

The project of bilateral and transactional cooperation between Republic of Karelia, Finland, and European Union concerning the transfer of art of bindery -technology, and how to advance publishing activities

Introduction

The main concern of this project (on the 12th March in 1995) is to give an impulse to the progress for the sake of utilizing more sophisticated forms of technical apparatus of the art of printing, or in the computer technology than which is possible in Republic of Karelia right now [common or professional use]. Unfortunately nobody in Finland was interested in this project, and I had NO support to it from any University, or from other institutes. But I was an extra student - probably I was taken with because they didn't get student enough to this course. But it is not fair - or what do you think - to put people work for nothing! Nut I was that stupid, and because I think that everybody must know what I have written in that topic, I have put my texts to net. It is that simple. But back to the business.

There are several reasons why to transfer know-how, and appropriate technology concerning printing art just to Karelia, and not e.g. to Leningrad district [which is pretty well inhabited with problems]. One of them is that there are contracts between Finland and Republic of Karelia which make it possible, and easy for the both participants. There are several single cross-border cooperation projects, as well as some wider aggregates of projects - as an example *Barents Program* - whose aim is to establish a new education, and make it easier to enterpreneurs to settle down in Karelia, and cooperate with Karelian counterparts. There are some special reasons why choose Sortavala [or Petrozavodsk] the target town from several other alternatives. One of them is its developed infrastructure - when considering the situation in other departments of Russia. And if we are discussing the history of printing art, there has been activities of producing literal material in Petrozavodsk, though they have used Finnish counterparts, when making e.g. books, but they have made this in purely business sense. Hence, when considering the readiness of Finnish side, there has been business contacts between Finland and Russia in the art of printing already, but there is no helping tendency with these activities. Some private Finnish enterprises are now interested in the work for further development, because it is the question of the new, opening markets, too, and because a remarkable part of the work shall be financed with different funds. One of those enterpreneurs is *IS-paino* in Iisalmi, who has had some earlier experience with Russian side.

But what about the readiness of Russian side to the modern art of printing. There is the need of computers, and electric mail - because of transmitting the material from a place to another, and because of making electronic books. In fact, it has been tested that it is quite possible to send facsimiles, and electric post e.g. to Petrozavodsk, and it has been also recognized that there are facsimile connections to Sortavala. This sounds good, but it does not mean that development is going to take place exactly in Karelia, and that there will be the new industry. One possibility is, that all the main work and planning shall be done e.g. in Finland, and that all the money shall be gathered by Finnish enterpreneurs, and institutes - and that only the goods shall be spread around Karelia. But this is no enough, because, - as it has always been the case - the men of streets in Karelia shall be the final financiers all the development. The aim of implanting the better art of printing, or the desktop publishing technology, and alike, to Republic of Karelia, might improve, and speed the development of the whole society, and especially

literature, and the field of education - which cannot be gained by the current technical equipments belonging to an elementary level only - or that every more complex operations are been making outboards.

But why discuss Republic of Karelia, and not the whole Federation of Russia? There are several reasons. In general: The question is not that simple that we had only one vast, and poor geographical area in front of us, which we should develop. When considering different departments of The Federation of Russia, we can find also regions which are pretty well developed, and which have some technology already, and which have also money to get more services, and welfare than elsewhere. But how we know that? Let us remind that there has been business contacts between private enterprises and Russian side before, and many government,- and municipal authorities have visited e.g. in Siberian towns - which have appeared to be pretty well-developed. There might be some fictive stories among those which I have heard about those rich Siberian towns. We can evaluate any aid, business, or technical support on the basis of their referential effectiveness to the current, or changing culture, or evaluate their effectiveness only emphasizing their ability to manipulate the future world. We may give certain, long- distance goals, to which to aim to, and which are both humanistic, and which can be ranked morally and ethically high, but many factors might cause that we never shall achieve those goals. We may have a vision concerning distant future which is far better than ours, but it doesn't help us to achieve any concrete goals. We may also have a false visions - as e.g. the better future achieved with computer technology, and with better networks of knowledge. Any easy going development, and future manipulation can be associated to ADP networks, to such medias as INTERNET and FUNET, which can be applied in universities, but also at schools - when producing material to instant use in real time. And when necessary, chosen elements of the whole material can be written out to literal form, when needed, either using draft, or fine output by printers. We can achieve more sophisticated forms of output, too, which, in turn, can be achieved by printing art. All of them can be grounded on ADP. But we should ask the question: Is all of this really the progress, or knowledge, or some kind of *Pandora's box* - or have we only an illusion of knowledge. If we have nothing to say, or nothing to add to the knowledge to mankind, it is just vast time to enjoy the interpretations which have been made elsewhere. It is just nothing more than watching TV. And further: Have we all our essential knowledge been saved in our ADP-networks? Have we there a respect of different ethnical interpretations, or international truth concerning what is absolutely good for man, or what is a good style of life? Can we find there the ancient wisdom of mankind, instead of forgotten cultures? Notwithstanding that these questions are philosophical, they must take in consideration, too, especially when planning [such things as] schooling.

