

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Salvijus Kulevičius

LIETUVOS PAVELDOSAUGOS IDĖJINIAI MODELIAI IR JŲ RAIŠKA
PRAKTIKOJE SOVIETMEČIU

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H)

Vilnius, 2010

Disertacija rengta 2005–2010 metais Vilniaus universitete

Mokslinis vadovas:

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

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkė:

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

Nariai:

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

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

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

doc. dr. Nerijus Šepetyš (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Oponentai:

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

dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – 03 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2010 m. rugsėjo mėn. 30 d.

15 val. Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto 30 auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto 7, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2010 m. rugpjūčio mėn. _____ d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Salvijus Kulevičius

IDEOLOGICAL MODELS OF LITHUANIAN HERITAGE PROTECTION AND
THEIR PRACTICAL EXPRESSION AT THE SOVIET PERIOD

Summary of doctoral dissertation
Humanitarian Sciences, History (05 H)

Vilnius, 2010

Doctoral dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University in 2005–2010

Scientific supervisor:

prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

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

Chairman

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

Members

prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

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

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

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

Opponents

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

dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, Art Studies – 03 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the public meeting of the Council of Scientific Field of History in the 30th auditorium of the Faculty of History of Vilnius University at 3 p. m. on 30 September 2010

Address: Universiteto 7, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was distributed on _____

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

The main data about the dissertation

Research problem and object. Soviet heritage protection is the phenomenon involving the origins of some aspects of the contemporary Lithuanian heritage protection. The Soviet heritage protection itself is treated controversially in Lithuanian historiography: on the one hand, it expresses pride of achievements and envisages “conspiracy resistance”, on the other hand it discusses the greatest heritage losses and Moscow dictate. It becomes rather complicated when tendencies that emerged during the Soviet times have to be recognised as the content of present heritage protection and virtually as an own thing. The question is, to what extent the present heritage protection is of “Lithuanian” origin and to what extent it is of “Soviet” origin. This is namely the research object of the dissertation. The traditional perspective, i.e. historical heritage protection practices, principles, grouping concepts into “good” or “bad” is not discussed here; instead, ideological origins of heritage protection of that time and expression of the very ideas are studied deeper. *Idea*, the main object of the present research, is understood in its widest sense, involving the fields of theory and practice, official and nonofficial concepts, implemented and unperformed projects. Model viewing helps to manage this expansion. It is a scholarly construct based on the assumption that every idea related to heritage protection discourse gives expression or content to one of the five *elementary components of heritage protection*. Management of the substance is subject to three cross-sections. Chronological cross-section is based on the fact that ideas are subject to time and are variable. Diversity cross-section is based on the tendency that there is rarely one attitude towards one issue, i.e. usually there is an entire range of attitudes. In this case there is an objective to identify marginal points of the spectrum of ideas as well as to define prevailing and more original concepts. The third cross-section is based on the ratio of idea to practice, i.e. to the degree of its implementation or effect. The above typology and cross-sections reduce an idea as an initial source to the *ideological model*,

i.e. a particular synthesis of initial source and scientific matrix. This is namely the main object of the present research (on theoretical level).

Ideas and ideological models related to heritage protection discourse are analysed in the paper. Here, *heritage* stands for cultural immovable tangible heritage, specifically buildings, their complexes and landscape. Only theoretical part of the dissertation makes an exception, where the concept, depending on context, is used in a broad sense as well. Territorial limits of the research is Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR). The chronology of the research covers the period from 1944 to 1990.

Aim and objectives of the research. The aim of the research is to identify and analyse ideological models of heritage protection which functioned or occurred in soviet Lithuania, as well as to analyse their interaction with the practice of heritage protection. The following objectives have been set to reach the aim: 1) to define the degree of influence and scope of control of Moscow directives on Lithuanian Soviet heritage protection; 2) to identify the main categories of Lithuanian Soviet heritage protection, to analyse their genesis, conceptions, interactions and impact on practice; 3) to identify the main ideological models of heritage management in Soviet Lithuania, to analyse their genesis, conceptions, interactions and impact on practice; 4) to define consistent patterns of Lithuanian Soviet heritage protection development and to indicate the stages of development; 5) to actualise the theoretical mind of Lithuanian heritage protection of the Soviet period as well as to conduct the study on its manifestation and impact on practice; 6) to provide a theoretical definition of the *cultural heritage selection* phenomenon, to analyse its expression in Soviet Lithuania and relation to heritage protection processes.

Novelty of the study. Besides traditional heritage protection research objects (official definitions and prevailing conceptions) the “margins” of world of thoughts, i.e. personal (individual) thoughts, unperformed projects, unexecuted alternatives of implemented projects, etc. are introduced into scientific circulation by the present dissertation; a new research matrix, a model of elementary components has been proposed, new periodisation of heritage protection of Lithuanian Soviet period based on the dynamism of ideological model expression has been developed; probably for the first time such thorough analysis of the phenomena of cultural heritage selection and heritage

subjectivisation as well as of the genesis of the idea of complex protected territories has been conducted. By the research, statements proposed in former scholarly works are verified and/or corrected.

Methodology of the research. Three aspects of the research matrix are to be distinguished: explanation of the reality, conception of the concrete (researched) phenomenon and instrumentation of source analysis. The first determines the most general issues, i.e. the concept of constitution of the society, approach to phenomena, possibilities of knowing reality. The author of the present research sees the world (reality) through a prism which is close to the concepts of *social constructionism* and *relativism*. The underlying notion of social constructionism is that the truth is a social construct built and rebuilt in the manner to best meet the needs of the society. In the second case, the basis is not on the “pure” relativism, but on its reduced conception. It is to be based on three fundamental principles: multiperspectiveness, conventionality, and equivalence. They respectively define that both ideologically and practically heritage conservation manifests as the diversity of conceptions, that these conceptions are determined by a concrete constitution and needs of the society and that all the conceptions are equally good and true. This perspective makes one to question the possibility of the existence of versatile theoretical models of heritage protection. Instead of searching for common denominators of the subject, relativism actualises conceptions and peculiarities of heritage protection of concrete societies.

In the present research, the phenomena of heritage and heritage protection are explained based on the *model of elementary components*. The essential principles of this model are that what is heritage or heritage conservation emerges at the point of interaction of certain elements; in every concrete society these elements acquire specific content and expression (see below). Moreover, these components are also problem units facilitating in selecting and managing sources. Several methods were involved in the source analysis: the method of *interpretation*, *analytical method*, *classification*, *generalisation*, and *comparison*.

Research results and conclusions defended.

1. The area of heritage protection in the USSR was attributed to the sphere of propaganda and was treated as the means of forming the consciousness of the society. There was no need to monopolise the entire phenomenon to reach this goal; it was enough to usurp its strategic points. The components of heritage relevance, identification and reality ambivalence (areas of value, distance categories and record) served as such units. On the other hand, there has been a less controlled medium. It included the components of authenticity and maintenance (categories of authenticity and areas of heritage conservation). Similarly, the influence of Moscow on the definitions and processes of Lithuanian heritage protection cannot be taken unambiguously; it was differentiated.

