711

Graham, L. (2005a). Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Australia Association for Research in Education*, *11*(4), 1–15. http://doi.org/10.1177/0959354301114006

Graham, L. (2005b). Schooling and "disorderly objects": doing discourse analysis using Foucault. *Paper Presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference*. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/2806/

Graham, L. (2011). The product of text and "other"statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *43*(6), 663–674.

Graham, L. J. (2011). The Product of Text and "Other" Statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *43*(6), 663–674. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00698.x

Graham, R., Nilsen, P., & Payne, R. J. (1988). Visitor management in Canadian national parks. *Tourism Management*, *9*(1), 44–61. http://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(88)90057-X

Gray, B., Purdy, J. M., & Ansari, S. (2015). From interactions to institutions: Microprocesses of framing and mechanisms for the structuring of institutional fields. *Academy of Management Review*, *40*(1), 115–143. http://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0299

Gruenewald, D. A. (2004). A foucauldian analysis of environmental education: Toward the socioecological challenge of the earth charter. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *34*(1), 71–107. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2004.00281.x

Hajer, M., & Versteeg, W. (2005). A Decade of Discourse Analysis of Environmental Politics: Achievements, Challenges, Perspectives. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, *7*(3), 175–184. http://doi.org/10.1080/15239080500339646

Hall, C. M., & Frost, W. (2009). Introduction:the making of national parks concept. In C. M. Hall & W. Frost (Eds.), *Tourism and national parks* (pp. 3–16). Routledge.

Hargreaves, T. (2010). *Putting Foucault to work on the environment: Exploring pro-environmental behaviour change as a form of discipline*.

Harrison, P. (2006). Poststructuralist Theories. In S. Aitken & V. Gill (Eds.), *Approaches to Human geography* (pp. 132–145). Sage.

Howarth, D. (2000). *Discourse*. Open University Press.

Hunt, C. A., Durham, W. H., Driscoll, L., & Honey, M. (2014). Can ecotourism deliver real economic, social, and environmental benefits? A study of the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *23*(3), 339–357. http://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.965176

Jaarsma, R., Beunen, R., & de Vries, J. (2015). Public recreation and landscape protection - hand in hand with visitor monitoring, (May). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236626136_Public_recreation_and_landscape_protection_-_hand_in_hand_with_visitor_monitoring

Khodorovsky, I. I. (1926). *On the frontlines of Enlightenment: articles and speeches*.

Ledovskih, E., Moraleva, N., & Drozdov, A. (2002). *Ekologitsheskii turizm na puti v Rossiyu [Ecological tourism on its way to Russia]*.

Legg, S. (2005). Foucault's population geographies: Classifications, biopolitics and governmental spaces. *Population, Space and Place*, *11*(3), 137–156. http://doi.org/10.1002/psp.357

Luke, T. W. (1997). The world wildlife fund: Ecocolonialism as funding the worldwide "wise use"; of nature. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, *8*(2), 37–41. http://doi.org/10.1080/10455759709358734

Makaseeva, E. (2016). Combining good and pleasurable. Retrieved August 3, 2016, from http://www.zapovednik-belogorye.ru/node/240

Mark, S. M. (2009). Framing the view: how American national parks came to be. In W. Frost & C. M. Hall (Eds.), *Tourism and national parks* (pp. 81–88). Routledge.

Mayr, A. (2008). Introduction:power, discourse and institutions. In *Language and Power: an introduction to institutional discourse*. Retrieved from https://books.google.nl/books?hl=ru&lr=&id=7mw5LHs5C2kC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=institutional+discourse&ots=OvdJBuvyy7&sig=srC9EKiXs0Ia7w0E3dOjlQl6Ftk#v=onepage&q=institutional discourse&f=false

McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (1993). *Foucault Primer: A discourse, power and subject*. NYU Press.

Miller, G. (1994). Toward ethnographies of institutional discourse: Proposal and Suggestions. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *23*(3), 280–306.

Ministry of Natural Resources. (2013).

Moon, G. (2000). Risk and protection: The discourse of confinement in contemporary mental health policy. *Health and Place*, *6*(3), 239–250. http://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8292(00)00026-5

Muller, M. (2014). From sacred cow to cash cow: The shifting political ecologies of protected areas in Russia. *Zeitschrift Fur Wirtschaftsgeographie*, *58*(2-3), 127–143. http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2365248

Narkompos. Decree on protection of natural monuments, gardens, parks (1921).

Narkompros. Decree on protection of natural areas and its several elements, having primarily scientifi or cultural-historical significance (1925).

Narkompros. On protection and development of natural resources of USSR (1930).

Naumkin, D. (2016). Scientific work in Zapovednik Basegi.

Orams, M. B. (1995). Towards a more desirable form of ecotourism. *Tourism Management*, *16*(1), 3–8. http://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(94)00001-Q

Ostergren, B. Y. D., & Hollenhorst, S. (2000). Russian Chronicles of Nature (Letopis prirody), *6*(1).