Perhaps more important than the access of networks, which we have discussed above, might be that Karelian people shall have an opportunity to enlarge their own publishing activities for different purposes, and that they shall have more audiences. Another kind of activity could be getting the knowledge from different cultures by books. Both of these interests can be associated to such interest groups as authors, schools, but also the commercial world, which has an utilitarian view associated to these activities. The computer networks can fulfill the needs of local cultural participants, as well as the need to communicate with other cultures. They have also a possibility to add their interpretations to existing interpretations, or criticize them. These activities belong to those cultural, ADP, and educational fields, which has been accepted by binational contracts to be cooperated between Finland and Karelia. The current project doesn't have a good chance to make complete economic and financial analysis concerning the whole economic system of Republic of Karelia - or describe all of its different geographical departments from north to south. There are other sources of information for the purpose. All that we can say is that there are less immediate financial resources in Republic of Karelia than in the least developed areas in Finland, and there are only few outside interests - e.g. arisen from European Union. However, we can evaluate that there are lot of potential material resources [as timber and mineral] in Republic of Karelia - by which Karelian people might be develop themselves in future, and by which they could achieve better economical status by trade. We must remember that there are another activities to offer, too, by which Karelian people could achieve similar results, as the alternative use of wilderness, plants, and animals - such as hiking, and nature trails for foreign people.

The needs of industry - or nature conservation?

Some geographical considerations

In geological sense, and for its nature of Republic of Karelia doesn't differ a much from Finland. From its western frontier to the White Sea, it is mainly flat country, which slopes gently to the east. There are only small hills, and there are quite similar forests as in Finland. The percentage of pine is of 60%, and of spruce 33% The rest of land is mire, which counts ca. 20% of the total. There are approximately 44 000 lakes, from which the most important are Lake Onega, Pääjärvi, Tuoppajärvi, Seesjärvi, and Uikujärvi. Most rivers are short but fast-flowing streams - such as Kem,- Vodla, - and the river of Suunu. These facts imply both to the possibilities to develop all kinds of industry dealing with wood, and timber - but also to the development concerning the networks of services for tourists. Some of them might prefer high class hotels with their services, or some of them might prefer to the development of shooting services for hiking.

Are the needs of industry and nature conflicting?

For the reason of the survival of original plants and animals, there is the need for founding the nature parks, and alike. There are some plans to establish them in Karelia, and there are some areas available for the survival of rare animals yet - such species as *Rangifer tarandus fennicus*, and *Dendrocopos leucotos*, as well as *Sciuropterus russicus* on the both sides of the border, who are demanding that wilderness as the prerequisite of their living - which might be threat by the wood processing industry, or by individual entrepreneurs, or the coalition between Finnish and Karelian men of industry. The thread might be caused by whoever is cutting and selling wood to the factories on the both sides of the border - without any feeling of responsibility, and restrictions. We know something what is taking place on the Finnish side right now, and something about the difficulties to preserve the biodiversity of forests. There is a report which has been made cooperatively by UNEP, WRI, IUCN, and UN, and where this demand is especially maintained. The needs of industry, and the preservation of nature are conflicting, when discussing e.g. cutting off the wilderness, or the pollution of nature, which is produced e.g. with mines, wood processing industry, or transporting of oil by waters - which all are the threads which are becoming more and more apparent also in Republic of Karelia.

But - if we are advancing only with the preservation of nature, and emphasizing only that topic, there might be the preservation of poor economical status of inhabitants, as well as the exploitation of another kind by the native and foreign enterprises. And if we are demanding the preservation of nature - as it is an sich - without any intervention of man, there is no place to any progress of human societies, but instead a need to make the whole country more an more empty of people. Obviously there is the need of the fundamental choice between the directions available, or accommodation between them. The northern and the middle wilderness of Karelia is almost empty of people now. This is the case notwithstanding that in Kostamus there is a mine producing such minerals as mica, titanium magnesite, sink, tin, and ply. Most of inhabitants are gathered to towns, which are at the southern part of Karelia, because the most favorable areas of Karelia are its southeastern-, and eastern regions. These areas are just nearby of north coast of Ladoga - where the seal of Ladoga lives. The seal of Ladoga is a close cousin of the seal of Saimaa, which is one of the endangered species of the world, because of its small population.

But why to discuss both seals there? Because there are some political speculations, as one, whose aim is to dig the shipping channel across Finland, and which should just go across the area of seals in Ladoga. But they are just fancy speculations at the moment - nothing more. Similar kind of harmful effects might be caused by the increase of wood-, chemical-, or tourist industry, or increasing transporting e.g. oil by waters, or increasing nuclear power. In general, we are more apt to fulfill the needs industries - all kinds, notwithstanding that there are more tender and soft alternatives - which are adapted to the conditions of nature. Due to the modern ADP-technology, certain services belonging to the tourist industry - can be processed elsewhere, and they can be planned so that there is not a strong demand of energy. In addition to this, certain modern services, as the art of printing, can be made elsewhere. When thinking all the

speculations concerning a chipping channel, and large holiday camps, and hotels on the shore of Ladoga, we can easily see that they shall produce a lot of trouble: we have there the first sign of the coming conflict between nature conservation and the needs of industry. However, when choosing any alternative of stronger infrastructure, and industries of all kinds, there is the need of art of printing near Ladoga, too, because this kind of activity is just demanding the presence of well-developed infrastructure.

