

# The renewal of the rural cultural heritage of the Czech Republic with the support of regional policy

## *Obnova kulturního dědictví venkova České republiky s podporou regionální politiky*

H. HUDEČKOVÁ, A. ŠEVČÍKOVÁ

*Czech University of Life Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic*

**Abstract:** The paper focuses on rural immovable cultural heritage as a part of the infrastructure for certain forms of tourism. Using the secondary analysis method, it compares data about the support of rural cultural heritage in the pre-accession period (2002) and after the Czech Republic joined the EU (2004–2006). Conclusions include a broader issue of animation of cultural heritage for the purpose of rural development.

**Key words:** cultural heritage, countryside, regional policy, animation

**Abstrakt:** Příspěvek zaměřuje pozornost k venkovskému nemovitému kulturnímu dědictví jako nezbytné součásti infrastruktury pro určité formy cestovního ruchu. Metodou sekundární analýzy bilancuje data o podpoře venkovského kulturního dědictví v předvstupním období (2002) a v období po vstupu ČR do EU (2004–2006). Závěry se věnují i širší problematice animace kulturních památek pro rozvoj venkovských lokalit.

**Klíčová slova:** kulturní dědictví, venkov, regionální politika, animace

This paper deals with the issue of renewing cultural sights and cultural monuments considered as a part of cultural heritage in rural areas. These sights and monuments were reconstructed using the pre-accession and structural funds related to the EU regional policy. Since the paper's extent does not allow to cover this topic entirely, we are going to select a part of it, which includes immovable cultural sights and monuments.

Immovable cultural sights and monuments are treated in their broad sense as things that are related to significant persons, cultural and historical events, and also as assets, which illustrate historical development of the society, its art, technology, science and other field of human work and life (Mráz, Trojan 1990). Hence the focus is not on the commonly used definition, which refers to the preserved historical milieu of settlement areas and sets of architecture (Mráz, Trojan 1990). The above-mentioned broader definition conveys better with the focus on rural

areas. The intangible cultural heritage is defined by the following typical features:

- dense and regular network of settlements with relatively preserved assets of tangible (material) culture
- cultural landscape with a number of small sacral buildings (i.e. small sacral architecture, such as chapels, reconciliation crosses, columns of crucifixion, devotional pillars, belfries, and others)
- dominants of rural settlements, such as churches, less frequently also castles, manor houses and monasteries.

Later on we will see that that current use of financial sources within structural policy is related to the renewal of those sights. Since the interest of this paper is in the renewal of immovable cultural sights and monuments based on the utilization of these sources, we will look at this issue with regard to tourism, respectively to the way how the backgrounds of tourism related to cultural development

are activated through their “revival”, which should enable to fructify its endogenous potential<sup>1</sup>.

## GOALS AND METHODS

The text will show that the means of regional policy, which are used for the renewal of immovable cultural sights and monuments in rural areas, a great importance, if we compare them with the means that originate from specific grant programme of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic, which is specially tailored to the maintenance of rural cultural heritage<sup>2</sup>. At the end, we will evaluate if in the new period (2007–2013) a shift in rural cultural heritage maintenance within the frame of regional policy of the Czech Republic with regard to the EU regional policy can be expected.

The choice of the research approach and research procedures is based on the topic in question and the goals of this paper. Above all, it applies secondary analysis of the available data about means, which were used for renewal of cultural sights and monuments in the previous programme period (2000–2006). Supplementary to this approach, we will conduct a content analysis of important documents within the studied topic, namely the National Development Plans for the previous (2004–2006) and starting (2007–2013) period. Their comparison will enable us to consider a potential change in the importance which was and is given to the renewal of cultural heritage of the countryside. It will also enable us to consider whether this endogenous potential of rural development in the form of “cultural infrastructure” is related only to tourism industry, or whether there are also offered other ways us using the regional policy support for renewal of rural immovable cultural sights.

