Russian *Kunstschutz* in the First World War between Looting, Monitoring and Protection. The Specificity of the Russian Empire's Cultural Policy in the Occupied Territories (Galicia, Poland, Bukovina, Ottoman Empire)

The principal objective within the project is to present Russian activity and cultural policy initiatives in the occupied territories as well as on its own territory, as initiated within the framework of military offensives during World War I. This contribution attempts to map the effectiveness of these activities as well as the roles of various social and ethnic groups, institutions, and individuals in this process.

One characteristic of Russian *Kunstschutz* was its strong correlation with the commemorative and religious policies of the Russian Empire. As such the focal points of Russian activity in this field in the years 1914–1917 were: the evacuation of museum collections and sacristies from Armenia and Georgia (1914); the mission to Galicia headed by Eugeni Shmurlo (1915); the great withdrawal and evacuations from Poland and Volhynia (1915); the expedition to Trabzon led by Feodor Uspensky (1916); the expedition in Western Armenia or Lake Van Expedition conducted by Nikolai Marr (1916); the expedition in Ottoman Georgia or Western Javakheti led by Ekvtime Takaishvili (1917); and the expedition in Bukovina headed by Petr Pokryshkin (1916-1917).

A distinctive feature of the mission to Galicia, organized by the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, was its sharp antagonism to the policy of Russification and Orthodoxisation of the Ruthenian population, who belonged to the Greek Catholic Church and was ethnographically and linguistically Ukrainian. Russia's great withdrawal from Poland and Volhynia in 1915 resulted in the loss of some monuments and collections. The Trabzon expedition of the Academy of Sciences was inscribed in the policy of claiming Byzantine heritage. The expedition in Western Armenia coordinated by the Academy of Sciences acquired some medieval manuscripts and made several archaeological discoveries. The expedition in Ottoman Georgia was arranged by the Georgian Society for History and Ethnography and served to consolidate Georgian culture. The expedition in Bukovina was jointly organized by the Academy of Sciences and the Imperial Archaeological Commission. As a result, it provided recommendations for the restoration of war-damaged buildings and collected photographic and ethnographic collections. Members of the Polish Society for the Protection of Monuments also took part in the mission.

The documents from these expeditions are distributed among various institutions, including the Library and Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Russian State Historical Archives, the Russian Museum and the Russian Ethnographic Museum in Saint Petersburg, the State Archives of the Russian Federation and the Military Historical Archives in Moscow. Members of the Imperial Archaeological Commission took part in at least three expeditions, and some records are in their archives, now in the Institute for the History of Material Culture in Saint Petersburg. The records in the Ukrainian state and regional archives in Lviv, Ternopl, Czernivtci, Kyiv and Lutsk are not extraordinarily rich. However, the special collections of the National Library of Ukraine and the Centre for City History in Lviv do offer original information.

The important task of the Russian part of our project is to work out a strategy of archival heuristics and information search, and to consider how the results can be presented. Significant results can only be obtained based on a juxtaposition of different types of historical information within the context of the mass media, propaganda documents, eyewitness accounts and memoirs.

Preliminary conclusions show that Russian cultural policy in the occupied territories related to the infringement of the Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV) of 18 October 1907. None of the five Russian expeditions fulfilled the primary task of *Kunstschutz* – the protection of historical and artistic monuments in the conditions of war. They were rather focused on gathering visual information, material evidence and ethnographic records that have proved significant for contemporary society and the academic community.