

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS
LIETUVOS ISTORIJOS INSTITUTAS

Viltė
JANUŠAUSKAITĖ

Urbanistinio paveldo apsauga sovietinėje Lietuvoje: idėjos ir praktika

DAKTARO DISERTACIJOS SANTRAUKA

Humanitariniai mokslai,
Istorija ir archeologija H 005

VILNIUS 2019

Disertacija rengta 2013–2018 metais Vilniaus universitete.
Mokslinius tyrimus rėmė Lietuvos mokslo taryba.

Mokslinė vadovė:

prof. dr. Marija Drėmaitė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija – H 005).

Gynimo taryba:

Pirmininkas – **doc. dr. Nerijus Šepetys** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija – H 005);

dr. Dalia Klajumienė (Vilniaus dailės akademija, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – H 003);

doc. dr. Salvijus Kulevičius (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija – H 005);

doc. dr. Vaidas Petrulis (Kauno technologijos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, menotyra – H 003);

prof. dr. Arūnas Streikus (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija ir archeologija – H 005).

Disertacija ginama viešame Gynimo tarybos posėdyje
2019 m. birželio mėn. 20 d. 15 val. Vilniaus universitete
Istorijos fakulteto 218 auditorijoje. Adresas: Universiteto g. 7,
Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Lietuvos istorijos instituto ir Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekose ir VU interneto svetainėje adresu:
<https://www.vu.lt/naujienos/ivykiu-kalendorius>

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
THE LITHUANIAN INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

Viltė
JANUŠAUSKAITĖ

Urban Heritage Protection in Soviet Lithuania: Ideas and Practice

SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Humanities,
History and Archaeology – H 005

VILNIUS 2019

This dissertation was written between 2013 and 2018 at Vilnius University. The research was supported by Research Council of Lithuania.

Academic supervisor:

Prof. Dr. Marija, Drėmaitė (Vilnius University, Humanities, History and Archaeology – H 005).

This doctoral dissertation will be defended in a public meeting of the Dissertation Defence Panel:

Chairman – Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nerijus, Šepetys (Vilnius University, Humanities, History and Archaeology – H 005);

Members:

Dr. Dalia Klajumienė (Vilnius Academy of Arts, Humanities, History and Theory of Arts – H 003);

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Salvijus Kulevičius (Vilnius University, Humanities, History and Archaeology – H 005);

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vaidas Petrulis (Kaunas University of Technology, Humanities, History and Theory of Arts – H 003);

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arūnas Streikus (Vilnius University, Humanities, History and Archaeology – H 005).

The dissertation shall be defended at a public meeting of the Dissertation Defence Panel at 3 p.m. on 20 June 2019 in meeting room 218 of the Faculty of History Vilnius University.

Address: 7 University street, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The text of this dissertation can be accessed at the libraries of The Lithuanian Institute of History and Vilnius University, as well as on the website of Vilnius University: www.vu.lt/lt/naujienos/ivykiu-kalendorius

SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Research problem and novelty

The history and theory of urban heritage protection is a relevant aspect of contemporary heritage studies. Interdisciplinary research strategies are employed; their main focus is not only the evaluation of certain results of conservation works as their research object but also frequently the change of the concept of heritage itself. Issues of local heritage, urban heritage as a place of social interaction, and change in the concept of urban heritage are raised and discussed on the international level. Lithuania's urban heritage protection system, which used to be ranked as a leader in the USSR context, has not been analysed in such depth. So far studies prioritised research of general features of the heritage protection system and of architectural conservation: the processes of urban heritage conservation were mostly presented as illustrations of general trends and based on statements, established in the Soviet era, without comparing them in the context of broader theoretical and geographical parallels.

After the restoration of Lithuanian Independence in 1990, change and evaluative processes began in many areas of culture, academia and education, including the field of urban conservation. Two positions regarding the Soviet period heritage protection system unfolded: negative, which emphasised destruction of national heritage, and positive, relying on the statement that during that period the system was working for Lithuania. The latter has been formulated and has increasingly gained support from heritage professionals who worked or have been working in the field. Advanced ideas and the model system that successfully functioned in the Soviet era are contrasted to the contemporary chaos and lack of purposeful heritage protection policy. It leads to the repetition and prevalence of uncritical statements, grounded by individual reminiscences in contemporary local public discourse and even

academia. Such contradiction in evaluation of the Soviet urban heritage protection system presupposes the main research problem of this study: how and why did a particular urban heritage concept and its protection system develop in Soviet Lithuania? Thus, the research is dedicated to answer these questions by focussing on this type of heritage and its protection and is based on thorough analysis of the various sources of the period.

The novelty of this study depends on the aspects analysed: not only the ideas but also the practices of urban heritage conservation, i.e., the applications of urban planning documents are taken into account due to their significance in revealing certain attitudes towards certain heritage concepts. Altogether it is aimed to explore the influence of practice on the concept and understanding of urban heritage and its values. Analysis of contemporary academic judgements confirms this topic being relevant and not yet comprehensively revealed. It must be noted that urban heritage protection in Soviet Lithuania, unlike its counterpart architectural conservation, in general was considered to be a success story and hardly criticised, except for remarks about ineffective implementation. However, contemporary Lithuania's urban heritage protection principles have their roots in the Soviet period and thus it is of utmost importance to understand the change in concept of urban heritage, maintaining distance from personal and/or biased judgements.

Comparative analysis of heritage conservation processes in Soviet Lithuania in the international context would make a significant contribution to the field, especially considering long-term testimonials on the Lithuania's heritage protection systems' exceptionality and *level of advancement* widely spread by specialists who were actively involved at that time. Interestingly, identical or similar trends prevail in historiography of the compared countries (e.g. Estonia) and it makes the issue of leadership or "being No.1" rather relevant within the framework of this research. Equally important is to answer the question of whether formal leadership, i.e.,

confirmed by facts and documents, received similarly successful reception from “the followers.” Hence, this dissertation is relevant at the national level as consistent and synthesised study on Lithuanian urban heritage. It aims to broaden the field of Soviet Lithuania’s heritage studies and enrich it with regard to the yet unexplored or superficially described aspects, as well as verify and/or correct certain statements well established in the national historiography.

The research is also very relevant at the international (Central European) level. In many countries that figure in this research and were subjects of collaboration and experience exchange (e.g. Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia), independent research concerning urban heritage protection history in each respective country has started. However, similarly to Lithuania, most of the studies (1) still concentrate on architectural conservation and (2) are limited to one particular country, often repeating, without critical verification, statements made by persons who were once active in the heritage protection systems. There are no comparative studies that would encompass a regional context and reveal complicated and multifaceted interactions between the neighbouring urban heritage protection systems, their similarities and their differences. This dissertation, besides exploring in detail urban heritage protection processes in Soviet Lithuania and their contexts, also provides data that could contribute to corrections and the broadening of certain concepts prevailing in the historiography of these respective countries.

It is noted that the contemporary Lithuanian heritage protection system, especially urban conservation, is now in a state of certain crisis (some uncertainty may be noted on the international level as well). Thus, on purpose to understand the present, it is wise to explore the past, i.e., the history of the protection of this type of heritage, that determined the contemporary concept of urban heritage and its protection.

