

The Likhachev Foundation

Papers of the Project

«The South Coast of Crimea – A Territory of World Heritage»

**COMPARISON BETWEEN THE SOUTH COAST OF CRIMEA
AND OTHER VALUABLE COASTAL
TERRITORIES OF THE WORLD**

2019, June 14

Introduction

The procedure of nominating a valuable site for the UNESCO World Heritage List implies, first of all, the proof that this site has “extraordinary universal value”, as well as integrity and authenticity. In order to get this proof, it should be explored whether the site meets at least one of the 10 selection criteria of World Heritage (see the end of this text); the extent of its preservation should also be explored.

Besides that, the existing procedure implies conducting the so-called comparative analysis in order to demonstrate uniqueness, singularity of the site, as well as absence of apparent analogues to this site. Sites-analogues (or, to be more precise, rivals) are being searched for in the same country or abroad, not only among the titles on the World Heritage List, but also among the nominees for this high status, as well as among other significant sites with the same characteristics, but not in relation to the UNESCO World Heritage List. It is considered that in this case comparative analysis becomes most complete and produces maximally objective results.

Judging from experience, the most “dangerous rivals” and close analogues are located precisely nearby – in the same geographic region, i.e., in the places with a similar climate, terrain, flora, with the same peculiar features of development of human civilizations and similar cultural traditions.

This is exactly the reason why – determining the prospects of adding the South Coast of Crimea to the UNESCO List – we concentrate our attention, in the first place, on the coastal mountain areas of the Mediterranean and Black Seas, and on the sites, which have already received the World Heritage status, or are capable of receiving it in the foreseeable future (the potential World Heritage Sites). At the same time, we will always emphasize the compliance of the UNESCO monuments,

which are being explored, with specific selection criteria of World Heritage Sites; this is also the *sine qua non* of the procedure of comparative analysis (as a matter of fact, comparison between the sites and their potential analogues should be carried out not in an abstract way, but in specific aspects).

The object of comparison: the South Coast of Crimea as a historical “coast-park”, performing important resort and winemaking functions

Physically, this part of the coast located between the relatively low Crimean Mountains and the Black Sea, from Cape Aya on the west to Cape Plaka on the east, is 75 km long with the average width of 2–3 km. All the principal human presence is concentrated on this coastal strip, above that there are forested slopes of the Crimean Mountains, in some places relatively gentle, with several spacious amphitheatres, but sometimes having the appearance of sheer cliffs. The border of the cultural landscape of the SCC (the South Coast of Crimea) is the margin of the yayla of the Crimean Mountains – the plateau-like highlands, covered mostly with mountain meadows and bushes. The total area of the SCC within the indicated borders is about 28 000 hectares, and about 2/3 of this area is allotted to buffer “framing”, formed by two major adjointly located special protected natural areas – the Yalta mountain and forest reserve and the Crimean national park (in the recent past the Crimean reserve). There are isolated small “natural core areas” of the SCC – special protected areas, like natural landmarks and sanctuaries, scattered along the entire coast. As far as administrative divisions are concerned, the external boundaries of Greater Yalta are regarded as the borders of the cultural landscape of the SCC.

For two centuries the SCC has been famous as an exceptionally picturesque sea resort, the principal medical factors of which are the warm sea, the healing benevolent climate, the abundance of greenery, as well as the proximity of mountains. Initially, during the period when the land was brought under cultivation, this area was used by the high-ranking aristocracy and other well-to-do representatives

of Russian society. Later, during the Soviet period, Crimea belonged, on the one hand, to the wide masses of working class people, and, on the other hand, to the Communist Party elite. At the end of the 20th century a new period of cultivation of the SCC began. At the same time, tourists from abroad have yet to discover the South Coast of Crimea.

The uniqueness of this cultural landscape is manifested in the combination of several particularities.

Firstly, a number of surviving palace and park ensembles are undoubtedly of global value: Livadia, the Vorontsov complex, Kharaks and Dyulber, to name just a few. This enables us to say that the SCC complies with the World Heritage criterion I.

Secondly, the archaeological finds discovered on the SCC – the traces of many different cultures, which have inhabited Crimea during the last two thousand years, beginning with the Taurians, the Ancient Greeks, and the Romans, vividly illustrate the historical multilayeredness of this territory, its past, rich in events. This enables us to say that the SCC complies with the World Heritage criterion IV.

Thirdly, the SCC has all the distinctive features of a valuable cultural landscape, the key elements of which are: balneological resources, parks-monuments, vineyards, a network of old roads and paths, sacral landmarks, as well as certain specially protected natural territories, inserted into the SCC or surrounding “the coast-park.” This enables us to say that the SCC complies with the World Heritage criterion V.

Fourthly, the memorial value of the SCC is important, particularly the one connected with the period between the early 19th century and up to the mid-20th century: this is the memory of the Romanov imperial family (Alexander I, Alexander II, Alexander III, Nicholas I, Nicholas II, grand dukes and duchesses belonging to this family), who had their estates here, as well as the memory of the representatives of Russian aristocracy, merchants, intelligentsia, and great figures of art and literature, who lived here or paid visits (A. Pushkin, A. Chekhov, L. Tolstoy, A. Chekhov, I. Bunin, I. Aivazovsky, S. Rakhmaninov, F. Chaliapin, M. Gorky, V.

Mayakovsky, V. Nabokov, etc.) Livadia is the place where in February 1945 the Yalta Conference took place, with the participation of the heads of the states, defeating fascism in the World War II. All of those enable us to say that the SCC complies with the World Heritage criterion IV.