Since we are not going to deal with a detailed list of the mentioned immovable cultural rural sights and monuments in the analytical part of the paper, nor are we going to analyze their various functions in terms of their animation, we will set out these monuments and their animation activities in this methodical section<sup>3</sup>.

Use (revival, animation) of the properties of rural monuments can be:

- sacral (liturgical)
- profane (civic, civil)
  - for living and stays – permanent (private), recreational (individual or group) including healing and health (wellness) programmes
  - for hospitality – hotels, restaurants, wine shops, coffee bars, tea houses
  - for sport entertainment – bowling, sport fields, dance halls, tourist trails with marked objects and information about them
  - for representation and promotion – representative halls, conference halls, exhibition halls, information centers for visitors
  - for cultural events – public cultural events, concerts, galleries, studies (artistic, musical and others)
  - for practical educational purposes – illustrative workshops with educational programmes about traditional production, traditional preparation of food and drinks with recipes, stables and fields
  - for education – museums, libraries and study halls and depositories etc.<sup>4</sup>

The ways of animation shall be done cautiously, with respect to the given properties, their history and character. They depend on animators, persons (natural and legal persons) and their willingness to initiate and cooperate in terms of revival of rural cultural sights

---

<sup>1</sup> Revival, which has got a synonym *animation*, is not strictly defined. These words mean the return of the sights and monuments to the life of local society with new or “like-new” function. The accompanying goal of this process is to increase attractiveness of the particular property for visitors, tourists. This definition of animation is mostly related to property (in our case rural immovable cultural sights and monuments), but it stresses the functions for the development of locality and society. It overlaps with the approach, which is regularly used in terms of tourism industry. This definition is related to tourists and its principle is the stimulation and organization of their entertainment during their stay in tourism facilities. As such, the animation is considered an additional part of tourism industry (reworded according to Pásková, Zelenka 2002)

<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that in case of the Czech Ministry of Culture grants and financial supports the aim at what is literary the care of historical monuments and monuments preservation; it means they are strictly targeted on entities and properties, which are claimed as rural cultural heritage reservation (rural sites and monuments reserves), zones and landscape heritage reservations.

<sup>3</sup> From this viewpoint, we exclude the previously mentioned entities that are labeled and listed as rural heritage reservation, zones and landscape heritage zones. Some of the properties of tangible cultural type, the so-called rural exterior, may be titled and listed as national cultural sights.

<sup>4</sup> This list is not complete as well as Table 1.

Table 1. Types of rural monuments

Large architectures, buildings and grounds		Other architectures, buildings and grounds	
Sacral	Profane	Sacral	Profane
Churches	Castles	Small sacral architecture	Schools
Monasteries	Castle courts	(chapels, columns of	Town Halls
Monastery courts (yards)	Castle parks, castle gardens	crucification, devotional	Post Offices
Cemeteries	Riding-Halls	pillars, belfries,	Farmsteads and farm
Large chapels	Large Farmsteads (Manor	reconciliation crosses)	buildings (production and
Tombs	Houses) and Courts	Parish buildings	technological architecture
	View-towers		on farms – such as cellars,
	Village centers		stables, granges, granaries,
	Technological buildings and		barns, oil houses, oats
	facilities (such as mills, iron-		house, beehives)
	mills, metallurgical works,		Other buildings production
	mines, lime works, sand pits,		and technological
	bridges, sugar-beet refineries,		architecture such as
	distilleries, fortresses, storing		workshops (weavery,
	buildings, baking houses,		potteries, woodcuttery,
	printing works, glass works,		smithery and others), pubs
	tanning works, stationary		or firehouses
	works)		Houses where important
			persons used to live

Note: This list is not complete, some architectures, buildings and grounds cannot be unambiguously put among large or others.

Source: Authors' own compilation

and monuments. Sensitive question of these activities is often not only of financial and material nature, but also of human potential. The high level of the last one is needed for the quality and neat practice of these activities and functions of these properties.