2. Heritage conservation during the Soviet period became an area where values that had not been regarded as heritage values, might be expressed. The value of age was treated as the principle of “bourgeois” heritage conservation; however this did not stop it from becoming a part of restoration practice and concepts. In Lithuania, the tendency of heritage ageing started to spread from the second half of the fifties and soon become a cult. At the beginning of the eighties, this practice was transformed, i.e. under the influence of propaganda identity model not only the oldest architectural, but also pagan layers were started to be searched for in heritage. Moreover, heritage conservation of the seventies was linked to another model of identity, i.e. to Lituanistic model. The most distinct product of this symbiosis was the Tolminkiemis Memorial. It must be stated that in subjectivisation of heritage, the traditional Lithuanian identity models made impact which was as strong as that of the Soviet models.

3. A more thorough analysis of ideas and practices shows that manifestations of so-called complex-structural heritage protection were present in Lithuanian heritage protection of the Soviet period. This is justified by at least two phenomena: regeneration and national parks. The first one represented complex heritage conservation, the second one represented complex protected territories. The Lithuanian conception of regeneration had obviously overstepped the framework of elementary monument protection: regeneration was focused on the maintenance of large, complex territories; it was based

on holistic or integrated conception of heritage; its main goal was not museums, but the revival of heritage by finding its new functions and integrating it into modern infrastructures. The idea of national parks was also based on the integrity of nature and cultural components as well as heritage conservation, recreational and economical functions. These were not only theoretical speculations; respective products were started to be developed at the close of the fifties. These facts lead to questioning the statements of historiography, that in the Soviet heritage protection, the manifestations of structural-complex paradigm were weak and therefore it fell behind the Western European tendencies.

4. Ideological models of heritage protection in Lithuania during the Soviet period existed according to specific dynamics which was not related to the development of legal-administrative system of heritage protection. The trends of idea sources, change and expression in this dynamics suggest at least six stages: 1) heritage protection of Moscow directives and slogan heritage protection; 2) eruption of Lithuanian heritage protection (since 1955); 3) revisions of heritage protection (since 1960); 4) implementation of the large Lithuanian heritage protection projects (since 1965); 5) stagnation of heritage protection (since 1978); 6) *heritage protection movement* (since 1987). This chronological scheme is able to integrate not only the phenomena related to ideological models, but also the tendencies of heritage protection practices, political or other contexts determining heritage protection, as well as changes in legal-administrative system of heritage protection initiated by Lithuania itself. For this reason it may be regarded as general scheme of heritage protection development in Lithuania during the Soviet period.

5. During the Soviet period, cultural heritage was the object of not only heritage protection but also of another phenomenon, i.e. of *cultural heritage selection* (destructive selection) The latter is to be understood as the destruction of physical form of heritage for ideological goals and it possessed much clearer definitions than it is tended to be provided in historiography ("for almost 50 years cultural values of Lithuania had been destroyed", etc.). Several groups of objects belonged to the area of destructive selection: monuments created in the years of the First Republic of Lithuania

related to the topics of independence heroes; state and other symbols of the same period (in their narrow sense); monuments in memory of Stalinist offences; German heritage (Klaipėda region); sacral objects: small sacral architecture, sacred sites, sculptural elements of churches. Selection of objects of historical-political origin took place until the middle of the sixties; selection of sacral heritage lasted until the end of the seventies. The task of the destructive selection before heritage protection was to solve the issues of heritage value as well as the possibility of its existence in the Soviet society; therefore heritage protection got the relicts that were of less conflict.

Brief content of the dissertation

1. Research matrix: the model of elementary components of heritage protection.

The concept of *elementary components* means elements without the existence and interaction whereof the phenomenon of heritage protection would be not possible. Two blocks of components are to be separated: the block of heritage protection object (heritage) and the block of specific treatments applied to it. Today's theoretical and practical mind allows for deconstruction of heritage into three elemental components: *reality ambivalence*, *authenticity* and *relevance* as well as enables one to provide at least two treatments: *identification* and *maintenance*. One more component, i.e. *interpretation*, cannot be excluded as well.

Component of reality ambivalence. Ability of heritage to connect two realities is considered to be the underlying feature of heritage. Every object of heritage protection has to be in its form at the present moment, i.e. in the reality to which the subject actualising the heritage belongs. Despite the presence in the reality which is the same as the subject's reality, certain features show to another reality the subject is not able to move physically whereto. The latter reality can be felt as a whole only mentally and may have a variety of expressions: it may be perceived as the past (the case of the European *historical monument* category), aesthetic ideal (Japanese *meishou* categories and cases of

European stylistic restoration), sacrality (the case of *associative landscapes*) etc. The ratio of other reality represented by heritage to the existing reality is usually defined via the category of *distance*. However, there are societies that ignore this interruption despite its objectivity and eliminate the boundaries between the realities. The interruption may be glued together by the spirit of a nation, by the ideas of universal beauty or other ideas. Therefore to name a component covering several realities, a more abstract notion of *reality ambivalence* is chosen, which does not specify the interrelation of the realities.

Component of authenticity. In the society which values another reality, heritage plays an invaluable role, i.e. it is the only phenomenon (source) existing in the present that may verify the factuality of another reality. Every object of heritage must respectively have a component verifying that its features attributed to another reality are authentic and not fake. In concrete heritage protections, the component is expressed by a variety of categories. In the European tradition the notion of *authenticity* prevails, which in today's heritage protection is usually related to the historicity of material features of an object (material, shape, performance). In the countries of North America, the concept of heritage *integrity* is established and is expressed by the verification of motivation of heritage meaning. In Japanese heritage protection, the component of authenticity is measured by the compliance of an object to traditional principles of crafts or performing art as well as to the canons of traditional aesthetics.

Relevance component. Not all representants of another reality existing in the present are attributed to the discourse of heritage protection; the component of authenticity is not enough. The relevance of an object plays an important role in the attribution. Depending on theoretical approach (in this case elementary functionalist approach has been chosen), it may be interpreted as an ability of an object to meet important functions and needs of the time: if an object is able to do it, it may be attributed to heritage; if not, it is left outside the discourse. Due to the component of relevance, the value status is granted to the object or to the entire group of objects. In the official heritage protection, the value status is named heritage *value* or *weight*. Yet, to define an elemental component of heritage, the concept of *relevance* has been chosen thus showing the subjectivity or relativity of heritage selection. The component of

relevance is important in a number of aspects. It shows what is to be protected, i.e. what is to be considered as heritage. Due to the relevance of its characteristics to the present, an object is separated from the mass of objects connecting several realities and is identified as a value, i.e. as a potential object of heritage. Moreover, the component motivates why heritage is protected. An object identified as heritage is attributed to the specific value field of heritage; these values become its inner, integral part due to which it is protected. Consequently, the attempt to deny the significance of heritage first of all faces the denial of the much more complex system of values.