Table 1. Principal parameters, which determine the value of the cultural landscape of the SCC

Factors	Parameters	Evaluation
Resort factors	ecology/ climate	+
	aesthetics	+
	Sea + mountains	+
	parks/ greenery/ phytoncids	+
	terrainscours	+ (around 15)
Historical and cultural heritage	archaeological monuments	+ (around 250, recorded by the state – 84)
	architectural monuments	+ (tens)
	old parks-monuments	+ (around 30)
	memorial places/ museums	+ (tens)
Winemaking	historical winemaking	+
Protected natural areas	Special protected natural areas – “natural core areas” of the cultural landscape of the SCC	+
	Special protected natural areas – buffer zones of the cultural landscape of the SCC	+

Characteristics of the most likely analogues of the SCC

So, what are the rivals of the SCC among the nominees or contenders for the World Heritage List? We have selected five sites. Four of them already hold the World Heritage status, but one of them has not yet been added to the list above. All of them are in Southern Europe, in the Mediterranean area or close to it. Let us briefly review them. We are going to list them with increase in similarity to the South Coast of Crimea.

The fifth position – The Lavaux Vineyard Terraces, Switzerland

(<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1243>)

Strictly speaking, this place may not be called a coastal site. This is not a sea coast, but a shore of a large lake – the Geneva Lake. Therefore we have included this site in our analysis. The length of the coastal strip between Montreux and Lausanne which was named a World Heritage Site in 2007 is around 30 km, and its width is no more than 500 m, in average – 200–30 m. The area of the heritage site is around 1 thousand hectares, which is significantly smaller than in the case with the SCC. The criteria of the World Heritage List are III, IV, and V; as we can see, the parameters of this site only partially coincide with the parameters, which would make the SCC eligible for the World Heritage List.

In general, viticulture has existed in this area since the Ancient Roman times. The vineyards, which are seen now, were founded in the 11th century, when these lands belonged to the Benedictine Monks.

It is important to note that the terrace vineyards do not have a usual protected status, this is neither a national park, nor a natural reserve, however, the shore has its “personal” Management Plan, and a protected area has been designated. The guarantee of the preservation of these vineyards is in meticulous combination of

national, cantonal, and local laws, besides that, let us consider the Swiss precision in observing this complicated variety of mandated rules and regulations.

Conclusion: we can see that the similarity between the Lavaux Vineyard Terraces can be traced only in one – “vineyard” – aspect. There is also similarity as far as external entourage is concerned – at both sites we are dealing with the border between the mountains and the water space. In other aspects the sites could not be more different. At the Lavaux Terraces there are “archaeology” and “architecture”, but in very small quantities. The health resort function is developed here, too, but also on a much more modest scale: there are small hotels and guest houses here. However, resorts are bubbling with life very close to this place – in Montreux and Lausanne. We will not find here palaces and estates, or such spacious old parks, rich in introduced species, as at the SCC. Thus this is not a “coast-park”, but more of a *historical “coast-vineyard.”*

Speaking of which, let us also mention other famous vineyards with UNESCO status – they are located in such regions as Champagne and Burgundy in France, Tokai in Hungary, Alto Douro in Portugal. However, all of them are distant analogues of the SCC, similar to it only in one single aspect.

The fourth position – the cultural landscape of Sintra, Southern Portugal
(<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/723>)

Here we are talking about the old mansion and park ensembles, located on the mountain ridge (there are about 10 of them), built by the Portuguese aristocracy during the period from the 16th to the beginning of the 20th cc., but mostly in the 18th – 19th cc. They are located as a compact group and the condition of every site is different. The most famous are the Pena Palace with a vast park, the mansions Quinta da Regaleira, the Monserrate Palace, the Moorish Castle. The historical ruins of old fortifications, temples, etc. have also survived.

This cultural landscape started to form in 1840, when King Ferdinand II remodeled an old abbey into his eclectic castle, and around that founded a vast park with fountains, sculptures, and various introduced species of trees, imported from different regions of the world. However, the principal species of wood here were local oaks and pines. The total area of this park is more than 200 hectares!

Thus, the concept of forming this cultural landscape was identical to that of the SCC: to establish vast residences in a beautiful place, situated not far from Lisbon. Sintra became famous as the first center of romanticism in Europe.

Strictly speaking, Sintra is not located in a coastal area, but the Atlantic Ocean is only in 5 km to the west from there. We can assume that Sintra would not have emerged at all, had the sea been situated much further. Obviously, the owners of these rich country residences would frequently visit the coast of the ocean in their leisure time – even in the 19th century that did not take a lot of time.

The area of this World Heritage Site, which is located within the borders of a major national park, is around 1 thousand hectares only, however, there is a buffer area around it which is about 3,6 thousand hectares. There is a Management Plan for this park, and specific ensembles of mansions are being protected additionally – as historical monuments – by the culture legislation. The criteria of World Heritage List – II, IV, and V; as we can see, the parameters of this site only partially coincide with the parameters, which would make the SCC eligible for the World Heritage List.

Conclusion: only one parallel can be clearly drawn between the SCC and Sintra – both territories concentrate unique palace and park ensembles, which have quite a few similarities. The buildings share such styles as eclectics, Neo-Renaissance, Neo-Gothics, Baroque, Moorish styles, and others, which attracted the 19th century aristocracy. In both cases we have rich parks with imported wood species and intricate planning, with small architectural forms. However, this is not “a coast-park”, like the SCC, but rather “*a mountain estate.*” Besides that, Sintra

is not a health resort, where people come for treatment, but a tourist destination, which people visit on a one-day tour from Lisbon (20 km).