## RESULTS

At the beginning, the projects of reconstruction of rural immovable cultural heritage supported within a frame of regional policy in period 2002–2006 will be discussed based on the analysis of sources allocated to them. In the so-called pre-accession period, the renewal of rural<sup>5</sup> immovable cultural sights and monuments was being supported mainly with the programme SAPARD, particularly the projects under the measure 2.1 “Renewal and development of villages and rural infrastructure”, respectively sub-measure 2.1. The projects listed in Table 2 have been accepted in the year 2002.

Despite that some projects involve town properties (38% of projects), all of them are related to regional centers of rural (not urban) regions. The total sum 112 333 672 CZK has been therefore allocated to support of rural cultural heritage in the Czech Republic, although only in about half of the cases (57%) the sites and monuments are situated directly in rural municipalities. The supported properties mostly include castles and their campuses and important administrative or living building (houses). There are rarely included projects focusing on green grounds, central parts of villages and sacral architecture. Official documents do not tell much about the ways of animation of the reconstructed objects. At the first glance, it is obvious only when looking at building of museum, sport hall, skittle ground and center of education. One can only estimate that the prevailing way of animation is linked with tourism rather than with direct use of local inhabitants.

Another source was the PHARE CBC programme. In terms of this programme, there was paid out about

<sup>5</sup> Countryside is delineated in accord with the EUROSTAT methods with respect to rural municipalities (i.e. with the density lower than 100 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>) and rural regions (i.e. location with 15% or more inhabitants living in rural settlements). According to the Consultation Document “Countryside”, it means that rural regions make up 80% of (original) districts of the Czech Republic (Konzultační dokument “Venkov”).

43 million CZK for a reconstruction of the Castle Kynžvart and monastery church in Kladruba at Stříbro. Both of these properties are monuments of rural origin.

After joining the EU, respectively in the years 2004–2006, the renewal of rural immovable cultural sights and monuments was implemented under the SROP (Joint Regional Operational Programme), within priority 4 “Development of tourist industry” and the corresponding measure 4.2 “Development of infrastructure for tourist industry”, divided into sub-measure focusing on projects of infrastructure of super- and regional (including local) importance.

Out of all (31) projects, supported from the SROP, there are 9 projects (29%) with the overall sum of 88 283 954 CZK which were implemented directly in rural settlements. The remaining 22 projects have been implemented in towns (with overall sum 314 923 302 CZK), whereas 17 towns are located in rural regions (55 % of all projects with the sum 219 982 072 CZK) and 5 towns in urban regions (16% of projects with a sum 94 941 230 CZK, which are not included in the table. It means that there was directed 22% of the overall financial support to rural municipalities, and 76% to rural regions (towns and rural settlements in rural regions) for the renewal of cultural heritage.

Table 2. List of projects funded by grants from the SAPARD programme for the renewal of rural cultural heritage

Applicant	Name of the project	Registered	Financial support from the EU (CZK)
Municipality Nový Jáchymov	Renewal of cultural sight – Municipal House nr. 1	01.11. 2002	3 712 425
Association of municipalities “CHOPOS”	Rehabilitation of small sacral properties and establishing a museum	05.11. 2002	3 471 741
Municipality Chanovice	Sport hall Chanovice – castle ground	13.05. 2002	3 675 000
Municipality Stříbro	Revitalization of gardens under the then minorite monastery	06.11. 2002	3 705 086
Municipality Kaplice	Renewal of cultural sight nr. 101 in Kaplice	12.12. 2002	4 250 000
Municipality Jevíčko	Renewal of castle in Jevíčko, center of education in Haná	30.04. 2002	2 091 848
Municipality Hamr na Jezeře	Hamr na Jezeře – reconstruction of historical building	02.05. 2002	3 120 186
Municipality Holovousy	The return of Holovousy Malináci – complete reconstruction of the village center	30.10. 2002	3 719 625
Municipality Knínice	Reconstruction of church and skittle ground as a part of the revitalization of the village center	04.11. 2002	2 573 085
Town Brtnice	Reconstruction of ‘Hoffman’s House	06.05. 2002	2 982 856
Municipality Kněžice	Reconstruction and finishing works of the castle Kněžice	07.05. 2002	10 497 747
Town Třešť	Reconstruction of the house of professor Schumpeter	09.05. 2002	8 121 629
Town Brtnice	Reconstruction of the culture-heritage protected renaissance town hall in Brtnice	09.05. 2002	9 120 984
Municipality Kaliště	Finishing of a birth-house of Gustav Mahler	24.10. 2002	7 462 500
Municipality Doloplazy	Castle Doloplazy – renewal and reconstruction of buildings	30.10. 2002	759 460
Municipality Drahanice	Renewal and revival of the Black Tower in Drahanovice	17.10. 2002	6 159 846
Municipality Ostravice	Reconstruction and additional building of the fire house in Ostravice	29.10. 2002	2 298 766
Town Albrechtice	Reconstruction of the castle campus in Linhartovy	29.04. 2002	3 203 533
Municipality Kunín	Castle Kunín – entrance gate to Poodří	03.05. 2002	10 160 409
Town Vimperk	Regeneration of the town park in Vimperk	13.05. 2002	19 422 837