Research object

Research object – urban heritage protection ideas and practice in Soviet Lithuania. It is aimed to reveal the connection between external contexts and the change in concept of urban heritage and how these changes were reflected in the urban heritage planning documents of that time. These documents in turn legally determined the materialisation of certain ideas and thus again became the external influence causing a change in heritage concept. Within the framework of this research the following are assigned to ideas: thoughts, reflections, discussions, speeches, concepts, described theories and accomplished methodologies. Practice is defined as specific conservation proposals (based on certain ideas/approaches) and their implementation. It must be noted, however, that ideas and practice are closely intertwined in most cases and form the whole of the information concerning the history of a certain urban heritage object. This is why this research does not divide them artificially into separate chapters but instead seeks to analyse them in parallel while revealing mutual interactions and influences. One more condition must also be taken into account: urban heritage is a type of heritage which is intensively used on a daily basis and thus it is utterly impossible to turn it into a museum. That is why other domains such as political and economic systems, social processes, financial issues, urban planning etc. are important to understand the full picture behind urban heritage conservation. In this context questions are raised: if attempts were made, how did they balance the formal demand to “ensure contemporary living conditions” and the principles of heritage protection? A hypothesis is suggested that architects (including conservation architects) who embraced modernist ideas took this argument as stimulus to implement their ambitions, likewise post-war ruins opened similar opportunities in prior decades across the whole of Europe.

The research problem is unfolded and analysed in chronological order. It provides the most favourable conditions to reveal the change and continuance of the processes and the cause and effect relationship between them, as well as compare Lithuanian phenomena which occurred in different periods and place them within the broader geographical and mental context, i.e., international heritage protection ideas. Focus is directed towards the identification and description of certain trends that were dominant during certain historic periods but, wherever their identification is possible based on data collected, critical or alternative ideas are discussed.

From an ideological perspective, urban heritage was considered as relatively “safe” during the Soviet period. There are no encoded symbols that would be unacceptable for the regime etc., except for individual objects such as churches. Therefore urban heritage objects, not being socialist in their form, were suitable to embody socialist (or at least consistent with ideologically soviet) content and at the same time were useful as living illustrations of the “dark past” and examples of the current government’s concern for its citizens; both in documents dedicated for professionals’ internal use and in public media the same statements discussing improvement of living conditions were continually repeated. Poor living conditions of the past were compared to socialist living norms to be achieved. On the other hand, during the period analysed (since the mid-fifties) the cultural elite, thus heritage professionals as well, were finally forced to become part of the system and conform so there were no significant contradictions with regards to the soviet ideology. In conclusion, it is possible to state that urban conservation in the cities and towns of Soviet Lithuania was oriented towards preservation of the form. Meanwhile sociocultural context was mostly ignored or, on the contrary, remodelled using such measures as change of historic function or meaning and naming these processes as “adaptation for contemporary man.”

Research aim and objectives

Research aim is to analyse the change of urban heritage concept and the development of its protection system in Soviet Lithuania.

Research objectives

1. To analyse and generalise the change in concept of value of preserved old towns and urban monuments of local significance at the level of ideas (discussions and polemics) and practice (enlisting, regulations, projects).
2. To analyse and summarise the political, administrative, social, cultural, legal and personal circumstances of urban heritage protection documentation.
3. To analyse and compare urban heritage conservation practices in reconstruction, regeneration projects and other complex planning documents in different urban heritage protection periods: 1956-1969, 1969-1987, 1987-1992.
4. To assess the urban heritage protection system of Soviet Lithuania in the context of the same period's international heritage protection trends, represented in international documents and discussions by renowned heritage professionals, looking for reflections and local modifications of international trends and reasons behind compliance or differences, and aiming to verify statements on Lithuania's leadership in the region established in Lithuanian historiography.

Research methodology

The research is based on an interdisciplinary approach. Analysis of historical-archival material (most of it has not been thoroughly or at all examined and is publicised for the first time) is combined with oral history methods, namely interviews, conducted to reconstruct the multifaceted reality based on a detailed historic research of the period in question. The main principle of this research is the complex

analysis of various sources, i.e., comparison of theoretical and practical data, in search of similarities and differences and seeking to determine any cause and effect relationships. In some cases it relies on cultural/collective memory study theories (i.e. nostalgia, systemic and anti-systemic memory, myths).

The research is essentially an historic one thus a chronological descriptive method has been employed purposefully as the main method. Selected sources (text and graphical documents) and bibliographies have been analysed using analytic methods (historic analysis, synthesis and interpretation). Comparative method has been employed to determine context and development of the phenomenon researched. Chronological and geographical differences and similarities have been identified after comparing aspects of legal protection, urban conservation projects, social processes, attitudes of professionals representing various disciplines and society, and approach and ideas that influenced changes in conservation practice. One of the goals was to reconstruct heritage conservation concepts, approaches and possibilities to act of that period, i.e., describe the functioning of the system “as it was,” thus theorising is deliberately avoided. The concept of heritage is understood as a modern Western phenomenon and is not conceptualised to a larger extent within the scope of this research, as it was successfully elaborated in previous studies by other authors. This work intends to enrich this academic field with details, authentic extracts that help to reconstruct a full and detailed picture of the Soviet urban heritage protection system. Accordingly this type of data is considered very important in this research. However, interviews and other forms of memoirs have been interpreted, critically evaluated and compared with other types of sources due to the natural subjectivity of this sort of data, which forms not only because of changes in personal attitude, but also due to the length of time and gaps of personal knowledge.

Concept of urban heritage

The main concepts and terms in the field of heritage protection were defined and developed throughout the decades described in this research. The most important shift is undoubtedly a shift from concept of monument towards the notion of heritage. Therefore within the framework of this study, the original uses of words such as legacy and monuments are understood as equivalent of heritage and are defined by this term. Wherever authentic definitions and legal categories such as urban monuments are to be mentioned they were named originally.

Heritage protection within the limits of this research is defined in a far broader sense than only practical actions (interventions) as it is known in the current Law for Immovable heritage protection of the Republic of Lithuania. Formal and informal processes of various stages of heritage protection are analysed in this research, beginning with ideas and discussions about what could be valuable and worthy of protection, discussing formal enlisting processes, legal framework, ideas, and projects related to regeneration of this type of heritage. Finally, practical implementation and its judgement and reflections among the professionals and society are analysed.

The concept of heritage is relatively new and under constant change at the international and local level thus it is important to describe how it was defined during the period analysed and how it is understood in this work. Françoise Choay asserted that it was John Ruskin who proposed the idea to preserve authentic urban fabric, meanwhile in 19th century France the progress and related demolitions of old urban fabric were cherished – however it was far from urban conservation as it is understood nowadays. Simultaneously in many European countries the value of background buildings and their importance for the genius loci entered discourse. Yet the exact term urban heritage entered use only at the beginning of the 20th century and is credited to Gustavo Giovannoni, Italian

conservation architect and urban planner, a significant figure in modern heritage discourse. It was he who promoted the idea that minor buildings testify urban development more accurately than exceptional palaces and laid down a contradictory foundation for urban conservation: the historic city is a monument but at the same time it is living fabric. He also advocated this approach in Athens at the conference of 1931 where the need to preserve the character of historic towns and integrate urban conservation into urban planning was declared. The CIAM conference held in Athens in 1933 did not share this holistic approach and defined historic cities as collections of individual monuments surrounded by slums. This meant that urban conservation and urban planning took different paths for decades to come.

