

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Agnė Vaitkuvienė

PROCESSES OF PATRIMONIALISATION IN SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET
LITHUANIA

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, History (05H)

Vilnius, 2010

Doctoral dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University in 2003–2010.

The doctoral dissertation is defended as an external work.

Research Consultant

Prof. Dr. Dovid Katz (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

The dissertation is being defended at the Council of Scientific Field of History at Vilnius University:

Chairman

Prof. Dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

Members:

Dr. Rasa Čepaitienė (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

Assoc. prof. dr. Irena Vaišvilaitė (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, Art Studies – 03H).

Dr. Dangiras Mačiulis (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

Assoc. prof. dr. Nerijus Šepetys (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

Opponents:

Prof. dr. Jonas Rimantas Glemža (Vilnius Academy of Arts, Humanitarian Sciences, Art Studies – 03H).

Dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

The dissertation will be defended at the public meeting of the Council of Scientific Field of History in the auditorium no. 330 at the Faculty of History of Vilnius University at 3 p. m. on 29 October 2010.

Address: Universiteto 7, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was distributed on ____ September 2010.

A copy of the doctoral dissertation is available for review at the Library of Vilnius University.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Agnė Vaitkuvienė

KULTŪROS PALIKIMO ĮPAVELDINIMO PROCESAI SOVIETINĖJE IR
POSOVIETINĖJE LIETUVOJE

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05H)

Vilnius, 2010

Disertacija rengta 2003 – 2010 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Disertacija ginama eksternu.

Mokslinis konsultantas:

Prof. dr. Dovid Katz (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas

Prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Nariai:

Dr. Rasa Čepaitienė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Doc. dr. Irena Vaišvilaitė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – 03H).

Dr. Dangiras Mačiulis (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Doc. dr. Nerijus Šepetys (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Oponentai:

Prof. dr. Jonas Rimantas Glemža (Vilniaus dailės akademija, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – 03H).

Dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Disertacija bus ginama viešame istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2010 m. spalio mėn. 29 d. 15 val. Istorijos fakulteto 330 auditorijoje Vilniaus Universitete.

Adresas: Universiteto 7, LT – 01513, Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2010 m. rugsėjo mėn. __ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

The main data about the dissertation

1. Research problem and relevance of the study.

Assumptions for the present research occurred after looking at the list of cultural monuments of LSSR. Even without a more thorough analysis, after viewing state-protected monuments provided in the list, the striking thing was a large number of objects of aristocratic culture and church heritage that was regarded as “non-advanced” during the Soviet period. How can this happen in the country that was managed by the Soviet ideology at the very “bloom of mature socialism”? Not valued by the Soviet ideology and even considered as harmful to the interests of the creators of communism, heritage might be recognised by the experts of heritage protection and included into the lists of protected monuments. What values were envisaged by heritage assessors in these monuments and how were those values actualised by recording them in the lists? There is still no exhaustive answer to the above questions.

Another problem related to heritage protection of the Soviet period is the issue of the ‘endurance’ of the ‘iron curtain’ during the Soviet times. How could possibilities of heritage protection experts in Soviet Lithuania to participate in the activities of international heritage protection organisations be assessed? Maybe, contrary to other sciences related to the evaluation of the past, the ‘iron curtain’ was not blind to the Soviet heritage protection? In the Western heritage protection of the second half of the 20th century, new trends emerged, i.e. national interest which had prevailed in heritage protection by then was started to be replaced with international cooperation. UNESCO, ICOMOS and other organisations encouraged international cooperation of heritage protection experts and searched for common principles of monument protection that were promoted in the approved international documents of heritage protection. Whereas behind the ‘iron curtain’, in the Soviet Union in the second half of the 20th century, mature socialism was declared, the great consideration of culture was celebrated by the soviets and achievements of the Soviet heritage protection were praised. Were these processes really isolated? Maybe the Soviet heritage protection was developing if not together with, but at least in parallel with the Western heritage protection? Is it possible to trace any qualitative leap of heritage protection after the fall of the ‘iron curtain’, or was the practice that had developed during the Soviet period just continued? When did

the changes in post-soviet Lithuanian heritage protection take place and who managed them? Were those processes determined “from above”, i.e. by the experts of heritage protection, or "from underneath", i.e. by the initiatives of lay people?

The issues of patrimonialisation are still relevant in today's heritage protection. Over 20 years have already passed since Lithuania regained its independence, yet the state system of heritage protection still cannot find constant and proper ways of cultural heritage assessment and protection. Heritage assessment is still dissociated from the society; state heritage protection experts are the only competent assessors who are increasingly less trusted. The concerned society seeks to represent their interest by developing opposition structures, such as the Alternative Commission of Cultural Heritage and thus to express their attitude towards the state heritage protection.

Another important aspect of the relevance of the research is the currently changed attitude towards the Soviet inheritance. After the fervour of the destroyers of Soviet relicts of Sajūdis movement and the beginning of restored independence had faded out, the objects of the Soviet period were started to be included into the lists of protected cultural values. The changes are clearly expressed in the changed topic of the Grūtas Park Soviet sculpture exposition. While the foundation of the park and the beginning of its life at the end of the last decade of the 20th century was followed by resentment against the very idea of storing and exhibiting Soviet inheritance, in the years 2006-2007, the questions of copyright of the exhibited Soviet sculptures and remuneration for them were raised. Does this show just the establishment of mercantile worldview or does the approach to the Soviet heritage and at the same time to the entire heritage changes with the discovery of its new values and meanings to the identity?

In general the studies on the Soviet society in Lithuania are mainly focused on the political history and the issues of resistance; whereas heritage protection of the Soviet period is usually studied with institutional approach by concentrating on the results of practical works. The positive qualitative move in the studies of Lithuanian heritage protection at the beginning of the 21st century was made by the research of heritage conception that revealed the issue of difficulty of inheritance perception and its links to sociocultural situation. Still, the very analysis of heritage conception did not allow the detailed analysis of heritage assessment; therefore in the present research heritage

protection is viewed through a narrower and at the same time more accurate prism of heritage values.

The conception of the present research emerges from the idea that the values of heritage objects are not just “technical” solutions designed for defining and recording the relevance of heritage objects. In the studies of heritage protection, values are understood as the essential aspect of heritage, since no individual or group of people protects what it does not value. Values are assigned to heritage objects in the sociocultural context which is constantly changing. In the present paper the sociocultural context is defined as the environment, historical narratives as well as social and economical processes having impact on the perception of cultural heritage. Those are cultural, social, economical and many other reasons including personal reasons, why inheritance is evaluated and becomes heritage. Such conception of the research helps to overstep traditional technical tasks of heritage protection related to the issues of heritage protection and heritage conservation and to move to the essential problems of heritage related to the assessment of material relics and becoming heritage, at the same time raising the questions of heritage “birth”, such as: what is involved in the process of patrimonialisation and what are the criteria for selecting heritage objects?

2. Methods of the research.

Two main concepts of the present dissertation, inheritance and heritage, are already common both in scholarly literature and in heritage practice. The major difference between them is the aspect of value. Under the influence of today’s sociocultural needs, separate objects are chosen from the abundant material remains of former times to which certain values are assigned; then the objects are legitimated by social institutions and become heritage.

