INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

ARCHITECTURAL RECONSTRUCTION IN HERITAGE CONSERVATION.

**Divergences and similarities as illustrated by case studies
of Canada and Poland.**

by

Barbara Eva Myslinski B. Arch., M.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Geography and Environmental Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

2001

© 2001, Barbara Myslinski

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-71944-8

Canada

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis

**Architectural reconstruction in heritage conservation.
Divergences and similarities as illustrated by case studies
of Canada and Poland.**

Submitted by Barbara Myslinski, B. Arch., M.A.

Chair, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies

Thesis Supervisor

External Examiner

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

January, 2002

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an exploration of the multidimensional aspects of the architectural reconstruction process seen in a historical perspective. It relates architectural reconstructions to the propagation of nation-building ideas and beliefs in the context of Polish and Canadian societies. The inquiry establishes what is happening in the process of architectural reconstruction and how the product of this process fits into heritage formation and conservation. Three identified formative phases of the reconstruction project are explored: formation of ideological objectives of the reconstruction initiatives, identification and selection of the values perceived in a destroyed relic and transferred to a reconstruction, and completion of the reconstruction project from the perspective of conservation practice. The process of architectural reconstruction is demonstrated in the detailed analysis of the formulation of the reconstruction guidelines and the execution of the design. The thesis investigates the particular production process of two reconstructions, the Royal Castle in Warsaw, Poland and the Louisbourg Fortress in Nova Scotia, Canada. Discussion of these two examples focuses on the formulation of the reconstruction guidelines and the execution of the design. There are several key areas of inquiry. Firstly, both reconstructions are linked through the discussion of their national significance and the role they have played as political and economic instruments in the policies of their proponents. Secondly, the preparation process including the negotiation that led to the formulation of the guidelines for the architects is

discussed. Thirdly, a detailed account of the reconstruction process is presented. Of central importance is the selective character of the reconstruction process with respect to replication of the identified features. The last area of inquiry in the production phase describes construction of the interpretive themes. The thesis investigates the reconstruction process in relation to the values identified in the relics and their replicas. This is done by developing a model that traces analytical connections between these values. The model allows the user to determine a specific configuration of value relations as identified in heritage relics, and to examine how these values have been transferred into reconstruction. The model is tested in relation to the cases studied.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to this dissertation in several ways. I am thankful to them for their interest, challenging questions and insights. It is a pleasure to mention at least some of them.

I wish to thank the members of my thesis committee for their persistent support and helpful comments. I have been privileged to work under the supervision of Professor John E. Tunbridge. He has been a sustaining presence and a dedicated supervisor and I thank him for his unwavering commitment to this project. His critical reading, knowledge and patience I admire and appreciate. Also, I thank Professor John Clarke for bringing to this project his illuminating insights and logistical support. I thank Professor Gennady Ozornoy for keeping an interest in the goals of this research.

The inspiration for this dissertation came from my work in the Heritage Conservation Program at Public Works Canada. For this I am deeply indebted to Architect Gouhar Shemdin - Simison of the Period Architecture Section who offered support and encouragement in my first professional steps in Canada ten years ago. I am also grateful to Architect Julian Smith, Professor at the School of Architecture, for his generosity in introducing me into the field of Canadian heritage conservation.

My sincerest thanks also to Professor J. Kenneth Torrance whose thoughtful comments and suggestions were particularly appreciated and to Professor Simon Dalby who rekindled my interest in epistemological issues and continues to be a source of intellectual inspiration. Special thanks to Professor D.R. Fraser Taylor for his support at the last stage of the process under significant time constraints.

I am grateful to the friendly office staff at the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies. In particular I would like to thank Hazel Anderson for her guidance and encouragement and Golda Markel for her humour and support.

To my friend, David Pritchard, for giving me the strength to pursue my goal, my gratitude.

To my son, Lucas Wan, for contributing to this work in many valuable ways, I truly thank.

To my parents, Teresa and Karol Jan Klepacz, for their unfailing support, I am grateful. It is to the memory of my father I dedicate this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Sheet	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Illustrations	viii
1. The purpose and research framework of the study	1
1.1 The argument of the study	1
1.2 Study area and limitations	11
1.3 Theoretical and methodological framework	14
1.4 Structure of the study	19
2. The field of study	22
2.1 The field of architectural conservation	23
2.2 Architectural conservation and Post-Modern architecture	30
3. Heritage, place and identity	48
3.1 Place and identity	49
3.2 Symbolic meaning, collective memory and heritage	55
4. Heritage relics and their reconstructions	66
4.1 Values and uses of heritage	67
4.2 The concept of authenticity	75
4.3 Values in reconstruction	83

5. A wider context of reconstruction practice in Poland and Canada	89
5.1 The development of reconstruction theory and practice in Europe and Northern America	90
5.2 Reconstruction in guidelines and regulations	128
5.3 National identity issues and heritage conservation	138
5.3.1 Poland: Defending national identity	139
5.3.2 Canada: Searching for national identity	164
6. Reconstruction practice in Poland and Canada	197
6.1 Poland	198
6.1.1 Reconstruction projects in Poland	198
6.1.2 Case Study: The Royal Castle, Warsaw, Poland	274
6.2 Canada	344
6.2.1 Reconstruction projects in Canada	344
6.2.2 Case Study: The Louisburg Fortress, Nova Scotia, Canada	387
7. Analysis and Conclusions	438
7.1 Results and analysis of research findings	438
7.2 Conclusions	448
7.2.1 Summary	448
7.2.2 Review of the purpose of the thesis and limitations	450
7.2.3 Areas for further research	453
7.2.4 Relevance to contemporary geographical concerns	456
References	458
Glossary of Architectural Terms	486

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	page
Fig 2.1 Gable Building, Tokyo	38
Fig 2.2 Humana Corporation Medical Headquarters, Louisville, Kentucky	38
Fig 2.3 House at Viganello, Ticino, Switzerland	38
Fig 2.4 Piazza d'Italia, New Orleans	40
Fig 2.5 National Gallery Extension, London	40
Fig 2.6 World Financial Center Tower, winter Garden, New York	41
Fig 2.7 TV-AM, London	41
Fig 2.8 Franklin Court, Philadelphia	43
Fig 2.9 Fort Chambly, Quebec	44
Fig 2.10 City Hall, Warsaw	45
Fig 4.1 Values as perceived in a historic relic	85
Fig 4.2 Transfer of values in the reconstruction process	86
Fig 5.1 The Acropolis of Athens, Greece, in 1910	94
Fig 5.2 Durham Cathedral, England; drawings by J. Carter	96
Fig 5.3 Cathedral of Bamberg, Prussia; the nave facing east	98
Fig 5.4 Marienburg Castle, Prussia	101
Fig 5.5 The walled city of Carcassonne, France	102
Fig 5.6 La Madeleine, Vézelay, France	105
Fig 5.7 Notre-Dame, Paris, France	105
Fig 5.8 St. David's Cathedral, Pembroke, England; the west front	110
Fig 5.9 Kasteel de Haar, the Netherlands	119

Fig 5.10	Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, the United States	126
Fig 5.3.0	Europe in 2000	140
Fig 5.3.1	The changing political geography of Poland during the twentieth century	146
Fig 5.3.2	The Polish Commonwealth during partitions, 1772-1795	152
Fig 5.3.3	Central and Eastern Europe, 1921-1989	156
Fig 5.3.4	North America in 2000	165
Fig 5.3.5	Canadian territories in 1700-1867	167
Fig 5.3.6	Canada in 1977 and 1999	172
Fig 6.1.0	Poland in 1982	199
Fig 6.1.1	The cathedral of Saint John Baptist in Warsaw, drawing by Z. Vogel, 1823	201
Fig 6.1.2	The cathedral of Saint John Baptist in Warsaw, the restoration design by Adam Idźkowski, 1823	201
Fig 6.1.3	Cracow (Kraków); the historic core (map of 1967)	205
Fig 6.1.4	The Wawel Castle, south elevation, Inventory drawings by Tadeusz Pryliński, 1882	206
Fig 6.1.4a	The Wawel Castle, south elevation, The reconstruction by Tadeusz Pryliński, 1882	206
Fig 6.1.5	The Wawel Castle, south elevation, The reconstruction by Zygmunt Hendel, 1908	208
Fig 6.1.6	Wawel Cathedral, south elevation, Before restoration by s. Odrzywolski	210
Fig 6.1.6a	Wawel Cathedral, south elevation, The reconstruction drawings by S. Odrzywolski, 1892	210
Fig 6.1.7	Kalisz	217
Fig 6.1.8	Plan of transformation of Warsaw into a <i>New German Town</i> (Die neue Deutsche Stadt), February 1940	223

Fig 6.1.9	The ruins of the Old Town in Warsaw, 1945	224
Fig 6.1.9a	The reconstructed Old Town in Warsaw, 1959	224
Fig 6.1.10	1. The Vernichtungskommando incendiary division in the streets of Warsaw, 1944; 2. Krakowskie Przedmieście Street in Warsaw in 1944; 3., 4. Warsaw Ghetto, 1942. Photographs from the report by J. Stroop, Commander of the Ghetto Operation	226
Fig 6.1.11	1., 2. The ruins of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, 1945; 3. The ruins of the Castle Square (Plac Zamkowy), 1945	227
Fig 6.1.11a	Warsaw, November 1946	228
Fig 6.1.12	The ruins of an eighteenth-century building with plaque 'Heritage Building'. 65 Krakowskie Przedmieście Street, Warsaw	229
Fig 6.1.13	Warsaw; the historic core (map of 1967)	230
Fig 6.1.14	The Old Town Square, Warsaw	231
Fig 6.1.14a	The Old Town Square, Warsaw	232
Fig 6.1.15	Warsaw in paintings by Bernardo Bellotto Canaletto, (1721-1780)	233
Fig 6.1.16	Krakowskie Przedmieście Street, Warsaw	234
Fig 6.1.17	The city walls, the Old Town, Warsaw	235
Fig 6.1.18	The ruins of the St. Alexander Church, Warsaw, 1945	237
Fig 6.1.18a	The reconstructed St. Alexander Church, Warsaw	237
Fig 6.1.19	Świętojańska Street, the Old Town, Warsaw	238
Fig 6.1.19a	The Cathedral of Saint John Baptist, the Old Town, Warsaw	239
Fig 6.1.20	Gdańsk; the historic core (map of 1967)	246
Fig 6.1.21	Gdańsk	247
Fig 6.1.22	Social Realism	253

Fig 6.1.23	Constitution Square, Residential District MDM, Warsaw, built 1949-52	254
Fig 6.1.24	1. Ministry of Agriculture, Warsaw; 2. Marszałkowska Street, Warsaw; 3. Muranów Residential District, Warsaw	257
Fig 6.1.25	The ruins of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, 1945	261
Fig 6.1.26	The reconstructed Royal Castle in Warsaw, 1970s	261
Fig 6.1.27	The ruins of the Ujazdowski Castle, Warsaw, 1945	262
Fig 6.1.28	The reconstructed Ujazdowski Castle, Warsaw	262
Fig 6.1.29	The preserved ruins of the Krzyżtopór Castle in Ujazd	262
Fig 6.1.30	The reconstruction of the Iron Age settlement at Biskupin	264
Fig 6.1.31	The Royal Castle in Warsaw, Poland	275
Fig 6.1.32	The Old Town in Warsaw	278
Fig 6.1.32a	Warsaw in 1939	280
Fig 6.1.32b	Warsaw in 1945	282
Fig 6.1.33	The Royal Castle, Warsaw	288
Fig 6.1.33a	The Royal Castle, Warsaw, 1945	290
Fig 6.1.34	The Old Town complex in Warsaw. Design prepared in 1946 at the Heritage Architecture Division of the Capital Rebuilding Bureau (B.O.S) by architect Wacław Podlewski and his team, implemented in 1951-54	292
Fig 6.1.35	The Royal Castle, Warsaw	293
Fig 6.1.36	The Tin-Roofed Palace and the King's Library	294
Fig 6.1.37	The preserved ruin of the Royal Castle, Warsaw, 1960	298
Fig 6.1.38	The Old Town, Warsaw, 1945; the ruins of the 14th and 15th century defensive city walls and the 18th century townhouses in Podwale Street	301

Fig 6.1.38a	The Old Town, Warsaw; the city walls in Podwale Street after reconstruction	301
Fig 6.1.39	The Old Town, Warsaw; the city walls after reconstruction	302
Fig 6.1.40	The Old Town in Warsaw. Comparison of the housing before World War II and after the reconstruction	304
Fig 6.1.41	The Old Town Market in Warsaw, the Zakrzewski Side	305
Fig 6.1.42	The ruins of the Old Town in Warsaw, the Zakrzewski Side	306
Fig 6.1.42a	The reconstructed Old Town Market in Warsaw, the Zakrzewski Side	306
Fig 6.1.43	The Old Town, Warsaw; polychromatic painted finish on the reconstructed townhouses	308
Fig 6.1.44	The Old Town, Warsaw; Piwna Street after reconstruction	309
Fig 6.1.45	The Old Town, Warsaw; the traffic pattern in the area	310
Fig 6.1.45a	Warsaw in 1982	311
Fig 6.1.46	The Old Town, Warsaw, after reconstruction	313
Fig 6.1.47	The reconstruction works at the Royal Castle, 1970s	315
Fig 6.1.48	The Castle Square, Warsaw; the medieval bridge uncovered during the archaeological research in 1977 and reconstructed in 1982-83	321
Fig 6.1.49	The Royal Castle in Warsaw (in 1920s; 1938; 1930s; 1939; after reconstruction)	326
Fig 6.1.50	The Royal Castle Warsaw	327
Fig 6.1.51	The Great Court at the Royal Castle, Warsaw; the Gothic remains	328
Fig 6.1.52	The Marble Room at the Royal Castle, Warsaw	330
Fig 6.1.53	The Chapel at the Royal Castle, Warsaw	333
Fig 6.1.54	The Royal Castle, Warsaw. The reconstructed apartment of Stefan Żeromski	335

Fig 6.1.55	The Royal Castle, Warsaw. The animated presentation at the Castle	335
Fig 6.1.56	The King's throne, the royal Castle, Warsaw	341
Fig 6.2.0	Canada in 1999	345
Fig 6.2.1	Fort Anne, Nova Scotia	352
Fig 6.2.1a	Fort Prince of Wales, Manitoba	354
Fig 6.2.2.	Fort Henry, Ontario	356
Fig 6.2.3	The reconstruction of the Habitation of Port Royal, Nova Scotia	362
Fig 6.2.4	Upper Canada Village, Morrisburg, Ontario	366
Fig 6.2.5	The reconstructed Fortress of Louisbourg, Nova Scotia	373
Fig 6.2.6	Dawson City, Yukon	375
Fig 6.2.7	Halifax Citadel, Nova Scotia	376
Fig 6.2.8	L'Anse aux Meadows, Newfoundland	378
Fig 6.2.9	L'Anse aux Meadows, Newfoundland	378
Fig 6.2.10	Fort Chambly, Quebec	381
Fig 6.2.11	Forges du Saint-Maurice, Quebec	383
Fig 6.2.12	Louisbourg Fortress, Nova Scotia, Canada	388
Fig 6.2.13	The reconstructed Louisbourg Fortress, Nova Scotia	390
Fig 6.2.14	Location of Louisbourg	392
Fig 6.2.14a	Fortress of Louisbourg and surrounding area	392
Fig 6.2.15	Louisbourg interpretation program; 'animated portraits'	397
Fig 6.2.16	1. Dauphine Gate, revised design, 1733; 2. Dauphin Gate, construction of éperon, drawing dated 1734; 2. King's Bastion, construction progress, drawing dated 1724	404

Fig 6.2.17	Louisbourg Fortress, plan by Verrier dated 1731	406
Fig 6.2.18	Louisbourg Fortress, plan by Verrier dated 1730	406
Fig 6.2.19	Dauphin Gate, Louisbourg Fortress	407
Fig 6.2.20	Frederick Gate, Louisbourg Fortress	408
Fig 6.2.21	Louisbourg Fortress; plan used in the reconstruction works	411
Fig 6.2.22	Vertical aerial photograph of the Louisbourg Fortress taken in the spring of 1961	411
Fig 6.2.23	Louisbourg interpretation program; 'living history'	415
Fig 6.2.24	Dauphin Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress	416
Fig 6.2.25	The Right Flank casemates, King's Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress	418
Fig 6.2.26	Guérite, King's Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress	419
Fig 6.2.27	King's Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress	421
Fig 6.2.28	Louisbourg Fortress; period interiors	424
Fig 6.2.29	Louisbourg Fortress, archaeological excavations	425
Fig 6.2.30	Louisbourg interpretation program; 'living history'	431
Fig 6.2.31	Fortifications of Louisbourg	433
Fig 6.2.32	Model of the Louisbourg Fortress, by Katharine McLennan, Honorary Curator of the Louisburg Museum, where the model is displayed	434
Fig 6.2.33	Finials, Louisbourg Fortress	437

I request, Caesar, both of you and of those who may read the said books, that if anything is set forth with too little regard for grammatical rule, it may be pardoned. For it is not as a very great philosopher, nor as an eloquent rhetorician, nor as a grammarian trained in the highest principle of his art, that I have striven to write this work, but as an architect who has had only a dip into those studies. Still, as regards the efficacy of the art and the theories of it, I promise and expect that in these volumes I shall undoubtedly show myself of very considerable importance not only to builders but also to all scholars.

Vitruvius, "The Ten Books on Architecture"

1. THE PURPOSE AND RESEARCH FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

1.1 The argument of the study

1.2 Study area and limitations

1.3 Theoretical and methodological framework

1.4 Structure of the study

1.1 The argument of the study

In my dissertation I discuss a number of problems which are relevant to a contemporary society, although they sound abstract when formulated generally. They concern heritage conservation, particularly one conservation activity, that is architectural reconstruction. Architectural reconstruction has probably aroused more controversy over the years than any other conservation activity. I hope to find grounds to temper the common tendency either to worship or to demonise such reconstruction, if only for the reason that heritage, and the human perception that produces it, are always subject to change. It will be one purpose of this dissertation to examine the physical and human dimension of this specific built form from the geographical perspective.

The nature of this dissertation is a result of my experience as a designer, researcher and teacher. My attempts to explain to students the nature of architectural reconstruction practice revealed gaps in the literature. When faced with this problem, I could find no existing books that fitted the needs of my

respect to reconstruction practice alone. However, it is useful to refer here to certain of the existing texts to identify the background for this study.

Since the 1970s the literature on architectural conservation has increased exponentially. However, the great majority of the papers published in the 1970s and 1980s are of a particular kind. They are mainly concerned with the practicalities of conservation and with individual case studies of buildings, areas or whole towns. Much of this literature takes the form of illustrated accounts in the journals of the architectural and planning professions, that is of those groups most concerned with the practicalities of conservation. In contrast, there is in this period a relative scarcity of publication in most academic journals within the fields of geography, history, politics and psychology. Among these studies international comparisons are particularly prominent, though they are concerned with comparing legislation, and the financing of conservation-related activity, rather than exploring the differences of attitude and the reasons for such differences. Kain (1975), for example, has assessed urban conservation measures in France, while Lowenthal (1983) has made Anglo-American comparisons. Since the 1980s there has been growing interest in the phenomenon of heritage and heritage conservation. A number of geographers and planners have been concerned with exploring the linkages between conservation and other parts of the planning process. Cherry (1981), for example, has considered conservation in the light of the general history of planning. Ashworth (1984) has been concerned to examine conservation within the whole process of urban renewal and regeneration of central city areas in

Western Europe. Other geographers have also investigated the processes of 'gentrification' more generally in the context of urban development processes, one of which has been conservation. Denslagen (1994) has put conservation policies and practices in England, France, Germany and the Netherlands into historical perspective, Burtenshaw, Bateman and Ashworth (1991) have compared conservation and conservation planning in West European towns and Jokilehto (1999) has provided an insight into the conservation trends in Europe, the United States, India, Iran and Japan. An interesting attempt to explain the need to conserve historical townscapes is the work of Lowenthal (1985, 1996) who has been concerned to provide justification for conservation in terms of a society's psychological needs.

Heritage tourism and urban conservation constitute the principal areas of concern in Ashworth and Tunbridge's (1990, 2000) writings. In their study on the planning and management of heritage, they explore the dimensions of the tourist-historic city from the standpoint of urban conservation and tourist industry. Also, they identify critical areas for managing 'heritage dissonance', that is conflicting claims and messages about the past as expressed in heritage (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996) and construct an analytical model for demonstrating how, in the process of heritage creation, the past is being transformed into a consumer product. Subsequently (Graham, Ashworth, Tunbridge, 2000) they have examined the relationships between heritage and geography more generally.

Particularly pertinent to this dissertation are works by Taylor and Wilson in respect to Canada and by Zachwatowicz, Pruszyński and Frycz in consideration

to Polish cases. The politics of Canadian heritage conservation has been revealed in Taylor's (1990) account on the national historic parks and sites program while Wilson (1992) has provided insight into the origins of reconstruction practice within the program until the Second World War. In Poland, Frycz (1975) has discussed the development of the conservation movement until the First World War and Zachwatowicz (1965) and Pruszyński (1989) have covered the development of the Polish Conservation School and conservation legislation in the following years.

Among many European and American works on the problems of individual reconstruction projects or criticism of reconstruction practice and directly relevant to the cases discussed in this dissertation, are writings on reconstructed sites in Poland, Canada and the U.S. by Jeffreys (1939), Way (1973), Biegański, Gieysztor, Lorentz, and Zachwatowicz (1988), Schmeisser (1979), Hosmer (1981), Maclean (1995) and critical articles by Cliver (1972), Mackintosh (1992) and Smith (1986). While acknowledging the contribution of all these writers, I feel that the comparative view of reconstruction practice in heritage conservation now merits discussion, particularly at a time of expansive and often theoretically motivated debate on the meaning of heritage.

My interest in the subject matter stems from four sources:

- The research I undertook for a paper in architectural history concerning industrial heritage conservation, *Zabytki Budownictwa Przemysłowego Warszawy* (*Warsaw Industrial Heritage*, The Institute of Material Culture History, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland, 1979-1983);

- My involvement in heritage conservation as a designer and executive architect (The Atelier for Monuments Conservation PKZ, Royal Castle Reconstruction Unit, Warsaw, Poland, 1984-87);

- The research project I participated in concerning the stabilizing and presenting of ruins, *Konserwacja Ruiny Zamku w Janowcu (Conservation of Janowiec Castle Ruin*, The Institute of Architecture History and Heritage Conservation, Architecture Department, Technical University of Warsaw, 1988);

- My participation in organising the workshop on reconstruction held in 1992 by the Heritage Conservation Program for the Canadian Park Service, Hull.

In addition, my perspective has been enriched from my professional contacts with the different approaches to heritage conservation and, particularly, architectural heritage reconstruction, under two different policies towards heritage: Canadian and Polish. Poland can be used as a textbook example of architectural heritage conservation, especially that which deals with reconstruction, often on the basis of almost total destruction. On the other hand, Canada can be seen as an archetype reflecting many of the problems of settler societies such as searching for national identity and fostering unity. In both countries, however, heritage has been used as a political resource in the creation or support of states. But it would be misleading or at best simplistic to consider the motive for heritage conservation as one driven solely by the forces of nationalism and state-building. A complete understanding of the evolution of the relevant heritage conservation theory and practice, as well as legislation,

management and other aspects of caring for heritage, cannot be achieved in isolation from the countries' political, economic and cultural context.

The broad aim of this dissertation is to examine the physical and human dimension of architectural reconstruction as a built form within the geographical framework. This will be undertaken through an examination of architectural reconstruction projects. The dissertation is premised on the assumption that human responses can be categorized broadly for the present working purpose as political, economic and cultural. My perspective is that, as a result of the differential political, economic, and cultural conditions under which the reconstruction projects have taken place, there has been a corresponding diversity in motivation for undertaking them which has substantially affected their character and significance for the geographic environment.

Specifically, this dissertation aims to establish and explain the relationship between heritage as represented by architectural reconstruction and geography. Heritage is a concept loaded with a variety of different connotations, among them are 'cultural product' and 'political, economic and cultural resource'. Geography is a discipline concerned with space, to which all built heritage belongs. It is also concerned with time, in this context, the ways in which the past is remembered by societies. Heritage, to which architectural reconstruction contributes, is of fundamental importance to the interest of contemporary cultural and historical geography which are both concerned with representation, signification and the issue of identity. Architectural reconstruction as a heritage resource contributes to the identity of places and the identity of the individuals involved. This study

explores how architectural reconstruction reflects the way societies remember their past.