If we think tourism - there are such sights in Ladoga as the seal mentioned above, and Valamo -, and Konevitsa monasteries, and the whole northern shore of Ladoga - because of its beauty. In The White Sea there is the Kitzi island, which has been long known as beautiful sight, and which is one of the natural conservation areas in The Republic of Karelia. To the east of The White sea there is the national park of the Lake Vodla, and to the west of The White Sea there is the Natural conservation area of Kivatsu. Hence, there seems to be a good change to develop tourism in both of Ladoga and The White Sea. If we think the progress of agriculture, it seems to be possible just in the districts, which are lying nearby on the shore of Ladoga, but it doesn't seem reasonable to make any progress in northern parts of Karelia. At the moment, there can be found very little agriculture in the whole Karelia - notwithstanding that there has been burnt-land cultivation even in 1820's in the broad line from Ilomantsi to Petrozavodsk, as well as on the shore zone of Ladoga. But long time since then there has been a full peace in wilderness. For many historical reason why there are still forests in Karelia, as well as may big animals, as bears and wolves, for example. But for money Karelian people might vast their forests, and beast animals, or let the earth and water become polluted - as in large parts of Europe. However, if they do so, they have just nothing to show for nature travellers, or nothing to let to be enjoyed by the future generations. There is always a choose between alternatives. One of them is the better social welfare, and the health, which both are demanding money. And there is the need for work, and many topics of similar kind. These things may be contrasted to the welfare of nature, and its animals and plants - if we are advancing the principle of utilitarianism.

The flow of EU-financing?

It was already in 1957 when EEC-countries made a contract in Rome, in which it was defined the general structure concerning the commercial-, and development aid with colonies, and overseas countries. A year later, in 1958, it was founded EDF, which was aimed to help French Africa. Later, in EDF's seventh contract [the period between 1991-1996], the quantity of those, which were aid-given, or participants, was already 69. Then there have been several LOME-contracts, which are concerning different economical arrangements, and developmental aid cooperation. Those contracts are legally binding - that is - the contracts cannot be annulled, which refers also to their continuity, and to their safe, and established nature. There is the tendency of both the equality, and independence of the participants, as well as the emphasis that any target developing country has the right to define the form of its political,- social,- economical,- and cultural systems. But nowadays there is no aid for the sake of the aid itself, because of the effectiveness of an aid given, which the demand especially LOME IV is emphasizing. It is just ACP-country, who states any initiative, and indicative program, in which there are defined the priorities, and goals of cooperation, sectors, operations models, and instruments - and just ACP shall choose the most important local, and national project to be realized. After this, European Union evaluates an appropriate among of aid, which is given. Then the process shall continue with several negotiations between EU and ACP- country, and after then there shall be a formation of National Indicative Program. The EU-markets are - for the most - open to the products of ACP-countries, but there are certain exceptions concerning the products, which are important to the economy of the southern Europe. The necessary conclusion concerning the aid, which is given by European Union is, that it is oriented to the south, and that there is the tendency of protectionism, too. There seems also to be a tendency to take in notice the needs of target countries, not only the needs of European Union, who gives an aid, or credit. But there is not much of orientation to the north. There is the fact that European Union has fixed its financial resources beforehand - because of that the contracts it has done with tens of countries - are binding European Union, and another participants. There is not much place to expansion to the northern direction - without any extra contribution of money of all the members of European Union.

There are some humanistic prerequisites concerning the aid given by LOME, as the demand of enlarging

of democracy, equality, and the human rights in the target countries. This does not become realized by the activities of European Union only, but it must be due of activities of target countries, too. In addition to this, there are certain mechanisms within LOME for structural adaptation, and for fund, as STABEX, SYSMIN, and SAP. The developmental aid - as such - consists of technical aid, financing of investments, and credits. Then there are micro-projects, and project investments. When studying LOME from the point of view of economic system only, there are certain contracts concerning customs, and the General Systems of Preferences. This is a deadline between the other target countries, and LOME. In the year 1976 European Union started cooperation with Asia, and Latin-America. In general, the relationships between European Union and Asia, and Latin-America are made according to LOME, and this is the case also with Mediterranean countries. However, there are some differences. Those contracts with them are made bilaterally, or sometimes multilaterally, when there are groups of countries. Their main emphasis is with economical cooperation, and not traditional developmental work. There are not so good commercial preferences as with LOME, indeed, but especially in Latin-America there is still the strong emphasis of the demand which we have discussed above. Just similar prerequisites are stated in Maastricht in 1993, with its a. 130u-130y. There is a demand for the stabile economic- and social development, which ought to be supported in the developing countries. In addition to this, the developing countries must be [gradually] integrated to the world economic system. There is the demand of fighting against poverty, and also the tendency of enlarging e.g. civil rights in those countries - binding together the principles, which has been accepted in the United Nations, and by similar organizations. But there are another demands, too. When cooperating with developing countries, there must be coherence in all of the activities, as well as coordination and complementarity - when trying to avoid e.g. overlapping activities.