Identification. Heritage *identification* or *records* is usually defined as the initial component (group of treatments) of heritage protection process. It indicates what is to be protected, i.e. attributed to heritage. The component is based on the assessment of the components of authenticity and relevance according to the defined or obvious criteria. The object meeting the requirements is recognised as heritage and is placed in the typological system of heritage, i.e. it is moved to the matrix of heritage protection logics out of the non-structured and immense plenitude.

Maintenance. As the needs of the society change in the course of time, the required functions of things change as well. The shapes of things do not change as fast as the needs do. Therefore besides useful objects, there appear objects that are not able to perform relevant functions at all or in an optimal way any more. There is the only means to restore their functionality and lost value, that is, to transform useless features so that they could perform the new functions again, i.e. the form of the object has to be renovated. Heritage protection consciousness stands out in this usual logic of things. If value and motivation for an object to exist usually emerge from the unity of its form and initial intention, heritage protection actualises an object by attributing to it values that it had not been directly designed for. These values have nothing in common with the initial intention, but they are completely dependent on the forms that were created for the implementation of the latter but are not functional any more. Since these forms are the basis of heritage protection phenomenon, the guarantee of their survival is necessary. Heritage protection takes care of it itself. The whole of theories and practices designed for reaching this goal comprises the component of maintenance. Maintenance covers a

large variety of expressions: from specially designed measures (conservation, restoration, anastylosis) to treatments that were taken over from traditional lifestyle (Japanese experience in building reconstruction); from striving to stop the change of an object and isolate it from environmental influence (conservation) to the wish to maintain natural development of an object and its interaction with the environment.

Interpretation. All the components discussed so far are the products of heritage protection consciousness. The component of interpretation is distinguished among them for its nature. Heritage protection has no instruments for constructing the heritage meaning; however this is done by history, folklore, religion, aesthetics and other phenomena instead. Although such attribution of meaning is external (with regard to heritage protection), the very meanings have crucial impact on all components of heritage protection. In fact, the interaction is mutual, symbiotical: the above mentioned phenomena provide heritage protection with meaning, and heritage protection guaranties the preservation of their sources or expressions. Again, interpretation itself is ambivalent, i.e. it covers both the process of creating meaning (*interpreting*) and its result – the meaning (*interpretation*). It may be respectively classified as the third component of heritage protection treatments and the fourth component of heritage; however due to its different nature it cannot be completely identified with them.

At the point of interaction of the mentioned components, the phenomenon of heritage protection emerges. These components are presumed to be traced in all heritage protections (in specific conceptions). It is presumed, since although the model has been developed taking into consideration the experience of different societies, it is not guaranteed that in respect to some concrete heritage protections it will not become imposed (will not impose non-existing components) or disregarding (will not notice unique components or individuality). Still, in comparison with other models of heritage research, this one is more respectful towards the attitudes of relativistic heritage protection. Here universal definitions (elementary components) are just an initial starting point leading to identification and specification of peculiarities of concrete heritage protection. Once these initial references are given, the final definitions are not controlled any more, i.e. no advance answers are provided; there is neither an indication what

concrete category must an elementary component become in concrete heritage protection, nor the character of content this category is to acquire or what interrelations among these categories have to be. Another feature of the model is that it is not used for strict definition of relations among separate components, which provides a possibility, when it is required by individuality of the concrete heritage protection, to supplement the model with new components or to reject the distinguished components. Hence, it is open to transformations and this enables one to make the very model closer to the reality, but not to use the model to impose in some cases non-existing (unfaithful) rules to the reality. In summary, the model of elementary components is advantageous to relativistic perspective in at least two aspects: 1) it does not have evaluating aspect and therefore it does not violate the principle of equivalence of heritage protections; 2) it is more focused on revealing concrete heritage protections of the societies rather than universalisation of heritage protection and thus it is favourable to the principle of multiperspectiveness. The basic principle of the model is as less statements as possible, allowing the research object to “tell for itself”.

2. Selection of cultural heritage (destructive selection).

The destiny of cultural heritage in the Soviet society also depended on its relation to the categories of *internationality*, *nationality* and *nationalism*. Heritage which both by its content and form was regarded as socialistic and perfectly suited educational and propaganda functions, was attributed to the international level. The topics of revolutionary movement, the Second World War, friendship with the Russian nation, socialist achievements met the above criteria. Objects that, being not socialist by their form, were able to embody socialist content or content that at least did not contradict the Soviet ideology were classified as belonging to the national level. Here reinterpreting of the initial meanings was applied. Everything that in its essence contradicted Soviet ideals and version of the reality under development, was included into the area of nationalism. The category covers manifestations of “bourgeois” statehood, live religion, etc. Inclusion into one or another category determined the sphere the heritage would be regarded the object of: heritage protection (*monument protection*) or destructive selection (*cultural*

heritage selection). In one case this meant granting the status of heritage (*monument*) and official protection. Such exceptional preference was received by international and national heritage. In another case this meant the verdict for complete or partial destruction. This was faced by nationalistic heritage.

Upon disassociation of communist and soviet ideologies from the capitalist system, the dilemma had to be solved, what this interrupted tradition meant for the present (post-revolution society), i.e. if it is a useless dumpsite or a potential collection of resources. In the USSR, when taking over the Marxist-Leninist terminology, this problem was named as the concept of *cultural heritage selection*. Nevertheless, if Vladimir Lenin treated the selection of cultural heritage as filtering what is to be picked up, in the Soviet reality it turned into an opposite process, i.e. it rejected what was unacceptable. In practice, this appeared in marginal and most aggressive forms, the most popular whereof was destruction. Conscious and systematic destruction of inheritance (namely *inheritance*, but not *heritage*) is not the characteristic or product of the Soviet system. This phenomenon may be considered a satellite of societies that experience constant internal turnings and start constructing new ideology as well as a typical means of external forces that strive to replace the ideology of usurped society with more acceptable one. The Soviet cultural inheritance selection fits into the framework of a wider phenomenon of *destructive selection*. To be more specific, the first one is the expression of the latter phenomenon in a concrete society. In the present research, the *destructive selection* is defined as the destruction for ideological purposes of physical form of objects that had not been classified as heritage by the official ideology, but possessed features that under another circumstances could be classified as such. *Cultural inheritance selection* was related to another phenomenon, i.e. to *monument protection* by an object, though by the goal and measures those were substantially different things. The separation of these two spheres is not a priori. They had been very clearly differentiated by the Soviet society itself: they were called differently (*inheritance selection* and *monument protection* accordingly); their objects were defined by different concepts as well (*cultural inheritance* and *cultural monument*).