The term 'architectural reconstruction' suggests that there are other types of reconstruction than architectural. 'Architectural' denotes the type and the scale; simply an architectural object. In the process of reconstruction, the destroyed building is re-created. Architectural reconstruction involves the re-creation of a vanished building on its original site. What makes architectural reconstruction a distinct category within conservation practice is that it represents the only form of contemporary architecture bound by restrictions formulated by conservation principles: e.g. aesthetic, stylistic, historic, interpretive principles. Since conservation is not a strict discipline, different writers use its terms differently. 'Reconstructing' is often exchangeable with 'recreating', 're-establishing', 'rebuilding' or other replicating activities that are not necessarily bound by restrictions that reconstructions are (Fram, 1988:40). For example, re-establishing of a village while using structures moved from different locations (Upper Canada Village) or recreating a destroyed building in a different location (the sod houses of L'Anse aux Meadows) is considered reconstructing by those involved. The results of these activities, while using approaches and techniques characteristic of reconstructing, are not reconstructions in the sense of the definition applied here. Nevertheless, together with reconstructions they belong to the same category, that is to interpretive media. But more importantly, they equally participate in the reconstructing of place, which is one of the motives

behind the reconstructing of historic structures. The concept of reconstruction will be examined in depth in Chapters 2 and 4.

The study investigates the political, economic and social uses of heritage as represented by architectural reconstructions and their presence in the construction of identities. The discussion is organised around the relationships between heritage and ideas of dominant ideology and legitimisation. Consequently, the stress is on the formation of heritage resources under the interplay of power and identity. The discussion also builds upon the geographical concerns with meaning and representation of place. The most fundamental questions that this study confronts are: what is happening in the process of reconstruction and how does the result of this process fit into heritage formation and conservation? Also, whose heritage is being identified and interpreted? In pursuing the issue of 'whose heritage?' the linkage between heritage, power and the creation of collective memory is considered.

The study is based upon the following five pre-suppositions which inform its logic. These are that:

- *Places are imbued with values and particularities that are perceived through symbols* (Barthes, 1986; Eco, 1986)
- *History is a significant component of symbols which are encoded in places through process of selection and interpretation of the relics associated with the place* (Carr, 1961; Foote, 1988; Lowenthal, 1985, 1996; Lynch, 1960, 1972; Pred, 1984; Schurmer-Smith and Hannam, 1994; Urry, 1995;)

- *Places are deliberately endowed with specific symbolic identities to convey messages in support of related ideologies (Anderson, 1983; Tunbridge, 1984; Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000)*
- *The conserved built-environment becomes a heritage product in the process of selection and interpretation (Massey and Jess, 1995; Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996)*
- *In the process of reconstruction the analysis of the reconstructed building is performed and the reassembly of the identified and interpreted components in a specific way is completed (Denslagen, 1994)*

We arrive therefore logically at a position that is expressed as the central argument of this exploratory study:

A reconstructed heritage relic becomes a heritage product by imitating heritage relics in a process of deconstruction, selective recomposition and interpretation of the elements that convey attributed themes and messages. Selective recomposition is the main characteristic of the reconstruction process.

It then becomes relevant to pose a series of questions about this process that will outline the task. These questions are:

What is actually occurring? The answers will indicate what values are to be transferred into a reconstruction.

How is it occurring? The answers will explain the deconstruction, selection and recomposition process taking place during reconstruction.

How is it performed? The answers will touch upon the mechanics of the reconstruction process from the perspective of conservation practice.

And finally

Who does it? The answers will reveal the ideological objectives of the reconstruction initiatives.

The ideas outlined above are exemplified in Canada and Poland through an examination of particular architectural reconstruction projects. The results of this investigation can be summarised as answers to a number of questions. The key questions posed include:

What messages have been conveyed?

Which place identities are selected for replication in support of the messages that are to be conveyed?

Whose heritage is selected?

Who is conveying such messages and what motivates this action?

The study also focuses on the technical aspects of the selected reconstruction projects and examines some of the questions relating to the design principles that have shaped and guided them. These questions demand answers not just for critical analysis to advance scholarship, but also for the insights they can provide for the future of the reconstruction practice in architectural conservation. Design policy is constructed from knowledge of the origins of problems, as well as the consequences of decisions. Exercising an interpretive judgement on the technical details provides a fascinating field of study in which there are many surprises and many lessons for academics and practitioners alike. In fusing insights from different subject fields within the

geographical framework I hope to strengthen the traditions of both the theory and practice of architectural conservation.

1.2 Study area and limitations

The intent of this dissertation is to trace the history of the reconstruction practice and to determine the origin of its philosophy primarily in Canada and Poland. The choice of these two countries was made because they represent significantly and perhaps radically different heritage contexts and perspectives, both cases being well known to the author. They are thus considered likely to constitute opposite poles of approach. Although prominence is given to the ideas and applications developed in these two countries, however, they are supplemented by reference to other countries.

The dissertation explores the history of attitudes toward and motives for the reconstruction of historic sites which occurred in both countries. This is being undertaken through an examination of Canadian and Polish architectural reconstruction projects. Comprehensive illustration of the complexities of the reconstruction process can be provided by the two largest reconstruction projects undertaken by the respective governments: the Louisbourg Fortress in Nova Scotia and the Royal Castle in Warsaw. Both reconstructions are linked through their national significance and the role they played as political and economic instruments in the policies of their proponents.

Among common themes that have been identified to set a framework for the analysis are the issue of national identity and the question of attitudes

towards heritage conservation, especially architectural reconstruction. The issue of national identity has been a central theme in the historical evolution of both countries, but while Canada has been active in searching for national self-definition, Poland has been defending its national identity through the years of continuous foreign occupation or threat. In both countries historical evolution has been based on ethnically and culturally different groups but while in Canada this has found reflection in a federal policy of multiculturalism, in Poland it has become suppressed by nationalist interpretations of the past in the creation of the nation-state ideology. Though both countries have developed an advanced system of conservation and interpretation, it has evolved under totally different political and economic systems, especially over the last fifty years. In both countries, however, heritage has been used as a political resource in the creation or support of the state. In Canada, as opposed to Poland, much of the impetus of the conservation movement is local rather than national, and unofficial rather than governmental, although reconstruction initiatives have normally come from government at federal or provincial level. Reconstruction practice has become a popular means of heritage interpretation in both countries, but while Polish reconstruction practice has generally evolved as a response to loss of historic structures to wars, Canadian reconstructions have mainly been created for political and economic reasons.

Comparison of these two countries is presented within the framework of an overall approach to heritage conservation. The study compares the development of reconstruction activities and the political, economic and cultural

context in which the activities began in both countries. A comparative approach has been adopted in order to address the question of differences and similarities, as well as the issue of uniqueness in the examined cases.

It would be impossible in the space of this thesis to describe and analyse all the numerous reconstruction projects that have been completed in both countries. Therefore a case example from each country is selected that provides the most comprehensive illustration of the processes happening during the reconstruction project. The selection of single illustrative cases within these two areas was motivated by conviction that for the purpose of this particular study detailed investigation in depth of a limited number of cases would be more revealing than superficial reference to many examples. Setting the primary case examples against an overview of the whole reconstruction practice will provide context and highlight process. The conclusions of the study will be qualified accordingly.

In pursuit of this goal the study traces the history of reconstruction practice as a part of the conservation movement from its origins in the eighteenth-century Romantic and historicist philosophies through the growth of legalised protection in the nineteenth century, to the present times when conservation is a truly popular movement. The events of 1989-1990 in East Europe have served as a meaningful temporal point for the study. Between 1945 and 1990 the East European countries became more distinct from countries in West Europe. However, the changes set in motion in 1989 –1990 quickly started affecting conservation policy and practice in East Europe. Some examples from the

1990s will be drawn to illustrate briefly the dynamics of the processes; this cross-section roughly coincides with philosophical and economic changes in the western world which also affected the extent and character of reconstruction there. In this pursuit, the dissertation portends neither to present a strictly historical narrative of reconstruction practice, nor does it necessarily offer new and previously undiscovered data. What it does present is a new analytical framework for the study of heritage conservation that fuses insights from different subject fields and approaches: geography, history, sociology, psychology, and architecture, among others.

1.3 Theoretical and methodological framework

Empirical research

The research in question has been concerned with an attempt, first to describe and subsequently to explain, the meaning and significance of one particular segment in the built environment, namely, the architectural reconstruction. Within the comparative and historical mode of research which this dissertation assumes, the first major empirical task was to develop a detailed chronological discussion which traces the origins of the reconstruction projects in both countries and to set a basis for selection. While the main aim of the empirical research was to analyze the selected historic reconstruction projects, it was necessary to first establish the context for their analysis. In this discussion particular emphasis was placed on the background for reconstruction activities. The approach to the case studies was more complex. Once the case studies

were selected, an account of the events and issues surrounding their conception and completion was constructed. The categories created to organize the data included the following: reason for reconstruction; promoters and supporters; implementation committees; the preparatory research and preliminary design process; the reconstruction works; the interpretation programmes. The categories were designed to reveal the main aspects of the reconstruction process that would correspond with the questions set. First, the values perceived in a relic that is to be reconstructed and their transfer onto the reconstruction were identified (*What messages have been conveyed?*). Second, the ideological objectives of the reconstruction initiatives were analyzed (*Who is conveying such messages and what motivates this action?*). Finally, the reconstruction process from the standpoint of commemoration activities (*Whose heritage is selected?*) and interpretation (*Which place identities are selected for replication in support of the conveyed messages?*) was examined.

Empirically, this thesis is based on textual analyses that draw on techniques of critical analysis applied in semiotics and literary theory. These textual analyses, once confined to the humanities, have also become a source of methods for the social sciences. It is possible since the notion of text has been extended to include types of social production other than writing and the assumption is made that these productions, whether they be built forms or political institutions, have a text-like quality (Flowerdew and Martin, 1997). For example, as inscription gives meaning to text, so human behaviour is given concrete form in the built environment. Architectural reconstruction seems to be

particularly suitable for such an approach since it encompasses all the relevant types of social production and consumption: text (guidelines for undertaking reconstruction projects dealing with cultural, economic and political aspects such as ideological intents), political institutions (initiating and facilitating the process of building architectural historic reconstructions), market product (commodified heritage) and a built form of the completed reconstruction as architecture, an example of a 'visual art' , or a 'spatial art'. The structural resemblance between linguistic and architectural models opens architecture to the ideas developed in 'deconstruction'. Architecture reveals itself to be conceptual, if not linguistic or semiotic. The theoretical implication of an 'importation' of deconstruction into the visual arts can be outlined in the following statement: architectural reconstruction, when approached as architecture should be conceptualised as meaning rather than artifact (Brunette and Wills, 1994).

While the analysis of architectural reconstructions as texts has been extremely useful both for suggesting literary theoretical techniques for analysing them as architectural exhibits, and for raising questions of authorship and of readers, there is an evident need to move towards further elaboration of ways in which architectural reconstructions are unlike texts. There are some distinctive features of architectural reconstructions proving this: especially, their roles as symbols of community, their durability and solidity as objects, the non-verbal nature of their messages, and the fact that audiences literally enter and move within them. Whereas architectural reconstructions may not be unusual with

respect to each of these features alone, together they constitute a distinctive cultural landscape.

Data collection

The sources for a history of Canadian and Polish heritage conservation are extensive. A large part of the necessary factual information can be found in magazines and proceedings published by various local and regional organisations. Equally essential are certain archives which contain letters and manuscripts left by conservationist pioneers. Two main sets of sources were used: archival materials and scholarly and professional (architectural conservation) articles and books. This includes government statements, memos and briefs, experts' analyses, architects' conceptual designs, heritage activists' messages, material from dictionaries, encyclopaedias, heritage conservation guidelines and regulations, newspaper and magazine articles, tourist booklets and guides. In addition, other sources such as graphic, photographic and cartographic records were consulted. Much of this work was carried out during an initial stage of the research process, in Canada and Poland. The Heritage Conservation Program and the Architectural History Branch of the federal government in Canada, and The Atelier for Monuments Conservation PKZ and the Centre for Heritage Recording and Documentation in Poland, as well as the National Archives in both countries provided archival material for scrutiny. Another source of information was site visits. Interpretation of these data and structuring them into some meaningful form has required drawing on perspectives and theory from various fields of research on built environment.

Theoretical framework

The built environment is an abstract concept employed here to describe the products of human building activity. Architectural reconstruction is one of them. The physical and human dimension of architectural reconstruction as built form is examined. Theoretical insights are taken from various sources in cultural geography, anthropology, sociology and psychology. Among different bodies of literature utilized are accounts of architectural heritage conservation seen from numerous different perspectives such as conservation theory and practice (Frycz, 1975; Fawcett, 1976; Taylor, 1990; Jokilehto, 1999; Denslagen, 1994), heritage interpretation (Uzzell, 1989) and heritage tourism (Ashworth and Tunbridge 1990). The topics discussed relate to the notion of authenticity (Stovel, 1995b; Samuel, 1996; Lowenthal, 1995), values as perceived in heritage (Lipe, 1984) and the commodification of heritage describing how cultural resources are entering the market as a consumer product (Urry, 1990, 1995; Goss, 1993; Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996). Psychological literature includes works on the human need for a time dimension in the visual environment and analyses of people's changing perceptions of and attitudes to bygone times and buildings of different ages (Lynch 1972, Davis 1979, Pred 1984, Lowenthal, 1985). Some insights are provided by approaches that interpret the built environment as an expression of culturally shared mental structures and processes (Rapoport, 1980). Symbolic studies take several forms: architectural phenomenology and semiotics (Norberg-Schultz, 1980; Eco, 1986; Walter, 1988); social symbolic accounts emphasizing how built forms communicate

social or political status (Breton, 1984; Duncan, 1989); examinations of the metaphoric and mnemonic functions of built form (Connerton, 1989; Casey, 1993). Perspectives are also drawn from the theories of the social production of built form with the focus on the social, political, and economic forces that produce the built environment, and conversely, the impact of the socially produced built environment on social action (Goss, 1988; Massey, 1995,1999; Rose, 1995; Malpas, 1998). Additionally, works have come from cultural geography, sociology (urban and social theory) and social history that link the history of the built form with the theoretical working-out of the mechanisms of political and social control (Kertzer, 1988; Agnew and Duncan, 1989; Baker, 1992; Lowenthal, 1994). In sum, these approaches identify expressions of social and political structures in the built environment. They focus on how the meaning associated with built forms is manipulated in communicating values and identities in relation to the social and political context. This literature permits the theoretical exploration of the differential approaches to heritage conservation with respect to architectural reconstruction.

1.4 Structure of the study

Chapter 2 which follows situates architectural conservation against the broader background of different social-cultural contexts and physical realities. Conflicts of approaches and rival attitudes are acknowledged (and later discussed in Chapter 5). Then the key conservation practices are defined for the purpose of the thesis. Chapter 3 examines the general relationship between

symbolic identities of places, history and heritage, reviewing some recent literature and exploring ideas that will provide the framework within which the exploratory questions can be answered. In Chapter 4 discussion is organised around the types of values identified in historic relics. To the extent that value is defined in relation to some aim or use, this discussion of values is intended to contribute to an understanding of how cultural materials from the past can function as resources. The concept of authenticity is analyzed. The chapter aims to provide an outline of the origin and the meaning of authenticity in relation to modern conservation, and reconstruction in particular, seen from the multicultural perspective. The chapter seeks to develop a model that will allow analytic connections between the values identified in the heritage relics and in the reconstructed projects. The framework developed here is applied to specific examples in subsequent chapters.

Chapter 5 discusses reconstruction practice from its origins in eighteenth-century Romantic and historicist philosophies through the establishment in growth of legalized protection in the nineteenth century to the present. Additionally approaches to conservation within the literature are discussed. For each country the crucial aspects of the historical experience are summarised and the way this experience has been reflected in political and administrative structures and conservation practices is described.

In Chapter 6, the history of reconstruction practice in both countries is traced and the origin of their respective philosophies determined. In this way the examples chosen are shown to provide empirical content for and to highlight the

reconstruction concepts considered central to the respective philosophies; in turn these reflect prevailing notions of nationality, ideology and economic and political creed within the two countries. In Chapter 7, generalizations are drawn that relate both to the nature of the theory, the assumptions upon which it is based, and to the most salient aspects of reconstruction practice. Finally, areas for further research are proposed and relevance of the work to contemporary geographical concerns discussed.

2. THE FIELD OF STUDY

2.1 The field of architectural conservation

2.2 Architectural conservation and postmodern architecture

This chapter situates architectural conservation among other disciplines dealing with built environment and discusses its relation to the liberal arts, science and architecture. In a first section (2.1) it considers the main approaches in conservation practice (passive and active). The notion of authenticity is briefly examined and its use in the literature of the subject explained. Then architectural conservation activities and their hierarchy are outlined. In a second section (2.2), the architectural conservation movement is examined in relation to the contemporary postmodern architecture. Against this background, architectural reconstruction is discussed. The focus is on architectural reconstruction as an architectural expression.

2.1 The field of architectural conservation

In this study, 'conservation' refers generally to many activities at a number of levels. *Conservation* means acting to prevent decay. Because conservation is not an especially strict science or discipline, its terms are used differently by different writers and practitioners¹ (Fram, 1988:40). American publications may use 'preservation' as a synonym for this sense of 'conservation', although *preservation*² refers to activities included under the term of conservation. It is appropriate to mention here that Polish modern conservation terminology also varies across the country and though it has generally originated from Italian, it bears a strong German influence, especially in those parts of Poland that historically were associated with Austria-Hungary³. To avoid misunderstandings and confusion and to facilitate the conservation process, attempts have been made to define terms in international charters and recommendations, but despite the effort tangible disparity still remains (Jokilehto, 1999:304). Problems are mainly caused by differences between languages, but even within the same language there is often confusion over the use of the terms that are shared by the various disciplines or come from the past: for example, the nineteenth century 'full restoration' is closer to contemporary understanding of 'reconstruction' than 'restoration' in terms of techniques employed, involving an alteration which would be unthinkable today.

Two characteristics distinguish *conservation*: *wise use* and *intervention*. *Wise use* means making use and caring for resources intelligently and conscientiously, recognizing their qualities, and protecting them. *Intervention*

means acting deliberately to make changes, or to defy changes (Ford, 1978).

The goal is to remove or prevent threats to those resources. Successful conservation requires both. Conservation has many dimensions as has heritage itself. It has to be emphasized that there is a distinct gap between a theoretical declaration and its practical application, and that the diverse influences discussed later in this study contribute to difficulties in interpreting and applying conservation principles. 'Conservation' is used in this dissertation as the most generally accepted and inclusive term to cover the wide range of activities aimed at protecting heritage for the future. As a result of the pragmatic evolution of architectural conservation as a craft, several different terms - *historic architecture, historic buildings, built heritage, architectural heritage*, and so on refer to the same concept. Each includes the inherited stock of old buildings and properties constructed and maintained by human activity. In this context, one should think of *architecture* very generally, since not all the old buildings can be traced to any particular architect.

The hierarchy of conservation activities was formally recognized in the code of ethics concerning treatment of historic architecture produced by UNESCO in 1964 and known as the Venice Charter (ICOMOS Canada, 1990). Since the 1960s, conservationists in various countries have devised national charters based on this principle. One of these is the Appleton Charter, formulated by the English-speaking branch of ICOMOS Canada in 1983 (ICOMOS Canada, 1990). This philosophy also forms the basis of the "Levels of Intervention System" used by the heritage professionals within the Canadian

Parks Service. The set of guidelines subdivides conservation into two categories: at the level of minimum intervention is *preservation* (or *protection*), which consists of *interim protection* and *stabilization*; more radical intervention is defined as *development* (or *enhancement*). The latter includes *period restoration* or *rehabilitation* and, at the maximum level of intervention it means either *period reconstruction* or *contemporary redevelopment* (i.e. *replacement*). The Canadian Parks Service Cultural Resource Management Policy has placed *reconstruction* within the category of *presentation*. The distinction between *conservation* and *presentation* is clearly stated. The policy defines the term of *interpretation* as conveying "an understanding and appreciation of the historic value of particular places, things, events and activities to visitors and the public" and explains that "this communication may be accomplished through firsthand experience of historic places, appropriate use of cultural resources and the use of media" (Environment Canada, Parks Service, 1990:108). According to this definition, *interpretation* as a form of communication sets up an interactive process involving a medium (a historic site) conveying a message (encoded in a historic site) and a recipient of that message. Interpretation is associated with the tangible artefacts that can be experienced by the visitor and therefore seeks to involve the visitor in an active way rather than mere cerebral comprehension. Reconstructions are perfectly suited to this purpose. Interestingly enough, in the face of enormous popularity of reconstruction practice among restorers, the Venice Charter specifically prohibits it. Attitudes toward reconstruction as

represented by the Venice Charter, the Appleton Charter and other guides and regulations will be discussed in Chapter 5.2.

The question whether conservation should be considered a discipline of science and as such founded on a unified scientific basis was discussed at length after World War II in an international effort to establish a coherent basis for modern conservation theory. Among the most influential works in this debate are those by Cesare Brandi, conservator and art historian, and Sir Bernard M. Feilden, restoration architect. Brandi (1977) argued that conservation activities required technical and historical competence as well as artistic sensitivity; science should be used as a 'tool' in solving problems conservation is faced with. The role of science is to assist in the decision making process. Thus he concluded that conservation, rather than a science, should be considered a discipline belonging to the liberal arts. This standpoint was also reflected in Feilden's definition of conservation as "an inter-professional discipline coordinating a range of aesthetic, historic, scientific and technical methods" (Feilden, 1982:22).

In many countries with a large conservation community (e.g. Italy, Poland), there is some form of division between, on the one hand, the intellectual and theoretician and, on the other hand, the architect and planner dealing with practical issues. Many professionals in the field of heritage conservation would feel that they fall somewhere between these two extremes. But it is often the case that those most involved as practitioners are uninterested in abstract theory, except perhaps when it creates the spectacle of a public debate between those

holding opposite voices. For example, one of the most basic questions to be answered when undertaking a reconstruction project is to decide which stage of the building's life is to be recreated. It should not be expected that a significant fact would be revealed by abstract theory that would solve the problem. This occurs only in the natural sciences, where a revelation can lead to a new theory. Since in the conservation field few phenomena are measurable, only evaluated, the dilemma which stage to reconstruct will remain open for interpretation rather than be explained. This is because the arguments for and against have no quantitative value; all discussion evolves around individual perception and judgment. Freedom of opinion adds unfortunately to numerous misconceptions. The reason for this lies in the insufficient development of conservation legislation, and more often in the lack of respect for it on the behalf of the conservation activists who are usually not restricted by legal consequences in any form. Unfortunately, it also refers to all involved in the conservation field: writers, designers, managers, and investors.

The specificity of architecture as a creative field adds to that already complicated conservation *modus operandi*. Though architects are expected to leave a mark of creativity on their works, restoration work demands from them rigorous discipline based on respect towards restored relics. Minimal intervention is the principal rule in architectural conservation. Michael McClelland (2000:21), restoration architect, considers this minimal intervention "good for the historic building, but it's tough on the architect's ego", and adds that the conservation rule demanding from the architect a 'reversible' work, that is

easily removable in case the next generation finds the work improper, "only furthers the sense of humility". He expects architectural conservation to be a "sensitive intervention into culturally rich sites" (ibidem: 21). The conflicting positions of conservation and architecture cannot be sufficiently regulated by conservation principles or conservation ethics. Architecture will always be practiced as a free expression of creativity, even when limited by strict regulations. Reconstruction, especially, is the most challenging project ever. It involves the analysis of the building in every aspect; architectural, urban, historic, social, and the reassembly of the identified and interpreted components in the replicated building. Thus every reconstruction can be seen as a re-composition. Restoration architects had been performing that specific deconstruction long before they heard of 'deconstructing architecture' from Derrida (Brunette and Wills, 1994: 27). All decisions regarding such re-composition bear a sign of their times, since architectural conservation depends on architectural tendencies and stylistic trends to the same extent as does contemporary architecture. This will be demonstrated in the following chapters.

When reviewing regulations and policies developed in regard to architectural relic conservation, it can be noticed that they have been developed on two main approaches: *passive* and *active*. The passive approach has as its goal preventing decay and preserving a relic, while in the active approach the emphasis is on recovery of the forms and details as they appeared in the past either by removing intervening elements or reproducing missing elements or whole buildings. The history of architectural conservation is a record of

continuous struggle between these two rival attitudes. All conservation policies tend to be organized around one of these two approaches. It can be noticed that the active approach dominates times of destruction caused by wars, natural forces or negligence. An immediate reaction is a will to restore and rebuild, even though this seems to contradict the recognized conservation principles.

Reconstruction constitutes an extreme case of the active approach.