The questions of RIGHTS like that are not demanding worrying, and immediate political changes in Karelia, and it is not the concern of the project, either. We cannot map adequately the current stage of the development of such things [as mentioned above] in any country, because we don't have any real, valid, and concrete ideal society, which to use as the universal model, and to which to compare the current situation in Republic of Karelia. But there are other similar, and important questions left, as the rights of women, equality, and the question of education. In general we can propose for that the rights of women are realized far better in Russia as in the countries in the southern pole of the earth, which we call "developing countries". The education is certainly under the progress - which does not imply to its low level, or that is is "undeveloped", because the whole basic education in Russia is at very high level, when comparing it to the most parts of Asia, or Africa. But there is a kind of the command and control problem instead, and the problems of the difference between practice and theory. As an example of this is the education at agricultural schools, which e.g. Kiteen maatalousoppilaitos in Finland has been studying and supporting, in order to influence to the methods, which have been carried on some Russian agricultural schools. In addition to these difficulties, there are some material, and also some other difficulties. There is also the lack of private enterprises, or entrepreneurs as well as lack of company policy. It might be difficult to explain certain things to Russian cooperating participant, and further, explain certain Russian concepts to financial associates, and other participants. Hence, here is the growing need of the schooling in economic science, which is tailored to the "western world", because of the growing interaction of all the nations, and their aggregates, as well as the need of cooperation. For the same reason, every "western" economist, and other professional must become acquainted with Russian schooling, society - and language. Those countries which have been in close interaction with Russia [or The Soviet Union] before, have better chances to get this information fast and easily. But there are obviously certain difficulties - as e.g. the lack of adequate words of trade, or the terms of finance in Russian language. One advantage we have, when comparing Karelia to the southern globe of the world, is that there is no overgrowth of the population in Karelia, and in the whole Russia, but instead the birth rate is relatively low. Moreover, we can find several villages which are left empty for years ago, but we shall return to this question later. When trying to find cooperating participants from the both sides of the border we find out that there is an important role of organizations of citizens - especially when trying to find money for any project of this kind. For example, 20% of EU-aid is channeled by the organizations, but there must be a contract and continuity, local partners, and the enterprises, which are oriented to the development.

History of Karelia, and Ingermanland

Nowadays there are much more than 800 000 inhabitants in Republic of Karelia, from which most are Russian speaking, and origin. In addition to them, there are some dialects of Karelian, Finnish, and Veps speaking groups. But there has been taken place many changes before the current situation. The earliest graveyards, which has been found in Karelia, were founded in AD 800, but we have not much to tell about those early inhabitants, or their language. After *The Great Schism* in 1054, which divided the Church into Western and Eastern Churches, there was a growing interest to Karelia from both sides. Many of vague border districts between them became suddenly important both to Constantinople and Rome. One of the reasons for Crusades to Finland was just this wish to have more and more spheres of interest. During Crusade time (1050-1150/1300 A.D.) it was Käkisalmi, which was the center of Karelian culture, and it has been found ornaments which are typical only to Karelia, and they cannot be found elsewhere. There were several attempts to join Karelia religiously to The Roman Catholic Church - notwithstanding that Karelia tried to make the policy of its own - being in close contact both with Gotland and Novgorod, and being ally of the latter, which was an advocate of Orthodoxian Christianity, which wanted to expand its political influence by religion, and by other means. There were several wars between Roman and Bysanthian Churches, and as [one of] the result was that in The Peace of Pähkinäsaari in 1323, when Karelia was divided, and the new border was starting from Rajajoki, going across the Karelian Isthmus, and before the shore of Ladoga to the northwest. The borderline was confirmed, again, in The Peace of Tarto in 1351 after the war between, which was started by Maunu Erikson.

Then there was the era of the strong expansion of Sweden-Finland, and as the first step of it, Ingermanland and Käkisalmi district were joined to Sweden-Finland in The Peace of Stolbova in 1617. Ingermanland was inhabited already 2000 B.C., and it has got people already in AD 500 from the area, which are known by the names Estonia and Latvia now. Sweden-Finland treated Ingermanland as conquered land, where the natives had no rights, and they had e.g. no representatives in the parliamentary of Sweden-Finland. Mostly people of Russian origin, who were mainly advocates of the Orthodox Church, left their homes, and immigrated to other parts of Russia - because all of the bad treatment they got concerning their religion, and language. But instead of them, several Lutheran people migrated from Sweden-Finland to Ingermanland - coming mainly from the Karelian Isthmus and Savolax. Käkisalmi and Ingermanland got more inhabitants from Sweden-Finland under *The Thirty Year's War*. But Sweden-Finland become gradually weaker and weaker. In 1702 Russian troops conquered Pähkinänlinna, and just the year after this Russians started to build St. Petersburg to a large area consisting of mire, between Neva and Suomenlahti. It didn't take a long time when Russians have got the whole Ingermanland back. In The Peace of Uusikaupunki in 1721, after *The Big Botnian War*, Russia got the southeastern part of Finland, and it was only 87 years later, namely in 1808, when the whole Finland was separated from Sweden, and joined into an autonomic department of Russia until 1917, when Finland became independent. During the time there was a dispute concerning official language in Finland, to which Karelians didn't take part in a much. Karelians sent several times Swedish speaking gentlemen as their representatives to parliament, notwithstanding that there were only few Swedish speaking land owners - for example from Sortavala in 1863, and from Salmi in the years 1891, 1894, and 1899. But Karelians were more initiative, radical, and liberal in other respects, too, when comparing them to people of western regions of Finland. There is the fact, too, that Karelians were more afraid of the thread of Russians than their western companions.