The selection of cultural inheritance (historical, heroic monuments and small sacral architecture) was started in Lithuania together with the first Soviet occupation, though the results of that time were relatively not very significant. After the Second World War, this phenomenon acquired much more aggressive and wider dimension. The destructive selection was executed directly, under the governance of local authorities, i.e. administrative, political and ideological leaders of a city, region, area, kolkhoz or sovkhos. The government of the Republic played the role not only of encourager of destructive selection, but also the role of a ‘tamer’ (local initiatives and behaviour was often much more radical than the decisions of central authorities). Moreover, it was trying to stay at the sidelines of the action: it avoided giving direct orders (except for the destruction of sacral inheritance), there were no attempts to centralise the process, there had not been a common plan of activities, there had not been public lectures on what is to be taken over and what is to be rejected. Opposite attitudes prevailed in the selection of other types of cultural inheritance. However, general Soviet contexts and final results demonstrate only one thing: tempering and prohibitions were merely a role, but not the true position: in practice, the order to decide on the spot meant the permission to destroy; and there was no punishment for the violation of the decision not to destroy or performing actions without the decision. Still, the central authority supported the ground that was handy to monument liquidation which provided undoubted results that it wished itself.

Summarising the development of cultural inheritance selection and resistance to it, it must be stated that in the Soviet society, Lithuanian non-soviet monumentalisation traditions of historical and religious memory had different fates. In a number of cases sacral sites did not lose their significance even after their physical liquidation. There was much more success in breaking connections between the lost statehood or memory of intolaterated topics of history and their tangible signs. This was first of all subject to institutional differences. During the Soviet period, the attempts to break the spine of social formations (hierarchy, community) developed on religious basis failed. Whereas social structures supporting historical memory were destroyed during the first years of

occupation already, and without them, traditions of honouring, commemoration, i.e. traditions of memory related to historical monuments soon faded away.

The selection of cultural inheritance had influence on the area of heritage conservation: the latter not immediately faced the complete incorrupt set of pre-soviet inheritance, i.e. heritage selection had been carried out before its official validation. Therefore specialists of Lithuanian heritage protection avoided the larger dilemma how to treat (in terms of the Soviet regime – *nationalistic*) inheritance that was especially not handy to the new system. They remained with milder issues, i.e. the so-called *national* and *international* inheritance.

3. Identification of inheritance and components of heritage relevance and reality ambivalence.

In Soviet heritage protection, there were two official models of heritage values (relevance component): *cultural values* and *types of monuments*. The first one was declarative and played the role of public motivation designed to clarify why heritage is protected. The second one was used to reason the practice of heritage recording (identification). That was a specific concept, covering the areas of typology, values and ideology. It was used not only for the typologisation of heritage, but also to control its values and interpretations: subject to the type (kind) the object was attributed to (archaeological, architectural, art or historic), it acquired corresponding value; the latter was considered the true and official value of an object. In the USSR, due to the model of monument type, the significance of sacral, manor and other inheritance which did not meet the Soviet ideals was devalued; it was permitted for them to be significant architecturally, aesthetically, but not historically. Among all typological groups, the exceptional status was granted to historical monuments namely. They were to become the main collection of heritage that was able to create the Soviet identity and necessary worldview orientations as well as to protect the Soviet discourse of history from the excess of relicts of national nature. The above mentioned models were reported in the years 1948-1949 and remained unchanged until the end of the Soviet era. Identification practice of Lithuanian heritage also conformed to the above schemes.

The component of reality ambivalence in the Soviet heritage protection was linked to the history discourse; however the very experience of historicity was ambiguous. Pre-capitalistic socialist formations were treated as complete stages of history having no more direct links with today's society, thus the inheritance of these periods was marked with the component of distance. The inheritance of capitalist society was also marked with distance, but this distance was of different nature: it was subject not to the feeling of historical interruption (time discourse), but to the intolerance to the existence of different meanings and values (semiotic and axiological discourses). The socialism era was perceived as the present, i.e. its inheritance was experienced immediately, without the feeling of distance. In the case of class cross-section, folk culture and inheritance were recognised as the only link between pre-revolutionary and soviet societies. The definitions of reality ambivalence as well as relevance components constituted an inviolable base of Soviet heritage protection; it was compulsory to the entire USSR and was unquestioned. The very component was not expressed by any clear category, it was not realised as a phenomenon; however, it undoubtedly determined the recording and interpretation of heritage; for example, distance became one of the stimuli to recognise pre-revolutionary inheritance as well (it was a certain guarantee ensuring that heritage was not able to revive pre-soviet memories and had no threats to the Soviet reality).

4. Components of heritage authenticity and maintenance.

The starting point - such notion would be the best to describe the area of heritage conservation (whether the ideological field or practice) in Lithuania after 1945. It is a paradox, but here, the Soviet model of heritage conservation did not become a panacea. In 1949, a corresponding instruction designed by Moscow did not acquire the status of guidelines or supporting document in Lithuania; it practically did not appear in argumentations of the fifties. Moreover, although the instruction said that the aim of restoration is the renewal of the initial or the optimum form of an object, in Lithuania in the first part of the fifties, all attempts were made to restore the appearance that the object had on the eve of the Second World War. Thus a different direction was chosen. Practical achievements of other Soviet countries did not have substantial influence on

Lithuanian heritage conservation either. The above circumstances determined that Lithuanian heritage conservation of the Soviet period developed by learning from its own activities. Such origins did not mean that Lithuanians started developing their own basic principles of heritage conservation: in Lithuania general laws of the area were already known and understood at that time, i.e. European tendencies whereof conservation, restoration and renovation methodologies were started being constructed.

The component of authenticity in the Soviet heritage protection manifested as the category of *authenticity*. This area together with the component of heritage maintenance was the area the least restricted by compulsory definitions (Moscow directives). In Lithuania, two models of authenticity conception were accepted: the model of *historical view* and the model of *historical substance*. The first conception referred to the view (correspondence of the existing view to the initial form of an object or to one of the forms of its development) as the substance of heritage authenticity provability, the second conception referred to the substance (historicity of the existing substance) accordingly. They became the basis for the appearance of two paradigms of restoration. The separation of the two developed in the second half of the fifties. The paradigm determined by the authenticity of historical substance required for strict separation of scientific facts from hypotheses and separation of authentic matter from the matter which was added (renewed) during restoration. Another paradigm strived for the restoration of the completeness of the object's historical form. Here, upon the lack of data, scientific hypotheses and analogies were regarded as acceptable, whereas the principle of separating historical and restored substances was ignored as deforming the view. Both trends of restoration crystallised out naturally, without the influence of external directives. In the second half of the sixties, Lithuanian concepts reasoning one or another paradigm were started to be created. Historian Juozas Jurginis formulated the ideological principles of historical substance paradigm (he called the latter the *realistic* trend of heritage protection): (1) the value of heritage lies in the form of heritage which exists at a given moment and all heritage conservation measures should be focused on preservation of this form namely; (2) intervention (restoration) is possible only for protective, but not for reconstructive purposes; (3) it is neither possible nor necessary to

restore the heritage to the state it used to be; (4) in any case, the restored object is an *imitation* – ‘*padirbinys*’ (original concept of Jurginis), the product of today, but not heritage any more; imitation does not possess the main feature of heritage, that is, authenticity; (5) exposure of former layers is damage to heritage. In app. 1968, architect-restorer Žibartas Simanavičius developed the hierarchy of conservation-restoration aims: according to him, the initial (introductory) aim of conservation-restoration is to ensure long-term existence of heritage; the main (deep) aim is to convey to the spectators as much and as much effective information as possible on the forms of living and historical events of the society of the past. The author considered the latter aim as “undeniable” and the one that should be strived for in “all monuments”. He suggested reconsidering the content of the very concept of *monument*: it was claimed that the status of *monument* had to be granted to buildings which partially or even completely did not have any authentic initial material, but had the respectively copied shapes of the initial original; it was offered to regard them as valuables and to protect them.