The term 'reconstructing' is often used as a synonym for 'recreating' that is not necessarily bound by restriction imposed on reconstruction, e.g. recreating a building on a new site. Since restrictions imposed on the activities termed 'reconstructing' have been changing according to different approaches that ruled conservation principles, the term 'reconstruction' has often been used in the subject literature in relation to the works that were conceived as 'reconstructions' though they would not qualify as such under the terms of contemporary regulations. These regulations, however, have been created not to evaluate existing 'reconstructions' but to guide future works. For the purpose of this thesis the term *reconstruction* will be taken as an activity that involves the re-creation of a vanished building or feature on its original site, based on evidence from historical and literary documents, pictorial records, and archaeological evidence. Terms 'full' or 'partial' reconstruction relate to the extension of the reconstructive works: full reconstruction takes place when no remains are present; 'partial' reconstruction completes partly intact remains. Faithfulness to a vanished original may include even the use of traditional building techniques, but often a reconstruction will be built on a modern framework of structure and utilities.

Reconstruction poses the same difficulties as restoration⁴, and though exact replication may be possible, the final result is often (and should be) distinguishable from a genuine work of the period so as not to falsify history, architecture or archaeology. Reconstruction can constitute a part of different conservation activities⁵ or their combinations.

2.2 Architectural conservation and Post-Modern architecture

At this point it is appropriate to comment briefly on the relationship between contemporary architecture referred to as 'Post-Modern' and architectural conservation, especially architectural reconstruction. As a built form, contemporary architectural reconstruction belongs to the realm of contemporary Post-Modern architecture but is guided by recommendations and bound by restrictions formulated for architectural conservation use. This brief presentation of the shift in architectural theory that was followed by the development of a new style in the postwar years will set a background for analysis of the origins and evolution of architectural reconstruction practice in the post-war heritage conservation.

One terminological discussion impossible to avoid in this review is the distinction between *architecture*, on one hand, and *vernacular structures* on the other. The definition of the terms of ordinary language is in general a useless practice. It generates either aphorisms of no applicability, or long explanations that explain nothing. But it may, at least for the purpose of this paper, prove useful to establish what is to count as *architecture*.

"Architecture is the unavoidable art", began Leland Roth (1993) in his book *Understanding Architecture*. Humans live in buildings and spaces by buildings. The history of architecture features the monuments of political or economic power. Did the culture create the architecture, or did the architecture direct the culture? Unquestionably, in the first instance, the culture, controlled by those in power, caused the built structure to be produced. The culture caused the social acceptance of architectural apotheoses of the King, the Church, or the Comrade Chairman. Having achieved that, architecture then influenced the culture, because emperors are more powerful and gods are more approachable when they reside in their temples. Architecture has carried this classical mission of glorification to our times. By contrast, the other historical influence on architecture has very different roots. These are vernacular structures; the result of building activity reflecting needs of individuals and communities. Nicolaus Pevsner began his *Outline of European Architecture* (1943) by making this clear distinction between *architecture* and *building (vernacular)*: "a bicycle shed is a building; a Lincoln Cathedral is a piece of architecture" (ibidem: 15). Pevsner's distinction is inherited from the nineteenth century tradition represented by Ruskin's differentiation between 'Architecture' and 'Building' (Ruskin, 1907: 7). According to Ruskin "Architecture concerns itself only with those characters of an edifice which are above and beyond its common use" (ibidem:8). Half a century later, Leland Roth (1993:3) defined architecture to be "the whole of the environment built by humans, including buildings, urban spaces, and landscapes", and "not just a few special buildings". Gulzar Haider (1996:39),

architect, sees architecture as "a formative element in culture rather than a mute expression of it - an isolated bit of gallery artwork to be received, honoured, bought, sold, and collected". Other definitions consider architecture a certain kind of activity, not a kind of building; it is a process and not a product (Johnson, 1994). Contrary to this view, the history and conservation of *architecture* deals with products rather than processes, though there are some exceptions. This approach results from the way in which architectural history, as a field, developed; its first concern was periodizing. For the purpose of this paper, *architecture* will be taken to be the activity of architectural and urban designing, by a professional designer, of structures of some social importance. Given the theme of this thesis, replicating activities in architecture, it is worthy of note that until the end of the eighteenth century replication and tradition rather than creativity and novelty ruled architecture. Architects followed established patterns and their work was judged by the mastery of the execution. Gradually, from the 1860s, architectural works have been expected to express ideas of national traditions, to capture the 'spirit of times', to impress with new construction materials. In the twentieth century architecture is supposed to reveal the imagination, individuality and originality of its creators. Architects are expected to surprise with new forms, functional and structural solutions (Krassowski, 1971). Architecture has been promoted from a craft into an art. The contemporary appreciation of originality, authenticity, uniqueness of architectural works seems to be reflected in the approaches to architectural conservation.

In the 1970s architecture has stepped into a period that some critics have named 'Post-Modern'. Architecturally, Post-Modernism means a shift away from the modernity associated with the work of architects such as Corbusier, Wright and Gropius and expressed in the international style. Modernists regarded breaking off with history and tradition as a necessary condition for the new (modern) architecture to be born. They were preoccupied with creation of architecture 'pure' in form and 'perfect' in function. Instead Post-Modern architecture adopts a diversity of forms and textures; goes back to symbolism, ornamentation, color, symmetry, eclectic use of forms, historical and vernacular references. This eclectic transformation of past architectural styles is often referred to as a new historicism (Höcker, 2000:171).

Charles Jenks (1991: 23), architect and one of the founders of the Post-Modern style, began his book, *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, 1977, with a critique of modern architecture that according to him "expired finally and completely in 1972". He referred to the demolition of Minoru Yamasaki's Pruitt-Igoe housing project in St. Louis, Missouri, which took place that year. The housing project, a winner of American Institute of Architects Awards, was built in 1951, failed as a design solution and the failure was used by the critics of Modernism as an example of fundamental unreasonableness and inflexibility of the Modern movement in general, and Modernist housing in particular. Jencks' criticisms contributed to the reduction of a half-century of architecture to the status of a mere mistake. Reducing the Modern movement output to a failure of a single project, albeit one symptomatic of wider concerns, discounted the entire

Modern thought. At the very core of architectural Modernism lies an aspiration to improve conditions under which people live. Inspired by the new technologies, architects in the 1920s designed a variety of innovative housing projects that challenge the status quo in many ways, but perhaps the most radical was introducing egalitarian right to modernized housing. They shared a sense of social purpose and believed that their work might potentially improve society. There were expectations among Modern architects that physical design exerts an impact on the patterns of social life among the users and will directly affect the way people behave. Consequently, the basic assumption was adopted, that the designers possessed a professional expertise that could be applied to the problems of other people. In other words, the designers informed themselves about the client's problems, then formulated a supposed solution based on their professional expertise. This characteristic of the designing process created a self-legitimizing cycle.

The failure of Modern designing may be difficult to explain without calling on anthropological theory. According to Amos Rapoport (1980:11,13), an architect and anthropologist, "when environments are being designed, four elements are being organized: space, meaning, communication, and time. ... The environments of various cultures can thus be conceptualized in terms of organization of these four variables... ". He argues that environment is neutral, inhibiting, or facilitating to behaviour, but not determining. It is apparent that Modern architects failed to understand the ways in which their buildings were

inhibiting and facilitating to behaviour. This has also been noted by Robert Gutman (1988:21) who wrote that architects

“mention the numerous ways in which a user fails to carry out the intentions the architect thought he had incorporated into the design of the building. Architect themselves inhabit a curiously divided world. They adamantly assert that buildings are major determinants of the flow of human culture, yet they constantly complain that the inhabitants of buildings are ‘unsympathetic’ users.”

Jencks has written Modernism into a record of architectural utopias demanding changes in human behaviour. He considers that the Modern architectural and urban proposals are just architects' fantasies - such as those by Wright, Le Corbusier, and Fuller (Jencks, 1991). However, to argue against Jencks' opinion, as an ideological system, urban planning exists in the realm of social ideology, and its goals lie in the improvement of the human condition and “by calling everything utopian that goes beyond the present existing order”, warns Karl Manheim (In Hayden, 1976:348) in *Utopia and Ideology*, “one sets at rest the anxiety that might arise from the relative utopias that are realizable in another order”. Manheim argues that those who resist revolutionary change will blur the distinctions between utopias and ideologies, regarding them as equally unrealizable. However, he explains, those who seek change need to recognize and exploit utopias as the “explosive material for bursting the limits of the existing order,” which contain “in condensed form the unrealized and unfulfilled tendencies which represent the needs of each age” (ibidem: 349). The innovative spirit of Modernist initiatives cannot be reduced to utopia.

Modernism has lost its ideological force for a number of reasons, and each of these reasons led to formation of one characteristic of the new architecture that has emerged. The Modern movement founders believed that their architecture would join technology to social advances and, thus, guarantee an adequate standard of life for all. In time, modernism and its great claims to cure of social cancers became too abstract and distant to new generations of users and, always looking for fresh means of expression, architects. By the 1970s, the techno-bureaucratic planning doctrines of the 1950s came under attack (Perks and Jamieson, 1991). Citizen groups protested actions against urban renewal schemes that destroyed old neighbourhoods, caused environmental degradation, and endorsed indifferent attitudes towards the destruction of historic places. In response to the critique and protests, and to shifting societal values, especially to changing public perceptions and attitudes about the historic architecture, the planning policies underwent reformulation. Initiatives taken to revitalize commercial areas required new approaches to architecture which in its Modern form no longer could meet the changing societal needs (Jencks, 1991:27).

An inspiration for a new approach to architecture came from architectural conservation. The directions in which Post-Modern architecture is now moving are influenced to the extent by the conservation attitude. It is based on a recognition that what is inherited from the past constitutes a part of architectural tradition, supplementing rather than limiting. The reasons that architects are moving away from the modernist doctrine are diverse and complex, and include

political, economic, technological, and, in particular, cultural factors, but conservation is unquestionably among them. The buildings that refer to or reproduce historical style not only respond to nostalgic feelings of society but also bridge the gap in architectural continuity, so suddenly and drastically interrupted by modernism (Fig 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). Marco Polo (2001: 4), editor of *Canadian Architect*, considers these changes superficial and notes that "much of the Post-modern response to the design of housing has involved dressing up Modernist building types in a variety of period costumes, embodying none of the risk-taking spirit of innovation that informed the work of an earlier, more idealistic generation."

The new eclecticism (as Post-Modernity in architecture is called) reveals an aesthetic that praises creative interpretation of classic form, and a wide range of means to achieve that can be found in architectural conservation.

Architectural reconstruction, in the broadest sense, is one of them. Replicating buildings in historic styles is not a new phenomenon in architecture, but using restrictions formulated by conservation principles in constructing contemporary buildings has never been practiced extensively before⁶. Robin Ward (1998: 4) laments that architectural heritage forms became so popular in Vancouver that the city is "awash with fakes". "Heritage designations", says Ward, "previously an indication of outstanding historic significance and architectural quality, are now applied as policy to heritage infill developments" (ibidem: 9).

While a wide use of replication of historic forms in contemporary architecture sets its definite eclectic characteristic, a closer architectural analysis

2.1	2.2
	2.3

Fig 2.1 *Gable Building*, Tokyo, 1978-80, Arch. Kazuhiro Ishii

Fig 2.2 *Humana Corporation Medical Headquarters*, Louisville, Kentucky, 1982-86,
Arch. Michael Graves

Fig 2.3 *House at Viganello*, Ticino, Switzerland, 1980-81, Arch. Mario Botta

(photos Jancks, 1991)

reveals that today reconstructions themselves bear Post-Modern features. The interrelation between reconstructions and architectural styles of their period can be traced through the history of reconstruction practice. For example, the nineteenth-century restoration works completed in France, later classified as Romantic reconstruction, created evocations of a medieval past similar in appearance to architecture of their time: Gothic Revival. In Poland the restoration and reconstruction works at the fourteenth-century Malbork Castle is an example of this tendency (discussed in Chapter 5.1), in Canada the reconstructed gates at Quebec City (discussed in Chapter 6.2.1). American reconstructions from the twenties and thirties tend to look like the Colonial Revival architecture of their time. The latest evaluations of Colonial Williamsburg, the first major reconstruction project in the United States completed in the 1930s, revealed the influence of Beaux-Arts, a style of this time, in the reconstruction of several buildings (Lounsbury, 1990). Recent works in reconstruction and other interpretative practices like volumetric restoration, also called volumetric reconstruction, mirror the trend in Post-Modern architecture of the last two decades to create visual metaphors of the past (Fig 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7). Volumetric reconstruction, which is limited to recreating in contemporary materials the volume of a historic structure, without replicating architectural details, remains faithful to the evidence of ruined walls and excavated foundations. In Canada, Quebec, it is illustrated by the Forges du Saint-Maurice constructed in the eighties where the archaeological remains of the blast furnace and of La Grande Maison were topped with a three-dimensional space frame representing the

Fig 2.4
Piazza d'Italia, New Orleans, 1976-79
 Arch. Charles Moore (photo Jencks, 1991)

Fig 2.5
 National Gallery Extension, London, 1991
 Arch. Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates
 (photo Jencks, 1991)

Fig 2.6
World Financial Center Tower, Winter Garden,
New York, 1982-87, Arch. Cesar Pelli
(photo Jencks, 1991)

Fig 2.7
TV-AM, London, 1980-82, Arch Terry Farrel
(photo Jencks, 1991)

original structures. Similarly, in Franklin Court, Philadelphia (Fig 2.8), architects Venturi and Rauch, conspicuous among the founders of Post-Modernism in architecture, used in their 1972 design a stainless steel open frame to delineate the site and profile of the lost fabric of Benjamin Franklin's house, while a museum space is located below ground (Strike, 1994:98). The sculptural frame provides an impression of the building in the open court space. Another innovative approach to volumetric reconstruction was implemented in 1981 at Fort Chambly, Quebec (Fig 2.9). It has been suggested that the design was inspired by a similar restoration work carried out at the Castle of Visegrad in Hungary (Galt, 1984). At Visegrad contemporary materials had been used to restore a broad outline of the original structure. A similar solution has been chosen for the Fort Chambly. It is discussed in Chapter 6.2.1. In Poland, Warsaw, the recent reconstruction of the city hall built in 1995 represents a mix of replicated architectural details on the front elevation and contemporary forms freely translating historical references for the rest of the building (Fig 2.10). Architectural conservation inspired Post-Modern architecture as much as Post-Modern architecture influenced architectural conservation practice. Such interrelation between reconstructions and architectural styles of their period can be traced through the history of reconstruction practice. This will be discussed later in Chapter 5.

It is apparent from this discussion that the field of architectural conservation requires various technical and humanistic skills. The conservation treatments have had a tendency to develop on two main lines, generally

Fig 2.8
Franklin Court, Philadelphia, 1972-76,
Architects Venturi and Rauch (photo Jencks, 1991)

Fig 2.9

Fort Chambly, Quebec

1. The rebuilt structure combines the relics with the newly constructed walls
(photo G.S. Zimbel)

2. The reconstructed fort; visible the remains of the previous forts
(photo Parks Canada)

Fig 2.10

City Hall, Warsaw

1. City Hall (the Jabłonowski Palace) in the 1930s (photo Ciborowski, 1964)

2. The ruins in 1945, cleared to form a square (photo L. Sempoliński)

3., 4. After reconstruction in 1995 (photos B. Myslinski)

1	
2	3
4	

characterized by 'passive' and 'active' approaches. Architectural reconstruction constitutes an extreme case of the active approach. It was established that the movements in the architectural conservation and architecture have common links, and tend to be joined by architectural expression prevailed in the current architectural trend. Architectural conservation, reconstruction practice not excluded, to a great extent depends on architectural tendencies and stylistic trends. Architectural reconstruction is a product of aesthetic perception and architectural imagination of its times. Like contemporary architecture, architectural reconstruction deserves recognition as valid architectural expression.

Notes

¹ The term 'conservation' as used in the English-speaking world does not exist in German. The word for the protection and maintenance of historic buildings is Denkmalschutz (protection of monuments), or Denkmalpflege (preservation of monuments). The literal equivalent of the English term 'integrated conservation' is 'integrierte Konservierung', though in German the term Konservierung does not imply the protection of buildings.

² *Preservation*, in its specific rather than general sense, consists of stopping (as permanently as possible) processes contributing to deterioration of a building or site and making essential repairs to keep it in its existing state. Certain types of new work may be considered part of preservation in this restricted sense: structural reinforcement, drainage repairs and so on. Preservation is primarily hidden work, to keep property as it was found, but permanently stabilized.

³ The English term 'restoration' is 'restauro' in Italian and 'restauracja' in Polish. The Polish word 'ochrona zabytków' that means literally 'protection of monuments' is close to the German term 'Denkmalschutz' and is used as 'conservation of monuments', although the Polish literal equivalent of the English term 'conservation of monuments' is 'konserwacja zabytków' and refers to technical aspects of conservation activities.

⁴ *Restoration* is the recovery of the forms and details of a property as it appeared (or may have appeared) at a particular time by removing work of intervening periods and, where necessary, replacing or reproducing missing elements. Restoration can be especially controversial because it is supposed to respect original materials as well as archaeological and documentary evidence, and these may be incomplete, requiring informed conjecture about the gaps. Though it may be possible to reproduce an original feature exactly, restoration is often (and should be) distinguishable from the original so as not to falsify history, architecture or archaeology.

⁵ Among other conservation activities mentioned in this work are:

Restitution - rebuilding of the structure with the use of the remains of its authentic material;

Relocation - moving and re-erecting a building or feature on a new site, can be considered conservation only when the alternative is complete destruction;

Redevelopment - Insertion of contemporary structures or additions sympathetic to the setting;

Stabilization - a periodic activity to stop deterioration and to put the existing form and materials of a structure into a state of equilibrium, with minimal change.

⁶ Infill projects completed in conformity with historic neighbourhoods, a practice common in the postwar years, do not belong to replicating, since they do not reproduce any previously existing building, but only evoke the gone architecture by applying historic forms, proportions, materials etc.

3. HERITAGE, PLACE AND IDENTITY

3.1 Place and identity

3.2 Symbolic meanings, collective memory and heritage

This chapter establishes the theoretical framework taken in this thesis to the approach to the study of architectural heritage and its reconstruction. The following sections aim to examine the interplay of place, identity and heritage. The question of meaning, representation, the construction of place-based sense of self, community and nationality are examined. At the same time, the concept of nation and nationalism is discussed including the particular role of nationalist ideology in relation to heritage creation. These observations are then employed to examine the reasons for protecting architectural heritage.

3.1 Place and identity

Of all the disciplines, Geography deals most explicitly with the analysis of the concept of place. Moreover, the concept of place has enjoyed renewed interest over the past two decades and, as Timothy Oakes (1997:509) has it, "has been invigorated theoretically by geographers emphasizing the unboundedness, historical dynamism, and multiple identities inherent in places". Oakes ascribed this renewed interest to postmodernity that assigned place the role of a new geographical touchstone. Modernism, he says, has been accused of devaluing place as relevant in understanding social change, but in fact place has played a significant role in representing the experience of modernity. Oakes claims that the conception of place in postmodern cultural geography is rooted, from the humanistic point of view, in nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature; humanistic geographers have used literary representations of place to "reaffirm the subjectivity of spatial experience as a refuge from positivist abstractions" (ibidem: 526).

Approaches to defining a geographical concept of place are competitive rather than compatible. In *The Power of Place: Bringing together Geographical and Sociological Imaginations*, Agnew and Duncan (1989:2) gave a brief review of the treatment of place within the geographical tradition:

"Firstly, economists and economic geographers have emphasized *location*, or *space sui generis*, the spatial distribution of social and economic activities resulting from between-place factor cost and market price differentials. Secondly, microsociologists and humanistic geographers have concerned themselves with *locale*, the settings for everyday routine social interaction provided in a place. Thirdly,

anthropologists and cultural geographers have shown interest in the *sense of place* or identification with a place engendered by living in it".

Agnew and Duncan explain that all the above frameworks interrelate with and complement each other, and for a comprehensive analysis of place, should all be taken into consideration.

The notion of *place* Duncan (1989) explains as derived from the more general geographical concepts: *environment* and *landscape*. He distinguishes a *landscape* from the more general term *environment* and defines it as a "culturally produced model of how the environment should look" (ibidem: 186). The meanings people ascribe to and derive from place, experienced on varying scales, determine how people constitute themselves as unique persons. Linking place to identity formation, Iain Wallace and David Knight (1996:79) argue that place, "the particular social and natural environment in which actors are set- is a formative influence on who they are, individually and as a community, on how they live, and on how they think". Similarly, Nicholas Entrikin (1991:7) observes that people have a sense of being a part of place, but they also perceive place as external to them, "thus", he concludes, " place is both a centre of meaning and the external context of our actions". The more detailed and complex people's interrelations to place, the more it constitutes a crucial part of individual and collective identity.

A view of a *place* as a dynamic web of linkages across time and space makes Oakes's concept of place an ideal point of departure for discussing temporal interrelations of places and humans that is the underlying theme of this

dissertation. Oakes argues that "it is in this way that place becomes the geographical expression of the interactions between individual action and abstract historical process" (Oakes, 1997: 510). Likewise, Kent Ryden explains: "the experiential meanings we ascribe to places are much fuller, more complex, and more vivid than the ones we pick up secondhand. Each element of a cognitive map has a memory attached; each is an allusive shorthand notation for part of a life story " (Ryden, 1993:55). With cognitive maps people navigate through the images they create of their environments. A cognitive map represents a person's experiences in geographical space and as such is highly subjective. To Paul Adams (1995), a concept of the person is a dynamic entity shaped by unmediated contacts with people and place. Thus, he argues, *identity* should be understood as a unique blend of multiple, fractured, negotiated, socially-constructed, and historically-embedded categories, derived from interaction with people and the environment. Subjectivity notwithstanding, a place binds people together by the common emotions it brings forth. Identification with the place fulfils man's sense of belonging.

Pred (1984) conceptualizes place as a constantly becoming human product as well as features observed on the landscape constituting a setting for human activities and social interactions. According to Pred's theory, place is a "historically contingent process" (ibidem:280). The basic idea of his theory, that rests upon integration of time-geography and structuration theory, is the socialization of individuals in collective values which includes their relationship to places and to place governed entities. Pred (ibidem: 281-2) explains:

"Social structure is comprised of those generative rules and power relations - including the control over material, symbolic or authoritative resources - that are already built into a specific historical and human geographical situation, or into an historically and geographically specific social system. ... the biography of a person can be conceptualized as a continuous path through time-space ... then place as historically contingent process - the becoming of place, all the humanly made elements of place, and all that takes place within a given area - is inseparable from the every day unfolding of the structuration process in place(s)."

Doreen Massey argues against the conception of place as "bounded and undisturbed" (Massey, 1995:64). She wonders if, in the world of "intermixing", where people live in a global village, and capital is going through a new phase of internationalization any sense of a local place and its particularity can be retained. "Longing for such a coherence", she says, "can lead to certain forms of nationalism, sentimentalized recovering of sanitized 'heritages', and outright antagonisms to newcomers and 'outsiders' "(Massey, 1991:24). Similarly, Gillian Rose (1995) believes that sense of place and the geo-politics of identity are intricately bound, and as nationalism, a form of identity, is used to justify violent actions, so sense of place may participate in expression of negative outcomes like discrimination against the excluded from belonging to the place. This can also occur as a response to any kind of threat. Simon Dalby and Fiona Mackenzie's (1997) examination of community responses to proposed local natural resources sets a ground for arguing that geopolitical identities are formed in response to environmental threat.

'Inclusion' and 'exclusion', resulting from the boundaries drawn around places that organize social and ecological space, determine about who can legitimately belong to a certain community in the process of creating an 'insider' and 'outsider' (Massey, 1991:28). Sense of place is lived and identity established by those included. Through the process of '*othering*', an oppositional sense of place (and identity) is being created. Understanding of such '*othering*' came from Said's study of the representations of *Orientalism*, which, he argues, was a justification of European hegemony over the Orient by comparing Oriental "backwardness" to Europe's "superiority" (Said, 1978:7). Counterposing 'us' and 'them', 'here' and 'there' around cultural and bio-physical difference underpins Said's concept of *Orientalism*. Drawing on the Orientalism thesis, Simon Dalby argues that geopolitical identities can be formed in contradistinction to the *Other* (Dalby, 1992; Dalby, 1997).