The concept of urban heritage was finally established precisely during the period analysed. After WWII clear and legally defined directions concerning the practical implementation of urban heritage protection and its adaptations for contemporary life emerged. The adoption of the Venice charter and the founding of ICOMOS can be considered milestones after which international heritage discourse became prevalent. Since then notably ICOMOS, UNESCO and similar doctrinal documents revealed evolution of the relevant concepts. However, it must be noted that the first international documents did not define the term 'urban heritage' and this might be one of the reasons why Lithuanian authors considered Lithuanian practice to be "ahead of its time." In comparison, even though the first Lithuanian Law for Cultural Monuments Protection of 1940 did not define the concept of urban heritage either, the instruction for its implementation that followed had named "ancient city quarters," which again vanished from the law of 1967. Nevertheless it was at this time when the term 'urbanism', referring to foreign practice, was introduced in Lithuania.

Meanwhile at the international level the concept of urban heritage became broader and the approach of integrated conservation

emerged. European Charter of the Architectural Heritage and Declaration of Amsterdam of 1975 established the connection between conservation and urban planning and the value of “less valuable” urban fabric. UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas of 1976 gave detailed guidelines on many aspects of urban conservation. However, unlike ICOMOS charters, UNESCO documents were not reflected to a larger extent in Soviet Lithuania.

Lithuanian Jonas Glemža, then a vice president of ICOMOS, contributed to the first ICOMOS charter dedicated entirely for the conservation of historic towns and urban areas (1987). This document is important for it presented many novelties regarding definitions of urban heritage and its authenticity, for example, authenticity since then has been related not only to physical fabric but also to its surroundings and various functions that the town or urban area has acquired over time. It reflected a trend which became increasingly prominent in recent decades – relevant terminology slowly evolved from clearly defined areas such as historic towns in the 1970s and 1980s to more abstract definitions such as urban areas and landscapes/townscapes. Equally intangible values became more important. Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape (2011) in a way culminated this process.

Within the framework of this research, taking into consideration recent urban conservation ideas (including HUL approach) it is assumed that urban heritage consists of two parts: intangible (only analysed to such an extent as it was discussed throughout the period in question) and tangible. It must be noted that Lithuanian authors, even though they recognised the complex and multi-layered nature of urban heritage, in general emphasised its tangible component. Therefore this research analyses urban heritage protection according to the understanding of that time, i.e., the concept of urban monument and tangible aspects. The latter encompasses several layers: natural conditions which have influence or urban features,

urban structure or network, spatial character, architectural features and other elements (street furniture etc.). Respectively this research seeks to analyse the ideas and their implementation related to conservation of all of the components mentioned above. Functional, social etc. aspects are concerned only so far as they were relevant to the professionals of the period. Newer concepts such as cultural landscapes, parks (not being defined as urban at the time) or small settlements (defined as vernacular heritage) are excluded as well.

Soviet Lithuania's urban heritage is divided into two categories in accordance to legal framework established in the late 1960s: *republican old towns* and urban monuments of local significance. The structure of this study is determined by this distinction because, as detailed analysis revealed, the ideas concerning these two subcategories and their implementation were developed in two parallel and rather different systems. This distinction is not influenced by the complexity of one type as opposite to the other because some local level historic urban areas were rather large and town-like, whereas Trakai, a republican level site since 1969, remained more village-like. Much more important are the completely different models of protection applied in these two types of objects. Research on republican old towns is often illustrated by the Vilnius case – it is the most prominent example in Lithuania (in Estonia, Tallinn is analogue) and thus most widely discussed and copied in other old towns. The third category of urban heritage emerged only in the mid-1980s. Formally, modernist urban design examples that were added to the monuments list were assigned to urban monuments of local significance but they were never treated the same so it supposes a need to distinguish a third category based on a different model of protection.

Research chronology

Research chronological limits (1956-1992) are symbolically framed by Vilnius old town conservation documents that became or coincided with milestones of urban conservation in Soviet Lithuania. Research begins in the fifties that generally corresponds to international trends – during this period or at least from the sixties the concept of urban conservation began to gain popularity in the Western world. 1956 is defined as the completion of the most prominent post-war reconstructions in neighbouring Poland. In former Czechoslovakia, which was regarded as a model in the field of urban conservation for a long time, the first period of urban heritage protection is dated between 1950 and 1960.

Within Lithuanian context the first to be analysed is Vilnius old town reconstruction project, since it is regarded as the beginning of systematic urban heritage protection system directed by Soviet era specialists. To give a broader context and understanding of starting positions, urban heritage conditions and attitudes towards it until 1956 are shortly summarised: urban heritage protection originated in the interwar Vilnius, post-war demolitions, the redesign of Vokiečių street in Vilnius and complaints and public critique that followed. Herewith it must be noted that in the same year (1956) Construction and Architecture Institute was founded in Kaunas where over time the basis for research and protection of historic towns was settled. An intention to consistently unfold the processes of urban heritage protection and its change in concept determined research logic that culminated in the completion of the correction of Vilnius old town regeneration project (1988-1992). This project symbolises the turn to different protection principles and has contributed to the inclusion of the Vilnius historic centre on the UNESCO World heritage list.

Various scholars suggest different periodisation models of Soviet Lithuania heritage protection. It reaffirms the fact that during the Soviet period individual fields of heritage conservation developed

according to individual dynamics and laws. For example, changes of legal framework did not correspond to institutional restructuring. Within the scope of this study, which is dedicated to the development of urban heritage conservation ideas and practice, three stages are defined:

1. 1956-1969 Emerging of the system. The beginning of this period is identified by a turning point, the very idea of urban conservation – initiation of the Vilnius old town reconstruction project. It was the first time in the LSSR that it was agreed to manage a certain historic urban area not according to the principles of a general plan but in compliance with an original, specific planning document based on heritage values and priorities. Equally important is the establishment of the Construction and Architecture Institute that began to investigate smaller towns and villages – potential candidates for the future list of urban monuments.

This period covers slightly more than a decade during which the so-called *first generation* reconstruction projects were accomplished in all four old towns of republican significance. Taking into consideration general trends in the field of heritage protection, particularly important is the Law for the Protection of Cultural Monuments which came into force in 1967. At the same time the preliminary evaluation of smaller historic towns was completed. Final establishment of the two-level urban heritage protection system is marked by approval of the urban monuments of local significance list in 1969 and the resolution to launch a new generation of projects for “republican old towns.”

2. 1969-1987 Maturity and Stability. During the first stage local specialists learned, copied and adapted Czechoslovakian methodology, experimented, carried on research and investigations, and filled out inventories. Meanwhile the next stage is marked by the Lithuanian urban heritage protection system’s recognition in local, soviet, and international levels. If public criticism occurred, it was usually directed towards other organisations that did not belong to

the heritage protection system and implementation works that were considered to be slow and inefficient, i.e., no conservation principles were criticised. In parallel, on the command of central government and in collaboration with architecture professionals, the process of inscribing modern Soviet architecture and urban design had begun. It was barely known by society at large and was controversial even among the experts of Scientific-methodical Council for Cultural Monuments Protection (the institution responsible for inventories and inscription procedures).