Source: Analysis based on sources of the State Agricultural Intervention Fund (SZIF)

More than ¾ of the total sum of funds from the SROP programme was addressed to rural areas.

The funds from the SROP exceeded more than 2.5 times the means from the SAPARD (and about 7 times the means from the PHARE CBC, which were however limited to near-border areas). The structure of the supported projects was in the case of the SROP more variable. They included castles and their campuses,

important houses (administrative and dwelling buildings), sacral architecture, green grounds and central places of villages, construction or reconstruction of historical journeys and trails, visitors' centers, production houses and facilities. Regarding the animation, they include the educational functions, sport activities, cultural and representative (promotional), but also social in narrow sense (protected work shops) and

Table 3. List of the supported projects from the SROP (only rural sights and monuments are indicated here)

Name of the project	Financial support from the EU (CZK)
Renewal of cultural sight – Vlašim park	5 587 889
Reconstruction of the Church Nanebevzetí Panny Marie in Kynšperk	10 316 661
Municipality Náměštl na Hané – Renewal of the Castle campus, sights of a regional importance	24 737 369
Museum Horní Smržov	4 570 582
Reconstruction of the Castle brewery in Litomyšl	28 213 452
Archeopark Chotěbuz	6 968 198
Reconstruction of the Church of St. František in Fulnek	14 277 326
Development and revival of the tourist trail "Through the Landscape of Battle at Kolín"	4 260 358
Protected workshops at the House of st. Josef (Červený Kostelec)	9 407 481
Přizámčí – school center of folk creativity and crafts	7 977 600
Visitors center of timbering on Modrava	5 959 300
Reconstruction and renewal of the Museum in Frenštát pod Radhoštěm	18 720 714
Birth house of Johann Gregor Mendel – visitors center of rural region Moravian Kravaňsko	19 015 975
Development of the Regional museum Kopřivnice – building of expositions of history of Kopřivnice, craft traditions and cultural heritage of significant persons – Zdeněk Burian and Emil Zátpek	15 149 475
Reconstruction of the castle loggia in Vyškov	4 043 250
Renewal and new use of the Strakonice castle for the development of tourism industry in the Strakonice region	14 004 000
National museum of photography – Jindřichův Hradec	10 394 169
Building of entrance objects to the grounds of the Exposition of Folk Architecture in Chanovice	4 495 728
Up to the Potštejn Castle	3 577 483
Žirovnice – regeneration of the castle grange	6 712 842
Regeneration of the urban cultural heritage reserve Žatec for the development of tourist industry – Stage I – Archway	6 572 558
Reconstruction and building of the museum and gallery in the Bauer's villa house of architect Josef Golčár (Libořice, Kolín District)	14 698 960
Reconstruction of the eastern wing of the Pavlínin dvůr campus in Šumperk	8 823 529
Middle-age sights – Castle Úsov, renewal of the old school and historical paths	8 509 172
Reconstruction of the administrative building – NKP Cistercian monastery in Vyšší Brod – Stage II	1 475 284
Renewal of the culture protected objects for the purpose of development of tourism in the Třebíč region	49 796 670

Source: Analysis is based on sources of the Ministry for Regional Development

practical-educational and creative functions (school of fold creativity and crafts).