The geographical stretching-out of social relations through movement and communication across space David Harvey (1998) termed '*time-space compression*'. He argues that time-space compression will demonstrate itself in globalization and, consequently, fragmenting identities and disrupting forms and concepts of place. While to some extent, all places are interconnected and interdependent, interlinkages between them form '*power-geometry*' that reflects geography of uneven development. Global political, economic, cultural and ecological flows involve power dynamics that, when mapped, reveal a 'geography of power' (Massey, 1995:55). Place is therefore a dynamic, fluid, and hybrid entity and sense of place easily "may be reduced to the 'commodified', 'pastiche',

'often romanticized', and 'partially illusory' presentations of, for instance the heritage industry (ibidem: 49). To Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996:8) it is obvious that "the product of the transformation process is not synonymous with preserved relict historical resources", since "by definition, heritage exists only in terms of the legatee and thus the heritage product is a response to the specific needs of actual or potential users". The changing demand on the part of the users (consumers) requires the industry to challenge or recreate existing cultural signifiers of the marketed places in an attempt to capture a new or changing market. Goss (1993: 671) calls on the hypothesis of Urry (1990) when writing that tourism advertising "forms part of a 'hermeneutic circle' - a closed semiotic system which links the representations of a tourist destination to the actual tourist experience, by creating a set of expectations that the tourist industry is designed to accommodate". Once place has been commodified as a series of sites that constitute backgrounds for experiences to be purchased, the total experience is rationalized with a high dose of predictability in regard to tourist behaviour. Tourists seem not to want to see beyond the interpretation and are quite content to watch the show passively (Urry, 1990). If the tourists are aware of the stage, argues Feifer (1985), they can manipulate the suggested images to their own ends. This awareness is characteristic of what Feifer calls post-tourism.

The idea of place as both a means to and a form of identity depends upon the mobilizing forces of symbolic meanings and memory associated with place. The interrelation between collective memory and symbolic meanings associated

with place will be explored in the next section as formative elements in the creation of heritage.

3.2 Symbolic meanings, collective memory and heritage

The ability so often noted in contemporary geography to 'socially construct' places reflects a position that recognizes the human tendency to create meaning associated with place. There is "a politics to place construction", observes Harvey (1991:39), that encompasses "material, representational and symbolic activities which find their hallmark in the way in which individuals invest in places and thereby empower themselves collectively". The discovery of meaning in landscape has become a challenging undertaking in cultural geography. The new task has often been termed in metaphors: landscapes are viewed as 'written material', subjected to Derrida's 'deconstruction' (Brunette and Wills, 1994; Duncan, 1989) or, the most prominent in landscape studies, 'message' that has to be decoded. Each author addresses a specific problem but collectively their work explains why the geographical study of landscape should engage many disciplines in addition to geography.

Since people endow places with social and cultural meaning, symbolic approaches should be necessitated in interpreting landscapes. They focus on how the meanings associated with landscape are manipulated in communicating values and identities in relation to social and political context. The meanings are encoded and revealed through symbols. In the process of assigning symbolic meanings to the surroundings, people created places. This is what Richardson

(1989) calls transformation of space into place. Geertz (1964:73), discussing the concept of ideology, explains the concept of symbol as used by him "broadly in the sense of any physical, social, or cultural act or object that serves as the vehicle for a conception". He considers cultural symbol-systems necessary templates for the organization of social and psychological processes, especially in situations where there is a lack of institutionalized behaviour guides. Ideology assumes a similar role and offers a judgment guided by "unexamined prejudices" (ibidem: 63). Similarly, Breton (1984) argues that the entire process of society formation involves the construction of a symbolic system. Through symbols people express their collective identity since symbolic meanings are employed in the public functioning of institutions, performing rituals and commemoration of events. Berdoulay (1989:136) claims that meaning is grounded in social relation, but it "unfolds within the place" and place is "where meaning is largely being constructed, instead of simply being considered as projected from outside". Heritage creation proves, though, that meaning can be projected and manipulated from outside but it still need to be grounded in symbolic images provided by place.

Since symbols are essential to how reality is perceived, the control of symbols creation and their meaning is a prime task of the dominant group in society. The meaning of symbols is tied to ideology, which Duncan (1998:185) defines as a "set of beliefs about how social life is or should be organized", giving the right of national self-determination as an example. Ideology, as a system of representations that includes myths, images, and ideas, possesses its

own logic and structure (Duby, 1985:152). Ideologies offer simplified and ordered views of the world in which a single certainty replaces numerous doubts.

Individuals are provided with a cognitive and moral map, with an assured place in the social system. Ideologies find expression not only in words but also in landscapes. The tangible symbolic realm is revealed in concrete representations including places. Places provide visual signs or markers that convey societal messages, which reflects the interests of those who create and control them (Baker, 1992).

History and memory are employed in commemorative practices involving the politics of identity. Because commemoration involves assigning to past events extraordinary significance and distinctiveness that affects the society's comprehension of the past, the commemorated events are invested with the most appreciated societal values. Recollection of the past events occurs in the constructive process, more complex than retrieving information. The process of remembering involves reflecting on the past in the light of needs and with use of the concepts of the present. The most significant moment in any nation's past is its formation. Formative periods, such as beginnings or regaining independence, are marked as especially important and regarded as more significant than any other moment in the historical process. Since comprehending the past is always instrumental to resolving the present, collective memory is actually a reconstruction of the past for present use (Schwartz, 1982). Connerton (1989:13) distinguishes *social memory* (collective memory) from *historical reconstruction*. He argues that historical reconstruction is not dependent on

social memory as historians proceed "inferentially" and apply the "historian's criteria of historical truth" by reference to which the evidence is assessed. Western historiographical traditions have distinguished between *history* as objective, guided by abstract reasons and capable of empirical validation, and *memory* as subjective and selective. The practice of historical reconstruction can be influenced by social memory, but it can in turn manipulate the memory of social groups. An extreme case of such manipulation takes place when a totalitarian regime deprives its citizens of their memory. Such "organised forgetting" (ibidem:14) characterized social policy of the communist regimes writing incomplete histories. Social memory relies on story telling, but what is called *place memory* can also help to trigger (social) memory. Places are more than settings or scenes; they are "active agents of commemoration" (Casey, 1993:277).

People have always attempted to embed public memory in narrative elements of buildings, from the Roman imperial monuments through doctrinal sculptural programs for Romanesque and Gothic cathedrals through Socrealistic 'palaces for the proletariat' in the postwar communist architecture. Most semiotic analysis of architecture has approached architectural objects as a system of signification which could be explained through notions such as architectural code or architectural sign (Eco, 1986). The architectural apotheoses of the King or the Church served the purpose of glorification that is a very basic mission of architecture. Connerton (1989) explains this as a very specific characteristic of cognitive memory. Cognitive memory is understood to be "encoded" according

to semantic, verbal, and visual codes, and seems especially place-oriented since "concrete items easily translated into images are much better retained than abstract items because such concrete items undergo a double encoding in terms of visual coding as well as verbal expression" (ibidem: 27). That is why places and the visual symbolic meanings encoded in them are such popular mnemonic devices and a resource for public history and creation of heritage sites.

Architecture always played a part in creating public history: it was a space where historical events were taking place. Many buildings became symbols of the state, and not only of the nation.

The creation of heritage relates to the concept of public memory.

As already argued, an official memory (history) and unofficial (social) memory are employed in commemorative practices. The official memory, based on formal research, is created and perpetuated by the governing elites, whose main concern is to maintain the status quo and to unify the nation around promoted ideas. Unofficial or popular memory, subjective and selective, represents a variety of interest groups whose evaluation of the past might fundamentally differ from that represented by the official memory. In order to ensure the political stability of the nation, interpretation of the past reflected in the official memory tends to encompass traditions and images of the popular memory. According to Lowenthal (1985) "the past as we know is partly a product of the present; we continually reshape memory, rewrite history, refashion relics" (ibidem: 26). Halbwachs (1980) claims that the present constructs the past. Schwartz (1982: 396), however, argues against this rigid view and claims that the past imposes

limits on how it is constructed in the present. "Given the constraints of a recorded history, the past cannot be literally constructed", he writes, "it can only be selectively exploited". This argument is significant in explaining the architectural reconstruction process: architectural (material remains or iconography) constraints of the lost relic impose limits on its reconstruction, the reconstruction cannot be fabricated, and it can only be selectively exploited. Selection of the past events and their interpretation by the ruling elites, usually in a glorifying mode, sets the basis of 'official history'.

The construction of 'official history' is carried out by the elites through commemorative activities (Bodnar, 1994). These activities aim at reaffirmation of the status quo, increasing citizen exposure to official concerns and promoting desired citizen behaviour Connerton (1989:71) argues that "commemorative ceremonies prove to be commemorative (only) in so far as they are performative". Place, and especially architecture, provides a background to those performances and symbolizes them "in a way that is tied to a *nation's* history" (Griswold, 1993:71). Such public memory endorsed by the governing elites as national memory is a formative aspect of national identity. Awareness of the past boosts national identity, legitimating a nation in its own eyes (Lowenthal, 1994). This becomes especially significant in the nation-building process. The nation-building process involves indoctrinating people into the feeling of necessity to share some commonalities with others and the outcome is formation of national identity. Related to the development of national identity is

the articulation of national history that would create a common bond resulting in a creation of a nation.

The concept of the *nation* assumed its modern meaning in eighteenth century Europe but it was not until the nineteenth century that the development of nations and nation states took place (Anderson, 1983:15). The nation according to Anderson (ibidem:15) is "an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign." The "political community" is "imagined" since the inhabitants of the nation-state can only believe in the community's existence, as they have never met. A national history is a formative factor of national identity. The belief in the existence of *national identity* is related to *nationalism*. But, as Gellner (1964:168) noticed, "nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist". As a political doctrine, *nationalism* is the belief that people belong to nations that have a right of self-determination either within existing nation-states but as self-governing entities or as a nation-state of their own (Ignatieff, 1994). Nationalism, says Ignatieff in his book *Blood and Belonging. Journeys into the New Nationalism*, as a moral ideal glorifies heroic sacrifices and justifies the use of violence in the defence of one's nation. Nation provides people with the primary form of belonging. Nationalism is said to assume two ideal forms: *civic* and *ethnic* nationalism. Civic nationalism claims that the nation should consist of people who subscribe to the nation's political agenda. This nationalism is called civic because it considers the nation as a community of equal citizens, regardless of race, gender, creed or ethnicity. In contrast, ethnic nationalism, maintains that

belonging to the nation is inherited, not chosen. The idea of nationalism is based on the principles of autonomy and unity:

"the people must be liberated - that is free from any external constraint ... the people must be united; they must dissolve all internal divisions; they must be gathered together in a single historic territory, a homeland; and they must have legal equality and a single public culture", but "only a homeland that was 'theirs' by historic right, the land of their forebears; only a culture that was 'theirs' as a heritage, passed down the generations, and therefore an expression of their authentic identity" (Hutchinson and Smith, 1994:4).

The nation-state is formed in the process of cultivation of a sense of distinct culture and territory (ethnic nationalism). But often, states contain a number of nations that may or may not be politically motivated to form their own state, but must be embraced by a broader idea of identity associated with the state (civic nationalism). In this case the state provides a sense of nation to guarantee its legitimacy by construction of national identity. In either case, the 'official' national heritage is created when places are selected to exemplify a nationalistic agenda. The concepts of memory, identity and symbolic meanings are of formative importance in the contemporary idea of heritage. The term heritage evolved from its original meaning of legacy from the ancestors to that of referring to any relic of the past, either physical or non-physical. A growing commercial activity known as the heritage industry is based on selling goods and services with a heritage component (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996). A popular demand on 'heritage products' in contemporary society is associated with its

response to the rapid changes it undergoes; a reverence for the past and a desire to engage with it. Heritage, as a tangible aspect of collective memory, is used in the nation-building process to "promote citizenship, to catalyze creativity, to attract foreign sympathy and to enhance all aspects of national life" (Lowenthal, 1994: 45).

Heritage is culturally constructed in an ongoing process: "We require a heritage with which we continually interact, one which fuses past with present" (Lowenthal, 1985:410). The first question in analysing the process of constructing heritage is about how relics from the past are valued. This task is performed in the next chapter (4.1 Values and uses of heritage relics).

Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996:16) link memory, symbolic meanings and heritage creation in the following sequential relations:

"Monuments, objects and past events and personalities, together with their interpretive markers, are one, often the principal, means through which places create a separate distinctive identity... Secondly, the act of preserving physical relics from the past for whatever reason inevitably preserves their accumulated messages although these may be expressed in archaic coding systems. Thirdly, in so far as heritage is the deliberate creation of official bodies then public heritage production becomes a particularly effective medium of official communication between governors and governed."

In the heritage creation process place is invested with historical meanings and symbolic associations, while collective memory and history are concretized in particular locations. Historic places integrate history into the landscape: history interpreted in historic sites becomes tangible. Historic places that commemorate

national history validate the nation. When symbolic landscapes are destroyed, culture and identity have nowhere to be concretized and nowhere to be commemorated. The intentional destruction of symbolic places during warfare leaves societies deprived of national identity grounded in symbolic places since to "lose the landscape is to lose the right to define identity in the landscape" (Till, 1999:251). Territorial identities have a significant role in the creation of national consciousness and may serve as the ideological foundation upon which political movements are organized. Justification for protecting and promoting architectural heritage delivered by Doug Franklin (1998:20) builds upon concepts of the collective memory and national identity in construction of heritage:

"The first and simplest reason is that heritage sites, buildings and properties are parts of our memory. The alternative to heritage preservation is demolition, removal and, finally, a collective amnesia. The importance of 'place' to the members of a particular society is no better exemplified than in postwar Europe, when Warsaw was completely rebuilt as it was prior to its devastation".

Contrary to this obvious justification in the light of the present discussion, Lowenthal (1995) gives a quite unexpected explanation of a society's protective efforts towards architectural relics. It is our inability and unwillingness, he says, to incorporate the legacy inherited from the past into our creativeness that forces us to save architectural relics. The less essential the past in contemporary life, the more profound the inclination to preserve its relics. Lowenthal, quoting architects and architectural historians of modern provenance, supports his argument by pointing out a post-modern failure to convey an essential meaning

of reproduced classical architecture and its ignorance of the origins and relationships of this. The failure of the post-modern efforts, as discussed in Chapter 2.2, should be rather sought in their weak spirit of innovation in solving functional problems in the design of housing (Polo, 2001) than in experiments with form.

This chapter presented different ways in which emotions about places can be connected to the notion of identity. A sense of belonging to and identifying with a place can be established at different geographical scales from personal and local to national. Senses of places are articulated through the process of representation. As this review has shown, symbolic places represent well-defined geographical locations, but also transcend these as metaphorical references that evoke cultural meaning independent of their physical locations. Senses of place become more intense when they are perceived as being under threat or lost. Symbolic places serve in political manipulations of history and as such enter the process of the construction of national identity. Places that commemorate national history validate the nation and have a significant in the nation-building process.

4. HERITAGE RELICS AND THEIR RECONSTRUCTIONS

4.1 Values and uses of heritage relics

4.2 The concept of authenticity

4.3 Values in reconstruction

Like heritage itself, the criteria by which it is valued are extremely diverse. This chapter addresses two explicit aspects of diversity: changes over time, and changes with culture. The approach to the critical evaluation of cultural heritage is closely related to the ethics of conservation. Over the past century, and especially since the Second World War, attention to conserving historic relics has been increasingly focused on making them part of a mass culture product in a growing tourism industry, rather than preserving their authenticity in its various dimensions. On the other hand, the concept of authenticity has been increasingly relevant due to the introduction of new methods of production, which changed the relation of art and society. Mechanically- or electronically-produced replicas of images, such as photography or computer images, give a new meaning to the 'original' that did not exist in the same sense in the past: all the photographs printed from the negative (or its digitized form) made by the artist are considered original.

A discussion in the first section 4.1 is organised around types of heritage resource values. To the extent that value is defined in relation to some aim or use, this discussion of values is intended to explore how cultural materials from

final section (4.3), a model is developed that permits analytic connections between the values identified in the heritage relics and in their reconstructions.

4.1 Values in heritage relics

In the past decades, historic relics have been subjected to extensive conservation practices. The nature of this work depended on changing concepts of authenticity and monument values. Thus, in the nineteenth century, highly valued 'stylistic purity' dominated the restoration movement at the expense of preserving the historic layers that had evolved over the course of centuries. This attitude is expressed in Viollet-le-Duc's, restoration architect of the nineteenth century, famous definition of restoration: "To restore a building is not to preserve it, to repair, or rebuild it; it is to reinstate it in a condition of completeness that could never have existed at any given time" (Hearn, 1992:269). At the beginning of the twentieth century, Georg Dehio and Alois Riegl, the founding fathers of contemporary conservation, objected to such a practice in their work under the instructive title "Conserve, do not restore" (*Konservieren, nicht restaurieren*, 1900). They expressed a new approach to heritage relic treatment that is the preservation of the historic fabric without its replacement. Riegl also contributed to the debate about the values of historic relics. His essay "The Modern Cult of Monuments; its Character and its Origin" published in 1903, provided a basis for the assessment of 'cultural and use values' of historic buildings and monuments for many contemporarily used evaluation systems. In Riegl's system of monument value, a central role is given to 'age-value', expressed in the patina of

time and based on the perception of the ageing process. According to him, evaluation for preservation should take into consideration also 'present -day values', especially the 'use-value' of a monument that sets different treatment for the monument, since "only works for which we have no use can be enjoyed exclusively from the standpoint of age value" (Riegl, 1982:24). Other values include 'art-value', which Riegl sees as a relative value that should be established in cultural and temporal context, 'memorial value' that connotes reading the message in the monument and 'relative artistic value' that refers to the artistic form of the object. Riegl summarised nineteenth century conservation as a concept which "rested essentially on the two premises of the originality of style (its historical value) and the unity of style (its newness value)" (ibidem:24). Although Riegl's "modern monument cult" does not introduce a value of authenticity, it refers to authentic historic fabric that is to be spared even from conservation interventions and that should show "at least a recognisable trace of the original form" (ibidem:24). In that context authenticity becomes a condition of the relic rather than a value itself.

After the Second World War in Europe, when entire cities were turned into ruins, such principles as 'conserve, do not restore' expressed at the beginning of the twentieth century by Dehio, an art historian from Germany, could not survive any more. New conservation attitudes developed and reconstruction and rebuilding became naturally the most popular activities. Modern post-war conservation regarded itself as a scientifically pursued discipline that has been governed by a set of principles and objective criteria. Its preoccupation with the

care of 'historic fabric' and its reliance upon purely scientific methods is very characteristic of its times.

Ascribing to historic relics 'cultural and use values' demonstrates that they are potentially cultural resources; that is, they have some potential value or use in the present and future. For many years, especially at the beginning of the conservation movement, the conviction prevailed that there existed a well-defined set of values recognisable and classifiable through objective and measurable criteria. Designation decisions and protective measures were based on such assumptions. These decisions did not take into consideration the relativity of resource value: value is not inherent in any relic from the past, at least in the same sense as property of colour, form, and textures. Furthermore, and philosophically more basic, value is perceived in heritage relics by humans, and thus depends on the particular historical, cultural, intellectual frames of reference held by the societies involved and by individuals.

Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) name three major categories of use of heritage. Their classification is based on the premise that heritage is a resource that is basic to creation of major activities and industries. According to this classification heritage is used as a cultural, political and economic resource. The most visible and obvious of such uses are considered to be use of heritage as an economic resource in heritage tourism, though these authors note that all three categories of use overlap.

Lipe argues (1984) that evaluation of a heritage relic in relation to its use can be performed in four contexts from which values emerge. These contexts are

provided by the society's popular knowledge and cultural tradition, as opposed to formal knowledge and the types of formal research it is engaged in, its economy and economic potential, and its aesthetic standards expressed in its stylistic tradition. Consequently the value contexts are identified as 1. *Traditional Knowledge* (oral tradition, folklore, mythology, etc.); 2. *Formal Knowledge* (historical research, archaeological/architectural studies, cultural studies, etc.); 3. *Artistic Standards* (aesthetic and craftsmanship norms); 4. *Economy* (market factors: public demand for heritage products, cost of conservation). The material remains that have survived into the present time are potential cultural resources, but their actual resource value to the society can only be established within these particular contexts. The contexts can interact among themselves: for example, architectural research may establish that a structure, which in the traditional wisdom was thought to represent a particular culture, was actually built much later by another. Or, a shift in popular knowledge resulting in appreciation of the Victorian era may lead to a higher aesthetic evaluation of Victorian architecture, and to greater economic value for structures built during this period.

When potential cultural resources are considered within these contexts, evaluations are made of these material relics of the past. These evaluations establish the degree to which these relics are to be considered resources by the society. Lipe (1984) identifies four types of values: *informational*, *symbolic (associative)*, *artistic (aesthetic)*, *economic*. The process of ascribing values to historic relics and the values which emerged in the above listed contexts will be now discussed.

1. Traditional Knowledge → Symbolic Value

Any account of the nature of human behaviour, at either the individual or the group level, must consider the role of learning and of cultural transmission among contemporaries and between generations. Human communication, and that includes learning, is symbolically mediated. Symbols let humans substitute experience in the learning process; symbols tell stories that are assumed as a virtual experience. With symbols humans can create and process abstract concepts (Arendt, 1958). Material items, due to their durability, are more stable basis for symbolism than abstract notions. Material objects, as artefacts, structures, or landscapes thus suit well society's need for continuity in the transmission of cultural information through time. Cultural resources that are publicly accessible serve well to communicate messages. In western societies, cultural resources such as historic buildings: churches, residences of political leaders or other famous individuals, historic landscapes; preserved battlefields, ceremonial routes often convey integrative messages, reminding viewers of a common historical experience or cultural origin. The feeling evoked, of common experience, gives the individuals a sense of their society's permanence and continuity.

2. Formal Knowledge → Informational Value

As discussed in the previous section, the symbolic use of cultural materials as resources is conditioned by what is known about them. The materials themselves are sources of information about the past. Informational value is discovered most directly from formal research; the

academic disciplines, such as art history, historical geography, ethnology, have well developed approaches for concluding about the past from the direct studies of cultural resources. These disciplines assist with providing accounts of the lifeways of past cultures that can be used to construct a complex cultural context for the material object under study.

Methods of direct study of cultural resources are often destructive of artefacts or of their spatial associations (e.g. architectural research damaging later stages of development while exploring earlier). In conservation, awareness of this problem has led the adoption of a 'conservation ethic' in conducting archaeological and architectural research.

Informational value is heavily dependent on an intellectual and political context. The argument can be developed further by examining how informational values revealed in, and symbolic values assigned to the relic, can be endowed with messages which are formed by an elite in power trying this to legitimise the dominant regime and to manipulate the society. Similarly, opposition groups, objecting to a ruling political power and legitimating their position, project a message using information and symbolism conveyed by historic relics. Interestingly enough, both parties can achieve this by claiming inheritance of the same symbols. For example, the Communist governments protecting national heritage projected themselves as the natural heir of national history. In Poland such political legitimisation created government patronage over the reconstruction of the Royal Castle. For the opposition, however, the same Royal Castle was a symbol of Polish democracy and, in mobilising the nation in support

of reconstructing the castle, the ethos of patriotic duty was created. In other cases, official heritage was promoted in opposition to national heritage: the Museum of Revolutionary Movements was situated in the former building of the Stock Exchange and the Bank of Poland. Today, the Polish Stock Exchange operates in the building of the former House of the Party (the Communist Party). The approach of many ruling regimes, or even pluralist western democracies, to heritage conservation and interpretation, discussed in detailed examples in later chapters, is explained by the so -called 'dominant ideology thesis' (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner, 1980), according to which heritage interpretation projects a message framed by the ruling elite and legitimating the dominant regime.

3. Artistic Standards → Artistic Values

According to studies of aesthetics, some qualities of cultural materials such as form and texture are more appealing to the observer's aesthetic sense than others. Aesthetic appreciation is conditioned by preferences and standards specific to the observer's culture. Consequently, the context from which the aesthetic value of cultural resources emerges is very complex and influenced as much by traditional standards of style and beauty as by critical writings rooted in art history research, or by conceptions of what aesthetic standards were held by the culture that created the item (Tatarkiewicz, 1976). Equally influential might be standards deriving from the existing market for the given type of cultural resource. The power of aesthetic value to create interest and appreciation is often coupled with the power of cultural resources to symbolise and to commemorate a past event, person, etc. The execution of aesthetic programs

expressed in mastery of craftsmanship is evaluated against accepted standards and set as an artistic value.

4. Economy → Economic Value

Conservation, studying or displaying of cultural resources will always have an economic dimension. Cultural resources may enter the market through several pathways. One of them is associated with their utilitarian value, which derives from their ability to serve as a modern alternative. For example, a historic building can often provide shelter as satisfactorily as could a modern replacement. Adaptive re-use has saved many historic buildings and districts. Strictly utilitarian decisions, however, may lead to conflicts between the proposed use of a property and the values that led to its becoming a cultural resource in the first place. For example, artistic and informational values may be destroyed by physical modifications designed to adapt the property to its intended economic use.

Symbolic and artistic values can also be translated into market value, provided consumers are willing to pay to visit, own or preserve them. In most countries, cultural tourism is a major economic force. Finally, informational values, though not often expressed directly in market value, can also affect and be affected by decisions made on economic grounds. In some cases, revealed information about historic relics creates a wide public interest that can generate direct monetary returns, or even can create the market, as it was in the case of the discovery of the Tutankhamen tomb. More often, particularly in the case of

archaeological excavation, even the research required to reveal new information from the resources may itself be too expensive to carry on.