3. 1987-1992 Change and collapse. The third and last Soviet urban heritage protection stage is the most diverse and is characterised by radically different attitudes formed during a short period and the division of society. Criticism of urban heritage conservation questioned the very fundamental methodological principles of urban regeneration which had been regarded as the biggest achievement of the Soviet Lithuania heritage protection system. Community involvement increased remarkably and it resulted in a change of discourse: alongside professionally-argued criticism, emotional or rather populist declarations and accusations emerged, which prevented any possibility of fruitful discussion. Heritage professionals were not united either and some colleagues raised severe issues in public as well. At the end of the period the correction of Vilnius old town regeneration project was completed. It is an illustration of a complicated and contradictory period that combined the Soviet heritage conservation approach with romantic reconstruction ideas, some of them dating back to the interwar period. The latter, such as reconstruction of the greatness of the Grand Dukes town, was considered acceptable by a society inspired by the patriotic ideas of the Reform Movement of Lithuania. It is symbolic perhaps that this project in its full extent was never approved but it served as a basis for documentation, necessary for the Vilnius historic centre nomination file for the UNESCO World

heritage list and thus connected the Soviet past with new heritage conservation direction of independent Lithuania.

International context

There are territorial boundaries of two kinds: the main research field is defined as Soviet Lithuania, however, taking notice of the goal to contextualise the processes of the LSSR internationally, a broader comparison is needed. In the course of research three levels of international context have been determined:

1. Soviet Union - noting Latvia and, particularly, Estonia in which historiography identical to the Lithuanian storyline is established: leadership in the USSR and international recognition (collaboration, regional events).
2. Socialist countries – in particular former Czechoslovakia, then Poland, Hungary, former GDR (study visits, adaptation of methodologies and approaches).
3. International modern heritage discourse (Western countries) – physically inaccessible but altogether as much as possible followed at the ideas level. Direct visits were rather rare but pieces of information reached Lithuanian specialists via Poland (e.g. translation of the Venice charter), Czechoslovakia and/or Moscow.

Theses to be defended

1. The urban heritage protection system in soviet Lithuania generally was accomplished by 1969 and it operated harmoniously until approximately 1987, when there were unsuccessful attempts to rearrange it to combine Soviet heritage protection principles, created to operate in ignorance of private property and romantic approaches, which emerged during the period of the Reform Movement of Lithuania.

2. Despite active and permanent professional discussions, neither urban heritage concepts, nor their values were ever established on conceptual or administrative level. The inscription of modernist Soviet urban objects on the urban monuments list of local significance only proved this tendency – it was just a formal recognition, without accepting them as “real” heritage.

3. After establishing two levels of significance of architectural/urban monuments (republican and local) and accordingly setting up different legal frameworks and assigning responsibility to two different institutions, two separate, even isolated, models of protection based on different concepts of value were formed.

4. On the international level three levels of context can be distinguished: USSR (Lithuania – leader), socialist countries (Lithuania – follower) and Western/international heritage discourse (almost no direct contact). In the USSR Lithuanian achievements were renowned, yet their reception and influence can be confirmed to a much lesser extent in neighbouring countries than it was claimed.

5. Urban heritage protection in Soviet Lithuania in general corresponded to international trends, both recognised as positive (integrated approach) and negative (radical modernisation). However these were rather loosely interpreted and applied to local conditions.

Dissertation structure

The dissertation consists of an introduction; three parts in which the research object is analysed in chronological order, each containing subdivisions dedicated to certain aspects relevant in each of the periods; conclusions; a list of sources and literature, and appendices. In each chapter the following are discussed: initial context of a certain period (previous situation, legal framework, prevailing trends and attitudes), general protection and conservation principles and measures applied in republican level old towns, their quarters and in monuments of local level significance that belonged to two separate

protection systems. Important events or phenomena that contributed to significant changes or turning points (e.g. Vilnius old town reconstruction project, ICOMOS regional conference in Vilnius, etc.) are highlighted. Each part is concluded by subdivisions in which local processes of the period are compared within international context of that time.

The first part reveals how the system of urban heritage protection formed in Lithuania. Combining information collected in previous studies and primary sources, the situation up to the turning point – first Vilnius old town reconstruction project – is presented. It includes actions that led to the initiation of this particular project, its local circumstances and influences from abroad. Further, the projects that followed are analysed as well as the formation of legal framework, the registration of cultural heritage, institutions and divisions of the spheres of responsibilities, and historic towns' studies that contributed to the final approval of the list of urban monuments of local significance.

The second part covers the period of the system's maturity and stability. It encompasses the so-called *second generation* regeneration projects that were based on renewed methodology proposed by local specialists and the supposed complex or integrated approach which at least by its title complied with international trends. Also prominent was recognition at the USSR and even international level: conferences, expert and study visits, and the ICOMOS symposium. The only aspect that was criticised in the 1970s was inefficient implementation. An altogether lesser known but much more complicated storyline of the urban monuments of local significance is presented: further research, attempts to manage change and their failures. A distinction is revealed between the conservation approach to the monuments respectively of republican and local value, and between formal status of monuments and actual protection by arguing what was understood as "pure urban value." The highlight of the history of Soviet Lithuanian urban design and, in

a way, of urban heritage protection, is considered to be a formal recognition of modern Soviet urban design and the inscription of several examples onto the Cultural monuments list. Here it is important to notice the distinction of attitudes towards “real” heritage and formal pride.

The third chapter unfolds dynamics of the last Soviet decade. The focus is oriented towards emerging changes – increasing societal involvement and (self) reflections by professionals, mass criticism etc. At the end of this part the last planning document to be initiated in Soviet Lithuania is analysed. This project (the second Vilnius old town regeneration project) is an illustration of attempts to combine both Soviet heritage protection principles and romantic approaches that emerged during the period of the Reform Movement of Lithuania.

I 1956-1969 Emerging of the System

1956 is considered to mark a turning point in Lithuania’s urban heritage protection history. Before WWII the standard of Lithuanian urban heritage protection was rather different depending on its political dependency: in Vilnius, which belonged to Poland, the historic city was valued as a whole and changes were regulated not only in individual monuments but also in the entire central part of the old town. In the rest of Lithuania no complex urban conservation or regulatory documents were made. After Vilnius was reincorporated into Lithuania, the conservative approach remained – it was inscribed to the monuments list in 1940, the same year the law on Cultural monuments protection eventually came into force. The law was complemented by the Rules on Implementation of Cultural Monuments Protection and it is there that the notion of a monument category that would nowadays be defined as urban heritage was included: “remnants of masonry and wood ancient architecture,” including “ancient quarters of the cities.” However, this recognition

was only formal and had no significant influence on urban intervention practices until the end of the 1950s.