Let us mention other well-known palace and park ensembles of Europe which hold the status of World Heritage Sites: the Loire Valley, Versailles, Fontainebleau, Peterhof, Pushkin and Pavlovsk, Wachau, Potsdam, Lednice-Valtice, Dessau-Wörlitz. However, all of these are distant analogues, similar to the SCC only in one aspect.

*The third position – the cultural landscape Cinque Terre,
on the Ligurian coast in Italy, 60 km south-east of Genoa
(<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/826>)*

The protected status of this site is that of a regional national park, established in 1995. The length of the area of the coast is 15 km, it is a section between the towns of Levante and La Spezia. The total area of the World Heritage Site is 4,7 hectares, which is several times smaller than the SCC. The coast was added to the UNESCO list in 1997 as a unique cultural landscape, which for many centuries had been witnessing the survival of man under the conditions of a complex rocky terrain. The criteria of World Heritage List – II, IV, and V; as we see, the parameters of this site only partially coincide with the parameters, which would make the SCC eligible for the World Heritage List.

Here, like in Crimea, not very high mountains are located quite close to the warm sea; however, visually these are two very different “pictures”. On the Ligurian coast there is no precise coastal area of settlement, only certain places here can be used for living: in specific intermontane troughs and in the creeks of mountain rivers; sometimes houses are built right on the coastal rocks. The major part of the coastal line consists of steep slopes, where people created and fortified a system of terraces. The image of this site is, for the most part, formed by the terraces, where grapes and olives are cultivated.

The local cultural landscape has a very long history, the first terraces and villages with churches emerged here as early as in the 12th – 13th cc., and the first fortifications on the hills appeared even earlier – in the 7th century. It is obvious that there simply are no major villas with parks here – and there is no way they could have been here, because there is not enough space for them.

Several small and nice villages are almost set into rocks, attached to the coast, the multicolored buildings there have a unique charm. Manarola, Riomaggiore, Vernazza, Portovenere – even their names sound romantic. By the way, there is *The Path of Love* here; it is right on the coastal precipices and is decorated with symbolic locks. There are also several miniature coasts here, old towers, ruins of fortresses have been preserved, and the churches here are designed in the style of Ligurian Gothic.

In the regional country park Cinque Terre tourism is actively developed, however, in most cases people come here for one day, therefore this is much of a health resort, where you can stay for a long time and get treatment, but more of a tourist destination. Only small hotels and tiny guest houses can fit in here, and only in specific places, most appropriate for construction. The system of bed-and-breakfast has been developed here.

Therefore, the inaccessibility of this area, one may say, protects it from the dangers of tourist industry. Moreover, construction of major hotels is completely banned by the law. In 1870 a railroad was built along the entire coast – it goes across the coastal precipices, helping the tourists to move from one town to another quickly. There is also an entire network of mountain terraces.

Last but not least, this site was added to the World Heritage List because of the imagery around it: it had been glorified by the English romantic poets Byron and Shelley, it had served as a source of inspiration for the German composer Wagner and the French writer Georges Sand. In this aspect the Cinque Terre region is similar to the SCC, which, as we know, also inspired people of the arts.

Conclusion: Thus, this part of the Ligurian coast of Italy shares quite a few common features with the SCC. However, there are also crucial differences, which

do not allow describing this area as “a coast-park”. Another image comes to mind here: *a historical “coast-terrace.”* Here, as it was mentioned above, the abundance of inaccessible coastal rocks make it impossible to have that very integrated strip of land, which the entire life of the SCC is based on.

*The second position – another area of the coast of Western Italy,
50–60 km south of Naples, the so-called Amalfi Coast
(<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/830>)*

The part of the coast with the total area of 11, 2 thousand hectares was named the World Heritage Site in 1997; the size of this site is quite similar to the size of the part of the SCC which we are discussing here. The length of the coastal strip is about 37 km. It is important that here, like on the SCC, there is an integrated and clearly expressed coastal strip, the width of which is up to 2–3 km, where the entire human activity is concentrated. Like on the SCC, this cultivable coastal strip sometimes narrows almost to the point of zero; that happens in the places, where the rocks are located too closely to the sea.

The criteria, which the Amalfi coast meets to be added to the World Heritage List are II, IV, and V; the parameters of this site partially coincide with the parameters, which would make the SCC eligible for the World Heritage List.

The most famous town here is Amalfi, founded in the 4th century A.D., other picturesque coastal towns are Ravello, Tramonti, Positano, etc. The total population of these towns is around 200 thousand people. In general, this area of Italian coast is highly popular. Naples is located nearby, the famous resort of Capri is across the gulf, and to the north, across the mountainous area of Lattari, the romantic town of Sorrento is situated.

On the north this coastal strip is fenced with relatively low mountains, made up of limestone, where there is quite a large national park – *the Lattari Mountains*. This is quite similar to the way the strip of the SCC is on the north fenced with the Crimean Mountains, covered with two major special protected natural areas: the

Crimean National Park and the Yalta Mountain and Forest Reserve. This analogue in the geographic position is also supported by the fact that Amalfi and the neighboring towns are on the south coast of the small Sorrento peninsula; this is obvious, if you look at the map. Therefore, in both cases we have the south coast of a peninsula.

There is no need to add that Amalfi – a coast with abundant southern greenery, a mountainous terrain, an indented coastline, the mosaic of nice little towns with multicolored houses, with insertions of dozens of old churches, – is exceptionally picturesque.