However, the concept of the process when inheritance becomes heritage is much more complicated. This process is usually called interpretation. Resources, i.e. inheritance: historical events, personalities, tangible relics, mythology, folklore, become heritage due to interpretation. However, the process of interpretation covers both selection of resources and their presentation. Inheritance is interpreted by turning it into heritage, and the object of heritage is interpreted once again by presenting it to the society. Therefore, in order to focus on the issue of heritage “birth”, this notion was too

extensive. In the practice of heritage protection, material remain is “turned into“ heritage in several stages: by inventorying, evaluating and by recording into the register. However, even upon keeping to all the above mentioned stages, there is only one qualitative change: material remains become (or does not become) heritage. Therefore to describe this process, a concept emphasizing namely this qualitative change and covering all stages of recording is needed. It was refused to use only the concept of “evaluation” due to emerging confusion between this concept as the stage of recording and a more general definition. Thus, to define the process of turning material remains into heritage, a relatively new concept of *patrimonialisation* (granting of heritage status) was chosen. All material remains become heritage by assigning a value to it and announcing it as protected. The passive form of this concept shows that this process is not self-contained, at the same time it reveals one of the main issues of the present research, i.e. who performs this granting of heritage status.

Choosing the assignment of value as the essential aspect of material remains patrimonialisation, the need to find tools enabling to conduct the research on value assignment emerged. Before starting the search for theoretical model of the research, the main criteria that should be met by the chosen theoretical model were emphasized. First of all, the theoretical model had to cover as wide range of values as possible, so that during the analysis of complex and often ambiguous situations of heritage assessment in the Soviet period it would be possible to uncover all motives and meanings. It was not enough to refer only to officially declared heritage assessment criteria of that time; therefore there was a search for a versatile contemporary model which could systemise all the experience of heritage assessment in the Western countries. Secondly, both in the Soviet period and in independent Lithuania, under the existence of watershed between culture and economics as incompatible areas, the model had to reflect that situation.

Methodological approaches of the research are based on the insights of the American archaeologist and researcher of cultural heritage W.D. Lipe. His model of value system demonstrated how the assessment of the relics of the past happens in different contexts (economic, aesthetic, traditional and academic). Under the influence of contexts, different values of heritage are formed and then the relics of the past are legitimated by social institutions and become objects of heritage. Lipe defined 4 types of values: economical, aesthetic, associative/symbolic and informational. Yet this model

was insufficient for the analysis of complicated situation of Lithuanian history, thus it was supplemented with heritage assessment systems of R. Mason and J. Jokilehto/B.M. Feilden. Upon synthesizing the theoretical model, the extensive classification of Mason's economical values was rejected, since basically neither during the Soviet period nor in the first decade of independent Lithuania the objects of cultural heritage participated in the market system, therefore there was no purpose to analyse it thoroughly. It was applied only at the end of the research for the analysis of the perception of heritage values. The major attention in the typology is paid to the associative/symbolic values because, contrary to informational and aesthetic values, they are most difficult to grope. Other important aspects of the research model are the direction of heritage focus on the present, the attitude of different groups of society towards relics of the past, the heritage dissonance conception and the attitude that cultural heritage is the reflection of the dominant political power.

Hence, upon the overview of theoretical heritage assessment schemes, heritage assessment typology applicable to the present research was synthesized and the major aspects were highlighted that are worth taking into consideration when studying assessment of heritage of Soviet and post-Soviet Lithuania. First of all, when conducting a study, it must be noted that monuments were assessed according to the scope they met the needs of the assessed period. It is important to try to differentiate what groups of society developed the values of heritage at respective period of time and how those values were accepted by other groups of society. Moreover, it is important to determine how the dominant political power was reflected in the state heritage protection and in whose favour value dissonances that occurred during heritage assessment were solved.

Several methods are combined in the present research. Firstly, it is historical research conducted by applying historical-chronological method including the elements of both synthesis and analysis. Research data are verified by the method of comparative analysis and supplemented with the data of statistical analysis.

The *method of particular historical research* is used in the present study: the state records of cultural monuments are reviewed and analysed according to the archive data by recording institutions and acts of law in force. The research is focused on the problem aspect; the narrative is developed not by conveying archive data directly, but by rising problem questions to the archive data on the perception of heritage values. The analytical

narrative prevailing in the research is “wrapped” into the context of the perception of heritage values in Lithuania and international Western heritage protection.

Moreover, in the research, the differences of Soviet and post-Soviet Lithuanian cultural heritage recordings, types of heritage objects and values as well as their links to the international thought of heritage protection are studied by means of *comparative analysis*.

For the sake of accuracy of the defended statements, *statistical method*, the quantitative analysis of the lists of cultural heritage is applied in the study.

3. Object, aim and objectives of the research.

The object of the research is the process of patrimonialisation in heritage protection by converting cultural material remains into heritage. To reveal it, the aspect of assessing monuments of the past is referred to which is expressed when an antique is recognised as valuable and protected by the state. At the moment the process of making a decision is in progress, which represents the hierarchy of heritage values. During decision making, not only values that are traditionally attributed to heritage such as beauty or informativeness to science are highlighted, but also numerous “concealed” values, meanings to culture, identity, spiritual perception or social state are actualised.

The research on cultural heritage assessment is closely related to the analysis of the changes in political, socio-cultural and economic conditions which determined the changes in heritage assessment as well. The present research aims to determine what values were followed on the state level when choosing what relics of the past were to be actualised by recognising them as heritage protected by the state and to save for future generations. The research is not limited to the analysis of official, i.e. established by Lithuanian heritage protection documents, values, such as scholarly, educational or artistic values. According to contemporary conceptions of heritage values, there is an attempt to find and evaluate the perception manifestations of values that are not regulated by the official heritage protection, such as values of identity or economic values.

The research consists of several *problem parts*. The paper analyses methodologies of cultural heritage assessment (heritage object assessment methods applied in practice are studied); value perception (values attributed to the objects of cultural heritage by

experts (archaeologists, architects, art critics – scholarly, cultural) and by non-experts (society, owners, users, etc. – social, economical, etc.) are analysed); and the development of the perception and actualisation of values of cultural heritage under the changes in political, as well as cultural and economical conditions.

The aim of the research is to find out the methods and principles of attributing values to the objects of cultural heritage during the processes of conversion into heritage in Lithuania during the Soviet period and after regaining independence.

The research is aimed to provide answers to the following questions: What was called ‘heritage’ in Lithuania during the Soviet period and how did this perception change after Lithuania regained its independence? How do tangible relics become heritage? What values of heritage were actualised in state heritage protection and what values were referred to when heritage during patrimonialisation processes? Who was to decide what objects would become heritage? What influence did heritage experts of that time have on heritage assessment and to what extent was their work influenced by the Soviet ideology?

Objectives:

1. To find out the theoretical and practical heritage assessment accesses applied in international Western and USSR heritage protection practice in order to evaluate the situation of Lithuania in these contexts.
2. To show the peculiarities of heritage assessment in Lithuania during the Soviet period.
 - 2.1. To find out who took part in the process of heritage assessment during the Soviet period and what schemes were referred to when conducting the assessment. To define what the relation of the assessors to the Soviet ideology was, how it manifested in different levels of heritage assessment and whether heritage assessors were influenced by the practice of Western heritage protection of that time.
 - 2.2. To find out peculiarities of the formation of monument values in heritage protection of Soviet Lithuania.
 - 2.2.1. To analyse the peculiarities of forming associative/symbolic values and to find out what symbols of the past and what version of history the monuments of culture protected by the state reflected during the Soviet

period. What role did the Soviet ideology played here? How was aristocratic and sacral heritage which was foreign to the Soviet ideology included into the lists?