In response to destructive interventions in the Vilnius old town and public critique towards them, the first Vilnius old town reconstruction Project was initiated in 1956. Initially it was organised in a form of closed competition and two organisations were commissioned: design institute “Lietprojektas” where standard urban planning norms were prioritised and MRGD (Scientific restoration production workshop) which attempted to take into account heritage protection issues. The project assignment required the combination of two radically opposite goals – respect the heritage but altogether ensure that modern standards regarding insolation and green spaces would be achieved in the old town. Moreover the restorers “guild” had not yet been fully established at the time, nor had they defined any solid professional principles in the field. Besides, it was the first project of this type made for an historic part of the city thus there were no examples in Lithuania or in the entire USSR. Local specialists led by renowned professor and urban planner Kazys Šešelgis acquired and adapted methodology of the Czechoslovakian historic towns’ reconstruction. One of the main measures adopted was the idea of *sanation* or clearance/demolition of less valuable buildings to obtain more light and space, which later became a key concept in Lithuanian urban conservation.

Eventually the project of the restoration workshop was approved; however the difference between the two was not as significant as it used to be affirmed. Both projects had to approach socialist city standards and thus suggested to decrease land to building ratio, improve transportation systems and enlarge green areas. Identical measures were to be applied: demolition of certain buildings, eviction of industry and commercial enterprises, widening of the streets and regulation of new construction. Thus radical destruction was avoided, but the project itself designed a number of smaller scale “clearances” and nowadays is appreciated so much partly because

most of the solutions based on socialist norms remained unfulfilled. Complex approach was most prominent in the research part of the project. It was specified that minor buildings that form the background of the monuments are considered important and thus must be managed “retaining their character.”

Following the Vilnius model, projects for Kaunas, Klaipėda and Kėdainiai old towns were prepared in early 1960s. These old towns were in general considered of less value thus their projects are respectively marked by a more liberal approach: more attention is paid to general issues (e.g. transport problems) that were usually solved in other types of planning documents such as cities’ general plans. Despite the fact that they were designed at the same MRGD, most of the investigation parts are prevailed by incompliance between current condition and planning norms and the solutions proposed may be assessed as closer to the traditions of urban design by “Lietprojektas” or the trends of modern urban planning, yet not to the approach of conservators. In addition, the old towns were categorised as living areas and this was one of the main reasons why hygienic-sanitary requirements were obligatory. The opposite approach promoted the romantic idea of touristic urban reserve (close to open-air museum). With reference to Czechoslovakian proposals it was suggested to select “appropriate” residents for the old towns, i.e., mainly intelligentsia who would respect cultural heritage and would not damage it to improve their daily life conditions. However, in practice the pace of the complex reconstruction of quarters was rather slow and many suggestions remained on paper.

Smaller towns were not yet legally protected at that time however Miškinis, with colleagues at Construction and Architecture Institute, began to study them. A preliminary list contained approximately 600 positions. After thorough research and evaluation which lasted nearly a decade 62 historic towns were approved on the list of urban monuments of local significance. The approval of the list is certainly

a milestone in the history of Lithuanian urban heritage protection, for not only the most significant old towns but also smaller towns were now assigned legal protection. It completed the first stage of the local monuments protection system.

In the USSR context both Lithuanians and Estonians regarded themselves as leaders and pioneers in the field thus it is of utmost importance to chronologically compare relevant processes in these countries. The Estonian restoration workshop was assigned in 1964 to define Tallinn's old town architectural and urban values and provide specific recommendations for its reconstruction, and the Tallinn old town conservation zone was established in 1966. By this time four Lithuanian old towns' reconstruction projects had been already approved. Moreover the boundaries of these old towns were defined in late 1950s-early 1960s and their territories were proclaimed to be zones of restricted construction. The Amendment of Vilnius general plan in 1960 stated that Vilnius old town is considered as a reserve and must be managed according to the reconstruction project approved by the Council of Ministers in 1959. Moreover, Lithuanian experience was known among Estonian colleagues – it was shared in regional Baltic conferences and described in an Estonian study on European urban reconstruction practices compiled in 1960. Yet it would be an exaggeration to confirm the statements assuming Lithuanian projects were “ahead of their time” but they certainly corresponded to general heritage protection and urban planning standards of the period (both positive and negative) and their complex approach and so the Lithuanian urban heritage protection system's leadership within the USSR should not be questioned.

II 1969-1987 Maturity and Stability

In the late 1960s the theory and practice of old town reconstruction, though consistent and solid at first sight, began to be questioned at

professional level. The regeneration projects of Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipėda, Kėdainiai and Trakai were initiated sequentially. Renaming from reconstruction to regeneration was not only a figure of speech: the approach, concept of values to be preserved and suitable intervention, had shifted. It was the period when an integrated conservation approach emerged and gained popularity in Western Europe. Meanwhile in Lithuania, as in most of the socialist countries, the equivalent of this approach was what they called the 'complex approach' that maintained professionals' dominance in decision-making (even if they directly concerned residents' needs) and rather radical interventions into historic centres in the name of contemporary architectural solutions. Moreover, the attitude was established that the essence of the regeneration process is not only protection but also change of the old city. Analysis of the conservation principles distinguishes not a dual but in fact a triple-layer background: history-heritage, aesthetics and technical-engineering. Transport issues were considered as particularly important. Regeneration projects for the first time aimed to define buffer zones or, as they were called then, influence zones around the old towns that were characterised by valuable historic building stock outside the old town's boundaries.

The focus of the new methodology was concentrated on aesthetic value of the buildings. Based on aesthetic criteria it was assessed that valuable buildings, i.e., architectural monuments, constituted merely 10.3% of Vilnius, 6.8% of Kaunas and 0.6% of Klaipėda old towns' building stock. In the author's opinion these were dominated by undistinguished buildings. He concluded: in the old town it must be preserved not what is old but what is valuable. On the contrary, on the official level the complex or integrated approach was declared: it was stated that not only monuments were to be preserved but also urban and architectural features of the old towns, their character and the surroundings of valuable buildings. Still, despite the declaration concerning the updated approach, the main measure of intervention

remained *sanation* – demolition of inner wings and less valuable buildings to decrease density. In regeneration projects this was seen not only as a measure to improve hygienic conditions but as a tool for perfection of environment as aesthetics and architectural composition.

The regional ICOMOS symposium was held in Vilnius in 1973. It was organised by the USSR and Czechoslovakia ICOMOS National committees and thus was dedicated to the protection of historic centres in the *socialist* countries and the organisational problems relating to their revitalisation. Naturally the conference was attended by the representatives of the socialist countries only with the exception of some Finnish colleagues (only as observers) and the ICOMOS president Piero Gazzola himself. The final resolution also reflected mandatory political reverence – the results of regeneration that could only have been achieved in socialist countries (e.g. relocating residents due to the nearly absolute state ownership) were praised as well as the general principles of regeneration that have been worked out and put into practice, achieving good balance between old and new. The need to integrate heritage and adapt it to the needs of today was emphasised. This event was considered a highlight of Lithuanian urban heritage conservation efforts because the results were well evaluated by the conference attendees from different countries.

The protection of urban monuments of local significance was organised following different principles and regulations. While the list of these monuments was approved it was yet to define the boundaries of protected areas and what elements or features should be preserved in each of more than 60 cases. In 1971 SAI was assigned with 40 objects and PKI (Monuments conservation institute, formerly MRGD) with 19 objects. In practice this division did not work because PKI was busy in the field of old town regeneration and finally in 1978 all objects were assigned solely to SAI, where most of the tasks had to be implemented by one person: Miškinis.