It is important to note that the region of Amalfi (unlike the Cinque Terre, considered above) does not have a definite protected status, it is neither a reserve, nor a national or a regional park. However, the territory has its own “personal” Management Plan as a World Heritage Site; the basic aspects of this plan are determined by the national cultural heritage law, and, besides that, various normative acts and a group of regional laws and regulations are also being reinforced. All of those together provide the coast with a guarantee of immunity.

The Amalfi coast, similarly to the SCC, is abundant with history and architectural monuments; a large number of archeological finds have been discovered here. Traces of various civilizations, starting with the Paleolithic, can be found here. The following buildings and sites remind about the Middle Ages:

- villas of the 13th – 18th cc. – there are around 20 of them here (the most famous are Villa Rufolo and Villa Cimbrone),
- churches, cathedrals, and chapels of the 9th – 19th cc.; there are about 130 of them.
- several abbeys of the 12th – 18th cc.
- old towers, 13th – 16th cc.
- several old castles of the 15th c.

At the same time, the Arabian and Norman style is obviously prevalent in local architecture: the combination of European and Arabic trends.

Thus, the villas of Amalfi are older than the palaces and mansions of the SCC and were designed in a totally different style. These villas are not large, they do not have major parks close to them – there is simply no space for these parks. Therefore here there are no luxurious palace and park ensembles, similar to those in Crimea.

The symbol of this coast, which gives it its characteristic image, as in the case with Cinque Terre, are terraces, created and fortified by man; that made it possible for people to live and successfully exist here. The terraces go back to the 11th century; grapes and olives, fruit and vegetables grow there. We will not see this at the SCC – there are no terraces there, and this is an important difference between the two coasts. However, winemaking and viticulture are developed in both cases.

Another characteristic feature of this coast, apart from the terraces, is the system of horizontal paths and roads, which are parallel to the coast and connect all the towns here. This system serves local residents, but, on the other hand, the paths serve as some kind of terraincours for tourists, the most important of which – the Path of the Gods – is 60 km long! The entire system is very similar to the network of South Crimean terraincours.

It was already said above that, unlike the rocky coast of Cinque Terre, the cultivated strip of coastal land in the area of Amalfi is sufficiently wide, therefore there already are hotels, guest houses, and the tourist infrastructure is being developed. So it is a sufficiently developed resort place, where one can stay not just for one day, but for several days. This is an important similarity between Amalfi and the SCC. However, there are no major hotels here, because they do not really fit in here. Since the 1960s, the locals have been fighting “ecomonsters” – major hotels, which business companies wanted to build. Some of these hotels, which have not been finished, are being demolished today. Event tourism is well-developed: festivals, fairs, etc. Production of ceramics is a famous brand here. The territory is visited by more than 1,5 million tourists a year. Thus, the Amalfi Coast demonstrates us its distinctive type of cultural coastal landscape, which has become livable

thanks to the diligent work of man. The terraces were the first to emerge here (and not the luxurious palaces and parks), where at first the locals grew tomatoes, grapes, and olives, later the villas of the rich appeared, and, at last, commercial tourism emerged. This is a significant difference between the two coasts, since historically the SCC developed specifically as a resort for aristocracy.

Conclusion: The Amalfi Coast and the SCC share quite a few common features. However, this site can not be defined as “coast – park”, therefore Amalfi, similarly to the other Italian site described above – Cinque Terre, would be better described as *a historical “coast – terrace.”*

*Lastly, the first position – closest to the SCC –
is occupied by the famous Côte d'Azur, or the French Riviera*

It goes without saying that it is the oldest and at the moment the most fashionable sea resort in Southern Europe. The local cultural landscape has an abundance of archaeology, architecture of various styles, churches, memorial and museum objects. The traces of different civilizations in the form of various archaeological finds serve as witnesses of a very rich history. For instance, a small Old Town, dating back to the 17th – 18th cc., has survived in Nice. Old churches, buildings, ruins of old fortifications can be found in other parts of this coast.

As for the mountain framework of the Côte d'Azur, we could say that, in comparison to the SCC, here we have a much wider cultivated area, where the distance between the mountainous areas and the sea is much larger – sometimes it is several dozens of kilometers (apart from Monaco, which is located right on the steep coastal slopes). Moreover, mountains here are made up not only of limestone, but also of many other kinds of rocks, therefore visually the Côte d'Azur looks a bit different.

Let us say from the beginning, that, strictly speaking, we are talking not about the whole Côte d'Azur, but only about the area from Menton to Nice inclu-

sively, the length of which is about 25 km; this area is bordered by the Mediterranean sea and the foothills of the Alps. It is this part of the coast that is nominated for the World Heritage list. One of its important components is Nice, the prospective cultural nomination, which was submitted by France to the Tentative List (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6179/>). Another component is the prospective natural nomination, which was submitted by three countries, sharing the same borders: France, Italy, and Monaco (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6178/>). This nomination, titled “The Mediterranean Alps” includes, apart from several major natural reserves in the high mountains, a coastal strip – from the Italian border and up to the eastern suburbs of that very Nice. Menton, Roquebrune-Cap-Martin, Cap-Martin, Monaco, Monte-Carlo, Cap-d'Ail, Cap-Ferrat, Villefranche, – all of these toponyms pertain to this very part of the Côte d'Azur.

Let us consider below the two important aspects, in which we would like to compare the SCC and the French Riviera in the first place.

The first aspect – mansions and historical parks. Do they exist on the Côte d'Azur? Yes, they exist, and the most vivid example is Villa Ephrussi de Rothschild, built in the early 20th century, with sculptures, water objects, and the original park, which in its essence is a botanical garden, because various exotic species, imported from different regions of the world, were planted here.