- 2.2.2. To show peculiarities of the formation of information values in the contexts of separate related subjects, i.e. history, archaeology, history of archaeology and history of art. To justify the existence of the priorities of information values in Soviet heritage protection and to provide reasons determining this.
 - 2.2.3. To define peculiarities of the formation of aesthetic monument values and to evaluate them in the relation to the propagation of aesthetics during the Soviet period in general. To show the possibilities provided by the priority of aesthetic values for preservation of heritage that was not valued by the Soviet ideology.
 - 2.2.4. To define the possibilities of forming economical values of heritage. To find out in what monuments and what kind of economic potential was envisaged.
3. To review the main changes in heritage assessment after Lithuania regained its independence, to evaluate the quantitative and qualitative results of the above changes.
 - 3.1. To show the changes in the practice of heritage assessment after Lithuania regained independence.
 - 3.2. To show the most significant changes in the formation of monument values after Lithuania regained independence:
 - 3.2.1. To find the most important changes in the formation of associative/symbolic values of monuments. To provide the relation to the inheritance of the Soviet period after Lithuania regained independence. To find out the reasons for the problems of including the Soviet period inheritance into heritage and to evaluate different manifestations of its inclusion into heritage. To highlight the intense periods of the interest in heritage in post-Soviet Lithuania and to reveal social and economic factors that made impact on this.

3.2.2. To evaluate the impact of the perception of economic value and actualisation on the Lithuanian heritage protection.

The chronology of the research covers the 2nd half of the 20th century and the beginning of the first decade of the 21st century. The second half of the 20th century marked the qualitative move in the Soviet Union: the “establishment of mature socialism” was declared, thus the major ideas of socialism had been implemented (as if), the issues causing socio-cultural tension had been solved. In the system of heritage protection, the year 1967 marked the beginning of the centralised monument record, when all functions of recording were concentrated in one organisation SMPCPM. Moreover, at that time all main levels of the contemporary heritage protection system were formed: legal-administrative, research, restoration and application levels which functioned in accordance with the law. The state also decided on heritage which was useful to it, and the selected monuments were included into the state lists of protected monuments. However, was the period of “mature socialism” in the Soviet heritage protection really so “clear”? What was happening in practice?

The end of the chronology of the research is the changing attitude of the society towards heritage at the beginning of the 21st century, restructuring of Lithuanian system of heritage protection. The economic value of heritage was started to be understood, which substantially changed the balance by giving prominence to other modern values of heritage, such as social value and value of use as well.

4. Resources of the Research.

Resources of the present research are regulatory, legal, administrative and other documents as well as press publications of Lithuanian heritage protection institutions. The basis of the research is comprised of record documents, since namely the record level of heritage protection is the best to reflect that main moment of decision making, when the question of value attribution and inclusion of inheritance into heritage is solved. Legal resources of heritage records (laws and secondary legislation on the protection of cultural heritage: documents regulating the procedure of keeping register of cultural heritage, lists of protected heritage objects) helped to reveal the possibilities of including inheritance into heritage, information resources (digests of cultural heritage,

atlases, other publications of information nature) provided the results, and administrative resources (the main documents of the Scientific Methodological Council for the Protection of Cultural Monuments which functioned in 1967-1991 (hereinafter – SMPCPM): correspondence with institutions, organisations and persons on the issues of protection, recording and methodology of cultural monuments, minutes of the meetings of the presidium and groups of the Extended Scientific Methodological Council for the Protection of Cultural Monuments, annual activity plans and reports of the Council, statistical reports on the staff, annual balance sheets and reports, estimates and lists of staff positions) were the best to show the basics of inclusion of inheritance into heritage, tensions between possibilities and the results were revealed. The chosen sources helped to reveal the possibilities of patrimonialisation in separate stages of this process, from legal possibilities of granting a heritage status and administrative procedures, to the results in the lists of protected objects; moreover, this was done in different angles, covering both official and non-official approaches of both experts and non-experts.

5. Novelty.

The topics of heritage values are relevant to a number of sciences, but in Lithuania it still has not been analysed widely. The largest attention to heritage values in their research is paid by architects specialising in the area of heritage protection, architecture historians and historians whose scope of studies covers the areas from value research designed for technical solutions of heritage protection to the extensive studies of the very conception of heritage protection. Another part of texts that are close to the problems of heritage values of the studied period are studies of historical consciousness of the Soviet and post-Soviet society as well as of the relation of values to the past. Researches designed for and closely related to the problems of heritage assessment may be classified into several types: researches of heritage assessment designed for the problems of heritage protection issues (Bučas, Stulpinas), overview studies, designed for the value aspect in Western heritage protection (Markevičienė, Riaubienė), overviews of administrative systems of heritage protection and works of heritage conservation (Glemža, Riaubienė, Bražėnaitė-Dijokienė), thorough studies of the very conception of heritage protection (Čepaitienė), works of historians and sociologists designed for the problems of collective memory, historical consciousness and national identity (Streikus,

Čepaitienė, Štutinienė, Rožankevičiūtė), studies of the relation of moral-value to the past (Putinaitė). However, the studies that have been conducted so far were either limited to the critics of the drawbacks of monument lists (Bučas) or were more of the overview nature (Markevičienė), or extensive accesses of the research selected by researchers hindered thorough and systematic description of the issues of inheritance assessment (Čepaitienė), therefore the present research strives to show the peculiarities of value formation by starting from the very basis of heritage assessment, i.e. from the heritage protection chain of monument records.

The present paper is the first attempt in Lithuania to synthesize the history of Soviet and post-Soviet heritage records referring more to the principle of values than institutional principle. The chosen research model of values is characterised by multiperspective approach, which should help to avoid the evaluation of heritage with ideological impact. In theoretical studies of Lithuanian heritage that have been conducted until the present, perception focused on the past prevails, when heritage objects are perceived as valuable in themselves, and the value of heritage is not questioned; moreover, objects complying with the values of today's nationalistic ideology are regarded as that heritage which is valuable in itself. In the present research, the process of heritage protection is analysed in the context of modern (then) resources and the resources that are intended for the future, without the fear of the question: why is (was) heritage valuable? The very perception of heritage value is expanded into the spectrum of cultural, socio-economical values by searching for the manifestations of the awareness of those values in the state heritage protection. By raising a question at such an angle, there occurs a possibility to look at the perception of heritage values in Lithuania not as at the evolutionary phenomenon, i.e. progress (regress) of heritage protection, but as at the product of different periods developed by socio-cultural contexts.