Valuable elements in these towns were defined as street network, spatial composition, fragments of building stock, panorama and natural environment. However, only 4 towns out of 61 were assessed as worthy of protection in all these aspects. In precisely half of the total only one or two aspects were recognised as valuable. This demonstrates a rather different approach towards old towns and urban monuments of local significance, expressed in this quotation: “it is well-tuned orchestra where ... there are no stars among the soloists.” SAI also created a separate methodology for the protection of historic urban structures which was based on the concept of historically developed valuable elements (the abbreviation *уццэ* was used in Russian) and promoted an approach oriented to identification and classification of values rather than practical measures of architectural intervention or conservation.

Due to the limited scope of new construction and the saving of financial resources there were no regeneration projects prepared for urban monuments of local significance; they were substituted with less detailed documents. This confirms that there were two different and isolated methodologies and approaches: the first by PKI dedicated to the old towns of republican significance and the second by SAI for urban monuments of local significance. Due to this *a priori* compromise attitude, significant losses of urban fabric and individual elements occurred in many historic towns.

As early as in 1969 Soviet republics were urged to include examples of Soviet architecture on to the monuments lists. A decade later the number of such objects was still rather low (only one in Lithuania) thus it was decided that more efficient measures were needed. In Lithuania, the experts of Scientific-methodical council for cultural monuments protection were against this idea, arguing that the most important goal of inscription is monument protection and questioning what protections were needed by a building completed just few years ago. However there was political will and the Ministry of Culture promptly explained that “if there had not been Soviet architecture,

there would not be a list at all.” What is interesting in the Lithuanian case is that “the number one object” included on the list in 1984 was not any public building known for exceptional architectural design but Lazdynai – a mass housing estate awarded the Lenin prize in 1974. In 1985 another estate (Žirmūnai), a university campus and a new administrative centre followed. Thus modern Soviet urban design was elevated to historic towns and Lithuania became unique in the region as other countries inscribed only architectural objects. There are two paradoxes however. First, only very fragile distinctions may be seen between architecture and urbanism within the framework of the heritage protection system. Second, crucially, the formal and declarative nature of Soviet urban design recognition is prominent. These entries were never perceived as “real” heritage that required any conservation measures – it was just recognition with no means of protection.

In general in the late 1970s the urban heritage conservation zenith was reached in Lithuania – the two-level urban heritage protection system was established. It was remarkable for its distinctive ideas, professional principles and procedures. Active discussions continued in the press and among the heritage professionals, however, conservation principles were not criticised and the authority of local specialists was reinforced by international recognition. At this time the three levels of international context were resolved.

Local specialists emphasised that Lithuanian principles complied not only with regional trends but also with international principles. One of the main differences from neighbouring Latvian and Estonian practices was the idea of clearance or *sanation* that was not applied in these countries. On the contrary, the term *revitalisation*, most likely imported from Poland, was barely known in Lithuania. However, despite different sources of inspiration or declared approaches, regeneration projects in all three countries were similar. It may be seen as paradox but, following political lines, the Western approach was sometimes criticised for being too oriented towards

aesthetic criteria with too little consideration of the need for the adaptation of the historic environment for contemporary life.

To assess Lithuanian urban conservation practices in the international context it is therefore necessary to distinguish between their formal declarations (which repeated international trends that relied on an integrated conservation approach) and specific design solutions in which there was at least some modernist will to improve the historic environment. The first are characterised by such aims as intention to protect minor buildings that were considered important for the old town as a whole, planning of functions, recognition of the importance of residents' needs, etc. In the latter the professionals' superiority, subjective assessment of values based on aesthetic criteria and tendencies of façadism or even radical modernisation, and rejecting of principles of traditional architecture prevailed. These decisions could have been contradictory to many of the doctrinal documents but their authors were accustomed to loosely interpreting international principles and were convinced they were acting in accordance with all of them. Hereby Lithuania became "little Czechoslovakia" in the region, noted not only for its advanced leader status but also for its rather liberal interventions influenced by modernism into its historic urban structures.

III 1987-1992 Change and collapse

The image of successful and sound Lithuanian urban heritage protection began to be questioned in the mid-1980s. In particular this criticism was levelled at the pride of the system, i.e., old town regeneration and *sanation* practice. Until then most of the publications were signed by conservation architects but since the criticism started, increasing numbers of patriotic intellectuals (Lithuanian Reform Movement activists who had never had first-hand experience in the field) became involved – their comments were more damning. What was regarded to be old town adaptation

for contemporary needs by most professionals, they titled the liquidation of the city's distinctiveness. Some colleagues also joined the critics and forged some winged words. Regenerated parts of the town were called "taxidermied quarters" and the importance of historic building plots was emphasised by claiming that "to destroy the building plots in the name of regeneration is the same as to cherish society by killing people." The fact that clearance of inner wings to get better insolation and improve living conditions was a common practice in most of Western Europe was ignored and remaining professionals tried in vain to point out that not every decision that was now considered wrong was directed by communist ideology but also by international trends of the previous decades.

Exposed inner tensions also began to complicate SAI activities – Miškinis and the institution in general were both accused of not ensuring timely protection and legal urban monument status for representative towns in the Klaipėda region and for inefficient protection of listed urban monuments. On the other hand, the idea of urban heritage broadened and the need to provide legal protection for newer historic urban structures as soon as possible (while not yet destroyed) began to be discussed in the region. The historic suburb of Žvėrynas in Vilnius was added to a tentative list in 1989.

The correction of the Vilnius old town regeneration project was initiated in 1987 (chief architect Augis Gučas) and completed in 1992. It was a completely new document, noted for its different attitude to *sanation* (clearance) – regeneration was now based on building plots and not on separate building volumes as before. On the other hand, though respect to owners' rights and residents' voice was declared, the project still suggested the relocation of harmful/damaging users from the most valuable buildings. It must be emphasised that for the first time a completely new goal was established – it was no longer improvement of living conditions but conservation and even reconstruction of the old town as a whole. The sociological survey confirmed that residents wished to see the old

town reconstructed and its spirit recovered. It also revealed stunning (mis)understanding of the concept of authenticity among the experts: nearly 90% of them promoted oxymoron “recreation of authenticity” that required the rebuilding of replicas.

In this context it is more than understandable that anyone tried to question compliance between these reconstruction ideas and international doctrines. On the contrary, Glemža, vice-president of ICOMOS at the time, stated in an article on this project published in “ICOMOS Information” that it ideally should comply with the Washington charter adopted in 1987. Despite the criticism on the local level, internationally the storyline (identical to the Estonian one) had been promoted, establishing the image of an advanced system that was ahead of its time, even in comparison with its Western counterparts. Around the same time Vilnius old town’s nomination to the UNESCO World heritage list was suggested, thus a nomination dossier was prepared and sent to Moscow. However, priority was given to Russian monuments and therefore neither of the Vilnius or Tallinn nominations reached the World Heritage Centre. The process was renewed several years later and inscription was achieved in 1994.

Lithuania regained independence in 1990. Not only the political and economic conditions changed; there were also attempts to reorganise and adapt the heritage protection system. The chaos of the transition period and revaluation of the system most clearly affected the old towns and, to a lesser extent, urban monuments of local significance. It again demonstrates two different attitudes towards the value of these objects and their components and confirms the existence of two absolutely isolated systems. It can be stated that in the context of revaluation and discussion it was revealed that consistent urban heritage and heritage protection were never established. A new law on Immovable Cultural Properties Protection came into force in 1994 and symbolically finished the period of Soviet heritage protection in Lithuania.