LITERAL ACTIVITY IN KARELIA, AND INGERMANLAND

In Ingermanland there was an activity of Lutheran priests at the end of 1800. Those priests founded e.g. the Seminar of Koppana, schools, and libraries. There were also such activities as articles at Finnish newspapers, and festivals of folk-dance, and several other cultural activities. It is obvious that Ingerians tried to achieve a full independence, or autonomy, especially in 1917, but they didn't succeed to get that - notwithstanding all of their efforts. In the *Peace of Tarto* in 1920 the politicians of Finland proclaimed that Ingermanland is an inseparable part of Russia. However, all of this didn't suggest to that people of Ingermanland had no opportunities to develop their culture any more, or - for a while - at least. During 1920's people of Ingermanland had a kind of independence concerning their local administration - until 1930's, when things changed to be worse and worse, and when approximately 50 000 people were moved

to other parts of Russia, and Karelia. Under *The Second World War* ca 60 000 Ingerians were moved to Finland, but after 19.9.1944 ca 55 000 of them were returned back to Soviet Union, and ca 8000 stayed in Finland, but most of them migrated from Finland to Sweden. A great deal of the people of Ingermanland were returned to Soviet Union, were spread to other parts of the Soviet Union - e.g. to Karelia, but a part of them were allowed to stay in Ingermanland. This was nearly the end of their local literal activity in Ingermanland. In Karelia there was a literal activity at the beginning of 1800. In 1804 there were two books [smaller catechism, and prayerbook] with the Cyrillic alphabet. At one of the books the language used was the dialect of Tver Karelian, and at the other the dialect of Aunus. Since then there were more and more religious literature until *The First World War*. During 1930's it was published tens of school books, as well as other literature, using the dialect of Tver. First of those books were written with Latin alphabets, but between 1938-1940 they were written with Cyrillic alphabets. Since then, there has been published several books, which has been written in Finnish, and by Latin alphabets. People in Northern part of the whole Karelia speak nowadays mostly Russian, but some of them can speak the dialect of Vienan Karelia, which is very close to Finnish. The material of Finnish *Kalevala* is derived from the traditional knowledge of inhabitants who has used this dialect. This does not suggest to that there is left those people any more who can give that information. In addition to this dialect, there are also some advocates of the dialect of Aunus [Livvi] left. Former this dialect was spoken from Säämäjärvi to Ladoga, and it could be found in such districts as Salmi, and parts of Suistamo and Impilahti. Nowadays in Impilahti there are not many people who can speak the dialect of Vienan Karelia, or the dialect of Aunus, because approximately 80% of Impilahtean people use Russian - as their mother tongue.

CONCLUSIONS

Now, if we think, to where we should be oriented, when planning to make any concrete action to transfer art of printing to any district of Karelia, we should decide who shall use that technology, and should we transfer that technology to Karelia? One conclusion which we might have is that at the first stage we shouldn't prefer the alternative of the technology transfer, but instead that of offering to Karelian people that possibility of getting their writings to be published, and getting to them better books for schooling. For an equality of citizens from different ethnic origin we ought to offer them that equality of publishing. Unfortunately there are only few groups, or people left, who have some special ethnological backgrounds [as Aunus, or other dialects speaking people]. On the contrary - we can find more of those Finnish speaking people, or people who have more or less that skill achieved. But there is still that need of culture preservation, or reviving the lost language, and culture, however. In this sense, those Karelian people, who have an ability to use their dialect, have an important role in the project - if they have any wishes to make their literal culture active again. But if we discuss the role of Russian and Finnish, we can find a lot of books, which has been published in these languages, and it is merely the question to make them available in Karelia again. Any modern technology can be utilized, but we must take in consideration other possible political needs, or interests. However, it is not very economical idea to transfer the whole technology, and appropriate education, and service systems counting only few thousands of people, and when making something available, there is the very possibility to print the books needed in Finland.

If we count together Russian, and other languages speaking people in Republic of Karelia, we can get over 800 000 possible customers. Have they any need for the new technology right now? Not necessary, if we are considering the current situation. They have more urgent needs, without any doubt. The urgent needs of men of streets do not offer enough chance for the economically profitable enterprise. We know that in Karelia there are three local newspapers, which do not fulfill the needs of of authors,- of musicians,- of local historians, and others - more or less professional people, who have not much opportunity to spread their ideas to the common availability, or process their materials, or make them known in Europe. In addition to them, there shall be thousands of businessmen, and growing tourism, which might demand those possibilities in future, as well as all kinds of other equipments being available to them, which belong e.g. to the modern telecommunications - as telefacsimile, transportable telephones, and computer networks. During the late years there has been a remarkable increase in the export and import of hi-tech in Finland [especially telecommunication], which is suggesting to that Finland has an ability to improve those things in Republic of Karelia, too. Business world has always the need to print out this or that, but also the need of getting more sophisticated services, as art of printing. Then there are

schools, and their needs, and the needs of local administration, and the growing needs of industry. All of this, in turn, sets the new prerequisites for education, which are not due of the complexity of technology, as such, but instead because of the complexity of society. We might propose for that the situation in Karelia is pretty near to the situation after *The Great Schism* in 1054 - notwithstanding that there are no political signs of dividing the whole Europe now. The decisions have been made far away from Karelia, again, but they must take in consideration, because - as the consequence - the world shall fill of activity to its most distant corners, from coast to coast, and Ocean to The Atlantic Ocean. There are growing interests, whatever they shall be, concerning the needs of the population of the southern Asian, and European Union, as well as the needs of Russia - which all concentrate to the same surfaces, or demarcation lines. There is no religion to be shared, or advocated for, only certain needs of the whole world trade - as transportation, and the needs of equipments, and materials. For these reasons there might be that tiny need of the art of printing, too.