6. The most relevant results.

At the beginning of the research, during the clarification of theoretical and practical accesses of heritage assessment applied in the international Western heritage protection and USSR practice with the aim to evaluate the situation of Lithuania in these contexts, it was stated that in the Western heritage protection in the second half of the

20th century, 2 paradigm trends dominated: conservational, striving to preserve the authentic substance of an object and based on inner values of an object, such as oldness, artistry, information to science and the trend of heritage resource management which became popular from the sixties of the 20th century and brought new hierarchy of heritage values by raising the significance of social and economical values of heritage. Like in a number of European countries, in the Soviet Union the state heritage protection was conservational, and the significance of social values brought by the new trend was perceived in a specific manner, based on the communist ideology, basically revealing only its educational potential. The state system of heritage protection of the USSR was formed during the period of Leonid Brezhnev in power in the seventies, but, although the wordings of legal documents were modern and demonstrated contemporary principles of Western European heritage protection, in all the Soviet Union it was applied with difficulties due to excessively centralised management scheme with uniform criteria of monument assessment which could not operate on the same level of effectiveness in all republics and regions having geographical, ethnic and other differences of heritage and history. Legal acts of the USSR heritage protection were comprised based on general wordings, emphasizing the fight and revolutionary aspects of ideology of Marxism-Leninism, whereas people who worked in the institutions of monument protection were usually the representatives of Russian nationalism. This dissonance of evaluation of the past in Russia turned monument assessment into a mere formality, "attraction" of scientific interest objects of certain disciplines to the provisions of laws, avoiding more detail considerations of value.

Further the aim was to demonstrate the peculiarities of heritage assessment in Lithuania during the Soviet period. It was cleared out that during the Soviet period in Lithuania (like in all the Soviet Union) the conservational model of centralised heritage protection became dominant. All the activities of monument assessment was basically concentrated in one institution, that is, in MMKPAT. Having no official assessment methodologies applied to the situation of Lithuania, the assessment of cultural heritage objects referred to the proposals of separate specialists, commissions and MMKPAT. However, in the work of the above experts, not the Soviet ideological or methodological approach was shown, but pragmatic approach towards the requirements for the formation of protected monuments, chosen as the means to smooth the dissonances caused by

political and identity values. They were not very diligent in trying to protect heritage that was important to the Soviet ideology, they often artificially gave prominence to the aspects of monuments glorifying Soviet ideology. It is obvious that during the Soviet period, the Western thought of heritage protection reached Lithuanian heritage protectors. Knowing and application of international legal documents made impact on the development of Lithuanian heritage protection system, which was close to the Western heritage protection of that time, especially in technical respect. In Lithuanian heritage protection of the Soviet period, monument was viewed in a complex manner, and the very conception of complexity more or less met the perception of complexity declared in the international documents of Western heritage protection.

During the Soviet period, the “popular interpretations of the past” applicable to historical monuments were clearly defined by the laws on monument protection revealing the obvious attribution of associative/symbolic values to historical events propagated by the Soviet ideology. The historical monuments were to have links to historical events among which the revolutionary movement, the Civil War and the Great Patriotic War and socialist construction were distinguished; the monuments were to demonstrate the events of the Great October Socialist Revolution and socialist revolution in Lithuania, civil war and the Great Patriotic War, as well as actions of working class, peasantry of collective farms, brotherly people’s friendship, heroic fight of the Soviet people for the creation of socialism and communism. However, “the popular interpretations of the past” applicable to the monuments of archaeology, architecture and art were not included in legal acts, therefore they were dissociated from political ideological evaluation. In practice, a historical monument symbolised the version of the history of people’s fights formed by the Soviet ideology and shown in the legal acts of heritage protection. Still, although the past of the people in heritage protection was developed on the basis of the Soviet ideology, the Lithuanian aspect of people was also reflected, especially in the monuments of national revival of the end of the 19th century. Aristocratic and sacral heritage was included into the lists of protected historical monuments by artificially emphasizing historical events that were relevant to the Soviet ideology. By interpreting heritage objects, those events were actualised as the most important moments of the existence of the above objects.

The values of information in Lithuanian heritage protection of the Soviet period were the most popular formal criterion often compared to monumentality in general, on the basis whereof the antiques were included into the lists of protected monuments. Under conditions of the Soviet regime, it was much safer to actualise information values than multi-meaning associative values. However, the focus of empirical studies of abundant monuments and monument protectors on the formation of information values should not be considered as the form of resistance to the Soviet regime. At that time, similar tendencies emerged in the entire Western monument protection, i.e. the significance of scientific knowledge and necessity for thorough analysis of a monument was exalted. Therefore the priority of informativeness to science in heritage protection of the Soviet period was more of the reflection of common tendencies in international Western monument protection than the strategy of Lithuanian monument protectors chosen specially for the fight against the Soviet regime.

Historical monuments protected during the Soviet period reflected the state of historical science of that time. Historians working in monument protection, just like in academic field, conducted empirical studies avoiding more thorough context evaluations. Objects were included into the lists of protected monuments on the basis of categories of historical monuments established by legal acts propagating the Soviet ideology. On the other hand, the very difference of a monument and historical text providing a possibility to evaluate more than one, officially declared value in a monument, enabled the historians working in the field of monument protection to select the study objects, assess them and protect more freely.

Monuments of archaeology also reflected the situation of archaeology science of the Soviet period where empirical studies and publications of sources prevailed. Most of the positions in the lists of Soviet monuments of archaeology were covered by pagan burial monuments and fixed settlements (mounds) most intensely studied by archaeologists of the Soviet period. On the other hand, contrary to history, academic and monument protection archaeology were related very closely, since archaeological studies were usually conducted for monument protection purposes, i.e. to assess monuments or to study vanishing monuments, thus saving the information they provide for the science of archaeology. In the case of archaeological monuments, during the Soviet period there were tendencies of increasing not only the number of facts, but also the number of the

very monuments, by including objects into the lists of protected monuments without more thorough research.

However, the priorities of architecture policy: secularisation of buildings, industrialisation, direction of rural development, team planning, complexity (industrial, medicine towns) as well as typical designing (except for complexity) was weakly reflected in monument protection of architecture. This is especially obvious in the case of sacral heritage, when Soviet architects were not allowed to design new sacral buildings; but architects involved in the field of monument protection were rather free to develop restoration schemes of such buildings. The main criteria referred to by the assessors of architectural monuments were architectural style and author's originality of an object. Public and defensive buildings were more protected in the lists of historical monuments by highlighting the "social content" of such monuments. Whereas sacral monuments and monuments of aristocratic culture that were not characterised by such content, in many cases were protected in the lists of architectural monuments, the criterion of "socialist content" was not applied to whereof.

In the development of assessment criteria for the monuments of art, the significance of decorative elements, good appearance and stylistic unity was highlighted, and the significance of information aspects was diminished. It is obvious that during the Soviet period, artistic value was understood not as the potential of information for science, but as aesthetic feature. In practice, aesthetic value was the main value in recording the monuments of art, whereas the attribution of information value was like a secondary thing, designed more to formalise the value of a monument of art in general. After dating a work of art and after determining its author, its information value was formed, which was easy to describe in dates and names, contrary to an abstract aesthetic value.