The *Venice Charter* of 1964 was considered to be the most authoritative source of authenticity paradigm of historical substance. In Lithuania, the principles meeting the provisions of the Charter had been known and practiced since the fifties, thus here the content of the document was not new. Still there was reaction to the Charter; moreover, it acquired a special status, i.e. it became the most important starting point of the Lithuanian heritage protection. However this by no means meant the implicit recognition of the stated principles. On an ideological level, there were three relations with the latter principles: recognition, free interpretation, and complete rejection. There were few experts who literally followed the provisions of the Charter. For a much larger group of subjects, it became not the initial ideological source, but the means for reasoning their own position which often only partially concurred with the provisions of the Charter or even contradicted them. Hence the famous title of the Charter was employed, but not its content. There was even a more strict position when the relevance and obligation of the Charter was openly questioned. It had the strongest effect in the last years of the Soviet era and it was influenced by the new moods of Lithuanian society – the boom of heritage restoration.

5. Heritage subjectivisation.

Besides the principles reported in heritage protection statements and declared in public, there exists an entire field of influence on heritage the origins whereof lie not in heritage conservation (principles of the discipline designed to define the very discipline), but in external factors, i.e. in the society models of identity or ideology. The difference between the first and the second types of principles is that the principles of heritage conservation (laws of the discipline) by the initial intention are focused on keeping heritage in the form it has reached the present, or on restoration of the form which an object once “really” had; whereas external models wish to see the form of heritage that would best meet the needs of the very models. In sum, the first principles are focused on an object (heritage preservation), the second-type principles are focused on themselves (implementation of own objectives). They may be respectively called the objective and subjective layers of heritage conservation. The subjectivity of identity and ideological models is not limited just to intention. Upon the implementation of the above models, an obstacle is faced: the forms of the past are not always capable of meeting and expressing properly the fancies of today. In such cases, the heritage itself starts to be corrected (physically reconstructed).

The impact of Soviet ideological models. It must be noted that during the Stalin regime, the Soviet ideology usurped neither the practice of heritage conservation, nor the selection of objects to be managed. On the contrary, the greatest attention was paid to the objects whose social, cultural and historic contexts were abused most savagely in the public, i.e. to religion buildings, manor palaces and suzerain castles. The reason for selecting them was relatively objective: the care was taken of the values that needed it most. At that time the interest of heritage protection prevailed over the ideological interest. Yet the Soviet ideology left its trace. The most popular forms of subjectivisation were desacralisation (applied to the objects which had lost their religious purpose; in all cases this was limited to the elimination of small elements, such as crosses at the tops of towers), elimination of the symbols of the First Republic of Lithuania (since this was the direct function of destructive selection and it worked honestly, here subjectivisation

through heritage conservation had little room left) and heritage sovietisation (it was expressed in different ways: by attaching soviet symbols to buildings; location of military cemeteries or soviet monuments in historical complexes; heritage monumentalisation).

The impact of oldness cult. This form of subjectivisation emerged in the second half of the fifties. In comparison with heritage sovietisation, the cult is based on a completely different ideological basis: its origins lied not in the Soviet ideology, but in the Lithuanian identity (the differentiation of concepts *Soviet* and *Lithuanian* is understood as relative). Heritage gothification or rennaisancing was completely irrelevant and useless for the formation of international culture; however this undoubtedly improved the image of national culture. The tendency of ageing in the fifties and sixties was not obviously linked to any traditional Lithuanian identity model; it was based on the formula that was characteristic not to one social group but on some universal formula (recognised by at least the majority of European society): the older, the more valuable. Every newly discovered (i.e. exposed or created) Gothic monument raised historical and cultural self-esteem of Lithuanians and was to demonstrate their cultural sensitivity to others. The concept of *cult* in the naming of the form of this subjectivisation has been chosen not accidentally: the category of oldness in heritage protection had a special place and this is justified by a number of facts: 1) there existed a developed scale of value of historical layers where the earliest layers were considered as the most valuable ones (Gothic, Renaissance as well as the so-called pre-gothic stonework), whereas the styles and layers of the 19th century were not regarded as belonging to the area of values at all; 2) the cult had its own apologists in the highest levels of the system of heritage conservation; 3) in the minds of the majority of heritage conservation specialists, the category of oldness was a certain value and even more, it was a taboo that could not be made attempts to.

The symbiosis of oldness cult and heritage conservation helped to create the justifications of Lithuanian culture oldness; however, the very justifications also showed the difference of Lithuanians from the most authoritative culture of the USSR, i.e. the Russian culture. It was conceived that no other historic style estrange Lithuania from

Russia to such extent and did not connect Lithuania to Europe, as the Gothic style did (partially as the Renaissance as well). On the other hand, the disfavour with the architecture of the 19th century was determined not only by artistic characteristics of the latter (eclecticism), but also by its imaginary or real hospitability: it was considered as the inheritance of tsarist Russia. The opening of the 19th century layer was respectively treated as the impact of barbarism and the restitution of the real, authentic form (Gothic, Renaissance). It is possible that beneath this procedure there was the search for cultural identity – the forms that did not match the ideas implied by the Soviet models of culture.

The impact of models of Lithuanian identity. In the second half of the sixties, legitimation of the pagan layer was strengthened in Lithuania. Restorers were subject to the interpretations on paganism and mythological times as well. Sigitas Lasavickas and Napalys Kitkauskas introduced a new change in heritage subjectivisation: the old layers were started being treated not only as the expression of style (pre-Gothic, Gothic and other architecture), but also as the expression of paganism. This break occurred in the second half of the seventies – at the beginning of the eighties. The most famous sensation on the topic of paganism was the discovery of the so-called Perkūnas temple in the old layers of Vilnius Cathedral in 1986. This event definitely had the impact on Lithuanian pagan identity. Due to the symbiosis of heritage research and pagan-focused interpretations, a new phenomenon of pagan buildings was formed. They enriched a rather poor (in typological sense) list of immovable objects suitable for this identity; those were the objects of completely different quality: they witnessed not only the paganism of the ancestors, but also their civilisation; these findings decreased the absoluteness of the thesis raised by the representatives of a pro-pagan trend that the most significant traces of pagan civilisation were destroyed; finally, they confirmed the objectivity of the sources (e.g. texts of Teodoras Narbutas) on pagan temples that the others (history specialists) had been calling fiction. In fact, pro-pagan interpretations supported and developed by the restorers did not have any greater influence on the physical form of heritage. Only the measures of monumentalisation, e.g. marking of the location by building an altar were applied.