## DISCUSSION

Previous analysis enables **the comparison of documented sources for renewal of rural cultural immovable sights and monuments provided through the regional policy framework with the means provided within of cultural policy framework**. If we sum up all of the stated means, which have been in the frame of the regional policy given to renewal of rural immovable cultural sights and monuments, we get a sum of 463 799 696 CZK. Regarding the cultural policy of the state, in the same period there was available a special grant title of the Ministry of Culture "Program of the maintenance of rural cultural heritage reservation, rural cultural heritage zones." It was founded in 1997 and its development shows a slight rise (1997: 15 million CZK, 1998: 20 million CZK, 1999: 17 million CZK, 2000: 15 million CZK, 2001: 13 million CZK, 2002: 15 million CZK, 2003: 20 million CZK, 2004: 19 million CZK, 2005: 18 million CZK; in total = 152 million CZK). Some funds were flowing from other grant titles of the Ministry of Culture (e.g. the Program "Rescue of architectural heritage", or from the "Emergency Roof Programme"), but their scope is negligible to the needs of this paper and its comparison (Výroční zprávy MK ČR).

Comparing the above mentioned numbers from the programmes implemented under regional policy and under the programmes within cultural policy, one can see that the means from the sources of regional policy were three times higher. Considering the bad shape of many objects and properties, there is no doubt about a significant contribution of regional policy for the rescue and renewal of rural immovable cultural sights.

We have argued that regional policy has so far focused its documents, with respect to renewal of the immovable cultural heritage in the countryside, solely on usage of these properties as a necessary part of infrastructure for tourist industry. Then there arise the following questions to discuss:

1. Is the renewal of these properties done cautiously with regard to technological and esthetic issues, i.e. with respect to architecture style and taste?
2. Is the revival and animation and equipment with new functions of these objects respectful to their history and local traditions?
3. Is the animation using well the potential, which exists in the given locality and what reserves can be found in it?

Answers to these questions are still to be found. Discussion of this topic has so far showed unambiguous hypothetical arguments:

1. There occur frequently confrontations of administrative bodies of sight and monuments maintenance and bodies of landscape protection. Sometimes they are justifiable, sometimes not.
2. Cases of sensitive as well as insensitive acts towards the studied properties are often appearing.
3. At the same time we can find neat as well as not neat examples of revival, with regard to the events, which are within the animation of cultural heritage offered.
4. In terms of the animations, there are possible less finance-demanding solutions, related to local potential.

Each of these preliminary answers can be elaborated into more analytical questions, which may become internal hypotheses for empirical research on the given topic. That is also why they will be further studied under the institutional research grant "*Ekonomika zdrojů českého zemědělství a jejich efektivní využívání v rámci multifunkčních zemědělskopotravinářských systémů*" (Economics of the resources of the Czech agriculture and their effective use in the frame of multifunctional agro-food systems). The grant which was also used to write this paper is funded by the Czech Ministry of Education under the number MSM 6046070906. Due to its agriculture oriented nature, the future analysis will also focus on farming sites and monuments which are almost not represented in the project listed above. Also the farming-oriented animation activities will be studied. The fact of low representation of agriculture in the supported projects might indicate the separation between regional policy and the Common Agricultural Policy in the Czech case.