This short review based on the approaches from different disciplines (archaeology, geography, aesthetics) suggests a coherent conceptual scheme within which the complex relationships among cultural materials and their resource values can be comprehended and discussed. There still remains the question of 'measurability' of heritage values. Herb Stovel (1995b) addressed this problem when he pointed out the relativity of heritage values as accountable for the definitional differentiations or even contradictions. He concluded his argument with a remark that lack of consensus on heritage values in society at a point in time due to changing perception should not prevent efforts to improve the objectivity of judgement. "Professionals involved in conservation activity", he noted (1995b: 397)," while they may enjoy debating the limits of objectivity, have no choice in practice but to try and measure the unmeasurable."

4.2 The concept of authenticity

The limits of objectivity which are relevant in determining heritage values, as argued in the section 4.1, are no less relevant when defining authenticity. Authenticity, after all, is the basis for the measurement of heritage values, though, as Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000:16) noted it is of limited use "as a practical guide to what should be preserved, where and in what quantity". According to them, assigning importance to a building or site or determining its

value is primarily a matter of knowledgeable opinion; a criterion of authenticity is one amongst many.

The word 'authenticity' appears almost always when the issues of heritage conservation are concerned. Heritage relics are routinely assessed in terms of criteria of authenticity. Moreover, the question of authenticity has been one of the key concepts in the professional discussion about reconstruction. This section aims to provide an outline of the origin and the meaning of authenticity in relation to modern conservation, reconstruction in particular, seen from the multi-cultural perspective.

"Authenticity is a widespread modern cult" stated David Lowenthal in his paper on criteria of authenticity (Lowenthal 1995:123). But concerns for authenticity are not new or modern. As long as there has been interest in the truthfulness, or faithfulness, or genuineness of the messages passed on by the heritage relics, there has been interest in authenticity, to use this word to describe all these related concepts. Western Europe inherited the notion of authentic from the Greco-Roman culture. The etymology of the word 'authentic' derives from the Greek *authentikos* since *autos* means 'the same'.

When modern restoration practice started developing in the eighteenth century, the aim in most cases was to complete the object to the form that was understood as having existed originally. John Ruskin (1849), artist and art critic, called it 'preservation of original character'. The conservation movement headed by William Morris (1877), a writer and poet, emphasized 'historical authenticity' and 'living spirit'- the concept that each epoch leaves its specific imprint on the

artifact, making it authentic and unique in relation to time (Pevsner, 1972).

Despite protests from John Ruskin and William Morris, the restorers, among them Eugene Emmanuel Violet-le-Duc (1854-68), favoured a fictional 'stylistic purity' and 'unity of style' over original form developed over time (Wethwred, 1875). According to Alois Riegl (1903) the aim of the restoration process would be to keep the traces of time, in a form of changes and additions, not excluding the patina of time. He called it 'Kunstwollen' and the aim of restoration according to his philosophy was to re-establish 'readability' (Riegl, 1982). In nineteenth-century approaches to conservation the concept of authenticity did not refer only to appearance. The essence of the artifact was defined also by its 'function', that is, its structure and techniques, as well as the materials used in production (Pevsner, 1972).

The eternal debate over authenticity of heritage relics seems to originate from the desire to protect and preserve what is genuine and original. Such is the intention of the Venice Charter of 1964, the code of ethics concerning treatment of historic architecture, that states our duty to hand the historic monuments of the past on to future generations "in the full richness of their authenticity" (International Symposium ...,1990:14). The notion of 'authenticity' is introduced in the Venice Charter without definition. It stirred no discussion around its use and meaning at the time the Charter was created because, as Raymond Lemaire, one of the authors of the Charter explains, the authors of the document shared similar backgrounds and assumptions about conservation issues (Stovel 1995 a). However, as the discussion spread on particular situations in the

different cultural areas of the world, the need for such clarification arose. The very European-oriented Venice Charter, already an historic document itself, appears not to be adaptable when applied strictly to some traditions of non-European cultures. The most famous example for this is the Japanese Ise Shrine, which has been reconstructed in the same form and with the same materials every 20 years since the seventh century, as part of a religious ceremony. In reconstruction work, all previous forms are strictly followed. All interior finishes and furniture are also renewed. That "periodical reconstruction and renewal system" transmits the traditional culture, particularly the architectural culture, and has been defined by Ito as a "system for preservation of intangible cultural heritage" (Ito, 1995:40).

The modern concept of authenticity has developed along with the critical evaluation and restoration of cultural heritage. On the other hand, the nature of these activities depends on changing concepts of authenticity in combination with favouring of particular monument values. The criteria of authenticity obviously vary from place to place, over time, and with cultural context. To solve the problem, The World Heritage Convention, the most universal legal instrument in the field of conservation, introduced in 1994 the 'test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting' as the principle guiding the establishment of the World Heritage List (Revision of the Guidelines..., 1992). Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000:14) refer to "broadening out the concept of authenticity from individual building to its setting" and call it "the authenticity of context". They are concerned with a question "how authentic is an authentic structure in a new

location?" (ibidem) When approached from the perspective presented above, the question invites the answer: the 'authentic structure' is authentic since it meets the test of authenticity of design, material and workmanship, a 'new location' is not, for it does not meet the test of authenticity of setting. Removal of all of a building to another location destroys much of a building's uniqueness and all relation to setting.

Cultural properties will be included in the World Heritage List only if they meet the test of authenticity. None of these aspects of authenticity are defined, neither are the permissible levels of restoration or reconstruction. In fact each property included on the list has its own authenticity. This suggests that there is not and never will be an unambiguous concept of authenticity. The concept of authenticity seems to evolve into a concept which encompasses all the different cultural expressions of the world. In regard to reconstructions they are accepted on the list if they are based on detailed documentation of the original and to no extent on hypothesis (Operational Guidelines...,1994). This gives reconstruction a privilege of representing values as perceived in historic relics. In the case of the reconstructed Warsaw Historic Centre, the accuracy in replicating material and form can be questioned but not that of function and tradition. This exception was made to recognize a unique post-war restoration. The Warsaw reconstruction becomes a memorial of reconstruction, a new original with its own identity and authenticity.

The Nara Document on Authenticity of 1994 clearly reflected the fact that international conservation doctrine had moved from a Eurocentric approach to a

multi-cultural position. The document, "conceived in the spirit of the Venice Charter", acknowledges the test of authenticity as defined in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention but moves away from "the outstanding universal values of cultural properties" towards "the social and cultural values of all societies" (Nara Document of Authenticity, 1995:xxi). Authenticity is to be judged as changing in time, social and cultural context, and as linked to a variety of information sources: "form of design, material and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors" (ibidem).

Authenticity can be understood as a condition of the heritage resource. To be authentic does not connote a value per se. Authenticity needs to be related to the criteria, which may vary according to each culture; there are no universal criteria to which authenticity could be related. It should be rather understood as the condition of a monument in relation to its specific qualities and "the essential qualifying factor concerning values" (ibidem). In a conservation process, authenticity is to be protected, not to be achieved. Authenticity cannot be added to the object; it can only be revealed in so far as it exists. Values, on the contrary, are subject to cultural processes, and may change over time.

If the meaning of authenticity connotes the genuine form, material, workmanship, setting and function of the heritage relic, then using the term in another context leads to misunderstanding; for example, the expression 'authentic reconstruction' used in relation to a new construction based on documented sources, suggests that a replica (reproduction, replacement) can be

authentic while it is, by definition, not authentic. Authenticity cannot be added to the historic relic; it can only be revealed in so far as it exists. Jukka Jokilehto (1999:304) explains:

"Authenticity is a basic concept in modern conservation, but its conventional reference has mainly been the genuine material documenting the different historical phases of a particular structure or place. Using the same word in another context can cause confusion. For example, the expression of 'authentic reconstruction', meaning a new construction representing the form of an earlier building and based on secure documentation, should perhaps rather be called 'accurate reconstruction'. The use of the word 'authentic' has, in fact, become a fashion in the late twentieth century - possibly due to a desire for truthful references in an otherwise increasingly fragmented world. Yet, when the word is overused, its meaning becomes obfuscated; in fact, some conservation specialists tend to look for other expressions to avoid using the word 'authentic' - such as 'identity' or 'integrity' - although these obviously can have different meanings."

If conservation aspires to form a coherent discipline, the use of its terms should also reflect that aspiration. Jokilehto (1999:304) agrees with De Angelis d'Ossat that the use of fundamental terms should be specified and limited within the scope of their *agreed* (emphasis by B.M.) definitions. The conservation guidelines and regulations such as the Venice Charter are facilitating that process. Meanwhile, the colloquial use of conservation terms needs some explanation, as the one offered by James Strike: " 'Authentic' used to mean that the object was made contemporaneously with its style, that it is not a copy, now 'this is an authentic copy' means that it is an accurate copy, the historical details

of the replica are correct" (Strike, 1994:138). In conservation theory authenticity takes on a role of an absolute quality, but in practice it is a duty of professionals involved in the restoration process to set criteria of authenticity. The 'test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting', introduced in 1994 as the principle guiding the establishment of the World Heritage List (Revision of the Guidelines..., 1992), cannot be used in relation to reconstructions as it is in relation to historic relics. The reconstruction of the Warsaw Old Town provides an interesting example of exception in which "the authenticity of materials might be questioned but not that of function, form or tradition. The inclusion of Warsaw on the World Heritage List was considered an exception to the rule requiring authenticity for cultural properties. The exception was made by the World Heritage Committee to recognize an exemplary and unique effort of successful post-war restoration" (Von Droste and Bertilsson, 1995:9).

Authenticity, in the sense of Herb Stovel's framing paper delivered at the Nara Conference on Authenticity, "is meant to have practical meaning for practitioners" (Stovel 1995 b: 396). Stovel explains: "Discussion of dictionary definitions or the evolution of word use are always useful in clarifying conservation exchanges, but they do not remove from practitioners the need for practical tools to measure the wholeness, the realness, the truthfulness of the site on which they work to improve the effectiveness of proposed treatment." (ibidem). Professionals involved in conservation activities have to make decisions. Sponsors, either a private owner or a government, expect from them conservation standards consistent with practice. Though, in conservation theory,

authenticity is commonly seen as an absolute quality, it is professional judgement that sets criteria of authenticity. "Authenticity is in practice never absolute, always relative" concludes Lowenthal in his paper under the ominous chapter title "Authenticity as Rock of Faith and as Shifting Sands" (Lowenthal 1995:123).

Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000:17) resolve these Herculean attempts to identify the concept of authenticity in an astonishingly simple and sharp conclusion: "Ultimately then authenticity is what and where we say it is and it is the nature and motives of the 'we' in these contexts that is worth investigating."

4.3 Values in reconstruction

The theoretical challenge in this section is to develop a model that will allow analytic connections between values as identified in the heritage relics and the reconstructed projects. The model will determine a specific configuration of value relations as identified in heritage architectural relics, and examine how these reconfigured value relations have been transferred into architectural reconstruction. All concepts used in this model and their configurations are constructed by the author to analyse the process of reconstruction.

The values of historic relics discussed in sections 4.1 and 4.2 pertain to the relic considered as material object. They can be arranged in four groups:

Intrinsic values - an original relic comprising authenticity as perceived; stem from the material aspects of the relic: authenticity of materials, form, function, construction, and setting.

Derivative values - stem from the abstract aspects of the relic. These are *artistic values* and *informational values*. The historic relic is a source of information about the past, and the more that is revealed from formal research, the fuller the understanding achieved about the relic. Similarly artistic values are revealed from studying aesthetic and craftsmanship qualities of the relic. These two sets of values are closely connected – informational and aesthetic values of the historic relic depend on its authenticity.

Acquired values - stem from the values gained over the time the relic participates in cultural context: symbolic value. Include values linked with the relic considered as material object through associations; e.g. the relic reminds an observer of some historic event or symbolises and conveys some ideas or messages. These are *symbolic values*.

Economic values - stem from the commodified intrinsic, derivative and acquired values gained when the relic enters a free market as a heritage product.

The relations between intrinsic, derivative, acquired and economic values can be shown on a diagram as a system of concentric rings around the intrinsic values (Fig 4.1).

Fig 4.1

Values as perceived in a historic relic

Destruction of the building leaves the core void; intrinsic values lose their base in the historic relic. Derivative values cannot be established or further explored when the relic is gone but if they are recorded they can form a source of information about the relic. Acquired values like symbolic values can still be sustained in cultural tradition, but economic values are gone since the utilitarian or other marketable aspect of the relic doesn't exist anymore. Preserving and protecting the site of the lost structure can aid in perpetuating symbolic values and promote tourist interest. That often leads to reconstruction of the lost relic.

During the reconstruction process the relations are reversed: it is the building that is formed under the influence of values (Fig 4.2). Transfer of values from the original monument to its reconstruction is feasible only in the case of acquired values and recorded derivative values. The reconstructed relic is being formed under derivative and acquired values and often in response to projected

economic values. The reconstruction process though is not repeating the creative process that resulted in the formation of the original relic. The reconstruction process should be understood as a projection of selected values perceived in the destroyed relic onto its replica.

Fig 4.2

Transfer of values in the reconstruction process

Transfer of selected symbolic values onto the reconstructed relic is relatively easy; the replica assumes symbolic functions as well as the original. Moreover, symbolic values might even be intensified by the facts of destruction and recreation. For example, the Warsaw Royal Castle, a symbol of Polish nationhood, destroyed during the Second World War and rebuilt in a remarkable effort, becomes a symbol of Polish tragic historic experience as well as the national will to survive.

Complete transfer of informational values is impossible. The reconstructed relic reveals no more than the source (that is recorded

informational values) its replication is based upon. But it can serve as a medium in facilitating comprehension of the destroyed relic. Artistic values are being transferred to a similar extent as in any other type of copy: the architectural replica will reveal the aesthetic program of the original design. Craftsmanship values relate more to the abilities of those who recreate past techniques but appreciation is directed towards original masters as well.

The model of the reconstruction process may be subject to a number of criticisms. The first concern would be pointing out of these reconstructions in which selectivity did not appear to take place. When selectivity is understood as elimination of some features and acceptance of other, this extreme case means that all the identified values were accepted for reconstruction without elimination. In the reconstruction process values had to be identified in order to be rejected or accepted.

The critics might also argue that 'selectivity' in recomposition and interpretation of the elements that convey attributed themes and messages suggests the existence of a controlling group exercising a right to what is selected and which message is conveyed. Such a view contradicts the consumer-driven assumption in the commodification of heritage, implying that producers are capable of dominating and suppressing consumers' free choice and that, consequently, this denies the existence of heritage as a free market product. Some of these objections can be accommodated by projection of reconstructed heritage forming, especially when supported by government, as an expression of a dominant ideology and a result of policy of governing elites.

However, Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996: 49) hypothesise that "it is possible to argue historically that even when dominant ideologies can be recognised they may have had little impact upon subordinate classes and were intended more for consumption within the governing group itself in order to strengthen its solidarity and provide a sense of purpose....A subordinate group may engage in passive resistance either consciously or unconsciously, or it may establish an alternative version of national heritage apart from and in opposition to official heritage."

Polish heritage under the communist regime is especially suitable for demonstrating this hypothesis.

It was demonstrated that all evaluations of heritage relics as well as the credibility of related information sources might vary between different cultures. This constitutes the main obstacle in judgements of value and authenticity on fixed criteria. Thus cultural heritage must be judged within the cultural context to which it belongs and authenticity so judged should be understood as the essential qualifying factor concerning values attributed to the heritage relics. The work of art or historic relic needs to be recognised in its cultural context, and the relevant values defined as a basis for use. Four types of values were identified: informational, symbolic (associative), artistic (aesthetic) and economic. When the historic relic is destroyed its reconstruction involves projection of the selected values perceived in the destroyed relic onto its replica. Selective recomposition and interpretation of the elements that represent these identified values is the main characteristic of the reconstruction process.

5. A WIDER CONTEXT OF RECONSTRUCTION PRACTICE IN POLAND AND CANADA

- 5.1 The development of reconstruction theory and practice in Europe and Northern America**
- 5.2 Reconstruction in guidelines and regulations**
- 5.3 National identity issues and heritage conservation**
 - 5.3.1 Poland: Defending national identity**
 - 5.3.2 Canada: Searching for national identity**

The previous chapters explored theoretical issues surrounding heritage, and laid the groundwork for the conceptual approach to the thesis. The origins of heritage, particularly architectural heritage, as defined by using the past as a resource for the present have been discussed and the process of architectural reconstruction explained. This chapter establishes a wider context for the discussion of reconstruction practice in Canada and Poland. In a first section (5.1) it considers the evolution of attitudes towards conservation; it places particular emphasis on the ideas and opinions about the practice of reconstruction within the field of conservation. This is based upon the European cases, as those most influential on Polish and Canadian heritage conservation, and these are listed chronologically to trace the process of change. Secondly, a review of conservation guidelines with respect to architectural reconstruction practice is presented in section 5.2. The review includes an examination of the documents that influenced attitudes towards reconstruction practice in Poland and Canada. These documents also reflect changes in the approaches to

analysis (in Chapter 7). Finally, as a comparative background for the Polish and Canadian cases, the conservation movement in the East European countries and in the United States and Great Britain is discussed and some themes significant to a construction of the theoretical base of conservation practice in those countries are presented. Against this background, the evolution of Canadian and Polish attitudes towards heritage conservation is explored. The focus is on heritage conservation as an expression of national identity and a product of historical experience.

5.1 The development of reconstruction theory and practice in Europe and Northern America

Especially in the beginning of the emergence of conservation as a discipline, the concepts of restoration and reconstruction were used interchangeably, and in the literature from that period, restoration often connotes reconstruction. This is probably due to the practice of the restoration of mutilated antique statues common during the Renaissance. Restored art works enjoyed more esteem than incomplete ones and restoration was a popular activity among sculptors eager to prove their talents this way. The question, though, was not of a 'restoration approach', but rather of aesthetic reintegration favoured by fashion (Philips, 1997).

During the eighteenth century archaeological study of antiquities became very popular among scholars. Antique monuments were recorded in measured drawings and 'restorations' in the form of illustrations of the hypothetical original

appearance attempted. Even much later, in the nineteenth century, the same meaning of restoration was still in use. In 1832, Antoine-Chrysostome Quatremere de Quincy, a classical archaeologist and art critic, defined the word 'restoration' as the activity carried out to repair a relic and, provided a second meaning, as a graphic interpretation of a ruined relic in its hypothetical original appearance (Denslagen, 1994).

The great archaeological discoveries of the eighteenth century were significant to the development of conservation theory. The Italian cities of Herculaneum, Pompei and Stabiae, long-buried under the ash of Vesuvius and lava, were excavated. One of those who studied the finds of Herculaneum was Johann Joachim Winckelmann, a founder of modern conservation and archaeology. Winckelmann made a distinction between *original* and *copy* and this separation of concepts became fundamental to later restoration principles, especially reconstruction. Distinguishing the original from later additions or replications was essential in safeguarding the original (Philips, 1997).

A key moment in the development of conservation policies, according to Jukka Jokilehto (1999:17) was the French Revolution which "sharpened historical consciousness, revealed the complexity of reality, and showed the force of passions, the insufficiency of theories, and the power of circumstances". This excellent description would fit perfectly other great historical moments that have a powerful impact on nations. The turns of history always put the past into perspective and new trends are emerging from rejection or destruction of the old schemes. In the turbulent years of the Revolution some fundamental concepts

were formulated in relation to restoration: the concept of 'monument historique' was established, giving a special significance to important works of art and historic buildings that otherwise would have been destroyed as symbols of oppression. There were also efforts to investigate all heritage structures in the country that after classification were to be protected as the property of the nation. The historical experience of the Revolution provoked developments in the appreciation and conservation of cultural heritage expressed in 'historic monuments'.

In the first large-scale conservation project of the nineteenth century, the conservation of the Colosseum in Rome, active and passive approaches were tested and appreciation for the 'historic monument' was displayed in the effort of preserving its original fabric. Antonio Canova, a sculptor and conservator, aimed at preserving each fragment of the Colosseum without reconstruction works, while Albert Thorwaldsen, also a sculptor, opted for partial reconstruction of the monument. These two opposite approaches: preservation of original material versus faithful reconstruction recreating the architecture of the monument, were supplemented by the third one in which to the conserved original parts are added reconstructed missing fragments, but clearly differentiated from the genuine historic fabric. This approach has been successfully carried out in many projects and became the most employed technique of conservation (Lancaster, 1976).

During the conservation works on the Acropolis in Athens in the mid-nineteenth century, another approach was established and successfully applied.

Among guidelines regarding excavation and restoration works on the Acropolis were recommendations suggesting re-erection of the dismembered parts (Fig 5.1). This reassembling technique called 'anastylosis', a Greek word for restoration, is performed using original material. It is even recognized by the Venice Charter, that strictly prohibits reconstruction. Medieval buildings, though, did not enjoy the same esteem as antique monuments. They were of little concern as 'non-classical' structures and during conservation works at the ancient sites they were often demolished and used as building material. While architecture was dominated by Neoclassicism, the field of conservation thrived on Historicism. Neoclassicism was a reaction to the Baroque and Rococo. The dislike of the Baroque style led to destruction of numerous buildings that were given a new form and detail better suiting the tastes of the conservators. However astonishing it may seem, historic architecture has been fanatically destroyed in the name of conservation. It proves how much an aesthetic program of architectural works conveys messages of a symbolic nature. In mid-nineteenth century Germany, Baroque was a symbol of decadent art forms, foreign to the spirit of German culture; it was perceived as pagan, courtly and excessive. The same hostility can be found in French and Italian rationalistic architectural theories based on the notion that architecture ought to display exclusively structural function.

Towards the end of the first half of the nineteenth century, the new movement, Romanticism, brought appreciation of medieval historic monuments. The period of Romanticism opened another chapter in the development of the

1

2

Fig 5.1

The Acropolis of Athens, Greece, in 1910

1. The temple of Athena Nike

2. The temple of Erechtheum

(photos Jokilehto, 1999)

new approach to the conservation of historic relics. The new approach was founded on an appreciation of the aesthetic values of the medieval buildings and respect for them as 'national monuments' regarded as a representation of the nation's achievements. The appreciation of Gothic in England came from linking the Gothic style with great national events and historical continuity. Many country residences were remodelled in the revived Gothic style, mainly for the purpose of a scenic effect. Cathedrals and churches that suffered through the iconoclastic purges in the seventeenth century and later from neglect and decay were given restoration treatment in Gothic style. Gothic was regarded as the only acceptable style for religious buildings. The restoration works ignored completely original historic fabric, focusing on 'beautification' of the form and detail, generally aimed at the unification of the internal space at the expense of the original structure (Jokilehto, 1999).

By the end of the first half of the nineteenth century it became obvious that the survival of medieval buildings was threatened by the way they were restored. James Wyatt's (1746-1813) restoration plans for Durham Cathedral (1795) were criticized by the Society of Antiquaries as a destructive treatment. The main aim of the plan was unifying architectural form and style (Fig 5.2). The planned restoration, which included extensive demolitions, was fortunately never completed in full. Another Wyatt work, the restoration of Salisbury Cathedral (1787-92), was also criticized for destroying the original spatial disposition of the building. The conservation works at the cathedrals were closer in character to reconstruction than restoration. However, they cannot be classified as

1
2

Fig 5.2
Durham Cathedral, England; drawings by J. Carter
1. before Wyatt's restoration
2. after Wyatt's restoration
(photos Boulting, 1976))

reconstruction, since the recreation of the intentionally demolished parts of the structure did not aim at reconstructing any particular phase in the structure's development, but a completely new form, designed in the name of 'unification of the form and style'. Restorations like those of Salisbury and Durham Cathedrals, were in fact building in historic style (Evans, 1956; Fawcett, 1976).