Ostergren, D. (2001). An Organic Act after a century of protection: The context, content, and implications of the 1995 Russian Federation Law on specially protected natural areas. *Natural Resources Journal*, *41*(1), 125–152.

Ostergren, D., & Hollenhorst, S. (1999). Convergence in Protected Area Policy: A Comparison of the Russian Zapovednik and American Wilderness Systems. *Society & Natural Resources*, *12*(911796916), 293–313. http://doi.org/10.1080/089419299279614

Ostergren, D., & Jacques, P. (2002). A Political Economy of Russian Nature Conservation Policy: Why Scientists have Taken a Back Seat. *Global Environmental Politics*, *2*(November), 102–124. http://doi.org/10.1162/152638002320980641

Packer, J., & Ballantyne, R. (2013). Developing ecotourists' environmentally sustainable behaviour. *International Handbook on Ecotourism*, *Chapter 16*, 192–202. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Parnikoza, I., Burkovskiy, A., & Boreiko, V. (2013). Absolute " zapovednost '" – a concept of wildlife protection for the 21st century. *Bulletin of the European Grassland Group*, *20*(19), 25–30.

Pochet, F. (2014). Discourse Analysis of Nature Conservation Policies in Africa: a Beninese Case Study. *EchoGeo*, (29).

Press-service MNR. (n.d.). Development of ecological tourism. Retrieved from http://www.mnr.gov.ru/news/detail.php?ID=134652&sphrase_id=1206343

Prime Minister Vladimir Putin holds a meeting on developing the system for specially protected natural areas. (2010). Retrieved August 1, 2016, from http://archive.government.ru/eng/docs/12789/print/

Recommendations on tourist map design. (1985).

Resolution on liquidation of the Commitee on zapovedniki and liquidation of individual zapovedniki (1951).

Resolution on means of tourism development in USSR in the period till 2000 (1985).

Resolution on ratification of statute on state zapovedniki RSFSR (1962).

Resolution on the ratification of a statute on the Main Agency for hunting and zapovedniki (1956).

Reymers, N. F., & Schtilmark, F. R. (1978). *Special natural protected areas*. Moscow: Mysl'. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Roe, D., Leader-Williams, N., & Dalal-Klayton, B. (1997). Take Only Photographs , Leave Only Footprints : The Environmental Impacts of Wildlife Tourism. *Wildlife and Development Series*, (10).

Rose, G. (2001). *Visual methodologies*. London Thousand Oaks New Delhi: Sage Publications. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Rutherford, S. (2007). Green governmentality: insights and opportunities in the study of nature's rule. *Progress in Human Geography*, *31*(3), 291–307. http://doi.org/10.1177/0309132507077080

Ryan, C., Hughes, K., & Chirgwin, S. (2000). The gaze, spectacle and ecotourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *27*(1), 148–163. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00061-4

Schtilmark, F. R. (2005). *The concept of absolute inviolability*. (V. E. Boreyko, Ed.). Environmentally-cultural centre of Kyev. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Schtilmark, F. R. (2014). *Zapovednoe delo Rossii:teoriya, praktika, istoriya*. Moscow.

Shaposhnikov, A. (Ed.). (2010). *Etymological dictionary of Contemporary Russian language*. Moscow: Nauka.

Sim, S. (2004). *Introducing critical theory*. Icon books.

Sokolova, M. (2002). Tourism in USSR. In *History of tourism* (p. 352). Moscow. Retrieved from http://tourlib.net/books_history/sokolova.htm

Solovyev, A. (Ed.). (1951). *Zapovedniki of USSR*. Moscow.

Spetich, M. A., Kvashnina, A. E., Nukhimovskya, Y. D., & Rhodes, O. E. J. (2009). History, administration, goals, values, and long-term data of Russia's strictly protected scientific nature reserves. *Natural Areas Journal*, *29*(1), 71–78. http://doi.org/10.3375/043.029.0109

Stanford, D. (2014). What Makes You Move ? Reducing visitor car use through segmentation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *22*(4), 666–683.

Stepanitsky, V., Kreyndlin, M., & Kuksin, G. (2006). *Organization and functioning of state protection service in zapovedniki and national parks.*

Strategy of tourism development in the period till 2020 (2014).

The Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas of 14 March 1995, Pub. L. No. No. 33-FZ (1995).

The Ministry of Natural resources. (2015). *The environment condition and its protection in Russian Federation in 2014. State Report.*

Torfing, J. (2004). Discourse theory: Achievements, Arguments and Challenges. In D. Howarth & J. Torfing (Eds.), *Discourse theory in european politics: Identity, Policy and Governance* (pp. 1–30). Springer. http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

United direction of Taymyr zapovedniki. (n.d.). No Title.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2014). *Protected Planet Report 2014. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre.* Retrieved from http://wdpa.s3.amazonaws.com/WPC2014/protected_planet_report.pdf

Usyskin, G. (2000). *Essays on history of Russian tourism.* Saint-Petersburg.