Besides the pagan consciousness, the model of Lithuanian identity existed. The most vivid expressions of the latter were the works of renewing Tolminkiemis church and the complexes of Vilnius University. In the first case, Lituanistic aspirations served as a stimulus for restoration, whereas in the second case they influenced the schedule of object monumentalisation. The restoration of Tolminkiemis church was treated as the building of a monument to one of the greatest Lithuanian poets Kristijonas Donelaitis and as the matter of national importance (“the matter of all of us”). Here subjectivisation was also applied. The most evident its expression was in the interior of a building: its initial sacral meaning was replaced with Lithuanistic memorial meaning. During the soviet period, the oldness of Vilnius University was especially emphasized (“the oldest school of higher education in the Soviet Union”). This was used to declare that Lithuanian culture had the oldest traditions in all Soviet republics. However, for the University to become Lithuanian, its Polish and Latin past had to be forgotten (a notice by Nerija Putinaitė). This desire or conviction was focused on the physical form of the university as well: monuments verifying (or probably creating) the Lithuanian identity were started being placed in its space.

In comparison with the expression of the oldness cult, the models of Lithuanian identity had only little impact on the physical form of heritage. However, due to them the places of memory of respective identity forms were constructed: during the Soviet period, Kristijonas Donelaitis became alive to Lithuanians not only through his poem, but also through a concrete site; the walls and courtyards of Vilnius University started showing Lithuanian signs like it never did before; manifestations of paganism moved from sideline spaces to the very heart of the nation and appeared to be much more civilised than it was thought before. Objective principles of heritage conservation were not capable of creating this.

6. Ideas and practice of complex heritage protection.

By its nature and principles, the Soviet experience of heritage regeneration belonged to the paradigm of complex heritage protection. The typical object of regeneration was huge, complex territories (entire parts of cities, villages etc.) and (this

is the basic specificity of regeneration and the feature of complex heritage protection) the territories constituent parts whereof were treated as one, undividable, and interrelated system. Such attitude determined a number of ideological breaks (in comparison with the traditional or the so-called elementary heritage protection). Not only objects with exceptional qualities, but also undistinguished objects that were important for the formation of traditional environment or character of a site were regarded as valuable and protectable. Traditional distinctive conception of heritage was withdrawn (division of heritage by regions, offices) by replacing it with holistic or integrated conception. Each object respectively started existing not on its own, but first of all it occupied a certain niche of a larger whole and interacted with other objects of that whole. The new treatment of heritage required new solutions of heritage conservation that were also complex. It was realised that the most rational way of managing constituent parts of the concrete environment was to manage them not separately, but all together, by coordinating heritage protection and construction works and after performing the advance complex consideration and planning perspectives (functions) of the entire territory or its separate parts. Another distinction of regeneration manifested through its intention: the behaviour was focused not on the past, but on the present. Its main goal was to revive historical territories by adapting them to today's needs and finding new functions as well as by integrating them into contemporary infrastructures. In Lithuania, the need and favourable conditions for complex heritage protection solutions appeared in the second half of the fifties. In 1958, a complex *Project of Vilnius Old Town Reconstruction* was prepared. Unfortunately, there was a considerable delay in its implementation: the first block of the old town was reconstructed according to the new principles only in 1972. Nevertheless, the seventies and the beginning of the eighties was a real boom of regeneration idea. Besides urban heritage, the idea of complex management at that time was started being applied to other types of heritage: to historical cemeteries, villages. Unfortunately, none of the above mentioned projects was implemented to the full extent.

Another phenomenon of Lithuanian heritage protection, complex protected territories is certainly attributable to the complex paradigm as well. For the first time the

idea of a national park in Lithuania was implemented in 1966 (the status of landscape conservation area of the special protection regime adequate to the regime of a national park, was granted to the territory of the Curonian Spit) or in 1974 (Lithuanian National Park was established). During the development of this formation, the experience of different countries of the world was analysed and summarised (Povilas Kavaliauskas, app. 1970). The complex model was chosen as a basis. This was not subject to any “advance” heritage protection idea: in general, in the European discourse of heritage protection, the respective ideas appeared a little later. The development of national parks was determined by the interests of environmental protection; however, the studies of Lithuanian landscape led to the perception that the resources of purely natural territories are very limited and landscapes affected by humans prevail. The establishment of larger protected territories could not escape the presence of cultural components. The question is, how they could function: as the insertions of natural landscape or as one of the constituent parts of a complex landscape. On ideological level, the second version was adhered to. The integrity of Lithuanian national parks, as seen by Kavaliauskas, was ambivalent, covering the integrity of culture and nature as well as the combination of several functions.

Rezumė

Tyrimo problema ir objektas. Sovietmečio paveldosauga yra reiškinys, kuriame glūdi kai kurių dabartinės Lietuvos paveldosaugos aspektų ištakos. Pati sovietmečio paveldosauga lietuviškoje historiografijoje vertinama prieštaringai: viena vertus, didžiuojamasi pasiekimais ir įžvelgiama „kondorcinė rezistencija“, kita vertus, kalbama apie didžiausius paveldo nuostolius ir Maskvos diktatą. Visa tai tampa gana komplikauta, kai sovietmečiu užgimusias tendencijas tenka pripažinti dabarties paveldosaugos turiniu ir iš esmės savastimi. Kyla klausimas, kiek šios dabarties paveldosaugos ištakos yra „lietuviškos“, o kiek „sovietinės“ prigimties. Būtent tai ir nagrinėjama disertacijoje. Čia atsisakoma tradicinės perspektyvos – istorinių paveldosaugos praktikų, principų, sampratų dalijimo į „geras“ ir „blogas“; vietoj to gilinamasi į to meto paveldosaugos idėines ištakas bei pačių idėjų raiškas. *Idėja*, pagrindinis šio tyrimo objektas, suprantama plačiausia prasme, apimant teorijos ir praktikos, oficialių ir neoficialių konceptų, realizuotų ir neįgyvendintų sumanymų sferas. Šias platumas padeda suvaldyti modelinė žiūra. Ji yra mokslinis konstruktas ir grindžiama prielaida, kad kiekviena su paveldosaugos diskursu susijusi idėja suteikia išraišką ar turinį vienam iš penkių *paveldosaugos elementariųjų dėmenų*. Medžiagą suvaldyti padeda trys skerspjūviai. Chronologinis skerspjūvis motyvuojamas tuo, kad idėjos yra sąlygotos laiko ir kintantis dydis. Įvairovės skerspjūvis remiasi tendencija, kad vienu klausimu retai kada egzistuoja viena pozicija – dažniausiai esama visos jų paletės. Šiuo atveju siekiama identifikuoti kraštutinius idėjų spektro taškus, o taip pat išskirti dominuojančias bei originalesnes sampratas. Trečiasis skerspjūvis grindžiamas idėjos santykiu su praktika, t. y. jos realizacijos ar poveikimo laipsniu. Įvardytoji tipologija bei skerspjūviai idėją, kaip pirminį šaltinį, redukuoja į *idėjinį modelį* – savotišką pirminio šaltinio ir mokslinės matricos sintezę. Būtent tai ir yra pagrindinis šio tyrimo objektas (teorinėje plotmėje).