Let us also mention villas La Leopolda and Grecque Kerylos, also dating back to the early 20th century. They are notable both in their own right and because of their parks, which have a very interesting structure. However, such villas with parks are more of an exception to the rule. We find here predominantly villas of the later periods.

Today, as we all know, the Côte d'Azur is a rich resort, with the grand hotels belonging to world brands, with the famous historical casino in Monte-Carlo, with the famous 5-star hotel *Le Negresco*, Formula One circuits, the Cannes Film Festival, as well as lots of interesting museums, etc. Many villas here are owned by the most well-known businessmen and show-business stars: Roman Abramovich,

Pierre Cardin, Dolce and Gabbana, Michael Schumacher, Tina Turner, and many, many others. Especially famous in this respect are the three capes: Cap Ferrat, Cap Martin, and Cap d'Antibes.

It is important to note that the Côte d'Azur, which began forming as a resort roughly the same time as the SCC (the first part of the 19th century), has always remained a place for the vacations of the wealthy. The SCC, as we know, also started as a place with mansions for the aristocracy. However, towards the late 19th century, a unique system of social tourism and health resorts had been formed there, targeting the underprivileged patients, established by the first in Russia charitable communities of the sisters of mercy. Thus, the particular feature of Yalta and its outskirts is not only the emergence of spectacular palace complexes and parks, but also the steady growth of the number of sanatoriums for diverse social strata. Significant funds were raised by supervisory boards in order to build and furnish them. After the 1917 revolution and the civil war the SCC gradually becomes a major health resort for the entire USSR – a destination for wide working masses (of course, the Soviet party elite, who turned their attention to the SCC in the 1930s, was also spending their vacations here).

The second aspect is the memorial aspect. Speaking about this region, a famous and wealthy European resort, we should not forget about its connections with Russia and its celebrated citizens, especially, towards the late 19th – early 20th centuries.

Thus, it is known that Nice was discovered by the English aristocracy in the 17th century. Lots of Russians were coming here in the mid-19th century, when many representatives of the imperial family moved here.

Here we can trace quite a few parallels with Crimea. Thus, the owner of Ai-Todor estate – Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich Romanov – died in 1933 in Roquebrune, not far from Monaco.

As for Grand Duke Peter Nikolaevich Romanov, the owner of Dyulber, he died in Antibes, not far from Nice, in 1931.

And here there is another example, showing the similarity between the SCC and the Côte d'Azur. In the early 20th century, the shareholders of the cooperative society of summer houses Batiliman (not far from Foros) moved to the Côte d'Azur and founded there a town named La Favière, which reminded them of the Crimean coast.

Chekhov and Dostoevsky gambled in the Casino of Monte-Carlo, Gogol, Tyutchev, Herzen, Bunin, and Merezhkovsky lived in Nice during different periods... Feodor Chaliapin and Anna Pavlova, Diaghilev and Balanchine toured here, Lenin and Plekhanov visited this area. Marc Chagall lived near Nice. Many Russian celebrities are buried in the Russian cemetery. The funeral services for them were held in the Cathedral of St. Nicholas of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Thus, the French Côte d'Azur, well-known for its past and present Russian connections (analogies, origins), its major role in the life of different waves of the Russian emigration, forms a fitting, interesting “pair” for Crimea, and this phenomenon deserves to be studied separately.

Conclusion: The French Riviera (to be more precise, the area from Menton to Nice) seems to have a lot in common with the SCC. However, the Côte d'Azur is different in quite a few aspects, connected with the history and traditions of the development of this coast, so here we seem to be dealing not with “a coast-park”, but with *a historical and resort “coast-villa.”* It is the villas that define “the face” of this fashionable and luxurious European resort.

Other resort areas in Southern Europe:

“coasts – hotels” between the mountains and the sea

Among such areas are those numerous coastal resorts of Southern Europe which were formed – similarly to the SCC – between the sea and the neighboring mountainous areas. (I.e., the intercontinental sites, which are not located on the coasts, as well as coastal areas, located on the plains, were not considered; specific

small islands were not considered either). First of all, we might consider the following major coastal resort areas:

In Spain: Costa del Sol, Costa Almeria, Mallorca, Canary Islands.

In Montenegro and Croatia: Bay of Kotor area, Dalmatia.

In Greece: Peloponnesus, Khalkidhiki, Rodos, Corfu, Crete, a number of other mountainous islands, as well as Cyprus, which has similar climatic conditions.

In Bulgaria: Zlatni Pjasc, Albena, Slnečné pobrežie.

In Turkey: Alanya, Side, Antalya, Marmaris, Izmir.

Georgia and Abkhazia: Gagra, Pitsunda, the region of Sukhumi and Batumi.

However, all the above listed sites – in their essence and appearance – can be defined as “coasts – hotels”, but not as historical “coasts – parks.” Indeed, these resort areas certainly have a historical and archaeological “substance” – and sometimes very rich; winemaking may also be developed there, and there are similarities between them and the SCC with respect to geographic position (the combination of the mountains and the sea), as well as the type of climate (Mediterranean). At the same time, almost all of these places belong to the areas of intensive development of resort business, where it is allowed to build large hotels with highly developed infrastructure and all the resulting consequences. Some of these resort areas have a rich history (some of the resorts in Dalmatia were founded as early as in the 19th century), others, like, for instance, “the Turkish Riviera”, emerged virtually out of nowhere and relatively recently – in the 1970–1980ss, as a response to the powerful impulse of global development of tourism.