In Germanic countries Gothic and pre-Gothic (late Romanesque) style was also gaining growing appreciation (Muthesius, 1981). The Romantic admiration for the Gothic style, of which Germans claimed to be initiators, reflected nationalistic feelings; medieval buildings were valued as an expression of national creativity and excellence of craftsmanship and considered Germany's national heritage. Restoration of the Romanesque Cathedral at Speyer destroyed in 1689 involved reconstruction of the original Romanesque form. Purity of style was also the criterion in restoration of Berlin and Vienna churches. Many modified churches in Germany survived to the nineteenth century far from completion. The construction of Cologne Cathedral that started in the thirteenth century was interrupted three hundred years later. In 1841 the construction was continued according to the medieval design under the supervision of architects Karl Friedrich Schinkel and Ernst Friedrich Zwirner, who also prepared the plan for completion. The restoration generally referred to removal of Baroque altars, sepulchral monuments and galleries. The cathedral of Bamberg underwent a similar restoration in the years 1828-37; all Baroque furnishings were removed, the coats of plaster on the walls and piers were scraped down to the bare stone and the choir stalls were reconstructed in Gothic style (Fig 5.3). Throughout the

1	2
---	---

Fig 5.3

Cathedral of Bamberg, Prussia; the nave facing east

1. oil painting of 1682 by G.A. Arnold

2. after restoration

(photos Denslagen, 1994)

nineteenth century the removal of Baroque features from church buildings was a common practice in almost every restoration. Aversion to Baroque was widespread, particularly because this style was associated with France which had recently occupied German states. On the other hand, medieval monuments were evidence of the glorious past of the German Empire and a source of inspiration for the unity of the German people. To achieve a purity of style, all post-medieval additions were removed in so called 'purifications'. In this climate, all the significant restorations, so called 'artistic' or 'archaeological' restoration, in fact reconstructions, aimed to make history applicable to current events, leaving any historical or artistic considerations aside. This approach is characterized by a strong bearing of Historicism, widespread in Europe, but especially present in Germany (Muthesius, 1981). This can be noted, for example, in the reconstruction of the Marienburg Castle (now Malbork in Poland). The restoration works on the ruin of the fourteenth-century castle, once a seat of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, started in 1816 with close involvement of Schinkel who designed new interior features for the main hall of the castle. The works at that very unique castle included restoration of the well-preserved parts, such as the refectory and the Ritter Hall, and reconstruction of the damaged parts. The original form and use of the intact as well as destroyed parts was established upon complex research. When the lack of sufficient data occurred or the original parts were destroyed in the course of unskilled restoration works, hypothetical reconstruction was performed. As a result the only restoration accomplished was of the original splendour of the 'Parthenon der Provinzen

Preussens' (Denslagen, 1994). The works that aimed at a recreation of the castle's medieval character continued for more than a century. During the Second World War the castle was destroyed and after the war, reclaimed by Poland, was restored by Polish conservators (Fig 5.4).

Towards the end of the first half of the nineteenth century, in many European countries architectural heritage was granted the status of national monuments and underwent 'stylistic' restoration bringing out the most appropriate features associated with the glorious times of the nation. A 'unity of style' was the first and foremost priority in conservation works. The concept of style was understood as an entity independent from the architectural object. Eugene Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879), architect and conservator, believed that "style resides solely in the true and marked expression of a principle and not in an immutable form" (Hearn, 1992:219). He regarded Gothic style 'free', 'non-immutable' and considered the principles underlying Gothic architecture most applicable to the foundation of modern architecture: "Gothic construction is not, like antique construction, immutable, absolute in its means; it is supple, free, and as inquiring as the modern spirit: its principle permits the use of all materials given by nature or industry in virtue of their own qualities; it is never stopped by a difficulty; it is ingenious: this word tells all" (Hearn, 1992:116).

The drastic 'complete restoration' of the fortifications in Carcassonne best illustrates this approach (Fig 5.5). Carcassonne, a fortified city of Roman origin, was enlarged and improved in the thirteenth century. It served successfully its military function until the French Revolution. When it lost its military status in the

Fig 5.4

Marienburg Castle, Prussia (now Malbork, Poland)

1. In 1885 (photo Jokilehto, 1999)

2. In 1999 (photo Polish National Tourist Office)

1	
2	
3	4
5	6

Fig 5.5

The walled city of Carcassonne, France

1. Before restoration in 1850s; drawing by Viollet-le-Duc

2. Restoration; drawing by Viollet-le-Duc

(photos Jokilehto, 1999)

3., 4., 5., 6. Carcassonne today (photos P. Cuq and B. Berniere)

beginning of the nineteenth century, the disintegration of the walls and the upper parts of the defensive towers (due to the use of their stones as building material) had to be stopped by classifying it as a military object again. In 1846, Viollet-le-Duc was commissioned to study the fortification which resulted in a comprehensive archaeological report with a set of measured drawings and hypothetical reconstruction of the construction phases. Ten years later he was in charge of the restoration of the fortress. The aim was a 'full restoration' of the lost and damaged parts of the structure to their appearance in the thirteenth century. The main reconstruction was finished in 1879, but the restoration works were continued by Viollet-le Duc's successors until 1910. Henry James, an author of *A little Tour in France* (1894), who visited the fortified town Carcassonne three years after it was reconstructed, was impressed with that 'splendid achievement', but expressed an opinion that a preserved ruin is preferable to a reconstruction: 'the one is history, the other is fiction' (In Denslagen, 1994:139).

Viollet-le-Duc worked on important restoration projects, among them Notre-Dame of Paris, the churches of La Madeleine in Vézelay, Saint-Sernin of Toulouse, the Synodal Hall of Sens, and the Castle of Pierrefonds. As he acquired more expertise, there were more extensive restorations based on reconstructions of lost structures. Preservation measures (a passive approach) gave way to replicating by extensive reconstructions (an active approach). In Vézelay in the attempt to provide structural stability of construction, the existing, defective flying buttresses were replaced with new ones designed in a new form. This was developed with the Gothic building logic, but in a form that had never

existed before (Fig 5.6). The Romanesque church Sain-Sernin in Toulouse was reconstructed into a hypothetical medieval form. Similarly, the picturesque ruined Castle of Pierrefonds was completely reconstructed (including interior sculptural and painted ornaments and period furniture) with extensive use of modern materials such as steel instead of timber in roof structures. The elevation of the Synodal Hall in Sens and the king's statues featuring the main entrance of Notre-Dame of Paris (Fig 5.7) were reconstructed on the basis of well preserved fragments, as well as on the basis of analogy to similar works. In the restoration of Notre-Dame in Evreux, as in Vezelay, the existing flying buttresses were evaluated as defective and replaced with improved and new ones different in form.

"It is hard to understand", writes Wim Denslagen in his book *Architectural restoration in Western Europe: controversy and continuity* (1994:116), "why Viollet-le-Duc regarded the material remains of Gothic architecture as being less important than his rational principles of construction that he actually based on this style. Was it not in fact quite irrational of him that he went so far as to sacrifice the authentic remains of the history of construction in favour of a modern interpretation of old architecture? If 'living' sources of history require a concept or theoretical model to legitimize them, what we are faced with is quite a sinister view of history." This critic represents the most recent disapproval of Viollet-le-Duc's restoration works, but his theories had already been refuted by the nineteenth century professionals in the field: restoration architects and antiquarians. Their opinions are often full of admiration, but at the same time

1 | 2

Fig 5.6

La Madeleine, Vézelay, France

1. In 1844, watercolour by E.E. Viollet-le-Duc

2. After restoration

(photos Denslagen, 1994)

1 | 2

Fig 5.7

Notre-Dame, Paris, France

1. Before restoration

2. After restoration by E.E. Viollet-le-Duc

(photos Denslagen, 1994)

marked with a high dose of criticism. Virtually everyone agreed on strict rules that should be imposed on a restoration architect attempting new design in reconstruction works. They also agreed that reconstructions should be exclusively based on reliable documentation and undeniable architectural remains. Anthyme Saint-Paul (1843-1911), an antiquary, considered Viollet-le-Duc's reconstructions and reconstruction practice as a 'regrettable mistake'. He considered reproductions of monuments 'destructive to art, to archaeology and to history'. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu disapproved the reconstruction plan for the cathedral of Evreux on theoretical grounds, by saying that reconstruction applied instead of restoration destroys the most important qualities of any historical monument, namely the authenticity that is a base for its documentary value (ibidem).

Prosper Merimee (1803-70), a leading personality in French heritage conservation who had a major influence in the evaluation of the restoration of the Notre-Dame Cathedral in Paris, also insisted on the faithful preservation of original architecture, but considered the 'authenticity of the artistic expression' more important than the authenticity of the historical material. He didn't object to the reconstruction of the sculptures in the portal of the Notre-Dame cathedral, considering it returning the monument to the artistic expression and splendour it had lost. It was not a singular case of compromising on restoration rules. There were numerous exceptions to established conservation principles for a variety of reasons and reconstructions of defective or damaged parts were often performed in the name of structural stability, 'stylistic unity' or architectural expression.

Generally, though, at the end of the nineteenth century there was an increasing number of critics, particularly archaeologists, who opposed hypothetical reconstructions. The critics included Anatole France (1844-1924) and Marcel Proust (1871-1922), who objected to the works of Viollet-le-Duc and other restoration architects (Jokilehto, 1999).

In England, in the first half of the nineteenth century there was a passionate debate on the principles of treatment of historic relics. One of the key problems discussed was 'stylistic unity' in restoration works. Considering that the buildings had been undergoing modifications in various styles in the past, choice of the restored style was given to 'the best and purist style' rather than restoring each alteration in its own form. Among preferred styles were the Decorated, Middle Pointed and Early English. This practice usually resulted in 'stylistic restorations' following demolition of undervalued elements representing 'unfashionable' or non-conforming styles. In 1842 *The Ecclesiologist*, published by the Cambridge-Camden Society which in 1845 became the Ecclesiological Society, presented this policy in a series of articles that were discussed in intense polemics among the professionals. The debate divided professionals into two opposing groups, *restorers* and *anti-restorers*. The restorers supported faithful restorations aided, when necessary, with reconstructions (an active approach). The anti-restorers opted for the protection and preservation of the authentic material of the original structure (a passive approach) (Boulting, 1976).

Among restoration architects following the Ecclesiologists' principles were Anthony Salvin (1799-1881), John Loughborough Pearson (1871-96) and

William Butterfield (1814-1900). According to them restoration should be carried out in such a way that the historic relic is completed according to the ideal form; anything that detracts from the perfect form must be removed. During the 1840s and 1850s, Salvin took part in the restoration works at Durham that involved drastic changes to the interior of the Cathedral that resulted in stylistic restoration. Pearson, who learned restoration principles from Salvin, restored Westminster Abbey according to the Ecclesiologist recommendations, giving the interiors of the building a new look. Though he tended to rebuild all the damaged parts following the original form and using original material as much as possible, the resulting restoration was not free of alterations introduced due to necessity of improvement or, simply, as an expression of contemporary aesthetic inclinations. Similarly, Butterfield practiced his own interpretation of Gothic style, aiming at achieving a high standard of structure and function, as well as the 'best and purist style'. This approach to restoration was defined as 'eclectic' and described by Edward Augustus Freeman (1823-93), author of the Principles of Church Restoration (1846). Freeman distinguished between three approaches to restoration: 'destructive', that didn't take into consideration the past forms and styles (hypothetical reconstruction was a part of its practice); 'conservative', based on faithful reconstruction of the restored structures and; the above 'eclectic' approach, according to which the building was restored to reach the best possible results from the various standpoints: style, structure, function. All the three approaches promoted reconstruction as a restoration treatment (Boulting, 1976).

The danger of 'over-restoration' and extensive use of reconstruction was pointed out by Sir George Gilbert Scott (1811-78), one of the most successful Victorian architects. Among his works are restoration of the cathedrals of Ely, Durham, Chester, Salisbury, Hereford and many others. In 1850 he published *A Plea for the Faithful Restoration of our Ancient Churches* that became a credo of his restoration principles. While disagreeing with the 'destructive' approach to restoration, Scott respected the original design, but not the original material or the form reflecting all the historic layers. His approach assumed positions corresponding with the restoration principles that were forming in France at the same time. Viollet-le-Duc was well known and appreciated in England and though Scott was highly critical of Viollet-le-Duc's reconstruction of Carcassonne, these two architects shared many similarities in their approach to restoration. Ironically, their restoration theories were often contradicted by their restoration practice; many of their restoration works did not reflect the respect they claimed for the authentic structure. In the restoration of the cathedral of St. David in Pembroke in South Wales, Scott reconstructed its west façade, previously rebuilt in late Gothic style in 1789, in Romanesque style, using old illustrations (Fig 5.8). He also demolished a late Gothic heightening of the choir walls to uncover the remains of early Gothic window mouldings, which he used to reconstruct the east façade. The east façade was reproduced in Early Gothic at the expense of the demolition of a late medieval structure. This approach to restoration disagreed with Scott's own principles based on preservation. The explanation for this action

1

2

Fig 5.8

St. David's Cathedral, Pembroke, England; the west front

1. Before restoration

2. After restoration by G.G. Scott in 1874

(photos Denslagen, 1994)

Denslagen finds in Scott's "great admiration for early Gothic, which led him to treat later styles as less important "(Denslagen, 1994:70).

The anti-restoration movement, led by artist and art critic John Ruskin (1819-1900), criticized restoration architects for the destruction of the authentic structures in stylistic reconstructions. Though Ruskin didn't formulate a theory of conservation, his writings on values and significance of historic buildings anticipated a foundation for modern conservation philosophies. In *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1907) he formulated guiding principles ('lamps') in determining qualities and values in architecture. In the "Lamp of Memory" he defined restoration as "the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the things destroyed" (Ruskin, 1907:200). He opposed restoration works of any kind on the ground of ethics: "We have no rights whatever to touch them. They are not ours. They belong partly to those who built them, and partly to all the generations of mankind who are to follow us" (ibidem). The genuine monument he considered to be a historic relic weathered through time, not its modern replica. "Do not let us talk then of restoration. The thing is a Lie from beginning to end" (ibidem), he concluded. The "Lamp of Memory" was an expression of Ruskin's thinking on national significance of historic architecture and its role in the history of society. Architecture, in his view, creates continuity through history, linking different times and sustaining the nation's identity.

Following the same line of thought as Ruskin was William Morris (1834-96), a writer and poet, remembered for founding The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in 1877. Morris strongly opposed destructive restorations and expressed it in a *Manifesto* which he wrote for the Society. He condemned any attempt to restore or reconstruct as a threat to the authenticity of the relic. Reconstruction was considered the creation of a fake. The *Manifesto* established the formal basis for conservation policy in England and formed an important reference for many other countries then preparing their own legislation (Pevsner, 1976).

The opportunity to test the developing conservation attitudes came in 1894 when the Acropolis of Athens suffered from damage due to an earthquake. Restoration works began in 1898 and were supervised by Nicolaos Balanos, who was appointed Chief Conservator. The restoration works, which included reconstruction, were discussed among international cultural personalities. In France, a forum for discussion was created in a new French periodical *Le Musée, revue d'art antique* (1904) when its editor Georges Toudouze (1904) objected to 'full restoration' and 'restitution' which he considered archaeological reconstructions. The intended restoration of the Acropolis was strongly opposed in the formal French protest presented at the First International Congress on archaeology held in Athens in 1905. However, the restoration works continued according to the plans of Balanos. The anastylosis of the temple of Nike, completed in 1940, had proclaimed the spirit of modern restoration. The beginning of the twentieth century was marked with many restoration works on

the greatest archaeological sites in the Mediterranean region: Pergamon, Miletus, Knossos, Herculaneum and Pompeii. There were substantial reconstructions involved in all these sites. Reconstructions continued through the following years and similar approaches were practiced in other restored sites (Papageorgius-Venetas, 1981).

In Germanic countries, protest over extensive restorations grew at the turn of the nineteenth century into a strong anti-restoration movement. Georg Gottfried Dehio (1850-1936), an art historian and the founder of modern conservation in Germany, opted for conservation, but permitted reconstruction under limited circumstances. He criticized plans for reconstruction of the Heidelberg castle ruin as damaging to the original material and misleading in respect to historical accuracy. The proposed reconstruction was hypothetical; there was not enough documentation to reconstruct the object to its original form. According to Dehio, the ruin was preserved in a good state with no structural problems and he did not see any justification for intervention. He blamed nineteenth century Historicism with its preference for the neo-Gothic style for the use of extensive reconstructions in the restoration process (Muthesius, 1981).

In Italy involvement in protection and restoration of the medieval architecture did not occur until the time of the unification of the Kingdom of Italy (1860-70). The unification process awoke nationalistic feelings expressed also in the appreciation of the nation's heritage. Italy could benefit from the experience of other countries already engaged in theoretical debates on restoration principles. This resulted in the rivalry of different restoration approaches

introduced according to the principles established earlier for the restoration of ancient monuments. The most influential personality in the developing Italian conservation movement was Camillo Boito (1836-1914), restoration architect. He promoted a methodology of restoration based on a thorough archaeological research and recognition of all subsequent additions and alterations as valid historical record. Reconstruction of lost or damaged parts he generally accepted on the condition that reproduction be based on the evidence of the original form, but all the reproduced features should be easy to distinguish from the original. Reconstructions, even stylistic, could be allowed as exceptions, but generally Boito evaluated two extreme approaches, represented by Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc, as not acceptable. He differentiated between 'conservation' and 'restoration' and gave preference to conservation treatment based on maintenance and preservation. Boito summarized his restoration principles in a recommendation that was adopted by the government and became the first modern Italian charter. Recognition of the importance of documentation as a basis for restoration works gave the name to 'historic restoration' (*restauro storico*) practiced by its creator Luca Beltrami (1854-1933), restoration architect. The difference between 'historic restoration' and 'stylistic restoration' lies in the methodological approach; 'historic restoration' is based on the archaeological evidence, 'stylistic restoration' on the theoretical extrapolations. Some critics argue, however, that in practice, the difference between these two approaches is not explicit (Jokilehto, 1999). The best-known reconstruction work by Beltrami was the Campanile of San Marco in Venice after its collapse in 1902. The tower,

considered important for the townscape of Venice, was reconstructed in 1910 in its old form but with use of modern materials (reinforced concrete). Although the Italian restoration practice at the turn of the century was strongly influenced by stylistic tradition, it also displayed new features of the conservation approach charted by Boito (*ibidem*).

In the dramatically changing world, where scientific, technical and industrial development shaped new forms of economy as well as political and social structures, the conservation movement has been evolving into a recognized discipline. The growth of urban centres stimulated development of conservation planning for historic urban areas. In the era of functionalistic and futuristic planning concepts in the beginning of the twentieth century, the conservation approach was not popular among planners. This makes Gustavo Giovannoni's (1873-1947) conservation even more remarkable. Giovannoni promoted a scientific, critical and thoroughly research-based approach in conservation that he called 'scientific restoration' ('restauro scientifico') and initiated application of the conservation principle to historic urban centres. While he opposed stylistic reconstruction as 'anti-scientific', leading to falsifications and damaging of the authentic fabric of the relic, he could approve the removal of the later structures in restoration of the Parthenon, Forum Romanum and the Pantheon. This ambiguous attitude is justified as much by the complex cultural context of these tasks as by the overall approach to conservation of his times. His conservation principles aimed at maintenance and consolidation, with help of modern technology, if required. Any restoration work resulting in new additions

should be integrating rather than 'improving' the structure. The principles, presented at the International Congress in Athens in 1931, contributed to the formulation of the Athens Charter. In Italy, his work was published in 1932 as an official document establishing norms for restoration works (Italian Charter).

The development of the modern Italian conservation movement greatly contributed to the founding of international guidelines and recommendations. Roberto Pane (1897-1987) was a central figure in the debate on restoration theory. Pane criticized the earlier guidelines as not flexible enough and inefficient in solving complex restoration problems. He disagreed with stylistic reconstruction or rebuilding on the basis on analogy, but permitted an aesthetic and creative approach in restoration works. According to him restoration performed in such a spirit will become a work of art itself. Generally, he agreed that all the historic layers should be conserved but also recommended discrimination in selecting what to conserve since aesthetic qualities of the monument can only be discovered when not obstructed by valueless elements. In the restored church of Santa Clara in Naples, which suffered from heavy bombing in 1944, he decided to restore only the medieval relics, ignoring the Baroque remains and completing the church in modern forms. In 1949 he wrote "...in the countries heavily bombed during the war, it is now impossible to keep restoration within rigid limitations owing to the wide range of individual problems. Restoration for the purpose of conservation, or simple consolidation, must now give way to the reconstruction of important parts of a building, or to something midway between restoration and the construction of a new building" (Pane,

1950:76). Similarly, Renato Bonelli, architectural historian, born in 1911, defined restoration as a creative act resulting from a critical process. The restoration process, according to him, should aim at a 'unity of line' and a 'real form', free of any historic additions. This approach was based on the architectural ideal of the restored period. It might come as a surprise that Bonelli condemned 'stylistic restoration' and, even more, that his approach was criticized by Pane. Nevertheless, Bonelli and Pane became the principal theorists of 'critical restoration'. Reconstruction practice remained guided by the 'critical restoration' principles. Cesare Brandi (1906-1988), conservator and art historian, incorporated the principles of 'critical restoration' into his theory of restoration that has been recognized as a paradigm in the development of conservation principles (Brandi, 1977). Brandi disagreed with the widely practiced approach of 'archaeological restoration' that aimed at scrupulous preservation of the historic values at the expense of aesthetic qualities. According to him, restoration of the arbitrarily chosen moment in the relic's history would result in contradicting the concept of a work of art that derives from the relic's integrity. Concerning reconstruction, Brandi stated that replicating can only be accepted for the purposes of documentation and he disagreed with the architectural reconstruction of the Campanile of San Marco, suggesting that reconstruction of the vertical form of the collapsed tower would have been sufficient for achieving the site integrity in a urban scale. This approach poses a question of scale (architectural, urban) in reconstruction practice and reveals formulation of restoration approaches in relation to the surrounding built context, especially

valid in historic towns. These issues have been vivid since the 1970s, when due to rapid development, there was growing concern about conservation planning in the developed areas. Gruszecki and Łysiak (1974), two Polish architects, systematized relations between conservation treatments and introduced differentiation between replicating practices in different spatial scales. This will be discussed in section 5.2 .

The restoration projects completed in France and Italy were known and discussed in Spain. The first restoration efforts concentrated on medieval cathedrals and Islamic monuments: the complex of Alhambra in Granada and the Giralda in Sevilla, the cathedrals of Sevilla, Cordoba, Burgos. In the restoration of the Leon cathedrals all the trends in restoration practice can be identified, from the 'Romantic' to 'stylistic' to 'scientific'. In the Alhambra, the restoration approach was replaced with the preservation approach in the 1920s.

In Belgium, strong support for the theory of stylistic unity lasted through the whole nineteenth century. Approaches to restoration were divided into two groups: 'the maximalist' and 'the minimalist'. The first group was based on stylistic unity, while the second approach promoted conservation of the original fabric from the all historic layers. In the Netherlands, the ideas of stylistic restoration prevailed throughout the nineteenth century. The ruined medieval water castle, Kasteel de Haar, was rebuilt to its original form (Fig 5.9). A more conservative approach was introduced in the new conservation law of 1917 (Denslagen, 1994).

1

2

Fig 5.9**Kasteel de Haar, the Netherlands****1. In ruined state in 1887****2. After restoration by P.J.H. Cuypers
(photos Jokilehto, 1999)**

The influence of French restoration practice and Italian developing conservation theories resulted in Austria-Hungary in the formation of minimum intervention policy. Alois Riegl (1857-1905), art historian and the author of the first systematic analysis of heritage value (1903), in his theory of restoration favoured limited restoration and opted for preservation of the object. He was against the reconstruction of the medieval bell tower in the Diocletian palace in Split as well as stylistic purging of the historical layers. His principles regarding possible treatments for the restoration of wall painting proves his pragmatism and readiness to accept compromises. At the same time Riegl's classification illustrates incoherence in conservation terminology in different countries. Riegl identified three categories of treatments: 'radical', 'art-historical' and 'conservative'. The 'radical' approach intended minimum intervention; the 'art-historical' approach aimed at preserving and consolidating; and the 'conservative' approach permitted reconstruction to the original image (Riegl, 1903). The understanding of the 'conservative' approach Riegl shared with the mid-nineteenth-century restorers in England. That was completely opposite to Ruskin's definition and to Italian terminology. Riegl's work was carried further by Max Dvořák (1874-1921), art historian, who strongly opposed stylistic restorations and promoted conservation of the whole heritage site and its environment. Dvořák argued that radical restorations and reconstructions should be avoided as damaging to the additions from later periods and devaluing historic relics artistically and historically by introducing arbitrary changes. He considered a work of architecture more than artistic concept expressed in design; to him it

was also the unique execution of this design. Reconstructions he judged as the product of the restorer (Breitling, 1981).

Sweden, a pioneer in the protection of antiquities among Nordic countries, was influenced mainly by the German and French restoration theories. The twelfth-century Lund cathedral was restored in stylistic unity and its interior was redesigned to accommodate the ideal space distribution. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, protests against stylistic restoration resulted in the introduction of new legislation. In the last decade of the nineteenth century Arthur Hazelius came up with the concept of the outdoor museum in a park in Stockholm, which he called 'Skansen'. Skansen was a living display of Swedish history; old buildings from the different regions of Scandinavian countries from different historic periods had been brought together to frame a set for a performance of every day activities performed by guides dressed in period costumes. The concept of the outdoor museum gained immense popularity, first in Northern Europe and, in time, throughout the world. In Denmark, stylistic restorations were popular through the nineteenth century and inspired mainly by German Romanesque tradition. The separation of Norway from Denmark ,and its union with Sweden in 1814, brought out a rebirth of patriotic feelings and an idealization of the country's past. It resulted in appreciation for the nation's architectural heritage. The unfinished medieval cathedral of Trondheim, named Norway's coronation church, was completed in the spirit of stylistic unity. The protection of historic buildings in Finland, part of Sweden until it was assigned to Russia in 1809, was influenced especially by German and Austrian conservation

theories. The restoration of the medieval cathedral of Turku combined all the approaches found in other Nordic restoration projects (Jokilehto, 1999).