Conclusions

1. Purposeful and systematic urban heritage conservation in Soviet Lithuania began in 1956 when the Vilnius old town reconstruction project was launched. The multifaceted (legal, administrative, practical) urban heritage protection system was fully-formed by 1969: Law for Cultural Monuments Protection came into force in 1967, lists of republican (1961, 1963, 1969) and locally significant (1969) urban monuments were approved, institutional framework that consisted of administrative institutions (Board for Museums and Monuments Protection) and research and design institutes (PKI, LSAMTI) was established, the first generation of reconstruction projects for the republican old towns were completed in the late 1950s and early 1960s, and valuable features to be preserved were determined in urban monuments of local significance. The period between 1969 and 1987 is noted for the maturity and stability of the Soviet Lithuanian urban heritage protection system: the local approach was recognised internationally, professionals could participate in experience exchange abroad (although only to a limited extent) – the system and its fundamental principles remained stable and unquestionable. Since 1987 when the Lithuanian Reform Movement started and 1990 when Lithuanian Independence was restored, the Soviet urban heritage protection system became a target of criticism for its soviet principles (*sanation* in particular), inefficient protection and, paradoxically, not enough control under the new free market conditions. Even though attempts were made to adjust the principles of conservation in Vilnius old town and in the field of urban heritage protection in general, it is acknowledgeable that the Soviet urban heritage protection system collapsed in the 1990s.

2. Throughout the period of time analysed (1956-1992) the issues of urban heritage were actively discussed by heritage professionals and, during the last decade, criticised by social activists, mostly referring

to the examples of old towns of republican significance. Since urban heritage and urban planning can be attributed to relatively ideologically neutral fields, public critique and discussions in most cases were inspired by the professional attitudes or personal ambitions of project authors, and very rarely due to a need to conform to soviet ideology. However, the period of Lithuania Reform Movement in the late 1980s is an exception – Vilnius old town then became a symbol of national consciousness and thus its protection and/or reconstruction became a matter of national consciousness expression. It can be concluded that even though the Soviet urban heritage protection system formally was centralised, the measures chosen and project results in practice depended upon the personal attitudes and interests of the individuals in charge. Moreover, representatives of the Soviet heritage protection elite had mastered manipulation with ideological clichés to justify actions that could have been considered opposite to official aims. However, despite active discussions, the concept of urban heritage was not clearly defined and established on legal, academic or practical levels. It can be assumed that influential specialists did not consider the issues of formal urban heritage definition or its legitimation and application in practice to be important. Within the framework of Soviet legal acts and heritage administration, urban heritage was assigned to the category of architectural monuments. Urban heritage and the approach towards its conservation principles and practical measures, expressed in professional discussions and projects, changed in response to general trends in architecture, urban planning and heritage conservation and directly correlated with legally established categories of monuments valued by republican and local significance.

3. In Soviet Lithuania two separate, even isolated models of protection and urban values were applied respectively on urban monuments of local and republican level (with individual exceptions). Despite the rather low number of institutions that were

related to urban heritage protection, two isolated centres formed that did not cooperate. This duality was predetermined by two formal levels of protection and the respective division of administrative responsibilities for two research and design institutes, and later was reinforced due to the human factor of personal ambition. Detailed conservation projects for historic old towns of republican significance were prepared by MRGD (later – PKI, PRPI) specialists, who mostly relied on individual methodology inspired by Czechoslovakian experience and declared such goals as adaptation of the old towns to the needs of contemporary society. Urban monuments of local significance were managed by SAI (LSAMTI, SAMTI and Miškinis in person) according to the methodology compiled at the institute, and focused on research and investigation of historic genesis and values (which were described in parameters of spatial structure and composition), and regulation of new construction. In most cases the need and/or possibility to preserve specific building stock was not determined. Thus, it can be stated that mutual ignorance prevailed between the two main Soviet Lithuania's urban heritage protection institutions, which is confirmed by different approaches, publications and even memoirs. It must be noted that in other countries of the region, such prominent division between the old towns and historic smaller towns embodied in legal framework, methodology and institutions did not exist. In a way it could be compared with the two-level system in Czechoslovakia (reserves and protected zones). However, a particularly small number of the objects of republican significance (four, later five) must be considered when comparing with more than a dozen in Estonia and tens in Czechoslovakia. Moreover in other countries specialised heritage protection institutes were more often responsible only for research and investigation and thus cooperated with organisations that worked in the field of architectural design and urban planning that provided planning documents and projects. Therefore the duality

of the Soviet Lithuanian urban heritage protection system can be considered as a distinctive feature within the regional context.

4. The most intense discussion in the field of Soviet Lithuanian urban heritage protection derived from contradiction between two attitudes: modernisation versus “protection under a glass dome.” The first reconstruction projects were expected to resist radical interventions however in these projects and even more in the following *second generation* regeneration projects the aim of modernisation is rather prominent and characteristic to the conservators approach as well. Essentially the argument behind modernisation shifted. In the first generation of projects improvement of living conditions, need to correspond general planning norms and transport issues were emphasised. Later for selection of valuable objects that were designated to *preserve as they were* a set of aesthetic criteria was applied and determined rather radical consequences. The argument that “it is not a museum” in most cases only concealed a wish to implement changes, i.e., urban heritage was valued as long as it was appropriate, convenient, aesthetic etc., not for its proper heritage value. Goals of improvement of sanitary-hygienic conditions, aesthetics, architectural expression and correction of past urban flaws were declared. Modernist urban planning ideas *per se* were sustained by legitimization of absolute project author – a specialist decision superiority against residents and/or other stakeholders that was only possible in a totalitarian state and remained until the very end of the period. The correction of Vilnius old town regeneration project that was carried out in 1988-1992 witnesses a return to the idea of romantic reconstruction, i.e., recreation of visual integrity, artificial ageing of the urban fabric and erasure of certain historic periods and facts. For a while it united the professional community and society at large. This romantic vision of the reconstruction of the Grand Dukes town was likely developed independently however many similarities can be traced to the ideas presented by Polish specialists of the interwar period or Vytautas Landsbergis-Žemkalnis in the 1960s.

Thus it cannot be acknowledged as original concept of the Lithuania Reform Movement period.