It is also important to note that the old parks, similar to those on the SCC, as well as palace or mansion complexes, which would have not only aesthetic and architectural, but also memorial and purely biological value (the storage of the genetic resources of introduced species), can be found in specified areas very seldom.

We should also mention that well-known subtropical resorts can be found in other regions of the world as well – for instance, in California (USA), Mexico, in the east of China, in South Africa, in the south of Australia; “the far north” of Africa – Morocco, Algiers, and Tunisia – are also within the borders of the subtropical belt. However, here we are not going to consider them, because, in the aspects of nature, history, and culture, there are no obvious similarities between these regions and the South Coast of Crimea.

Special case 1:

*Comparison between the South Coast of Crimea
and the area of Greater Sochi*

Greater Yalta and Greater Sochi have lots of similarities, but a lot of differences, too. Let us consider particular features of both coasts in several aspects.

The most important factor, uniting the two coasts – the Crimean and the Caucasian, – is that in essence they are two *unique subtropical resort areas of modern Russia* (in the former USSR the Black Sea coast of Georgia belonged to the same group). There are no other places like that in Russia. For a country with the territory, more than a half of which is in the permafrost zone, under the conditions of cold, relatively uncomfortable climate, the presence of such oases can not be overestimated. This played a particular role during the Soviet era, the times of “Iron Curtain”, when ordinary Russians did not have access to the Turkish or Adriatic coasts – and especially to the Côte d'Azur.

Furthermore, the South Coast of Crimea and the coast of Sochi have a similar territory structure: in the physical aspect, there are lengthy coastal strips, fenced by the mountains; in the case with Yalta the length is 75 km, whereas in the case with Sochi it is more than 100 km; as for the width of the coastal strip – in the aspect of settlement and cultivation – it is between 3 to 5 km for Yalta and between 8 to 10 km for Sochi. The mountain slopes are in both cases occupied with mountain forests, protected by a special regime: these are national parks and reserves, so

to say, the buffer zone, surrounding the resort itself, which is totally correct from the ecological point of view.

As for the management of the above mentioned territories, we should note that both of them correspond with municipal formations: Greater Yalta and Greater Sochi. In theory, this is supposed to make it easier to solve many problems of management, connected, among other things, with cultural and natural preservation (unfortunately, this is not always easy in reality, because other – “hindering” – factors tend to interfere).

The differences in climate and landscape:

1) the dry subtropics and the wet subtropics – this is the key difference as far as climate is concerned.

2) the mountains, fencing the resort, are of very different types:

– The Crimean Mountains, which are no higher than 1,5 km, are in essence a smoothed out plateau (without pointed peaks), which was mostly made up of limestone (thanks to which, by the way, there are lots of beautiful inselbergs, caves, waterfalls). The SCC is characterized with steep picturesque precipices towards the sea, and sometimes the rocks approach the water very closely.

– The Greater Caucasus in the area of Sochi (its highest peaks reach almost 3 thousand meters) has a typical Alpine terrain: pyramidal peaks, narrow gorges, mountain lakes and glaciers, cirques, etc. Its characteristic feature is that, unlike the Crimean Mountains, the slopes of the Greater Caucasus approach the sea not as precipices, but more or less gradually. The appearance of thickly forested, evergreen slopes of the Greater Caucasus contrasts sharply with the whitish precipices of the Crimean yayla, hanging above many sections of the coast. The geological structure of Western Caucasus is not limited to limestones, it is an assemblage of very different rocks: crystalline, volcanic, and sedimentary rocks. However, in both cases we are talking about landscapes of purely natural beauty.

The two coasts have a very different history of settlement and cultivation:

According to archaeology, both of these coasts are areas with very long history of settlement: we can find here traces of very different cultures, which were replacing one another, starting from the Stone Age, through antiquity and the Middle Ages, to the modern and contemporary periods.

Let us emphasize the most important thing: during the 19th century, mansions and palaces were already blooming on the SCC, when spectacular parks were founded, winemaking developed, members of the imperial family and well-known people settled there (by the mid-1830s the best lands of the South Coast had become the property of the Russian aristocracy, and in 1825 the imperial family purchased Oreanda). During the same period, on the Black Sea coast of the Caucasus the Russian Empire was still fighting the belligerent mountaineers and also trying to overcome the malaria-ridden swamps, which were in abundance in that area. Thus, prosperity was out of question in the Greater Black Sea region at that time.

Such tardiness in the process of settlement at the Greater Black Sea region had its historical reasons. Thus, the territory of modern Sochi joined the Russian Empire in 1829 as a result of the Russo-Turkish war (Crimea joined Russia in 1783), then a war against the mountaineers (the Ubykhs) followed. The Caucasian War ended during the time of Alexander II only in 1864, when the Ubykhs were deported to Turkey. Sochi as the fort of Alexandria was founded in 1838, and in that very 1838 Yalta already received the city status.

After the victory in the Caucasian War, starting from the 1860s, settlers – Kuban Cossacks and re-settlers from other regions of Russia – were gradually coming to the Greater Black Sea coast. However, because malaria was widely spread and the mountainous territory was hard to access, initial colonization efforts had little success.

It became possible to start a more peaceful life on the future Sochi coast only in the late 19th – early 20th cc. In 1909 Sochi was officially recognized as a resort town. Around the same time they started using the mineral water of Matsesta for medical treatment.