Aesthetic or artistic values played one of the most important roles in the Soviet monument protection as well. Although the origins of such phenomenon are to be related to general tendencies of the significance of heritage aesthetic qualities, its links to the aesthetized communist worldview may also be noticed. The study of the lists of cultural monuments of the Soviet period has first of all shown the abundance of the monuments of artistic value. Monuments of art and architecture of artistic value made 66 per cent of the entire number of cultural monuments protected during the Soviet

period, whereas objects in the list of historical monuments serving the interests of the creators of communism most of all, made only 14 per cent of all the monuments. Soviet aestheticism put artistic values of heritage on one of the highest positions in the hierarchy of values, thus creating conditions for including a large number of objects of sacral and aristocratic cultural heritage into the lists of monuments, protecting and restoring. In fact, the majority of art monuments from the list of art monuments were objects of sacral art that did not serve the interests of communism creation and even hindered it. It must be noted that the rest of the monuments, i.e. monuments do not belonging to sacral art were concentrated in Vilnius, and in the remaining part of Lithuania the absolute majority of art monuments were monuments of sacral art and only a few of them were graves of some public man or monuments. Similar situation was in the case of decontextualisation of monumental churches. Approximately one third of the list of architectural monuments of the significance at the level of the Republic was comprised of such decontextualised churches, though the majority of them were located in Vilnius (63 per cent). Meanwhile sacral monuments of architecture of local significance, i.e. churches and chapels in rural areas in the majority of cases (88 per cent) were operating and performing their original function. Moreover, another way of applying relative political “neutrality” of artistic values may be noticed in the Soviet monument protection, it is namely exaltation of artistic values of sacral buildings by establishing art museums in them. Monuments of art were as if taken from religious context and presented as neutral and valuable because of their beauty. Hence, in this case aestheticism propagated by the Soviet regime became certain intermediary between the values of the Soviet ideology and objects of the past that were difficult to apply for the interests of communism creation.

In Lithuanian monument protection of the Soviet period economical values of monuments were not perceived and formed. Similarly to the West, in Lithuania economic potential of heritage was started to be perceived and actualised only in the seventies-eighties of the 20th century. However some manifestations of forming the value of use which was closely related to economic value, might be noticed during the Soviet period already. Although the term of use during the Soviet period was in general applied not in the meanings of utilitarian use, but more in other meanings, such as the purposes of science, education and culture development, patriotic, ideological, moral,

internationalism and aesthetic education. Still, some economic potential might be envisaged during the Soviet period as well, and the value of use was formed for housings and their groups (the fund of flats). The value of use for public buildings that met the requirements of prevailing ideology, were partially formed as well; while monuments of archaeology might be used only for scientific studies and educational activities. Functional value of archaeological monuments was perceived as dissonant to the main scientific and educational values of these monuments. During the Soviet period, archaeological monuments for the same reason were forbidden to be used not only in utilitarian manner, but also for social needs of the community. Monuments included into the lists of history had similarly to reflect events and memories. Only the objects of the group of labour, production and technologies history comprising app. 10 per cent of all historical monuments, were more or less able to maintain their original, initial functional purpose: organs, mills, etc. However, the main goals of protecting these monuments were not the adaptation to the needs of today, but preservation for future generations and exhibition. It must be noted that despite the intentions to use historical monuments for economic purposes, this was strongly resisted by monument protectors. The preservation of the value of use of sacral and aristocratic architecture as well as art monuments was generally not compatible with the Soviet ideology.

After exhaustive analysis of the Soviet situation, the move was made towards the changes of patrimonialisation upon Lithuania regaining its independence. The research was aimed to show changes in the practice of heritage assessment in Lithuania after regaining independence.

The research has shown that after Lithuania regained its independence, the legal regulation of the heritage assessment process was difficult because of the dissonant situation which emerged due to the changing values of heritage. Only in 1995, the first heritage assessment criteria were approved, while before that, the lists of monuments were made on the basis of the same principles as during the Soviet period, i.e. the same structure of lists, the same assessment model remained. Still, upon the changes in history interpretations, the possibilities occurred to actualise in the lists the values of Lithuanian identity that would not be included into the lists before. Nevertheless, up until the reform of heritage protection system which was started at the junction of centuries, state heritage protection kept records on the basis of the principles of

temporariness, it did not actively react to the development of heritage assessment in the society, by traditionally referring to the priorities of information for science. Both the absence of traditions of systematic heritage assessment and general crisis of values in the society which confused the hierarchy of values that existed during the Soviet period had also strong impact on the delay in the development of heritage assessment schemes.

Political values of heritage, i.e. links to the Soviet ideology that had essential impact on the protection of heritage objects during the Soviet period, in independent Lithuania upon the absence of unified ideology and clear political values, and consequently stable assessment criteria (temporary assessment criteria were valid) were replaced by the exaltation of purely scientific criterion, the age of the objects. The age of objects affected the assessment of heritage authenticity and complexity, integrity, uniqueness, even artistic value and public significance. Differently from the Soviet monument protection, where the priority of actualisation of political values encouraged the preservation of relatively new (revolutionary and of the Soviet period) objects, post-Soviet state protection of cultural values paid more attention to older, pre-Soviet objects of heritage, by evaluating the inheritance of the Soviet period only in the negative context (cruelty heritage), and ignoring its other potential values (artistic, social, economic, etc.). Still, in the course of time, the attitude in independent Lithuania towards the Soviet inheritance was slowly changing: at the beginning of independence, the drive of destroying Soviet monuments dictated by nationalist ideology calmed down by providing conditions to actualise another values of monuments, related to nostalgia for “old good times” and to individual relicts of Soviet household. Nostalgia evoked by the Soviet period was especially actively actualised in food industry as an effective means of marketing. The change in the relation to the Soviet heritage, both its destruction at the beginning of independence and rehabilitation of individual household aspects based on nostalgia, were initiated by the society and usually by private initiative. Whereas state monument protection, just like in the Soviet period, was focused on the recording of scientific heritage values, slowly taking over the changes in identity perception in relation to the Soviet heritage, and solving “awkward” questions based on the Soviet tradition of exalting the significance of neutral, i.e. artistic values.

Throughout the entire period of independence, 2 periods of increased interest in heritage (heritage boom) may be observed: During the first nationalist boom of heritage

which started together with Sajūdis and prospered soon after regaining independence values of Lithuanian nationalistic identity were actively actualised. However, while Lithuanian independence was getting stronger and perception of an enemy was getting weaker, and the economic situation was worsening, which forced people to isolate and concentrate only on meeting basic needs, the first heritage boom in post-Soviet Lithuania calmed down. Still, at the junction of the centuries, when economic situation in Lithuania was improving, the heritage boom revived in new, social form which due to the establishment of consumer-oriented culture in the private sector started acquiring the form of heritage industry. Upon the increasing significance of social and economic heritage values, heritage, its assessment and use were no longer the matter of state and its institutions solely; public organisations and private persons got involved into the processes of heritage protection, regionalism and multi-culturality were started to be emphasized.

During the post-Soviet period, in Lithuanian state heritage protection economic value of heritage was not actualised. Following the tradition of the Soviet period, areas of economy and culture seemed to be incompatible. While in the private sector, perception of economic value of heritage started changing together with the improved economic situation in the country, app. from 1998; at that time in Lithuania there already were manifestations of heritage industry, related to the improved economy of the country, increased purchasing power of population which afforded to spend more time and money for leisure and entertainment, including heritage. However, in official heritage protection the dictate of traditional scientific values prevailed, thus heritage industry in Lithuania appeared not in the context of balanced heritage management, but in show business and industry marketing.

7. Conclusions

1. Heritage assessment during the Soviet period was carried out not according to common recommendations of the Union, but according to the opinion of experts which reflected not the pure Soviet or Lithuanian nationalistic ideological approach, but pragmatic approach to the formation of monument lists possessing both features. Moreover, under participation of Soviet monument protectors in the activity of ICCROM and under cooperation in

restoration projects, Lithuanian monument protection, contrary to other related fields of science (e.g. history, archaeology) was not 'behind the iron curtain', it was reached by the Western thought of monument protection and was applied in practice.