## CONCLUSIONS

Documents that are dealing with regional development, respectively with activating its cultural potential usually do not distinguish between rural and urban regions. If we analyze these documents, going from general to more specific ones, we are finding out:

1. Act Nr. 248/2000 Coll. On Regional Development Support mentions the focus of this support also on cultural development including cultural sights and monuments maintenance, but with the condition of creating labor opportunities (Zákon č. 248/2000 Sb. o podpoře regionálního rozvoje)
2. The Strategy of Regional Development of the Czech Republic from 2000 that is based on this act includes

- argument, which says that culture in regions is threatened by increasing deficit in financing cultural facilities and maintenance of cultural sights and monuments. That is why it in the strategic measure No. 1.3, turns to development of tourist infrastructure and products of tourism industry in relation with the specificity of regions and their cultural and natural heritage. There is added the development activity (sub-measure 1.3.3) about the protection and development of unique historical, cultural and natural values and healing sources in regions (Strategie regionálního rozvoje České republiky 2000).
3. The National Development Plan 2004–2006, respectively a part of the SROP (Joint Regional Operational Programme) sets out among priorities that would be supported from structural funds of the EU in terms of the Objective 1 (Support to regions that are lagging behind) also development of tourism and spa industry focusing on the active use of historical and natural wealth of regions (Národní rozvojový plán ČR 2004–2006).
  4. The Conception of State Policy for Tourism of the Czech Republic until the year 2006 put among opportunities in the SWOT analysis increasing demand for the new products of tourism and names cultural tourism and use of technological sights and monuments. Among threats, there is included the underestimation of maintenance of cultural and technological sights that could be used for tourism. Among the objectives, there appeared effective utilization and protection of cultural and historical potential for tourism and one of the measurements also deals with the support of creation and realization of tourist products focused mainly on educational tourism (Konceptce státní politiky cestovního ruchu v ČR do roku 2006 /2004/).
  5. The Conception of More Efficient Care about Traditional Folk Culture of the Czech Republic is focused on intangible cultural heritage. This heritage is strongly tied with the countryside and the animation of rural immovable cultural heritage can be linked with renewal of rural traditions, such as showing crafts, celebrating feasts, customs, ceremonies, markets and various holidays (Konceptce účinnější péče o tradiční lidovou kulturu v České republice 2003).
  6. The Regional Development Strategy 2007–2013 sets out the priority field Culture, which also includes the priority Preservation and use of cultural heritage. In terms of this priority, there are supported project not only for renewal and reconstruction of culture-heritage funds, but also projects enhancing attractiveness and use of culture-heritage objects.
- The document is therefore specifically aware of the animation (Strategie regionálního rozvoje České republiky 2006).
7. The National Development Plan of the Czech Republic 2007–2013 goes on in this direction in relating development of cultural potential of regions, including rural regions, with tourism industry, but it is not limited only to such orientation as documented by:
    - a. The Integrated Operational Programme (IOP) is focused on realization of national and transnational projects for development of tourism industry. Activating cultural development sources is a part of the 2<sup>nd</sup> specific goal of this programme.
    - b. Although the Regional Operational Programmes (ROP) do not relate the development of culture directly with tourism, one of their specific goals pays attention to cultural development as one of the conditions for improving quality life of local inhabitants.
    - c. Operation programmes of cross-border cooperation, developed for border regions participating in these programmes, include development of culture in relation with tourism, but also with other areas, such as development of local societies in near-border regions, with development of human resources, with social and cultural development and cooperation, and with social interaction (Národní rozvojový plán 2007–2013).
- The main source for financing the activities of renewing immovable cultural sights and monuments in the terms of regional policy in the period 2007–2013 is the European Fund for Regional Development. In selected cases it could also become the European Social Fund. The comparative content analysis of the National Development Plan 2007–2013 implies that in the previous (2004–2006) and current period, the field for the development of cultural potential of countryside is increasing.
- It has been already said that answers to the questions stated in discussion will be investigated within a research project (MSM 6046070906). The goal of this paper was to introduce only one part of this problem, selected for the purpose of solution – the need of development of immovable cultural heritage of the countryside, threatened by desolation. That is why basic sources that are being used for this purpose in the term of regional and also cultural policy had been analyzed and compared. We have also demonstrated that in the period 2007–2013, there is a widening field of potential support dedicated to the occasions even without tourism industry.