It is important to note that new inhabitants started to flock to the Black Sea coast of the Caucasus almost a century later than to the SCC. Moreover, by that time members of the imperial family (Romanov) had already acquired residences in Crimea (Livadia, Massandra, etc.), however, they also paid attention to the Caucasus – not to the coast, but to the mountains. It is well known that on the site of the present Caucasus Nature Reserve, in the area of present Krasnaya Polyana, the so-called Kuban hunt existed: the estates, where the tsar and the grand dukes could go hunting wild boars, bison, mountain goats, etc. Thanks to this, the local transport network started to develop, and the mountains here became more accessible.

Besides that, the Greater Black Sea area does not have such a healthful dry subtropical climate as the SCC – here they have wet subtropics, therefore TB patients were not flocking here; people came here for the sun, the sea, fruit, mountain walks, hunting. That is why it makes sense that Anton Chekhov and hundreds of others, suffering from the diseases of the lungs and the bronchi, tried to settle in Crimea...

What has survived from that “heritage of the estates” of the late 19th – early 20th centuries? A small number of old parks, summer houses, renovated and restored to different extents. For instance, in Sochi there is the Riviera Park, one of the architectural landmarks of this city today (the park was founded in 1898), there is also the famous Sochi Dendrium (1901), the summer house of merchant Khludov, the Frunze Park, the Yuzhniye Kulturi Park, and some others. However, the number of such cultural heritage sites and parks-monuments is limited, and you will not find here any grandiose ensembles, similar to those on the SCC. This is explained by the fact that here, unlike the SCC, there was no targeted program of distributing land among the high-ranking aristocrats, and, although the settlers were well-off, they did not hold such a high status (most of them were military men, merchants, industrialists...).

In the 1930s, the Black Sea coast of the Caucasus (similarly to the SCC) began attracting the attention of the party elite, which started building summer resi-

dences here (for instance, Stalin's dacha has survived, although it is quite ascetic), the first sanatoriums in the pompous "Stalin's empire style" were built and some new parks founded. The fight against malaria was successful. The new stage in the development of Russian resorts began. 1933 – the time, when the General Plan of the development of Sochi-Matsesta area was created. However, this is a very different story.

The present condition of resort areas is also perfect:

The SCC is still a relatively quiet vacation destination, however, certain noisy and "hot" spots can be found here, too. Sochi, on the opposite, is a bright, noisy, and modern vacation center, with fashionable hotels of the most famous world brands: Swiss Hotel, Hyatt, Radisson, Marriott, Rixos. Here there is an oceanarium, an aqua park, the Olympics park, the Amusement park, an observation wheel, spacious sports arenas, theatres and museums, further attributes of a major resort town. The Krasnaya Polyana Mountain Cluster also lays claim to be on a par with internationally acclaimed ski resorts. The number of hotels in Sochi area is more than 600, there are more than hundred sanatoriums and retreat centers. All-Russia and international forums, negotiations on the highest level regularly take place in Sochi; business projects develop, massive infrastructure investments are made, the sports are thriving (let us remember the 2014 Winter Olympics); last but not least, the residence of the President of the Russian Federation is situated here.

Thus, the Greater Sochi area is more of *a business and political "coast-resort"*! It is quite different from the SCC, which we still define as a historical "coast-park", performing important health resort and winemaking functions.

Special case 2: the Old Peterhof Road

We might also mention another interesting Russian project, which for almost 30 years has held the status of UNESCO World Heritage Site. This is *the Old Peterhof Road*, founded in 1710 and also reminding us of the Romanov imperial

family and the Russian aristocracy of that period. It goes along the south coast of the Gulf of Finland for 40 km, connecting St. Petersburg with Strelna, Peterhof, and Oranienbaum. According to the concept of Peter I, evenly parceled out plots of land on both sides of the road were supposed to be distributed among the aristocracy so that they could build their estates, and the resulting gigantic architectural ensemble was supposed to outshine the road from Paris to Versailles. At the beginning, construction of estates was regarded as a certain obligation of the nobility, however, gradually the road was becoming a prestigious construction site. Plots of land continued to be parceled out and distributed until the mid-19th century, and some of those plots had previously been a part of the imperial property. Many plots changed hands several times, were joined together or divided by the owners.

During the three hundred years, the line of the Peterhof Road almost did not change, and inside the city it corresponds to the mainline: Staro-Petergofsky Prospekt – Prospekt Stachek – Petergofskoye Highway. However, its appearance has significantly changed during the long period of its existence, and lots of monuments have not survived. Yet, this old mainline, alongside almost 40 clusters, is featured in the huge serial nomination of the UNESCO World Heritage List: “The Historic Center of St. Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments” (№540-034g and etc., criteria I, II, IV, VI). This cluster includes the following items, which are in different conditions: palace and manor ensembles, gardens and parks, historic centers of towns, located along the highway, cathedrals and churches, various other buildings. It is quite possible to draw certain historical parallels with the SCC, which, as we know, used to be the place where the Russian tsars and high-ranking officials had residences and spent their vacations. However, there is no way we could draw a direct analogy between the Old Peterhof Road and the subtropical “coast-park” – the famous resort and winemaking area with a completely different geographic location and climate.

The general conclusion, drawn from the comparison between the SCC and analogous valuable coastal areas of the world

The South Coast of Crimea (SCC), occupying only 1% of the total area of the peninsula, is a territory with an incredible concentration of cultural and historical heritage and incredibly picturesque nature. This is a unique manmade landscape, a historical “coast – park”, performing important resort and winemaking functions. It is necessary to consider the SCC not as an assembly of monuments of various types and purposes, but as an outstanding cultural landscape – an integrated object of cultural and natural heritage. It is in this capacity that the SCC represents a unique territory on a global scale which deserves to be considered the heritage of the entire humankind.