2. During the Soviet period, the formation of associative/symbolic values was regulated by the laws by defining "popular interpretations of the past" which reflected historical events propagated by the Soviet ideology, mostly fights with internal and external enemies. However this was applied to historical monuments only; the remaining monuments, i.e. the monuments of archaeology, architecture and art were dissociated from ideological assessment. Aristocratic and sacral heritage was included into the lists of protected historical monuments by artificially emphasizing historical events that were relevant to the Soviet ideology. By interpreting heritage objects, those events were actualised as the most important moments of the existence of the above objects.
3. The priority of information values in the Soviet monument protection which was actualised by the large number of empiric studies should not be regarded as the form of resistance to the regime. At that time in the Western monument protection the significance of scientific knowledge and necessity for thorough analysis of a monument was exalted; thus this was more of the reflection of common tendencies in international Western monument protection than the strategy of Lithuanian monument protectors chosen specially for the fight against the Soviet regime.
4. Especially frequent attribution of aesthetic values to monuments links to the aesthetized communist worldview may also be noticed. Aestheticism propagated by the Soviet regime became a certain intermediary between the values of the Soviet ideology and objects of the past (sacral and aristocratic) that were difficult to apply for the interests of communism creation.
5. In Lithuanian monument protection of the Soviet period economical values of monuments were not perceived and formed, yet some manifestations of forming the value of use which was closely related to economic value might be found, but only among the architectural and urbanistic monuments, i.e.

residential and public buildings. All other monuments might be used for scientific studies and educational activities only and their functional value was perceived as harmful to monuments and dissonant to the main scientific and educational values of these monuments.

6. After Lithuania regained its independence, the state heritage protection kept records on the basis of the principle of temporariness, by traditionally referring to the priorities of information for science. Both the absence of traditions of systematic heritage assessment and general crisis of values in the society which confused the hierarchy of values that existed during the Soviet period had also strong impact on the delay in the development of heritage assessment schemes.
7. Differently from the Soviet monument protection, where the priority of actualisation of political values encouraged the preservation of relatively new (revolutionary and of the Soviet period) objects, post-Soviet state protection of cultural values paid more attention to older, pre-Soviet objects of heritage, by evaluating the inheritance of the Soviet period only in the negative context (cruelty heritage), and ignoring its other potential values (artistic, social, economic, etc.). However in the course of time the negative approach started changing, and "awkward questions related to the Soviet inheritance" were started being solved according to the Soviet tradition, i.e. by exalting the significance of neutral, artistic values.
8. During the post-Soviet period, approximately since 1998, economic value of heritage was started being perceived in the private sector of Lithuania. Since then, manifestations of heritage industry may be found in Lithuania, linkable to the increased economy of the country, improved purchasing power of people which enabled people to spend more time and money on leisure and entertainment, including heritage. However while the perception of culture and economics as incompatible areas prevails in the state heritage protection, economic values of heritage are still not regarded as significant and are still not formed.

Reziūmė

Tiriamoji problema ir darbo aktualumas. Pagrindinė tiriamoji problema išryškėjo analizuojant LTSR kultūros paminklų sąrašą, kuriame į akis krito didelis sovietmečiu laikyto „nepažangaus“ aristokratiškosios kultūros ir bažnytinio paveldo objektų skaičius. Tai iškėlė keletą klausimų: Kaip tai galėjo atsitikti sovietinės ideologijos valdomoje valstybėje pačiu „brandaus socializmo žydėjimo“ laikotarpiu? Kaip sovietinės ideologijos nevertinamas ir net laikomas kenksmingu komunizmo kūrėjų interesams paveldas galėjo būti įvertintas paminklosaugos specialistų ir įrašomas į saugomų paminklų sąrašus? Kokias vertes palikimo vertintojai išvelgė šiuose paminkluose ir koku būdu jos buvo aktualizuotos įrašant juos į sąrašus? Tai pat neaišku kokiais kriterijais rėmėsi sovietmečio Lietuvos paminklų vertintojai? Ar tai buvo sovietinė ideologija, ar Vakarų paminklosaugos teorijos įtakos, o gal specifinė lietuviškoji paminklosauginė prieiga? Čia pat iškyla ir „geležinės uždangos“ sovietmečiu „patvarumo“ klausimas. Gal „geležinė uždanga“ sovietmečio paminklosaugai, skirtingai nuo kitų su praeities vertinimu susijusių mokslų, nebuvo aklina? Ar galima atsekti kokį nors kokybinį paminklosaugos šuolį griuvus „geležinei uždangai“ ar tebuvo tęsiama sovietmečiu susiformavusi praktika? Palikimo vertinimo klausimai aktualūs ir šiandienos paveldosaugoje. Nuo Lietuvos nepriklausomybės atkūrimo jau praėjo daugiau nei 20 metų, tačiau valstybinė paveldosaugos sistema vis dar neranda pastovių ir tinkamų būdų kultūros paveldo vertinimui ir apsaugai. Darbo aktualumą parodo ir pastaruosiu metu pasikeitęs požiūris į sovietinį palikimą. Kokiais kriterijais remiantis įpaveldinamas šis palikimas?

Iš esmės, sovietinės visuomenės tyrimai Lietuvoje daugiausiai koncentruojasi į politinę istoriją ir pasipriešinimo klausimus. Tuo tarpu, sovietmečio paminklosauga dažniausiai tyrinėjama instituciniu požiūriu, daugiausiai dėmesio skiriant praktinių darbų rezultatams. Pozityvų kokybinį poslinkį Lietuvos paminklosaugos tyrimuose XXI a. pradžioje padarė paveldo sampratos tyrimai, atskleidę palikimo suvokimo sudėtingumo klausimą, jo sąsajas su sociokultūrine situacija. Vis tik, plati paveldo sampratos analizė neleido detaliai išnagrinėti paveldo vertinimo klausimų, todėl, šiame tyrime, į Lietuvos paminklosaugą pabandydysime pažvelgti per siauresnę, o tuo pačiu ir tikslesnę, paveldo verčių prizmę.

Tyrimo metodika. Šiuo darbu bandoma atskleisti palikimo įpaveldinimo, t.y. verčių suteikimo ir paskelbimo vertu išsaugoti įrašant į saugomų objektų sąrašus, procesus kintant sociokultūrinėms sąlygoms. Tyrimo koncepcija kyla iš idėjos, kad paveldo objektų vertės nėra vien tik „techniniai“ sprendimai, skirti paveldo objektų reikšmingumo nustatymui ir dokumentavimui. Tyrinėjant paveldosaugą vertės suvokiamos kaip esminis paveldo aspektas, nes joks individas ar žmonių grupė nesaugo to, ko nevertina. Tokia tyrimo koncepcija padeda peržengti tradicines technines paminklosaugos užduotis, susijusias su paveldosaugos ir paveldotvarkos klausimais, ir pereiti prie esminės paveldo problematikos, susijusios su materialijų liekanų vertinimu ir tapumu paveldu, tuo pačiu keliant pamatinius paveldo „gimimo“ klausimus, tokius kaip: kas dalyvauja paveldo kūrimo procese ir kokiais kriterijais remiantis pasirenkami paveldo objektai?