5. When comparing of Soviet Lithuania's urban heritage protection realities with broader geographical context three levels have been defined: USSR, socialist countries and international heritage protection. At the first level (Soviet Union) Lithuania was considered advanced – it was the first to prepare urban heritage protection planning documents, lists of urban heritage monuments, etc. Second, other socialist countries inspired aims to be achieved – Czechoslovakian, Polish, sometimes GDR or Hungarian urban conservation methodology and projects and their implementation served as examples to follow. Influences of the third context, the Western world and international organisations, are the most complicated to trace – it was rarely formally mentioned, sometimes (even at the end of the period) criticised, but altogether it was attempted to follow at least general international trends. However they were rather loosely interpreted and adapted under specific local circumstances in each of the stages of the period analysed. It may sound paradoxical but actually the first urban heritage conservation projects of Soviet Lithuania best corresponded to the international approach of the time. In justification of later delay several circumstances should be considered. For the first, since in the 1960s and 1970s demands of international doctrinal documents became broader and more complex, consequently they became more difficult to implement, especially under Soviet conditions. It is possibly one of the reasons why regeneration projects were formally declared as following international trends but in practice this complex approach (corresponding to integrated conservation in Western Europe) was interpreted according to the socialist model of the second level of context, particularly regarding the social aspect. It was from Czechoslovakia that Lithuanian heritage professionals took radical principles of intervention and this allowed the claim that Soviet Lithuanian urban heritage protection (not to be confused with urban

planning) trends were the most liberal in the Baltic States. It is also obvious that Lithuanian specialists were working in an information “bubble” and were usually more aware about Czechoslovakian heritage practices than those used in Moscow.

Lithuania’s leadership within the USSR context declared by witnesses should not be questioned and is grounded by solid facts (with the exception of Estonian Law for Cultural Monuments Protection which came into force several years earlier). However, the reception of Lithuanian influence in neighbouring countries was significant to a much lesser extent than was claimed. Lithuanian achievements were recognised but both countries relied more on Polish experience and did not apply the *sanation* concept that was transferred to Lithuania from Czechoslovakia. Nowadays it is nearly ignored in both Latvian and Estonian historiography even if it is confirmed by primary sources of the period. Thus the statements claiming the Tallinn old town conservation area as the first document in the USSR based on an integrated approach established in Estonian discourse should be revised. Lithuanian reconstruction projects for historic old towns and their boundaries with corresponding regulated construction regimes approved in the late 1950s and early 1960s should be considered.

6. The exclusive feature of Soviet Lithuania’s urban heritage protection is the formal inclusion of Soviet period urban design on the monuments list. Lithuania inscribed them from 1984-1985 and thus became unique in the USSR. The decision was based on political will requiring the representation of Soviet achievements and criteria for inscription were determined in a regional meeting. Nevertheless neighbouring countries included only architectural and not urban monuments on their respective lists. This act confirms the exceptionally high regard in which Lithuanian modernist urban design was held but from the perspective of heritage protection this remained the only formal recognition. These objects were never

perceived as “real” heritage and no conservation measures were taken.

7. The image of successful and sound Lithuanian urban heritage protection was developed and established in Soviet Lithuania. However, detailed analysis of the evolution of the urban heritage concept and its protection system reveals that it was characterised by intertwining methodological approaches and ideas that existed in parallel: compromises with radical Soviet urban planning and construction standards, attempts to combine modernisation and heritage protection, romantic ideas of national revival, subjective judgement, and conflict between professionals and the society. Such inconsistency and contradiction were frequently present in expressed opinions and projects by the same specialist, especially if concerning the aspects of value, authenticity and their preservation. It confirms that the ambiguous attitude embedded in the first Lithuanian old town reconstruction project remained throughout all the periods analysed and penetrated to the deepest layers of heritage concept, enabling the application of subjective judgements and arguments to justify desired actions. It must be noted that integrated urban heritage protection system could not have been established due to the theoretical and practical distinction of urban monuments of different significance and ignorance between the institutions and persons who operated in the system. Neither urban heritage concept, nor its values were ever clearly defined and established and this is possibly the main reason why after it lost artificial support by authorities the Soviet Lithuania’s urban heritage protection system collapsed.

ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS ON THE DISSERTATION THEME

Viltė Janušauskaitė, „Socialistinio miesto standartų ir paveldosaugos dilema: pirmojo Vilniaus senamiesčio rekonstrukcijos projekto variantai“, in: *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, vol. 31, Vilniaus universitetas, Istorijos fakultetas, 2013, p. 138–154.

Viltė Janušauskaitė, „Lazdynai – sukonstruota vietos dvasia?“, in: *Vietos dvasios beieškant*, ed. R.Čepaitienė, Vilnius, 2014, p. 398–430.

Viltė Janušauskaitė, „Lietuvos senamiesčių apsaugos projektai tarptautinių paveldosaugos tendencijų kontekste“, in: *Acta Academiae Artium Vilnensis Nr.77–78: Dailės ir architektūros paveldas: tyrimai, išsaugojimo problemos ir lūkesčiai*, sud. Dalia Klajumienė, 2015, p. 115–132.

Viltė Janušauskaitė, „Masinės statybos perlai – paveldas ar palikimas?“, in: *Masinės statybos gyvenamųjų rajonų architektūra Lietuvoje (Architektūra: objektai ir kontekstai Nr. 2)*, ed. Liutauras Nekrošius, Vytautas Petrušonis, Edita Riaubienė, Vilnius: Technika, 2017, p. 8–26.

Viltė Janušauskaitė, „Lithuania – the Standard Setter for the Urban Heritage Protection in the Former USSR?“, in: *HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF HERITAGE LEGISLATION. BALANCE BETWEEN LAWS AND VALUES*, ICOMOS Estonia NC; ICLAFI; Estonian Academy of Arts, 2017, p. 29–32.

Viltė Janušauskaitė, „Saving Socialist Modernism: a Gap between the Formal Status and the Real Protection of the Post-war Modernist Heritage in Lithuania“, in: *Denkmalschutz im Baltikum – Probleme, Potentiale, politische Bedeutung* (accepted).

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF THE DISSERTATION

Viltė Janušauskaitė was born in Vilnius in 1983. She studied architecture at Vilnius Gediminas Technical University in 2001-2007 and Technical University of Valencia, Spain in 2006-2007. She holds degree in architecture and master in architectural history and theory. In 2008-2013 she studied at Vilnius University Faculty of History and graduated from Cultural history and anthropology (cum laude), then continued doctoral studies at the same faculty in 2013-2018. She was awarded a scholarship for academic achievements by Lithuanian Science Council between 2014 and 2016.

During the doctoral studies she participated at ICCROM Conservation of Build Heritage Course (Rome, Italy, 2014, grant for a study visit by Lithuanian Science Council), International Summer School on Revitalization of Historic Cities (Lublin, Poland, 2015), ICCROM and Riksantikvaren International Course on Wood Conservation Technology (Oslo, Norway, 2018). While collecting material for her thesis she went on several study visits to Scotland, Latvia, Estonia, Czech Republic and Italy. In 2017 she was selected to US/ICOMOS International Exchange Program 2017 and carried an internship at the National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington D.C., USA.

She has published several academic and popular publications on the dissertation theme and participated in a number of conferences of republican and international level (in Lithuania, Estonia, Germany and China).

She has been working in the field of built heritage conservation since 2006 and has been responsible for multiple architectural heritage conservation projects and urban heritage planning documents. She is a licensed specialist – expert on immovable heritage protection and member of Lithuanian national ICOMOS committee.

She has been lecturing a course of Built heritage conservation at Heritage conservation master's study programme at Vilnius University since 2014 and has been taking the position of junior researcher at the same faculty since 2017.

Research interests: history of conservation, urban heritage, history of Soviet everyday life.

NOTES

Vilniaus universiteto leidykla
Saulėtekio al. 9, LT-10222 Vilnius
El. p. info@leidykla.vu.lt,
www.leidykla.vu.lt
Tiražas 30 egz.