If considering the maintenance of rural cultural heritage from a wider perspective, which includes not only tangible, but also intangible form, it is important to mention the following tendencies:

- since the 1970s, there is obvious revived interest in rural areas (for instance due to summerhouses, re-appearing of rustic style of architecture, household equipment, eventually other elements of life style);
- since the 1990s, one can observe in tourism industry in the Czech Republic a demand for new forms of tourism, which would also include rural space; this form of tourism is called cultural educational tourism;
- this kind of tourism does not put together only interest and activities of getting to know regional natural and cultural interesting places, traditions, sights and monuments, but also the so-called creative activities (in our case, the important are especially the events, which enable people to learn about folk products and crafts, preparation of rural regional special food etc.);
- since the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there is discussed sight and monuments maintenance, at the same time there is growing discussion about the so-called conservation paradigm, which asks for strict conservation of sights or monuments and often refuses animation activities.

Since nowadays probably nobody challenges the integrated endogenous approach to rural development, it seems that it is quite important in the field of cultural potential to put the questions of tangible (embodied in architecture, buildings and grounds) together with intangible (embodied in traditions, customs, holidays, crafts, artifacts and creations) cultural heritage and with the use of this potential for current development, either by mediation in the frame of tourism industry, or directly through the offer of labour and free-time activities for local inhabitants.

## REFERENCES

Mráz N., Trojan R. (1990): Malý slovník výtvarného umění (Small dictionary of art). SNP, Praha.

Konzultační dokument – „venkov“ (Consultation document “The Countryside”) (2006). [Quoted 18.10.2006]. Available at [www.mmr.cz/cz/regional/venkov.html](http://www.mmr.cz/cz/regional/venkov.html)

Koncepce státní politiky cestovního ruchu v ČR do roku 2006 (Conception of State Policy for Tourism of the Czech Republic until the year 2006). [Quoted 20.4.2007]. Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj, Praha. Available at [www.mmr.cz/index.php?show=001027001000](http://www.mmr.cz/index.php?show=001027001000)

Koncepce účinnější péče o tradiční lidovou kulturu v České republice (Conception of More Efficient Care about Traditional Folk Culture of the Czech Republic) (2003). Usnesení č. 571/2003 (červen), Ministerstvo kultury České republiky, Praha.

Národní rozvojový plán 2004–2006 (National Development Plan of the Czech Republic 2004–2006). [Quoted 8.5.2007]. Available at [www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/rps/narodni-rozvojovy-plan-2004-2006](http://www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/rps/narodni-rozvojovy-plan-2004-2006)

Národní rozvojový plán 2007–2013 (National Development Plan of the Czech Republic 2007–2013). [Quoted 8.5.2007], available at [www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/regionalni-politika/narodni-rozvojovy-plan-ceske-republiky-2007-2013-prvni-pracovni-navrh](http://www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/regionalni-politika/narodni-rozvojovy-plan-ceske-republiky-2007-2013-prvni-pracovni-navrh)

Pásková M., Zelenka J. (2002): Cestovní ruch, výkladový slovník (Tourism, dictionary of terms). MMR, Praha.

Strategie regionálního rozvoje České republiky 2000 (Strategy of Regional Development of the Czech Republic). Usnesení č. 682/2000 (červenec 2000), Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj, Praha.

Strategie regionálního rozvoje České republiky 2006 (Strategy of Regional Development of the Czech Republic). Usnesení č. 682/2000 (červenec 2000), Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj, Praha.

Výroční zprávy MK ČR 1997–2005 (Annual Reports of Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic). Ministerstvo kultury ČR, Praha.

Zákon č. 248/2000 Sb. o podpoře regionálního rozvoje (Act on the Support of regional development) (2000). Praha.

Arrived on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2007

---

Contact address:

Helena Hudečková, Adéla Ševčíková, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Kamýcká 129, 165 21 Prague 6-Suchbát, Czech Republic; e-mail: [sevcikova@pef.czu.cz](mailto:sevcikova@pef.czu.cz)

---