Metodologinės tyrimo priegijos remiasi amerikiečių archeologo ir kultūros paveldo tyrinėtojo W.Lipe išvalgomis. Jo verčių sistemos modelis parodė kaip praeities liekanų vertinimas vyksta atskiruose kontekstuose (ekonominiame, estetiniame, tradicijos ir akademiname). Vis tik sudėtingai Lietuvos istorijos situacijai nagrinėti šio modelio nepakako, todėl jis buvo papildytas R.Masono ir J.Jokilehto/B. Fieldeno palikimo vertinimo sistemomis išplėtusiomis paveldo verčių spektrą. Kiti svarbūs tyrimo aspektai koncentruojasi ties paveldo orientacijos į dabartį kryptį, skirtingų visuomenės grupių požiūriais, paveldo disonansų koncepcija ir paveldo, kaip dominuojančios politinės jėgos atspindžio, reprezentavimo klausimais.

Tyrimo objektas, tikslas ir uždaviniai.

Tyrimo objektas – palikimo įpaveldinimo procesai valstybinėje paveldosaugoje. Jam atskleisti remiamasi palikimo vertinimo aspektu, kuris atsispindi senieną pripažįstant vertinga ir saugoma valstybės.

Tyrimą sudaro kelios *probleminės dalys*. Darbe nagrinėjamos kultūros paveldo vertinimo metodologijos (tiriami praktikoje naudoti paveldo objektų vertinimo metodai); verčių suvokimas (tiriamos specialistų (archeologų, architektų, menotyrininkų, istorikų, kt. – mokslinės, kultūrinės) bei ne specialistų (visuomenės, savininkų, naudotojų, kt. – socialinės, ekonominės, kt.) kultūros paveldo objektams suteikiamos vertės); bei kultūros paveldo verčių suvokimo ir aktualizavimo kaita pasiteikus politinėms, o kartu ir kultūrinėms bei ekonominėms sąlygoms.

Tyrimo tikslas – išsiaiškinti įpaveldinimo procesų metu vystančio verčių priskyrimo kultūros palikimo objektams metodus ir principus Lietuvoje sovietmečiu ir atkūrus nepriklausomybę.

Uždaviniai:

1. Išsiaiškinti tarptautinėje Vakarų bei SSSR paminklosaugos praktikoje taikytas teorines ir praktines palikimo vertinimo prieigas siekiant šiuose kontekstuose įvertinti Lietuvos situaciją.
2. Atskleisti palikimo įpaveldinimo ypatybes Lietuvoje sovietmečiu:
 - 2.1. Išsiaiškinti kas dalyvavo palikimo vertinimo procese sovietmečiu ir kokiomis schemomis remiantis vertinimas buvo atliekamas. Nustatyti koks buvo vertintojų santykis su sovietine ideologija, kaip jis skleidėsi skirtinguose palikimo vertinimo lygmenyse ir ar palikimo vertintojams turėjo įtakos tuometinė Vakarų paminklosaugos praktika?
 - 2.2. Išsiaiškinti asociatyvinių/simbolinių, informacinių, estetinių bei ekonominių verčių formavimo ypatybes įpaveldinant palikimą sovietmečio Lietuvos paminklosaugoje.
3. Apžvelgti pagrindinius įpaveldinimo pokyčius Lietuvai atkūrus nepriklausomybę, įvertinti kiekybinius ir kokybinius šių pokyčių rezultatus:
 - 3.1. Atskleisti pakitimus palikimo vertinimo praktikoje Lietuvai atkūrus nepriklausomybę.
 - 3.2. Atskleisti ryškiausius paminklų asociatyvinių/simbolinių bei ekonominių verčių formavimo pokyčius Lietuvai atkūrus nepriklausomybę.

Tyrimo chronologija apima XX a. II-ąją pusę ir XXI a. pirmojo dešimtmečio pradžią.

Tyrimo šaltiniai. Lietuvos paveldosaugos institucijų norminiai, teisiniai, administraciniai, kiti dokumentai ir publikacijos spaudoje. Tyrimo pagrindą sudaro apskaitos dokumentai, nes būtent apskaitos paveldosauginis lygmuo geriausiai atspindi tą pagrindinį, apsisprendimo momentą, kuriame sprendžiasi verčių suteikimo ir palikimo įpaveldinimo klausimas. Teisiniai paveldo apskaitos šaltiniai (kultūros paveldo apsaugos įstatymai, poįstatyminiai aktai: kultūros paveldo registro vedimo tvarką reglamentuojantys dokumentai, saugomų paveldo objektų sąrašai) padėjo atskleisti

palikimo įpaveldinimo galimybes, informaciniai (kultūros paveldo sąvadai, atlasai, kiti informacinio pobūdžio leidiniai) – rezultatus, o administraciniuose šaltiniuose (Mokslinės metodinės kultūros paminklų apsaugos tarybos, veikusios 1967-1991 m. (toliau MMKPAT), pagrindiniai veiklos dokumentai: susirašinėjimas su įstaigomis, organizacijomis ir asmenimis kultūros paminklų apsaugos, apskaitos ir metodikos klausimais, Išplėstinės mokslinės metodinės kultūros paminklų apsaugos tarybos prezidiumo ir grupių posėdžių protokolai, tarybos metiniai darbo planai ir ataskaitos, statistinės ataskaitos apie kadrus, metiniai balansai ir ataskaitos, sąmatos ir etatų sąrašai) geriausiai atspindėjo palikimo įpaveldinimo „virtuvė“, atsiskleidė įtampos tarp galimybių ir rezultatų.

Naujumas. Paveldo verčių tematika aktuali daugeliui mokslų, tačiau iki šiol Lietuvoje tyrinėta negausiai. Daugiausiai dėmesio paveldo vertybėms savo tyrinėjimuose skiria paveldosaugos srityje besispecializuojantys architektai, architektūros istorikai ir istorikai, kurių tyrimų spektras skleidžiasi nuo verčių tyrimų, skirtų paveldosaugos techniniams sprendiniams iki plačių pačios paveldosaugos sampratos studijų. Kita dalis tekstų, artimų nagrinėjamo laikotarpio paveldo verčių problematikai, - tai sovietinės ir posovietinės visuomenės istorinės sąmonės ir moralinio – vertybinio santykio su praeitimi tyrimai. Šis darbas - tai pirmasis bandymas Lietuvoje susintetinti sovietinės ir posovietinės paveldo apskaitos istoriją remiantis daugiau vertybiniu nei instituciniu principu, tyrimą atliekant indukcinio požiūriu, t.y. nuo pačių paveldo vertintojų link vertinimo kontekstų. Pasirinktas vertybinis tyrimo modelis pasižymi multiperspektyviu požiūriu, kuris turėtų padėti išvengti ideologiškai įtakoto palikimo vertinimo. Ligšioliniuose teoriniuose Lietuvos paveldo tyrimuose vyrauja į praeitį orientuotas paveldo suvokimas, kai paveldo objektai suvokiami kaip vertingi savaime, o paveldo vertingumas nekvestionuojamas, be to, tuo savaime vertingu paveldu laikomi objektai, atitinkantys šiandieninės nacionalistinės ideologijos vertybes. Šiame tyrime paveldosaugos procesas nagrinėjamas šiuolaikinių (tuometinių) ir ateičiai skirtų kultūros išteklių kontekste, nesibaiminant klausimo – kodėl paveldas yra (buvo) vertingas? Pats paveldo vertingumo suvokimas išskleidžiamas į kultūrinių, socialinių – ekonominių verčių spektrą, ieškant tų verčių įsisąmoninimo apraiškų valstybinėje paveldosaugoje. Keliant klausimą tokiu kampu atsiranda galimybė į paveldo verčių suvokimą Lietuvoje

pažvelgti ne kaip į evoliucinį reiškinį – paveldosaugos progresą (arba regresą), o tik kaip atskirų laikotarpių produktą, suformuotą sociokultūrinių kontekstų.