Darbe analizuojamos idėjos ar idėjiniai modeliai, susiję su paveldosaugos diskursu. *Paveldu* čia vadinamas kultūrinis materialus nekilnojamas paveldas, o tiksliau – statiniai, jų kompleksai bei kraštovaizdis. Išimtimi tampa tik teorinė darbo dalis, kurioje sąvoka, priklausomai nuo konteksto, vartojama ir plačiąja prasme. Tyrimo teritorinės ribos – Lietuvos SSR. Tyrimo chronologiniai rėmai apima laikotarpį nuo 1944 iki 1990 m.

Tyrimo tikslas ir uždaviniai. Tikslas – identifikuoti ir išanalizuoti paveldosaugos idėjinius modelius, funkcionavusius ar pasireiškusius sovietinėje Lietuvoje, išnagrinėti jų sąveiką su paveldosaugos praktika. Tikslui pasiekti išsikelti šie uždaviniai: 1) nustatyti Maskvos direktyvų poveikio Lietuvos sovietmečio paveldosaugai laipsnį ir kontrolės sferas; 2) identifikuoti pagrindines Lietuvos sovietmečio paveldosaugos kategorijas, išanalizuoti jų genezę, sampratas, sąveikas ir poveikį praktikai; 3) identifikuoti pagrindinius elgsenų su paveldu idėjinius modelius sovietinėje Lietuvoje, išanalizuoti jų genezę, sampratas, sąveikas bei poveikį praktikai; 4) nustatyti Lietuvos sovietmečio paveldosaugos raidos dėsningumus ir išskirti raidos etapus (sukurti periodizaciją); 5) aktualizuoti lietuviškąją sovietmečio paveldosauginę teorinę mintį ir atlikti jos apraiškų bei poveikio praktikai tyrimą; 6) teoriškai apibrėžti *kultūrinio palikimo atrankos* reiškinių, išanalizuoti jo raišką sovietinėje Lietuvoje bei santykį su paveldosaugos procesais.

Darbo naujumas. Darbo naujumas glūdi daugiau atskiruose aspektuose nei visumoje: pasiūloma nauja tyriminė matrica – elementariųjų dėmenų modelis; sukurta nauja Lietuvos sovietmečio paveldosaugos periodizacija, grįsta idėjinių modelių raiškos dinamika; berods, pirmą kartą imamas tokios išsamios kultūrinio palikimo atrankos bei paveldo subjektyvizacijos reiškinių, kompleksinių saugomų teritorijų idėjos ištakų analizės; į mokslinę apyvartą greta tradicinių paveldosaugos tyrimo objektų (oficialiųjų apibrėžčių ir vyraujančių sampratų) įvedamos minčių pasaulio „paraštės“ – asmeninės (individualios) mintys, neįgyvendinti sumanymai, įgyvendintų sumanymų nerealizuotos alternatyvos ir pan. Tyrimu verifikuojami ir / ar koreguojami ankstesniuose moksliniuose darbuose išdėstyti teiginiai.

Tyrimo metodologija. Kalbant apie tyriminę matricą, atskirtini trys aspektai: tikrovės paaiškinimas, konkretaus (tiriamąjo) reiškinių samprata ir šaltinių tyrimo instrumentarijus. Pirmasis aspektas apsprendžia pačius bendriausius dalykus – visuomenės sanklodos sampratą, reiškinių traktavimą, tikrovės pažinimo galimybes. Šio tyrimo autorius pasaulį (tikrovę) suvokia per prizmę, artimą *socialinio konstruktyvizmo* bei *reliatyvizmo* konceptams. Pamatinė socialinio konstruktyvizmo nuostata – tiesa yra socialinis konstruktas, konstruojamas ir perkonstruojamas taip, kad geriausiai atitiktų sociumo poreikius. Antruoju atveju remiamasi ne „grynuoju“ reliatyvizmu, o redukuota jo samprata. Pastaroji grįstina trejais pamatiniais principais: daugiaperspektyvumo, sąlygotumo ir lygiavertiškumo. Atitinkamai jie apibrėžia, kad paveldosauga idėjiškai ir praktiškai reiškiasi kaip sampratų įvairovė, kad šios sampratos yra nulemtos konkrečios visuomenės sanklodos bei poreikių ir kad visos sampratos yra vienodai geros bei teisingos. Ši perspektyva skatina suabejoti universalių paveldosaugos teorinių modelių įmanomumu. Užuoat ieškojus bendrų disciplinos vardiklių, reliatyvizmas aktualizuoja konkrečių visuomenių paveldosaugos sampratas ir savitumus.

Paveldo ir paveldosaugos reiškiniai šiame tyrime paaiškinami remiantis *elementariųjų dėmenų modeliu*. Esminiai jo principai – tai, kas yra paveldas ar paveldosauga, gimsta tam tikrų elementų sąveikos taške; tie elementai kiekvienoje konkrečioje visuomenėje įgyja savitą turinį ir išraiškas. Pabrėžtina, kad šie dėmenys kartu yra ir probleminiai mazgai, kurie padeda atsirinkti bei suvaldyti šaltinius. Šaltinių tyrime derinti keli metodai – *interpretacinis*, *analitinis*, *klasifikuojantis*, *generalizuojantis* bei *lyginamasis*.

Tyrimo rezultatai ir ginamos išvados.

1. Paveldosaugos sfera SSRS buvo priskirta propagandos sričiai ir traktuota kaip visuomenės sąmonės formavimo priemonė. Šiam tikslui pasiekti nereikėjo monopolizuoti viso reiškinio – pakako uzurpuoti strateginius jo taškus. Tokiais mazgais tapo paveldo aktualumo, identifikavimo ir realybinio dvilypumo dėmenys (vertės, distanciškumo kategorijų bei apskaitos sferos). Kita vertus, būta mažiau kontroliuojamos terpės. Jai priklausė tikrumo bei palaikymo dėmenys (autentiškumo kategorijos ir

paveldotvarkos sferos). Atitinkamai Maskvos įtaka Lietuvos paveldosaugos apibrėžtims ir procesams negali būti vertinama vienareikšmiškai – ji buvo diferencijuota.