Have we learned something about history? Not much, I think, but we must try to avoid the same mistakes which we have done during the earlier years. There must be avoided colonialism, all kinds, and try to be practiced participation, instead. That is, if there is something bad to be waited for, it should be shared together - which refers to responsibility concerning the results, which have been caused by our decisions, whatever they were. In addition to this, we ought avoid to practice utilitarianism, and only utilitarianism, because there are also other values than the changing values of business world. We must help people to stay in their homeland, where they have come from, and whatever history we can trace right now concerning their past history. And we must encourage people to maintain their own habits, and traditions - which concerns as well Russians, as Karelian-dialect -speaking people - and encourage people to live together in peace.

THE GOALS AND METHODS OF THE PROJECT

All that we can propose concerning both economy and culture, is that Karelia, and in its close districts in Russia, namely Murmansk, St. Petersburg, and The Lenigrad district. Our target area is more restricted, however, but we shall discuss it later. However, our general strategy is to find out some of the possibilities, from which we could develop a single functional solution - using varying and alternative methods if the one which we have chosen does not work. For the reason of the culture differences, there is no sense to apply only one management, which is pre-determined and fixed beforehand. For example, we know that it is not possible to force any people to any larger environmental planning, or politics, if they do not have that opportunity at the moment. The question of urgent needs is also problematic, because it should not be the question of current wishes, or hopes, and their fulfilling of Karelian people, but instead the question of something which takes time and effort - and the respect of own cultural roots - and vivid imagination. The common people might be wished to have the same electronic equipments that are common in Finland - as e.g. color televisions and microwave ovens. Karelian people should certainly wish instead better power transmission, and other similar prerequisites. It must be presented the question: what is possible right now. We cannot force our wishes to be the wishes of common Karelian people, either, or propose for that their way of life is worse than our own style. The situation is just alike what comes to our conceptions concerning their politics and bureaucracies. We should not condemn their systems, because they have chosen their own people to manage things in them. During any short project nobody can change a much of anybody's ways of managing with things.

Let us just think what kind of politics and bureaucracies we can find in European Union, or Finland. Let us think, too, in what way we form any project - there are several levels of members and interest groups, which do not participate the actual work! We must cooperate and manage with Karelians, whatever we wished they ought to be, or whatever they wished to be themselves. We cannot lean to any wider, or more common socio-cultural conception concerning the most valid ways of life, or the essence of culture, either, because the whole world is full of managements of all kinds, and no-one of them is more valid than others. When thinking the project, and how its objectives are clearly restricted to one kind of districts in Karelia, namely to towns, and the main goal of the project, which is to improve their skills and machinery in printing art, and appropriate ADP technology applied in it. We must offer these equipments just because of Karelian people can fix better the certain prerequisites of elementary schooling, or

increase the flow of information - as a consequence. But there is the fact that they have not yet that technology at the low level - in the wide use. But why? Why they have such difficulties as they have? There are several reasons. One of them is that Karelia lies on the border. Let us remind that the most villages has been left quite empty, and people has been moved to the towns and cities for better work. One extra reason to that emptiness is the lesser importance of that district under the development programs of The Soviet Union. Still now there is not much settlement in countryside, and most of the population has been concentrated to towns and cities - as in everywhere in the world. But why we should make those empty areas more functional than the areas in northern, or eastern Finland, and try to advance their infrastructure - and in the same time trying to empty the Finnish countryside.

This emptiness of Karelia just mentioned does not mean that there were no people in there. If we think the whole area of Murmansk, Karelia, St. Petersburg, and Leningrad district, there is approximately 10 000 000 inhabitants, but for Karelia we can count far less than it. The equipments which has been used in printing art, are the equipments of well-educated professionals, such as foremen, and the only reason to implant the technology in question to any country in progress in the area - is to do it to increase the among of different publications, as school books. The only way to do it is to focus the activity to one district, which has some kind of an infrastructure already now, and which shall maintain it also into the distant future. It is clear that just those people can take the most advantage of the information provided by our [and by any] project, and by the project there might be a lot of new opportunities both to Finnish and Russian side - in time. Another question is the development ADP-technology is the general development of such things as power transmission and telecommunications, but the development depends of the interests of appropriate enterprises, and if they have appropriate plans, or not. If we are discussing the use of microcomputers, and their possible interactive use of networks at the more or less instant future - by which we are personally able to produce a lot of publications, too, there is not that instant need to have be implanted them to the countries of the elementary progress - just at the moment. There are some economical reasons, as well as the question of resources. Any publication, which is also technically excellent, must be produced with expensive desktop publisher program, and there must be appropriate printer. When using both of them in Finland - the production of any publication costs a lot of money, as well as time, when duplicating hundreds of publications with one microcomputer and printer. For the reason there ought to be speed, but also expensive duplicating machines for the excellent printing quality, without the loss of originality. If we succeeded to overcome these difficulties, there is the question concerning the availability of service, as well as availability of the components of printers. But for what this implies? When trying to spread a lot of microcomputers to developing countries, there ought to be much more economical support, and technological assistance, than by any restricted project can be given, in order to transfer higher technology to any country which does not have it yet. But if there were an appropriate printing machine, and some person who maintain it, and who are trained to it, it could to be applied with computer program, if wanted, but this is not quite necessary, because there are manual ways to print books, too.