The dramatic experience of the First World War, that left damage and destruction across many historic towns, forced restoration architects to rethink their approaches to the repair of historic buildings. It was necessary to accept the reconstruction of the destroyed parts of the building or even of the whole structure. This prompted a reexamination of the principles and reassessment of the techniques of their execution. Particular attention was given to the application of modern technology, such as reinforced concrete, and treatment of the ruins. Reconstruction again became a favoured treatment; this time, though, out of necessity rather than theoretical justifications. The completely destroyed city of Ypres was rebuilt exactly as it had been before destruction. Similarly, the French cathedrals of Reims, Soissons and Notre-Dame of Paris underwent restoration and reconstruction.

The scale of destruction caused by the Second World War has changed conservation practice to the point that it seemed to be in conflict with the established principles. Many important historic urban centres lay in ruins, including Warsaw, Dresden, London, Berlin, and Florence. Not only single buildings but also whole urban centres were reconstructed. The principles of architectural restoration were again brought into discussion and reconstruction practice was once more condemned. But this time, the debates about approaches to restoration and reconstruction were accompanied by rebuilding activities that had to be carried out as a simple fact of ongoing life. The range of

reconstruction works varied from a faithful replication, as in Warsaw (which will be extensively discussed in the case study), to rebuilding in contemporary architectural form that was carried out in Rotterdam where a modern architecture replaced the totally destroyed city. Also in London, the area of Saint Paul's was rebuilt as modern office blocks. In Hildesheim, the ruined parts of the historic centre were rebuilt in modern forms but according to the old street grid. In the 1980s, however, the growing criticism against the presence of modern forms in the historic surroundings and the lack of historic continuity resulted in replacing the 1950s architecture with replicas of the destroyed buildings (Denslagen, 1994). This approach, often practiced in the post-war years, revealed the relativity of conservation principles in different scales, architectural and urban, and brought up a problem of their mutual correlation. The Polish solution to this problem came in 1976 in the form of UNESCO "Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas" (Warsaw Recommendation, 1976) and will be discussed in the next section 5.2. The Alt Pinakothek in Munich represents another daring yet sensitive approach to restoration that integrates the historic remains within a modern design for the infill of the missing central part. The central part of this Neoclassical building was destroyed during the heavy bombing. The restoration project completed according to the design by architect Hans Dollgast introduced to the old structure new modern forms and materials: two new staircases were incorporated into the missing part of the building, steel columns replaced the brick piers and the new section of the roof was constructed in aluminium. The architect based his design

on the premise that the war destruction is a part of the building's history and camouflaging it by the reconstruction would be falsifying that history (Strike, 1994). Between these two extreme approaches, there were many variations in restoration treatments involving reconstruction. Especially favoured was partial reconstruction that gained popularity and was applied even to structures that did not suffer from war destruction.

European conservation experiences were well known in the United States through direct contacts as well as through the writings on heritage conservation issues that gained popularity among American conservators. Sumner Hosmer, in his book on the history of the conservation movement in the USA *Present of the Past* (1965), describes the early American conservation initiatives as a 'truly grass-roots effort'. He points out that the most influential European initiatives were Swedish Skansens, the outdoor museums with guides dressed in period costumes. Other influences came from England and France. William Sumner Appleton (1874-1947), founder of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, was in contact with the conservators in England, France and Sweden. He was a strong supporter of the concepts favoured by Ruskin and Morris. His restoration practice was based on recording and research; hypothetical restoration was accepted only in exceptional and justified cases. The majority of the restoration projects undertaken by the National Park Service in the 1930s included 'period restorations', an American term for 'stylistic restoration', and reconstructions. Through these works the more systematic approach to conservation was shaped and the American school of restoration

finally emerged. The most important work was the reconstruction of the ruins of the Mission La Purissima Concepcion in Lompoc, California. But it was not until the reconstruction of colonial Williamsburg that for the first time restoration principles were defined and applied. Williamsburg, capital city of Colonial Virginia in the eighteenth century, played an important role in the development of American nationhood. In 1926 John D. Rockefeller Jr. decided that he would undertake the complete restoration of colonial Williamsburg according to the plans proposed by the Reverend William A.R. Goodwin. The restoration scheme, prepared by architect William G. Perry, was based on detailed research and gave priority to authenticity rather than to conjecture or enhancement. Restorations and reconstructions were based on archaeological surveys and well-documented iconography (Hosmer, 1981). For example, the 1732 entrance pavilion to the Wren Building was restored on the basis of archaeological and historical evidence and despite efforts to improve its aesthetics. Fiske Kimball and Lawrence Kocher, consultant architects for the restoration work, insisted on distinguishing all the restored parts by marking the introduced new materials. Arbitrary selection of the buildings evaluated as permitting visualization of the architectural development of the complex, led to excluding other buildings seen as not appropriate to project the ideal image of the colonial town. In the result, the post-Greek-revival structures were excluded from the project and demolished. The replicated and restored houses furnished with genuine antiques provide a background for costumed animation (Fig 5.10). Fifty years later Alan Dobby (1978:82) described the Williamsburg project as "a peculiar

Fig 5.10
Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, the United States
(photos www.history.org)

American ersatz historical environment which to Europeans may be both fascinating and distasteful, but educationally it is invaluable." The model of Williamsburg, despite criticisms, became a pattern for 'period restorations' and 'period reconstructions' in the United States and in other countries.

This review shows that there is often a gap between theoretical intent and practical execution, and the diverse influences presented above certainly add to that. The theories and concepts have generally been organized and inclusive of two approaches: passive (preservation) and active (restoration). Interestingly, opponents still present strong assertions in favour of opposite approaches, that is preservation and restoration. This clearly indicates that the conservation movement is highly polarized along these two traditional lines, which are likely to remain for many irreconcilable subjective viewpoints. Nevertheless, the preservation of authenticity, as perceived in historical relics, became the foundation of conservation principles. As a consequence of cultural disasters during the First and Second World Wars, these principles were suspended, but not abandoned.

The declared purpose of this section was to review the evolution of attitudes towards reconstruction practice within the field of conservation. The concept of reconstruction evolved from the extreme approach to restoration that produced restorations, labelled as 'complete' or 'full' to stress the extent of structural works, or 'archaeological', 'historic', 'stylistic' for theoretical extrapolations or archaeological association. In their essence they were based on value judgment and the relativity of values in cultural context was at their

roots. The relevant justifications varied from the scientific and rational in France, religious and moral in England or Romantic and national in Germany. The concept of reconstruction developed along with the concept of style; restoration of the unity of style promoted the advance of building in historic styles. Still remaining within the field of a 'memorial', reconstructions became a new form of cultural resource open to redefinition of the implicit values. With the increase of historical and archaeological knowledge and with the rapid development of tourism, reconstruction has continued throughout the twentieth century as a dominant feature in conservation practice.

5.2 Reconstruction in guidelines and regulations

The first systematic effort to establish internationally regarded conservation principles took place in Athens in 1931 during the congress on restoration of historic buildings organised by the International Museum Office (ICOMOS Canada, 1990). The International Museum Office was created by the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, a body within the League of Nations of 1919. Its activities reflected the growing international interest in the protection and conservation of cultural heritage after the First World War's disasters. At the Athens Congress seven main resolutions, then called *Carta del Restauro* and later known as *The Charter of Athens*, were made regarding doctrines and general principles, legislative and administrative measures, aesthetic enhancement, restoration materials, deterioration of monuments, conservation techniques and international collaboration. Concerning

conservation principles, the document recommended abandoning stylistic restoration. In the case of ruins, recomposition of the existing parts using the methods of anastylosis was accepted: any new material was supposed to be marked. *The Athens Charter* formed a model for modern conservation policy. It was superseded in 1964 by *The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter)* (ICOMOS Canada, 1990).

The Venice Charter remains the best known guiding document and it has generated several other charters, guidelines and recommendations. The charter emphasised a respect for historical authenticity and integrity. It rejected reconstruction and permitted anastylosis: "All reconstruction work should, however, be ruled out *a priori*. Only anastylosis, that is to say, the reassembling of existing but dismembered parts can be permitted" (ICOMOS Canada, 1990:15). In practice, the new charter showed some apparent shortcomings, especially when applied to rural and urban settlements and in providing guidance for specific regional problems. These problems were addressed by a series of documents concerning limited thematic or regional scope within Europe and, at the international level, by constructing new thematic and national charters: *The Florence Charter* (regarding historic gardens), the Washington Charter (regarding historic towns), charters on *Archaeological Management and Vernacular Architecture* (ICOMOS Canada, 1990). National ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) charters have been approved in several countries

including Canada (Poland remains under the direct influence of the Venice Charter).

ICOMOS Canada (1990), divided into French-speaking and English-speaking committees, developed charters representing recodification of principles embodied in the Venice Charter. *The Declaration of Deschambault*, developed in 1979 for use in Quebec, focused on preservation of a uniquely Quebecois heritage. It represents a major step forward from the Venice Charter in its promotion of public participation in a decision making process and in its efforts to place heritage conservation in a wider social context. Regarding reconstruction, the declaration recommends to "conserve as much as possible of the original, and to avoid reconstruction based on conjecture" (ICOMOS Canada, 1990:47). In August, 1983 the members of the English-speaking Committee of ICOMOS met in Appleton, Ontario and prepared a draft charter of conservation principles for English-speaking Canada. *The Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment*, proclaimed in 1983, seeks to dispose the traditional principles of conservation within an ordered framework and, similarly to the Declaration of Deschambault, to locate heritage conservation in a wider social context. Reconstruction is approved and classified as a 'level of intervention' and called 'period reconstruction'. It is defined as "recreation of vanished or irreversibly deteriorated resources" (ICOMOS Canada, 1990:56). Among the listed 'practices', the Appleton Charter distinguishes 'conjecture' and advises that "activities which involve the recovery or recreation of earlier forms must be limited to those forms which can be achieved without conjecture"

(ICOMOS Canada, 1990:57). Approved by the International Institute for Conservation, a *Code of Ethics and Guidance for Practice for Those Involved in the Conservation of Cultural Property in Canada* (1985) recognised reconstruction, together with restoration, as a means of "re-establishing the cultural values of cultural property" (ICOMOS Canada 1990:114). Both restoration and reconstruction should be performed "without fraudulent intention, to the minimum extent necessary and fully documented" (ibidem). In the Canadian Parks Policy statement (1990) reconstruction is placed under the heading of interpretation, indicating that reconstruction is no longer considered a form of conservation.

Reconstruction is also permitted in the USA *Standards for Rehabilitation* (1980). Recreating of missing architectural features can be performed but "should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures" (ICOMOS Canada, 1990:61).

In 1983, ICOMOS developed an international charter for historic towns and urban areas that complemented the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter). The Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas concerns cities, towns and historic centres and defines the principles and methods that should be applied in their conservation. The document states in the section on *Methods and Instruments* that "when it is necessary to construct new buildings or

adapt existing ones, the existing spatial layout should be respected, especially in terms of scale and lot size" (ICOMOS Canada 1990:122). The Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas adopted by ICOMOS in 1987 was based on *the Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas*, known as *The Warsaw Recommendation*, approved by the Conference of Governments' Experts at the meeting in Warsaw in 1976 and adopted by the UNESCO General Conference in Nairobi in the same year. In the Warsaw Recommendation, historic and architectural areas (including vernacular) are defined as "any groups of buildings, structures and open spaces" including "prehistoric sites, historic towns, old urban quarters, villages and hamlets as well as homogeneous monumental groups" (UNESCO, 1985:35). In the section dedicated to technical, economic and social measures, the document introduces regulations for and control over new buildings introduced into the historic environment and recommends in Article 28 that "their architecture adapts harmoniously to the spatial organisation and setting of the groups of historic buildings" and instructs in Article 23 that "in historic areas containing features from several different periods, preservation should be carried out taking into account the manifestation of all such periods" (UNESCO 1985:41). The description of the recommended techniques and methods of conserving historic areas is almost identical with those suggested in the Venice Charter regarding restoration and reconstruction of single buildings. The difference lies in the different scale.

The problem of scale (architectural versus urban) in conservation practice was systematised by two Polish architects from the Technical University of Warsaw, Andrzej Gruszecki and Waldemar Łysiak (1974), co-authors of the Warsaw Recommendation. The architects analyzed conservation treatments in different spatial scales. They observed that the recreation of the Campanile of San Marco illustrates reconstruction in the architectural scale (the scale of a building) and, at the same time, restoration in the urban scale (the scale of a square); the Campanile of San Marco was reconstructed, but the San Marco Square was restored by adding the missing element. The association between the levels of interventions in different spatial scales is ruled by a shifting pattern: what is merely restoration in the urban scale becomes full reconstruction in the architectural scale. Łysiak and Gruszecki also proposed revision of the definitions of conservation treatments as adopted by the Venice Charter and suggested a completely different approach to especially reconstruction. Such a reforming tone of their paper entirely justifies its daring title: "Proposal for the new version of The Venice Charter" (1974). In the paper they re-examined definitions of conservation treatments as presented in the Venice Charter and proposed definitions of new treatments. They fully accepted the principle of not reproducing monuments, but they suggested that *reconstruction* should be clearly differentiated from *rebuilding* which they approved. They defined *rebuilding* as the "immediate recreation of the last phase of a destroyed relic /prior to its destruction as the result of a war or any other disaster/, the image of which still exists in the memory of the living generation, and of which original substance

survived in a considerable amount " (ibidem: 4-5, trnsl B.M.). The authors did not define a "considerable amount" but it can be assumed that the ruins of the Old Town in Warsaw can be considered such, since the recreation of the Old Town is used as an example of rebuilding. Other examples of rebuilding include the conservation work at the Monte Cassino monastery and the historic district of Tsarskoye Selo in St Petersburg (former Leningrad) that also illustrates rebuilding in the urban scale. Regarding *reconstruction*, there are two options of the definition and the choice of one of them over the other is contingent on a) the presence of the image of the destroyed relic in the memory of the living generation, and b) the extent of the relic deterioration. *Reconstruction* is, then, either "recreation of one of the development phases of the relic which image is no longer present in the memory of the living generation and which original substance has barely survived or has not survived at all /e.g. the reconstruction of the bell tower of St. Abbondio church, Como, that collapsed in the thirteenth century and was reconstructed in the second half of the nineteenth century; and the reconstruction of the Loggia del Pesce in Florence, destroyed in the nineteenth century and reconstructed in the second half of the twentieth century, on a new site/ or it is the immediate recreation of the totally destroyed relic, the image which still exists in the memory of the living generation /e.g. the reconstruction of the Campanile of San Marco/" (ibidem:5, trnsl B.M.). Following this line of thinking, in post-war Poland, the recreation of numerous ruined buildings (which were judged to have survived in a "considerable' amount") is classified as *rebuilding*, not *reconstruction*. That solves the Polish problem of

complying with the Venice Charter that rules out reconstruction. It is very significant that a revision of the principles on reconstruction practice has come from Poland. It is in Poland that after the Second World War reconstruction became the most applied conservation treatment. Polish dedication to reconstruction was neither an expression of inclination towards any particular conservation doctrine nor was it a favouring of reconstruction over restoration practice. The popularity of reconstruction practice in post-war Poland was a result of tragic necessity: the war left destruction across many historic towns and forced restoration architects to revise their approaches to the conservation of historic buildings. Reconstruction was accepted as a valid conservation practice. The position assumed by Łysiak and Gruszecki (1974) is a manifestation of the complexity and conflicting priorities of heritage management under the extreme conditions after wartime destruction. It also reflects the experience of the post-war generation of Polish conservators, who originated new modes of attestation and led to revision of criteria of the fixed and universal guidelines so they could better accommodate local and temporary realities.

From this review is apparent that the general tendencies in the field of architectural conservation in Europe has been toward abandoning reconstruction. In North America, a quite opposite approach has been favoured; reconstruction based on conjecture is not recommended but otherwise, approved. The goal in the case of such reconstruction is to achieve the overall balance in the presentation of the site while preserving its historical integrity. It is, however, quite surprising, given the extent of the war damages in Europe, that European

recommendations do not permit reconstruction while American do. Rebuilding would seem to be a natural reaction and Polish efforts towards reinstating reconstruction (rebuilding) practices seem to be justified. Moreover, many reconstruction projects (partial or full) completed in Europe demonstrate that practical execution has already departed from theoretical intent, expressed in international guidelines and official policy statements. This gap between theoretical and practical approaches confirms only a need for strict restrictions against reconstruction practices. An immediate goal of these restrictions is guarding authenticity, considered a basic concept in modern conservation. The opponents of reconstruction advanced the argument that, reconstruction treatment poses threat to the surviving original fabric which often has to be removed or altered, and fostering reconstruction easily lead to uncontrolled elimination of authentic material during construction works. Reconstruction in their view was an act of falsifying; reconstruction structures pose as authentic. The advocates of reconstruction insisted that , in the past , restorations were always performed with extensive reconstruction and were willing to accept limitations in applying reconstruction treatment only in cases of important architectural works of a high artistic quality. This debate, seen from the perspective of the ethical aspects of the conservation profession demonstrates a significant shift in the modern conservation principles from active towards passive approaches. Moreover, even within active approaches, such as restoration, non-drastic treatments are preferred (Denslagen, 1994:30).

The main difference between European and American approaches towards reconstruction lies in a different classification of reconstruction practice: American guidelines classify reconstruction as a means of interpretation, not conservation. In the United States and Canada, such reconstruction trends can be easily associated with tourism and are often justified due to educational values of replicas (demonstrated in chapter 6). In both approaches, however, architectural reconstructions are bound by restrictions formulated by conservation principles: e.g. aesthetic, stylistic, and historic.

5.3 National identity issues and heritage conservation

5.3.1 Poland: Defending national identity

5.3.2 Canada: Searching for national identity

A recurring theme in this section is the interplay between attitudes toward heritage conservation as an expression of national identity and as an outcome of historical experience. Along with the role of national identity created by the historical experience, the third theme that surfaces as an attitude-shaping factor is political ideology. Strong relationships can be drawn between dominant ideologies and value systems and attitudes towards heritage conservation. These three interrelated themes of historical experience, national identity and political ideology together account for much of the variety and the continuing distinctiveness of attitudes towards heritage conservation, of which reconstruction practice represents a part.

In order to put into perspective Polish and Canadian conservation it is important to consider foreign methods of preserving and protecting buildings and sites of historical interest. Attitudes toward heritage are best reflected in heritage conservation legislation. In the process of shaping policies the national judgement is so predominant that the policies cannot be compared unless the national differences are pointed out. Similarly the consideration of heritage conservation policies seems incomprehensible without direct references to the heritage conservation legislation at various levels of jurisdiction (national, regional and local), as well as participation in international agreements on

heritage conservation. In order to provide reference points for the isolating of particular national approaches and relating them to particular problems and traditions, the Polish and Canadian nations have been set against the background of countries similar in their democratic and cultural development patterns. This has resulted in an obvious division into two groups: Poland will be discussed in the context of Eastern Europe and Canada will be considered in relation to Great Britain and the United States.

5.3.1 Poland: Defending national identity.

It would be mistaken to expect a single adequate explanation of Polish identity. In order to comprehend the uniqueness of this society, it is necessary to examine different aspects that help to reveal its multidimensional nature.

What is unique about Polish society?

Polish society presents a complex object for such an inquiry. Once, in sixteenth and seventeenth century, it played a prominent role in the political and economic arena of Europe while to-day it is merely of a secondary importance. Since the essential force behind the development of a state is not economic, but military-geopolitical (Collins, 1986), the Polish geopolitical situation is to be blamed for that (Fig 5.3.0). Poland was almost completely surrounded by military powers of imperialistic inclinations. The eastern frontier was open to the Russian Empire attempting to transform Poland into a subservient state and seeking to establish through the Polish territory a controlled corridor between itself and the rest of Europe. The western borders were pushed towards central Poland by the

Fig 5.3.0
Europe in 2000
(photo The General Libraries at The University of Texas at Austin)

military expansion of Germany. From the north, through the Baltic Sea, came the Swedish aggressor. Even the southern borders, along the Carpathians, once considered secure, did not withstand the rise of the Austrian Empire.

Polish society is one of the oldest ones in Europe and its longevity is quite impressive given the loss of independence in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries. There followed 20 years of independence but after World War II Poland was exposed to the influence of an alien 'super system' and became a substructure of the Soviet Union's Marxist regime. It resulted in nationwide, hated, 'sovietization' that should be understood as the violation of basic social values. All these tragic historical experiences defined a very specific relationship between the state and the citizen. Viewed as an oppressive and foreign force, the state was an enemy. Consequently, cooperation with the 'oppressor' was considered national treason. The law and the legal system have been treated by an average citizen as an alien imposition and abuse of the law was perceived as a patriotic act. Political imprisonment, as well as emigration, followed. This deprived Poland of its most intellectually active population. Survival under the burden of continuous foreign occupation has become a virtue of the highest order. Mutual help and support for protest actions, despite the threat of penalties, were considered a civic duty. Women played a significant role in Polish society. While men were fighting as soldiers or partisans, women took all the burden of maintaining the household and family and, moreover, co-operating with patriotic organisations. This created a particular image of the Polish woman-patriot.

Traumatic national events, especially the loss of independence in the eighteenth century, gave birth to myths glorifying the 'golden past'. The Poles, still proud of their past, escaped into the world of fabricated dreams. The myth's function was to strengthen a nation's ability to cope with adversity, while reinforcing the sense of national identity. A martyr or a leader, created through a myth, has become the object of social respect. The dominant Catholic religion greatly contributed to this attitude: in part, fed by belief that each suffering would be compensated by an equivalent reward, in part by the conviction that an intervention 'from above' will restore 'justice'. The Poles expected that either God, Napoleon, Churchill or, more generally, the West would come to the rescue. The most patriotic of the Polish population, "with reckless Polish courage" (Le Carre, 1991:155), joined the Napoleonic Wars, and later, in World War II, the Allied Forces, in the hope of resurrecting the Motherland. This adds two more features to commonly perceived Polish characteristics: political naivety and a tendency to escape into collective dreams. At the risk of excessive generalization, the Poles seem incapable of perceiving reality as it is (Podgorecki, 1984). They are inclined to perceive reality according to perspectives drawn by 'governors of souls' whom Poles have often sought especially among poets, writers and fine artists. It has tended to make them particularly receptive to interpretations offered by literature and fine arts for their emotional appeal.

Prior to its loss of independence and statehood in 1795, the most characteristic features of Polish society were political, social and religious

tolerance. This tolerance embraced mainly those who belonged to the same status group, but generally the tolerant attitude was extended to other ethnic and religious minorities and to those of a different material status (Letocha, 1986). Poland became a centre of refuge for a number of oppressed groups in Europe, among them Protestants escaping The Holy Inquisition and Jews, whose community in Poland was once the largest in the world. Assimilation into the Polish environment was facilitated by tolerance and economic opportunity. The Jewish community, however, evaluated an assimilation process negatively as a treason of cultural and religious values committed for opportunistic reasons (Torańska, 1985). Paradoxically then, in a tolerant country, the Jews remained in voluntary self-contained ghettos. In the times of the eighteenth-century partitions, the occupants' 'divide and conquer' policies provoked the emergence of antagonisms. To the Poles, resisting the perceived invasion of foreign elements became a matter of national survival. These attitudes laid the foundations for the tragic Polish anti-Semitism and Jewish anti-Polishness (Schatz, 1991). The emergence in the twentieth century of Communism as a political force added to the Polish-Jewish antagonism. "If a specifically 'Catholic Poland' (supported by a Polish Pope) is regarded as the core of successful national resistance to an atheistic international Communism, then anti-Communism can easily become anti-semitism: if some leading Communists were Jews and some Jewish intellectuals supported Communism then a still officially unacceptable anti-semitism can be cloaked by a patriotic, catholic anti-Communism" (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996:154).

In his book *Polish Society*, Adam Podgorecki (1994: 52) introduces a concept of 'spectacular principledness' to describe Polish society. He explains, " *Spectacular principledness* (principled heroics) refers to the attitude that not only approves of a given norm or value for its own sake but also celebrates certain norms or values because they are considered sacred and symbolically significant. Poles have a clear tendency to accord respect to everything connected with the Fatherland, political independence, and the suffering of the nation throughout its history (martyrology)." Podgorecki considers spectacular principledness as a link that connects many features of Polish mass behaviour throughout the centuries. He speculates that Polish traditional attachment to religion and the Church has helped to maintain that characteristic. The Polish religious attitude displays a unique character; as much as on religious faith, loyalty to the Polish Church is based on recognition of the Church's resistance against either foreign religious traditions or alien philosophical doctrines. That explains why the prestige of the Polish Church declined dramatically after the 1989 revolution. The common enemy was gone, and maintaining a union against it was no longer required.