2. Paveldotvarka sovietmečiu tapo sfera, kurioje galėjo skleistis vertės, oficialiai nelaikytos paveldo vertėmis. Senumo vertė traktuota kaip „buržuazinės“ paveldosaugos principas, tačiau tai jai nesutrukdė tapti restauravimo praktikos bei konceptų dalimi. Lietuvoje paveldo sendinimo tendencija pradėjo plisti nuo 6 deš. antrosios pusės ir netrukus virsto kultu. 9 deš. pradžioje ši praktika transformavosi – įtakojant propagoniškajam tapatumo modeliui, pavelde pradėta ieškoti ne tik seniausių architektūrinių, bet ir pagoniškujų sluoksnių. Be to, 8 deš. paveldotvarka buvo susieta ir su kitu tapatumo modeliu – lituanistiniu. Ryškiausias šios simbiozės produktas – Tolminkiemio memorialas. Tenka konstatuoti, kad tradiciniai lietuvių tapatumo modeliai, subjektyvizuojant paveldą, turėjo ne menkesnį poveikį nei sovietiniai.

3. Išsamesnė idėjų ir praktikų analizė atskleidžia, kad Lietuvos sovietmečio paveldosaugoje neabejotinai būta vadinamosios kompleksinės-struktūrinės paveldosaugos apraiškų. Tai patvirtina bent du reiškiniai – regeneravimas ir nacionaliniai parkai. Pirmasis atstovavo kompleksinei paveldotvarkai, antrasis – kompleksinėms saugomoms teritorijoms. Lietuviškoji regeneravimo samprata akivaizdžiai peržengė elementinės paminklosaugos rėmus: regeneravimas buvo orientuotas į didelių, sudėtingų teritorijų puoselėjimą; jis grįstas holistine arba integruotąja paveldo samprata; pagrindinis jo tikslas buvo ne muziejifikuoti, o atgaivinti surandant naujas funkcijas, integruojant į šiuolaikines infrastruktūras. Nacionalinių parkų idėja vėlgi buvo grįsta gamtos ir kultūros dėmenų bei paveldosauginių, rekreacinių ir ūkinių funkcijų integralumu. Ir tai nebuvo tik teoriniai samprotavimai – atitinkami produktai pradėti kurti dar 6 deš. pabaigoje. Šie faktai skatina kvestionuoti istoriografijos teiginius, esą sovietinėje paveldosaugoje struktūrinės-kompleksinės paradigmos apraiškos buvo silpnos ir dėl to ji atsiliko nuo Vakarų Europos tendencijų.

4. Paveldosaugos idėjiniai modeliai Lietuvoje sovietmečiu gyvavo pagal savitą, su paveldosaugos teisinės-administracinės sistemos raida nesutampančią, dinamiką. Idėjų ištakų, kaitos ir raiškos tendencijos šioje dinamikoje leidžia išvelgti bent šešis etapus: 1) Maskvos direktyvų ir lozunginės paveldosaugos; 2) lietuviškosios paveldosaugos

proveržio (nuo 1955 m.); 3) paveldosaugos revizijos (nuo 1960 m.); 4) didžiųjų lietuviškųjų paveldosaugos projektų realizavimo (nuo 1965 m.); 5) paveldosaugos sąstingio (nuo 1978 m.); 6) *paminklosaugos sąjūdžio* (nuo 1987 m.). Ši chronologinė schema pajėgi integruoti ne tik reiškinius, susijusius su idėjiniais modeliais, bet ir paveldosaugos praktikos tendencijas, paveldosaugą sąlygojusius politinius ar kitus kontekstus, pačios Lietuvos inicijuotus paveldosaugos teisinės-administracinės sistemos pakitimus. Dėl to ji gali būti laikoma bendrąja paveldosaugos raidos Lietuvoje sovietmečiu schema.

5. Kultūrinis palikimas sovietmečiu buvo ne tik paveldosaugos, bet ir kito reiškinio – *kultūrinio palikimo atrankos* (naikinamosios selekcijos) – objektas. Šis reiškinys suvoktinas kaip palikimo fizinio pavidalo naikinimas dėl ideologinių tikslų ir jis turėjo daug aiškesnes apibrėžtis nei mėgstama pateikti istoriografijoje („beveik 50 metų naikintos Lietuvos kultūros vertybės“ ir pan.). Naikinamosios selekcijos sferai priklausė kelios objektų grupės: Pirmosios Lietuvos Respublikos gyvavimo metais sukurti monumentai, susiję su nepriklausomybės ir herojų temomis; to paties laikotarpio valstybiniai ir kiti simboliai (siaurąja prasme); monumentai, skirti stalinizmo nusikaltimų atminčiai; vokiškasis palikimas (Klaipėdos krašte); sakraliniai objektai – mažoji sakralinė architektūra, šventosios vietos, skulptūriniai bažnyčių elementai. Istorinės-politinės prigimties objektų selekcija vyko iki 7 deš. vidurio, sakralinio palikimo – iki 8 deš. pabaigos. Naikinamajai selekcijai pirmiau paveldosaugos buvo patikėta išspręsti palikimo vertingumo ir jo galimybės egzistuoti sovietinėje visuomenėje klausimus, tad pastarajai teko mažiau konfliktiški relikvai.

Mokslinių publikacijų sąrašas

1. KULEVIČIUS, Salvijus. Kultūros paveldo autentiškumas: reliatyvistinė perspektyva. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės Valdovų rūmų atkūrimo byla. Vieno požiūrio likimas*. Vilnius, 2006, p. 147–182.

2. KULEVIČIUS, Salvijus. Reliatyvistinė paveldosaugos samprata: prielaidos, principai, galimybės. *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, 2009, t. 24. p. 150–166.

Trumpos žinios apie doktorantą

Salvijus Kulevičius gimė 1979 m. balandžio 20 d. Šiauliuose.

2005 m. Vilniaus universitete įgijo istorijos magistro (paveldosaugininko profesinė kvalifikacija) laipsnį. 2005–2009 m. Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto doktorantas. 2001–2005 m. dirbo Kurtuvėnų regioninio parko direkcijoje kultūrologu. Nuo 2005 m. dėsto (dirba) Šiaulių universitete, o nuo 2009 m. – Vilniaus universitete. Mokslinių interesų sferos: Lietuvos paveldosaugos idėjiniai modeliai, neeuropietiškosios paveldosaugos sampratos, tarptautinės paveldosaugos patirtis, nematerialaus paveldo apsauga.

Brief information about the doctoral student

Salvijus Kulevičius was born on 20 April 1979 in Šiauliai.

In 2005, he acquired the Master's degree in History (professional qualification of heritage protection specialist) at Vilnius University. In 2005-2009 - the doctoral student of Vilnius University Faculty of History. In 2001-2005 he worked as a culture specialist at the Direction of Kurtuvėnai Regional Park. Since 2005, the doctoral student has been teaching (working) at Šiauliai University and since 2009 he has been teaching at Vilnius University. Areas of scholarly interests: Ideological models of Lithuanian heritage protection, conceptions of non-European heritage protection, experience of international heritage protection, protection of intangible heritage.