Notwithstanding there are large areas in Karelia which are demanding immediate help, our project is not concentrating to them all, but only to one district - namely to Sortavala [and to its surrounding villages]. There is not much of risk in our project, because those people in Karelia has a need to the materials of elementary schools, and they have another informational needs, too. All of these needs they can materially fulfill with the wider use of ADP, and skills of printing art. If we manage to have them e.g. appropriate machinery, schooling of its use, and service, they have better opportunity to produce independent whatever they want. But advancing their society we could also make their situation worse than it is now, but it is the risk of another kind. The time-schedule of the preparatory stage of the project is restricted for two years, but there shall arise the need of another stage of the project, and its satellite programs, which shall last for several years, perhaps ten years. However, before any concrete action [according to the program of the project], there must be made a clear definition concerning project organization. At the very first stage of the project the coordinator [or promotor] of it is **Timo Kinnunen**. There are some larger contexts, as well as when starting the project, as continuing it further. When discussing the very start, and the invention, and shaping the project, there is Universitas Ostiensis, and by the contract between it and Kuopio-, and Petrozavodsk Universities there is a larger context available.

Then there are some other prerequisites for the project, as an example the programme, which has been

named "*Keski- ja Itä-Euroopan Toimintaohjelma; Suomen toimintastrategia*", being accepted by Foreign Ministry of Finland on the 11th March in 1993: It has close connections to KIE-programme. Then there is "*Lähialueyhteistyösopimus*", being accepted on the 20th January in 1992 between Finland and Russia. These contracts include also the activity, to which the art of printing, and publishing activities can be associated to. In addition to these contracts, there ought to be find out if there are some general plans at the higher lever of the whole Federate - which could be associated to those things, which has been discussed in those contracts. And there ought to be connections to local levels of administration, and their resources, if needed. In addition to these, there might be cooperation with UN organizations as well - as financial and professional participants [UNDP and Unicef, for example]. In addition to these there might be some other financial participants, as FINNIDA, or FINNFUND, and from European Union such as TACIS, and some other financial sources. There is a demand that The Republic of Karelia must be as initiative, when trying to get financing from TACIS. From TACIS, and similar financial sources, we could get 50% of costs, and from FINNIDA approximately 35 %. Hence, the excess were only 15%.

Now, when studying social and cultural prerequisites concerning the possible success of any action, which we have in Karelia, there is a need of social and educational interaction with we ought to get, too. But I'm not going to discuss it now, because is out of the scope of the project, but we might suppose that the project shall have a strong environmental and cultural influence in the course of time - trough of the continuing activity and maintaining the level achieved by Karelian people. In time, there shall be financial investments just to the area which has been achieved the level which comes close to European Union, because it has more infrastructural power than others have at present. Without the large cooperation - there might not be any chance to maintain the work of the project, or assure that there is any progress taken place. In addition to this, there ought to be an evaluation concerning the results achieved, and predicted. When evaluating the results achieved there must be an emphasis of nature orientation, as well as the dimension of the social and cultural refreshment - etc. Hence, we can clearly see that there can be different interests, and we ought to avoid any colonialism, or superior attitude alike. All of this is demanding some professional, which is wider, and socially oriented - which an ability the project doesn't have. The project should be connected to other projects, which are oriented to Karelia, or its related areas. Financial participants might demand too much that only their interests must be taken in consideration, and an organization, or another, may demand that the project is a part of its own, and only appropriate program, or project. There ought to be a drifting to the type of aid, which is maintained in UN at the moment - that the aid, which is given, must be realized by the people of target area, and not by the professionals, which has been sent to those areas. Let us remind that demand of positive intensives by EU, which we have discussed at an earlier stage when dealing with the background information - which must be taken in consideration, too, which says that there must be an increase of the human rights, and alike. These intensives must be taken in consideration - especially when making appraisals to European Union for a fund. These things ought to be taken to the wider consideration, too, but there should be remembered that the whole nature of the project could change, when concentrating to these things too much, and some of the interest groups could loose their interests, and some other groups could appear instead. An appraisal is a product of those varying interests, and any appraisal is unique in that sense - and as false, too.

PROPOSAL INFORMATION AND SCHEDULE

1. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL DATA

[According to the terminology of European Union R&D Programmes]

1.a) GENERAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION

The coordinator of the project [at the moment] is **Timo Kinnunen**. The project is going to study, and advance the technological, pedagogical, and social means in in Republic of Karelia. At the very preparatory stage, **Timo Kinnunen** has visited in Sortavala, and has made a brief evaluation concerning

the instant needs of the art of printing, as well as the need of ADP-technology in Sortavala.