Indeed, there are no exact analogues of this coast in the immediate environment – neither in Southern Europe, in the regions of the Black or Mediterranean Seas, nor in Russia (where there is a severe shortage of such subtropical sea resorts), nor in other regions of the world (where, because of the geographic position, natural and social conditions are very far from those, which we find on SCC).

It is important to note that there are no obvious analogues of the SCC neither on the present UNESCO World Heritage List (where today there are more than 1 thousand nominations), nor on the Tentative Lists from various countries.

Thus, there is nothing similar to the SCC neither among the 19 Russian sites from the World Heritage List (which includes predominantly old Russian kremlins, cathedrals, and monasteries), nor among the prospective cultural nominations from our country, listed in the Russian Tentative List (there are only 13 of them, and they are predominantly historic towns, architectural, and archaeological monuments). The only exception, at least to some extent, is the Old Peterhof Road (see above).

The biggest similarity is between the SCC and the two popular seaside territories of Southern Europe: the Amalfi coast in Central Italy and the Côte d'Azur in France – Monaco (the former has been the World Heritage Site since 1997 and the

latter might acquire this high status in the foreseeable future). However, in both cases we are dealing with historic resort coasts, where the role of old parks has never been as significant as on the SCC, therefore, although the sites share quite a few common features, there is no way we could talk about complete similarity between them (table 2).

We might find a certain similarity between the SCC and another Italian coast – Cinque Terre (it been in the UNESCO list since 1997), Sintra in Portugal (since 1995), the Lavaux Vineyard Terraces in Switzerland (since 2007). However, there are even more differences between the SCC and these sites, analogues can be drawn only in certain specific aspects, i.e., the sites are not similar as far as the entire complex of parameters, characterizing the sites in question, is concerned (table 2).

Table 2. Comparative analysis between the SCC and its potential analogues.

Factors	Parameters	SCC	Côte d'Azur	Amalfi	Cinque Terre	Sintra	Lavaux
Resort factors	ecology/ climate	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Aesthetics	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Sea + mountains	+	+	+	+	–	–
	parks/ greenery/ phytoncids	+	+ –	+ –	–	+	–
	terraincours	+	+	+	+	+ –	+ –
Historical and cultural heritage	archaeology	+	+	+	+	+	+ –
	architecture	+	+	+	+	+	+ –
	parks – monuments	+	+ –	+ –	–	+	–
	memorial places/ museums	+	+	+	+	+	+ –

Winemaking	Historical winemaking	+	+	+	+	+ -	+
Protected natural areas	Special protected natural areas – “natural core areas” of the cultural landscape of the SCC	+	+	+	+	+ -	+ -
	Special protected natural areas – buffer zone of the cultural landscape of the SCC	+	+	+	+	+	+ -

All things considered, we can assert that the unique cultural and landscape complex of the SCC, this *historical resort “coast – park”* – with an abundance of tourist attractions and treatment centers, memorial, architectural, and archeological monuments, vineyards, – surrounded by a protected landscape belt, is fully eligible to apply for the high status: the UNESCO World Heritage Site.

However, before that the territory must be guaranteed secure protection on the federal level.

We are tempted to conclude this analytical review with a quote from Vladimir Mayakovsky, who composed the following lines during his stay in Alupka in 1928:

It is stupid to call it “Red Nice”,
And boring to call it “the All-Union resort”.
What can we compare our Crimea to?
Our Crimea is incomparable!

Thus, the most important conclusion of our comparative analysis, the essence of which has been formulated above, was, as it turns out, anticipated by the great proletarian poet as early as 90 years ago!

Bibliography

Maksakovsky N.V. Istoriya razvitiya i sovremenniye tendentsii formirovaniya Spiska vseмирnogo naslediya UNESCO [The History of Development and Modern Tendencies in the Forming of the UNESCO World Heritage List]// *Naslediye i sovremennost*. Izdatelstvo Kazanskogo universiteta, 2018. Issue 1, pp. 8–30.

Maksakovsky N.V. *Predvaritelny spisok Vseмирnogo naslediya Rossii: istoriya razvitiya, sovremenniy sostav, puti optimizatsii* [The Tentative List of the World Heritage of Russia: the history of development, the modern contents, the ways of optimization]// *Naslediye i sovremennost*. Izdatelstvo Kazanskogo universiteta, 2018. Issue 2, pp. 39–71.

Maksakovsky N.V., Butorin A.A. Metodicheskiye aspekty rossiyskoy praktiki prodvizheniya novikh ob'yektov v Spisok vseмирnogo naslediya UNESCO [Methodic Aspects of Promoting New Sites to be Nominated for the UNESCO World Heritage List]// *Collection of articles: Problemi regionalnoi ekologii*. Moscow, issue 1, 2019, pp. 97–102.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/> (the UNESCO World Heritage List, 2019, English).

<http://www.heritage-institute.ru/vn/documents/teaching-materials/item/2259-rukovodstvo-po-podgotovke-nominatsij-ob-ektov-vseмирnogo-naslediya> (Preparation for nominating for the World Heritage List, 2011, Russian).

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/> (Guidelines for applying the World Heritage Convention, 2017, English).

APPENDIX

The Criteria for Selection used in order to evaluate potential UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

The site, nominated for the World Heritage List, should meet the following criteria:

(I) – to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;

(II) – to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;

(III) – to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

(IV) – to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

(V) – to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

(VI) – to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);

(VII) – to contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;

(VIII) – to be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;

(IX) – to be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh

water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;

(X) – to contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.