Išvados.

1. Tyrimo metu išsiaiškinta, kad palikimo vertinimas sovietmečiu buvo atliekamas remiantis ne bendromis sąjunginėmis rekomendacijomis, o MMKPAT ir IMKPAT specialistų nuomone, kuri atspindėjo ne gryną sovietinį ar lietuviškąjį nacionalistinį ideologinį, o jų abiejų savybių turintį pragmatinį požiūrį į paminklų sąrašų sudarymą. Be to, sovietmečio paminklosaugininkams dalyvaujant ICCROM'ο veikloje ir bendradarbiaujant restauraciniuose projektuose, Lietuvos paminklosauga, skirtingai nuo kitų susijusių mokslo sričių (pvz. istorijos, archeologijos) nebuvo „už geležinės uždangos“, Vakarų paminklosauginė mintis ją pasiekdavo ir buvo taikoma praktikoje. Sovietmečio Lietuvos paminklosaugos praktika vystėsi lygiagrečiai su Vakarų tarptautine, tačiau pasižymėjo ir specifiniais palikimo vertinimo metodais, atsiradusiais politinių, socialinių, kultūrinių ir ekonominių sąlygų įtakoje.
2. Sovietmečiu asociatyvinių/simbolinių verčių formavimas buvo reglamentuotas įstatymuose apibrėžus „populiariausias praeities interpretacijas“, kurios atspindėjo sovietinės ideologijos propaguojamus istorinius įvykius, daugiausiai liaudies kovas su vidaus ir išorės priešais. Tačiau tai buvo taikoma tik istorijos paminklams, visi kiti, t.y. archeologijos, architektūros ir dailės paminklai buvo atsieti nuo ideologinio vertinimo. Aristokratiškasis ir sakralinis paveldas į saugomų istorijos paminklų sąrašus buvo įtraukiamas dirbtinai išryškinant sovietų ideologijai svarbius istorinius įvykius. Šie įvykiai, interpretuojant paveldo objektus, buvo aktualizuojami kaip svarbiausi tų objektų egzistavimo momentai.
3. Informacinių verčių prioritetą sovietmečio paminklosaugoje pasireiškęs empirinių tyrimų gausa neturėtų būti vertinamas kaip pasipriešinimo režimui forma. Tuo metu ir Vakarų paminklosaugoje buvo išaukštinama mokslinio pažinimo reikšmė ir išsamaus paminklo tyrimo būtinybė, taigi, tai buvo daugiau bendrų tarptautinės Vakarų paminklosaugos tendencijų atspindys nei specialiai Lietuvos paminklosaugininkų pasirinkta kovos su sovietų režimu strategija.
4. Ypatingai dažnas estetinių verčių suteikimas paminklams sietinas su bendromis paveldo estetiškumo svarbos tendencijomis, tačiau, matyti ir jo sąsajos su

estetizuota komunistine pasaulėžiūra. Sovietinio režimo propaguojamas estetizmas tapo savotišku tarpininku tarp sovietinės ideologijos vertybių ir tų praeities objektų (sakralinių bei aristokratinų), kurie sunkiai buvo pritaikomi komunizmo kūrimo interesams.

5. Sovietmečiu Lietuvos paminklosaugoje ekonominės paminklų vertės nebuvo suvokiamos ir formuojamos, bet aptinkama su ekonomine verte artimai susijusios panaudos vertės formavimo apraiškų, tačiau tik tarp architektūros ir urbanistikos paminklų, t.y. gyvenamųjų ir visuomeninių pastatų. Visi kiti paminklai galėjo būti naudojami tik moksliniams tyrimams ir edukacinei veiklai, o funkcinė jų vertė buvo suvokiama kaip žalinga paminklams ir disonuojanti su pagrindinėmis šių paminklų mokslinėmis ir edukacinėmis vertėmis.
6. Lietuvai atkūrus nepriklausomybę valstybinė paveldosauga paminklų apskaitą vykdė besiremddama laikinumo principu, tradiciškai besiremddama informatyvumo mokslui prioritetais. Didelės įtakos paveldo vertinimo schemų sukūrimo delsimui ir turėjo sistemingo paveldo vertinimo tradicijų neturėjimas, ir bendra visuomenės vertybinė krizė, supainiojusi sovietmečiu egzistavusią verčių hierarchiją.
7. Skirtingai nuo sovietinės paminklosaugos, kurioje politinių verčių aktualizavimo prioritetas skatino saugoti ne tokius senus (revoliucinius ir sovietmečio) objektus, posovietinė valstybinė kultūros vertybių apsauga, didesnę dėmesį skyrė senesniems, ikisovietiniams paveldo objektams, sovietmečio palikimą vertindama tik neigiamame kontekste (žiaurumo paveldas), ignoruodama kitas potencialias jo vertes (meninę, socialinę, ekonominę, kt.). Tačiau laikui bėgant neigiamasis požiūris pradėjo keistis, o „nepatogius, su sovietiniu palikimu susijusius“ klausimus imta spręsti remiantis sovietine tradicija - iškeliant neutraliųjų – meninių – verčių svarbą.
8. Posovietiniu periodu, maždaug nuo 1998 m., Lietuvoje privačiame sektoriuje pradėta suvokti paveldo ekonominė vertė. Nuo tada Lietuvoje galima aptikti ir paveldo industrijos apraiškų, sietinų su išaugusia šalies ekonomika, padidėjusia gyventojų perkamąja galia, kuri leido daugiau laiko ir pinigų skirti laisvalaikiui ir pramogoms, tame tarpe, ir paveldui. Tačiau valstybinėje paveldosaugoje vis dar vyraujant kultūros ir ekonomikos, kaip nesuderinamų sričių suvokimui, ekonominės paveldo vertės iki šiol nėra laikomos reikšmingomis ir formuojamos.

Mokslinių publikacijų disertacijos tema sąrašas

1. VAITKUVIENĖ, A. Paveldo industrija Lietuvoje. *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* Nr. 17/2006, p. 87-96.
2. VAITKUVIENĖ, A. Nuo nacionalistinės link socialinės paveldosaugos – du paveldo bumai posovietinėje Lietuvoje. *Kultūros paminklai* Nr. 13/2008, p. 43-52.

Trumpos žinios apie autorių

Agnė Vaitkuviene gimė 1978 m. kovo 17 d. Vilniuje.

2001 m. Vilniaus universitete Istorijos fakultete įgijo archeologijos bakalauro kvalifikacinį laipsnį, 2003 m. – archeologijos magistro. Nuo 2003 m. pradėjo doktorantūros studijas Vilniaus universitete Istorijos fakultete. 2006 m. pagal ERASMUS programą studijavo Suomijos Turku universitete.

About the author

Agnė Vaitkuviene was born in Vilnius, March 17, 1978.

On 1997–2001 – Bachelor studies in Archaeology at Vilnius University, Faculty of History. On 2001–2003 – Master studies in Archaeology at Vilnius University, Faculty of History. At 2003 started PhD studies in Faculty of History of Vilnius University. In 2006 studied at Turku University (Finland) as ERASMUS student.