I have written a short Finnish report concerning that journey named "VÄRNI JA SORTAVALA GO-GO", which expresses with most languages pretty well the very essence, and heart of that story. Of course, there are another possibilities, to where during the project to establish the necessary machinery, and one of the possibilities is to join the whole project to another projects.

More general aim, which the project has, is to improve cooperation in that field between European Union and Republic of Karelia. More Special aim is to map the instant needs, by which to improve such things as telecommunication, which is one of the prerequisites of the larger use of computers e.g. in education. Quite close to this comes the connections to the organizations, which have the similar aims, and activities - and resources. The project is interactively trying to find out how much there is left the live and usable infrastructure, as well as active people, who were capable to advance higher technology in Sortavala. We should help them to produce themselves new materials to their schools, and for another purposes. Legal questions must be evaluated carefully before any more sophisticated actions taken. Far close to this comes the question concerning the own contribution of Karelian people, and how fast they can get money for the purposes of the project of their own side immediately, or using their official, and political machinery. One of the questions to be evaluated is that how fast we can give appropriate education to Karelian people - concerning the theme, and Finland, and its hi-tech. Very close to this comes the question of the institute which shall give that education. But the most important question is, however, which are those areas, and local resources, which must be developed first, and what are other interest groups. This, in turn, associates to human networks, and avoiding overlapping.

1.b) INDIVIDUAL PARTNER INFORMATION

Participant Status

Coordinator: Timo Kinnunen

Partners

-Open

ESTIMATED BREAKDOWN OF COSTS/ DIRECT COSTS

1. Cost of labour

A. Annual/monthly salary (includes holiday pay)

B. Wages

C. One time payment

D. Remuneration

E. Emalumenet

F. Commission

G. Scholarship

H. Bonus

I. Fee

J. Holiday allowance

K. Illness and accidents (reservation)

L. Pay-raise (reservation)

M. Social charge

N. Pension contribution

P. Insurances

(A+P)=

2. Appliances/ instruments

Q. Appliances and instruments to be bought

R. Expenses

$(Q+R)=$

3. Other Costs

S. Business trips

T. ADP-costs

U. Materials

V. Services to be bought

X. Other

$(S+X)=$

Direct costs (1-3)

INDIRECT COSTS

4. General cost (20% of indirect cost)

5. Space allocation- and capital outlay (10% of indirect cost)

PRIME COSTS (1-5)

6. Varying marketing expenses

MARKET COSTS (1-6)

7. Value-added tax (22% of previous)

THE PRICE OF THE PROJECT (1-7)

BASIS OF COST CALCULATION

Full cost -principle (50%)

or

Additional (marginal) cost -principle (100%)

COST SHARING: max 50% of the total costs

2. PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

2.a) SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL CONTENT

Evaluation
Negotiation

Costs of the project are:
Accounting rules and systems are:

Running of the project

The project is reporting in the middle of the project, but also when completing the project, there shall be given a final report to all the financing participants, as well as to Finnish and Karelian cooperating participants. The reporting languages are Russian, English, and Finnish.

Costs of the reporting are:

Completion of the Project

When evaluating the work done - after it has been finished, the project can use some equipments of economy, but for the purpose of evaluation we can take in advance some psychological and sociological aspects, too, using some questionnaires - if available.

Consolidated costs are:

Final payment is:

2.b.) PARTICIPANT ROLES AND QUALIFICATIONS

Subcontractor

Some possible financial participants (Also resources):

FINNIDA FINFUND
UN: UNICEF UNESCO UNDP
European Union

Plan for a year

The Project of Bilateral and Transnational Cooperation Between the Republic of Karelia, Finland, and European Union concerning the Art of Printing Technology Transfer, and Advancing Publishing Activities

Time-schedule for the first year

The 1th quarter of the year

A division of labour, the main goal, and the pre-evaluation of project, deciding how to get running costs for the first stage of the work. An active scouting of different participants available.

1. The choosing of coordinator of the project, his partners, and participant roles and qualifications and their roles. The most important task is to choose the coordinator who can become accepted with active participants, as well as with monetary, and other participants.
2. The pre-evaluation of the whole project. After making pre-evaluation, there must be continuous additional evaluations during the whole process.
3. An active scouting of new participants, and personal networks available using personal relationships, whatever. They must be willing to cooperate, too, and their work must support the project. After getting them the members of the project can make agreements to be accepted or rejected by the whole project, and then making necessary conclusions and contracts - especially with Karelian administration.
4. Deciding how to get running costs for the first stage of the work.

5. Questions concerning rights:
 - 5.1. Deciding the questions concerning proprietary right.
 - 5.2. Deciding the owner of copyright.
 - 5.3. Patent
 - 5.4. Deciding the questions of usufructuary rights.
6. Other questions:

The 2th quarter of the year

1. If it seems possible to finance the project by The republic of Karelia, or the other participants which have joined to the project, there is need to make appraisal to them for financing. But if there are not those kind of participants consulted with, is should be chosen an appropriate target, to which to address a tailored appraisal. Anyway, there must be taken in consideration:

- 1.1. Cost Sharing
- 1.2. Forms of Support
- 1.3. Estimated Breakdown of Costs
- 1.4. Basis of Cost Calculation
2. Posting appraisals.

The 3th quarter of the year

The 4th quarter of the year

... *Continuing the project*