Waitt, G. (2005). Doing Discourse Analysis. In I. Hai (Ed.), *Qualitative research Methods in Human Geography* (pp. 163–191).

Waugh, L. R., Catalano, T., Masaeed, K. Al, Do, T. H., Renigar, P. G., Waugh, L. R., … Renigar, P. G. (2016). Critical Discourse Analysis: Definition, Approaches, Relation to Pragmatics, Critique, and Trends Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching. In *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society* (pp. 71–135). http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6_4

Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2007). Twenty years on: The state of contemporary ecotourism research. *Tourism Management, 28*(5), 1168–1179. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.004

Weiner, D. R. (1999). *A little corner of freedom: Russian nature protection from Stalin to Gorbachev.* Univ of California Press.

Wells, M. P., & Williams, M. D. (1998). Russia's Protected Areas in Transition: The Impacts of Perestroika, Economic Reform and the Move Towards Democracy. *Ambio, 27*(3), 198–206.

Wilton, R. D. (1998). The constitution of difference: space and psyche in landscapes of exclusion. *Geoforum, 29*(2), 173–185. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(98)00005-0

Zapovednaya Rossiya. (n.d.). Zapovednye lyudi. Retrieved April 10, 2016, from http://news.zapoved.ru/ludy/

Zapovednik Baikalsky. (n.d.). No Title. Retrieved August 1, 2016, from http://baikal-zapovednik.ru/

Zapovednik Basegi. (n.d.). Rules of conduct. Retrieved from http://www.basegi.ru/poseshchenie-territorii

Zapovednik Belogorye. (n.d.). Excursion service. Retrieved August 3, 2016, from http://www.zapovednik-belogorye.ru/node/24

Zapovednik Bolshaya Kokshaga. (n.d.). Ecological trails. Retrieved August 3, 2016, from http://www.b-kokshaga.ru/ecopromo/tracks/

Zapovednik Bryansky les. (n.d.-a). No Title. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from http://www.bryansky-les.ru/awareness-activities/

Zapovednik Bryansky les. (n.d.-b). No Title.

Zapovednik Darwinsky. (n.d.). Code of conduct in the zapovednik. Retrieved August 1, 2016,

from http://www.xn--80aeesagfxyn.xn--p1ai/conduct-in-the-nature-reserve.html

Zapovednik Denezhkin Kamen'. (n.d.). Information for tourists. Retrieved August 1, 2016, from http://www.denkamen.ru/

Zapovednik Kaluzhskye zaseki. (n.d.). Code of conduct in the zapovednik. Retrieved August 1, 2016, from http://zaseki.ru/pravila/

Zapovednik Kronotsky. (n.d.). History of zapovednik. Retrieved July 1, 2016, from http://www.kronoki.ru/territory/reserve/history

Zapovednik Leopard Land. (n.d.). Rules of conduct. Retrieved July 1, 2016, from http://leopard-land.ru/tourism/visitorsadvice

Zapovednik Verhne-Tazovsky. (n.d.-a). No Title.

Zapovednik Verhne-Tazovsky. (n.d.-b). No Title. Retrieved from http://www.xn-----7kcbgccqcagtcmgjpj5bokhwk6av1f.xn--p1ai/museum

Zapovednik Vishersky. (n.d.). Guardpost "Kruglaya yamka." Retrieved August 1, 2016, from http://www.vishersky.ru/infrastructure/kordon-kruglaya-yamka

Zapovednik Voroninsky. (n.d.). Ecological trail. Retrieved August 1, 2016, from http://voroninsky.ru/posts_full/ekskursii/ekologicheskaya_tropa_zapovednye_tropinki

Zapovednoe Podlemorye. (n.d.-a). Barguzinsky gosudarstvenny prirodnyi zapovednik. Retrieved April 1, 2016, from http://zapovednoe-podlemorye.ru/territory/barguzin/

Zapovednoe Podlemorye. (n.d.-b). Retrieved from http://zapovednoe-podlemorye.ru/activity/

Zavitz, K. J., & Butz, D. (2011). Not that alternative: Short-term volunteer tourism at an organic farming project in Costa Rica. *Acme*, *10*(3), 412–441.

Zelenka, J., & Kacetl, J. (2013). Visitor management in protected areas. *Czech Journal of Tourism*, *2*(1), 5–18. http://doi.org/10.2478/cjot-2013-0001

Appendix 1

List of the conducted interviews

#	Length,min	occupation
1.	60	Lecturer, game management
2.	30	State inspector
3.	30	State inspector
4.	120	Tourism professional
5.	90	Educator
6.	60	Tourism professional
7.	60	Scientist
8.	60	Educator
9.	90	Educator
10.	60	Educator
11.	90	Scientist
12.	60	Scientist
13.	30	Director
14.	60	Educator
15.	30	State inspector
16.	15	Tourism professional
17.	60	Tourism professional
18.	30	NGO specialist
19.	30	Educator