The essential features of Polish society account for Polish attitudes towards heritage conservation. The Poles love history. Their apotheosis of historical events is manifested through the celebration of anniversaries of glorious military victories or public events and through commemoration in the form of monuments or restored or reconstructed historic sites. "Symbolic values certainly surpass real ones. Informal evaluations are more significant than the

tangible, socially and objectively recognised effects of actions. Legends and myths become the critical factors" notes Podgorecki (1994:54). It would not be far from the truth to say that heritage conservation has become par excellence the Polish way of expressing national identity.

The changing political geography of North-Central and North-Eastern Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries fundamentally included Poland (Fig 5.3.1). "Boundaries failed in defining homogenous ethnic homelands within the mosaic" noted the authors of *A Geography of Heritage* (Graham, Ashworth, Tunbridge, 2000: 64) which addresses, among other problems, the complex relationships between heritage and nationalism. According to them "nationalism can maintain universalising myths only at the cost of privileging a particular representation at the expense of subordinating or actively suppressing many others" (Graham, Ashworth, Tunbridge, 2000: 74). After World War I, the newly-established Polish state reclaimed the territory lost in the partitions, only to lose much of this again and to reclaim other land following World War II. The heritage in this shifting space can therefore be projected as a product of one main culture, with minority contributions. In a wider context it belongs to Central European heritage, though the Cold War reserved for this part of Europe the adjective 'Eastern'. Ashworth (1996:49) argues that Central Europe is "a political concept rather than a sub-continent delimitable by any 'limits naturelles' " and "whatever its title, and thus political perception, it has shifted, expanded and contracted over the centuries." Ashworth (ibidem) identifies four political contexts in which Central European heritage has gained its main features. They relate to

Fig 5.3.1
The changing political geography of Poland during the twentieth century
(photo Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000)

four periods marked by the historical events; the First and Second World Wars, the years of the Cold War and the period that followed collapse of the Soviet system. In the first context (until 1919), *'Heritage in the clash of empires'*, heritage is shaped under the ruling of non-national dynasties. This reveals the political and ideological duality of the imperial versus the national. Ashworth observes that " The heritage ambiguities resulting from conflict between the imperialist and nationalist ideas through the nineteenth century are clearly seen in Cracow where the nationalisation of heritage has always been incomplete" (Ashworth, 1996:49). After the First World War, due to the political nationalist movement and tendency towards establishing the dominance of the core nationality over non-core minorities, heritage entered a phase of *'the nationalisation of heritage'*. This is followed by *'the suppression of national heritage'* during the Cold War years, when Central Europe became Eastern Europe and politically was reduced to a border zone between two competing ideologies. Ashworth reveals the ideological ambiguity of Communist policy towards heritage; the new regime declared a break with the past while a rejected past was used to demonstrate social injustice of previous regimes. The collapse of the Soviet system resulted in *'the re-emergence of nationalist heritage'* which Ashworth sees as vulnerable to modification by liberal democratic dominant ideology and market forces in a growing tourism industry. Political and ideological duality appears as the main feature of Central European heritage. Especially the years under the Cold War were marked with conflicting approaches to heritage issues: heritage symbolized outmoded concepts and

social relations in the Communist society but at the same time it was a source of pride and self-esteem to the nation.

Given these considerations, the roots of the conservation movement in Poland cannot be traced without referring to these four political contexts that shaped the historical consciousness of Poles. Conservation has been essentially related to historical consciousness, but it has also been closely linked with evolving science and historical research. The concept of Polish conservation had thus evolved from dealing with 'historic relics of the past' to also include more complex practices involving use of modern technologies.

The tradition of taking care of the past relics in Poland was a part of the eighteenth century Age of Enlightenment. There emerged a critical appreciation of antiquity and cultural heritage. The period witnessed the emergences of the concepts of 'picturesque' and 'patina of age' - initially in relation to paintings, but later also extended to ancient ruins (Frycz, 1975). The eighteen-century European painters with antiquarian interests illustrated antiquities, raising public enthusiasm for the ancient monuments. Among them was Bernardo Bellotto, the nephew and pupil of A. Canal also known as Canaletto, from whom he took the nickname Canaletto. Bernardo Bellotto Canaletto travelled around central Europe painting architectural landscapes of the major cities, among them . His works displayed scrupulous accuracy in recording architectural details and were used two hundred years later in reconstruction works in Warsaw in the 1940s. Bernaro Bellotto was one of the artists and architects who were commissioned by Polish aristocrats. Their works, as well as works of Polish artists and architects

of this period, often included the rebuilding of aristocrat's mansions and churches that involved activities belonging to the conservation realm (Lorentz, 1956, Mossakowski, 1962). In eighteenth-century Poland, the upper classes dominated protection of historic architecture and conservation projects. Polish aristocrats', Adam Kazimierz Czartoryski, Tadeusz Czacki and King Stanisław August himself, established collections of antique works of art and became interested in patronizing the arts and architecture. The first steps towards establishing conservation principles were associated with the survey of ancient buildings initiated and financed in 1787 by King Stanisław August. The assignment was given to Zygmunt Vogel, painter, who produced a series of inventory drawings of historic buildings and classified and described them in a first attempt of such a kind. He also commented on their condition and made some recommendations regarding conservation treatment. Tadeusz Czacki, member of the Treasure Commission, conducted in 1871 inspection and evaluation of Wawel Royal Castle in Cracow and recommended conservation works in the interiors and restoration of the Renaissance carvings in the Senator Hall (Sala Poselska). He justified the necessity of conducting these works by pointing out the Wawel Royal Castle as a historic site of national significance. Czacki based his conservation approach mainly on preservation works, limiting restoration, which he considered damaging to the relic, to the architectural detail only (Czacki, 1881). A particular reference in this regard is the treatise of Ignacy Krasicki, the Bishop of Warmia, poet and intellectual, who published *Of ancient buildings (O gmachach starożytnych)* in the last decade of the 18th century.

Krasicki objected to any corrective works attempted on the historic relics, even on those he did not approve of for aesthetic reasons, namely German Baroque (Obłak, 1957). His treatise is the earliest critique of the destruction of historical authenticity in restoration works in Polish conservation literature.

At the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, the new movement, Romanticism, began the development of new approaches to the conservation of historic objects and places. The expression 'picturesque' is often used in connection with ruined buildings and connotes in this context the passage of time expressed in decay of ruins. Such 'picturesque' ambience became an important element of the eighteenth-century landscape garden. The demolition of old castles, considered in a state beyond repair was conducted to the point where a picturesque ruin emerged from the rubble. This controversial practice saved many historic relics, otherwise destined for oblivion. The material recovered from demolition was used to create 'natural ruins' in the landscape gardens or in new constructions built in historic styles. The concept of 'natural ruins' refers to the use of ruined features as elements in an English-type landscape garden. The goal was to arrange historic relics in a form of ruins in picturesque settings. This was done using original fragments reintegrated with modern structures such as the Archpriest Temple in Arkadia, built in 1795 by Szymon Bogumił Zug for Helena Radziwiłł; or the Gothic Pavilion in Puławy, created in 1809 by Piotr Aigner for the Duchess Izabela Cartoryska, who demanded integration with the pavilion of architectural relics collected from different historic sites in Poland,

France, England and Scotland. This practice of presenting historic remains led later to more organized museum displays (Zachwatowicz, 1967).

When the eighteenth century ended, Poland had already been partitioned three times (1772, 1793, 1795). Polish territories were divided into three occupants, Russia, Prussia and Austria, and each sector existed as a separate entity with its own rules" (Brückner, 1946). A short period of independence, brought by Napoleon between 1807-1815, was again followed by reverting to the 1795 post-partition frontiers. In each sector of partitioned Poland different approaches to heritage conservation were applied and organized under different set of principles and laws (Fig 5.3.2).

The Russian sector (from 1815, the Congress Kingdom of Poland) was deprived of its autonomy, and all cultural institutions were closed down. The conservation movement did not exist and any cultural activities were persecuted until 1905 when the tsar signed the decree that gave the kingdom more cultural independence. A year later, in 1906, the Society for Protection of Ancient Monuments was created. Soon the first conservation works were conducted and by 1914, 364 historic buildings in 240 towns were restored (Pruszyński, 1989:72). The first inventory of historic buildings in the kingdom was conducted by Kazimierz Strończynski, senator, with a team of architects and archaeologists. *The description of the ancient monuments (Opis zabytków starożytności)*, completed as a report for the government, included 400 drawings by Adam Lerue, Teodor Chrzański and Józef Polkowski. Together, 386 towns, 79 castles and 250 churches were recorded (ibidem: 57-58). In the sector under Prussian

Fig 5.3.2
The Polish Commonwealth during the partitions, 1772-1795
(First partition - 1772, second partition - 1793, third partition - 1795)

(photo Kieniewicz, 1968)

rule it was not until 1891 that Provincial Commissions and Provincial Conservators were appointed to assist the Chief Conservator (nominated in 1841). All conservation services in the provinces in the Prussian sector were governed by Prussian administrators. The inventory works of historic buildings conducted by these services, amazingly, did not consider ethnic differences and treated Polish and German relics with equal attention. In the Prussian sector there were active local historic societies; in Gdansk, the Association of Art Enthusiast (Stowarzyszenie Miłośników Sztuki) was formed in 1835, in Szmotuły, the Association of Antiquities Collectors (Towarzystwo Zbieraczów Starożytności) in 1841. Despite these initiatives, strict Prussian politics aimed against the Polish nation did not permit any development of a conservation movement. Conditions were less rigorous under the Austrians, in Galicia, and it was in that part of the country that cultural activity became concentrated. Especially Cracow (from 1815 to 1846 a capital of a tiny neutral state formed from the city and its surrounding district) remained a centre of cultural life. In Lwów (L'viv), a technical college with a civil engineering department was opened in 1844, while in Cracow, alongside the Jagiellonian University, the Polish Academy of Learning (Polska Akademia Umiejętności) commenced its work in 1871 (Pruszyński, 1989). The Art and Archaeology Section (Oddział Sztuk i Archeologii) of the Scientific Association of Cracow (Towarzystwo Naukowe Krakowskie) was created in 1848 to organize heritage conservation services and had performed this task until the Society was transformed into the Polish Academy of Learning and a new conservation agency, the Polish Art History

Research Commission, was formed. In 1850 the Emperor signed an order to form the Central Commission for Research and Conservation of Historic Buildings and three years later the first Conservators were nominated. The Central Commission worked on a voluntary basis; it coordinated the activities of Honorary Conservators appointed in different parts of the Empire (ibidem). In Cracow and its district, the duties of Conservator were given to Paweł Popiel, lawyer and the first editor of *Czas* (*Time*). During the 1880s the conservation services evolved into a more complex organism as it absorbed more autonomy of liberal Austrian policy in Galicia. In 1888-90 a new association, the Conservation Circle (Grono Konserwatorskie), was created in both Eastern and Western Galicia. The circle became the leading force behind every conservation initiative and contributed to the development of conservation principles (Frycz, 1975).

For a brief moment, Poland enjoyed its independence when it emerged after the First World War as a separate country in 1918. In the same year the decree of the Regency Council (Rada Regencyjna) became a fundamental document for the conservation of cultural heritage in Poland. The document, for the first time in the Polish conservation legislation, introduced protection of historic landscape. The concept of heritage was extended from monuments to historic areas. The national heritage legislation introduced in 1928 regarding protection of national heritage was mainly concerned with properties in national ownership. These properties, according to the act issued in 1932 by the Cabinet, were protected from any unauthorized restoration works and their maintenance was controlled by the Conservation Commissions (Urzędy Konserwatorskie)

(Pruszyński, 1989). This legislation became the foundation for the conservation policy of the Polish administration after 1945. An inventory of the properties of heritage significance was undertaken just two years before the Second World War started, in 1937, and though incomplete became a precious source of information in the post-war restoration. With the advent of the socialist government after the Second World War, Poland, like all the East European countries, was faced with a new system of state planning operated through medium-term programs; similarly city planning was integrated into the overall economic planning of the state. Conservation was brought under the control of the Ministry of Culture through the directorate of Museums and Monuments, and the majority of land and properties nationalized. Nationalization ensured that historic buildings became the common cultural property of the people (*ibidem*).

As a result of the division of Europe after the Second War, the eastern part allied with the Soviet Union formed, isolated politically and economically from the rest of the continent, the so-called 'East Bloc' (Fig 5.3.3). This new political situation has found expression also in policies towards heritage conservation. Immediately after the war, the main concern was certainly of rebuilding and economic development. During the late 1940's the planners of most East European cities began rebuilding the urban centres in conformity with the historic land use patterns, but in the early 1950's the idealized dictates of Marxism-Leninism started being adopted and, worse, implemented into planning standards. This led to rapid industrialisation of East European cities. Society was to be change in all its aspects and it was assumed that the past had no

Fig 5.3.3
Central and Eastern Europe, 1921-1989
(photo Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000)

relevance. The city of the future would also be based on new principles. The centralization of planning powers and the expropriation of much private property of the church and large estate owners facilitated the new urban order. If the dreamers of new societies in new settings mostly ignored the past, Communist leaders were however aware of the role of heritage in social consciousness; a nation must have a historic foundation, rooted in its culture (French, 1988:2). The Communist government protecting national heritage appeared as the natural heir of national history. In Poland such political legitimation created a well-established government patronage (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

Conservation works had a top priority in government policy since political legitimation was of the highest importance. As a result historic buildings were restored or reconstructed to their former splendour. The restored heritage buildings were assigned an appropriate use within a new social order; as a consequence palaces and castles took a role of community centres, daycares or holiday resorts for 'the working class'. The relatively liberal policy of the Polish Communist government towards the Catholic Church, compared to strict religious policies in other countries of the East Bloc, saved, though limited in size, properties that previously belonged to the Church. Contrary to what Yukka Jokilehto notes in his otherwise insightful presentation of a history of architectural conservation (Jokilehto, 1999:256), Polish churches had never been turned into concert halls or museums. This took place, though, in the Soviet Union, where one among the most preferred new uses for church buildings was 'museum of atheism', while others included warehouses, or, simply, abandonment followed

by deterioration. However, some of the heritage of the absent minorities in post-war Poland, notably Jews and Germans, was restored and assigned a new use (such as libraries and museums) (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

Since Communism was imposed on mostly old and once well self-defined nations, their final transformation has never occurred and a sense of national identity survived in any case. This was a concept which, in time, according to classical Marxist-Leninist ideology, would disappear. East Europe emerged by the mid-1960s as a series of 'people's democracies', well aware of their national identities. Each country had its own individual attitude towards conservation. Motivation varied and depended on the goals and immediate needs, e.g. protection of the scenic and historic heritage was predominant in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania, while rebuilding and reconstructing prevailed in countries like Poland and East Germany, almost totally destroyed by the war. Similarly, in the Soviet Union the restoration effort was dedicated to restoring and reconstructing. The Soviet Union lost most of its architectural heritage to the war as well as to demolition on a massive scale by the new regime in the post-revolution years. In the twenties and thirties, a deliberate effort to destroy all the architectural symbols of the past was undertaken by the Communist government. It continued until the Second World War, when a change in the government's attitude permitted restoration activities in response to the re-awakened pride in the national heritage so severely damaged in the war. Once again, the country suffered from self-imposed large-scale demolition of heritage buildings in the early sixties, but in later years an

increase in tourism promoted many spectacular restorations and reconstructions (French, 1988:9-10). The Venice Charter was recognized as an official document, but an array of different approaches was accepted and implemented. The conservation theory tended to be based on scientific research, while conservation practice was dominated by stylistic restorations with the aim of adaptive reuse. This involved restoring churches as museums and adapting palaces and monasteries as hotels. The exceptional case is a restoration of the city of St. Petersburg (Leningrad), the Tsarist capital and the birthplace of the Red Revolution, where, unlike the eclectic Polish restoration tendency, the whole complex has been restored as it was before the war, that is to eighteenth-century designs. "The extravagance of these works is probably unparalleled in the West", as Dobby (1978:89) comments on the impressive restoration works in the Tsarskoye Selo, and explains that it was achievable because "the Leningrad restoration school has 100 craftsmen who can match the skill of the first masters, labour is cheap and the destroyed precious materials of which much of the decorations were made can be replaced from mines in the Urals" (ibidem).

In Germany some restoration works, especially reconstructions at the Zwinger in Dresden, were done with similar generosity. Given the lack of resources however, many monuments such as the Frauenkirche in Dresden were not restored (until 1994) and their conserved ruins were left as commemoration of the tragic war events. However, East Germany shared Poland's problem of accommodating a national heritage into a new political and social order. In the German Democratic Republic heritage conservation was

more than a task of rebuilding; heritage issues became a part of the political program. The Communist government projected itself as the custodian of the heritage and completed some significant conservation projects, as the already mentioned reconstructions in Dresden, initiated in the response to public expectations. Generally, though, a new political ideology demanded establishment of a new socialist society, with no other associations with a German past than Communist tradition personified by German Communist leaders such as Luxemburg and Liebknecht. This has resulted in demolition of historically significant buildings, such as the fifteenth-century Royal Palace in Berlin. Compared with Germany, Czechoslovakia suffered from little war damage, so that it did not develop extensive reconstruction practices. Instead, conservation activities were concentrated on architectural restoration and renewal of historic urban centres. Similarly, in Hungary the emphasis was on conservation planning. Effort was concentrated on the restoration of tourist areas and the preservation of the vernacular architecture. Hungary, interestingly enough, displayed a significantly different attitude to restoration from that in Poland, though both countries were among the signatories to the Venice Charter. The difference related to reconstruction practice, not permitted by the Venice Charter but mastered by Polish conservators in the post-war years. There was evident avoidance of reconstruction in Hungarian conservation practice in favour of preservation of the destroyed building in the form of a conserved ruin or as a part of a new structure, contemporary in form and style. Development in old towns followed the same approach; new structures introduced to the historic

urban core were built in the spirit of modern architecture (Dobby, 1978). In Romania, the first conservation law of 1892 was inspired by the French model. The occupation by the Soviet Union that followed World War II did not interrupt continuation of the conservation and inventory works initiated earlier. The conservation law was revised in 1955 and 1974 and Romania entered an active period of restoration work and international collaboration with the European conservation community. The government program of economic development caused systematic destruction of the historic towns and villages, especially in Moldavia. The restoration works undertaken in Bucharest in 1977, when the city suffered from damage due to the earthquake, and the development activities in the historic centre initiated in 1984, were performed with no respect to the existing legislation (Jokilehto, 1999).

The highest monument protection authority in most East European countries was the Ministry of Culture and Art. The only exception was Hungary, where this responsibility was with the Building Ministry. In Poland, the Law on the Protection of Cultural Goods and Museums (Monuments Protection Law) was passed in 1962 and stated the value of historical monuments in the country's cultural development, making all the citizens responsible for their protection. Each province had its own curator, and without his official permission protected buildings couldn't be destroyed, altered, renovated, conserved or changed in any way. This law was closely linked with more general building laws permitting conservation work only under supervision from the state building authorities of

each province. At the same time the monuments inventory was continued (Carter, 1981).

The legal basis for heritage conservation in East European countries during the socialist period was divided into planning, building and land laws relevant to conservation and monument protection. The conflict between protection of private property and public interest was almost absent in socialist countries. Land ownership in Poland requires closer definition. A distinction was made between 'public' property (state, co-operative or other organisations' property), 'individual' property (not exclusively reserved for public ownership) and 'personal' property (to serve personal needs). Land was not exclusively state-held and most historic residential properties were privately owned. The Recovered Territories, formerly in eastern Germany, were governed through special legislation that gave land ownership to the state. Planning law was based on the Regional Planning Act of 1961, which constituted the legal basis for the regional plans of each province (województwo). In the heritage conservation context this meant that the use of the land plots was specified and upon that basis investment funds assigned (ibidem).

Poland, like other European countries, had monument conservation offices, but was unique in the establishment in 1950 of multidiscipline workshops (Pracownie Konserwacji Zabytków, referred to as PKZ) as an agency of the Ministry of Culture and Art. The enterprise, coordinated from the headquarters in Warsaw, was granted financial autonomy. It consisted of 19 branches in different cities and was growing by extending adding branches (27 in 1981) and the scope

of conservation activities. Each PKZ branch contained all research and design sections (conservation laboratories, archaeological workshops, architectural offices, and documentation studios) as well as construction, management and executive units (Pilch, 1986). Poland thus stands in the vanguard of European conservation. The first congress of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) was held in Poland in 1965. Though Poland has not developed any unique or original doctrine in conservation, Polish conservation practice has become known world wide as the Polish School of Conservation which was based on extensive use of architectural reconstruction (Milobedzki, 1988).

This section has explored the process of shaping attitudes towards heritage and heritage conservation in Poland. It was discovered that Polish tragic historical experience gave birth to apotheosis of the historic events that manifested itself in the attitudes towards conservation of monuments; restoration and reconstruction of the historic relics destroyed during the Second World War was a top priority of the Polish nation. Reciprocally, the restored historic sites demonstrate an affirmative attitude towards the past and a sense of national pride. This is most noticeable in the conservation projects of the monuments of national significance. The supportive attitude towards conservation initiatives adopted by the Communist government after World War II was motivated by the need of the political leaders for acceptance as the heirs of Polish history. At the same time, the government patronage over the conservation project completed by the state owned conservation agencies secured 'politically correct' interpretation of heritage.

5.3.2 Canada: Searching for national identity

As in Poland, national identity is a quintessential Canadian question. The search for national identity, that is the isolation of the elements that constitute the image Canadians have of themselves, has been a central preoccupation of Canadian politicians, academics, writers and ordinary people since Canada has existed as a separate political unit. "Moreover", says David Taras (1987:10), "there has been throughout Canadian history a passion for identity". There are four dominant aspects of the Canadian past that are crucial to the national self-definition: relations with the imperial powers of Britain and France, historical experiences with the United States, interaction with a native society in a process of exploration and settlement in the northern frontier; and coexistence in a multicultural immigrant society (Fig 5.3.4).

The first post-aboriginal discovery and exploration of the lands which were finally to be united as Canada were the outcome of the advance westward of the northern and maritime frontier of Europe. The European discovery and occupation of Canada was substantially separate and distinct from the discovery of the Americas to the south. In that respect Canadian history makes a significant chapter in a bold human endeavour of the exploration of the northern and arctic lands. The historical characteristics of the northern frontier are clear and definite. Canada was perceived as a vast empty land of harsh climate. The wilderness and the strong seasonal rhythm not only marked everyday life but also shaped the whole society and its economy. The significance of "survival in the face of 'hostile' elements" in Canadian identity has a well-established tradition

Fig 5.3.4
 North America in 2000
 (photo The General Libraries at The University of Texas at Austin)

(Atwood, 1972:32). Such environmental conditioning is characteristic of almost all settler societies, but possibly only in Canada has it been so elevated to a national virtue. The image of the northern pioneer as a particularly independent, self-reliant individual survived to our times and even gained a status of a national stereotype.

The pioneers of that frontier, at the beginning mostly hunters, quickly became farmers and fishermen. Individual freedom and independence of the first frontiersmen gave way to collectivist well-governed order. The creation of a collective identity, which people could rally behind, became a prime goal of the evolving Canadian State. The birth of Canada was a result of political necessity rather than of nationalistic affirmation. The advancement of Canadian nationhood from the colonial self-government to the continental stature of 1867 was a result of the relatively liberal colonial policy of the United Kingdom (Morton, 1965:47) (Fig 5.3.5).

Morton (1965:46) describes Canadians in 1867 as a "nation projected rather than a nation formed". While Canada was created with two distinct cultures, the 'projected' Canadian identity failed to reflect this truth and instead shaped its population into a distinctly British oriented society. The retention and cultivation of British tradition is ascribed to the Loyalists, who took their name from simply rejecting the American Revolution and remaining loyal to the British sovereign. Most of the 40,000 Loyalists who moved north during and the end of Revolution had come from the eastern seaboard and many of them were "Cultured townsmen" (McNaught, 1970:58). This migration was crucial to the

Fig 5.3.5
Canadian territories in 1700-1867
(photos www.canadiangeographic.ca)

development of a strong and politically conscious British-oriented society north of the border. Cook (1971:51) argues that the Loyalist, and their successors, held a 'love-hate' attitude towards the United States: the American that had undermined the British tradition, but the United States remained their homeland. He explains that this attitude was characteristic of exiles from revolution and gave reasons for "the bitterness of much of this Canadian criticism of the United States - it the bitterness of the rejected" (ibidem:51). The Loyalists, with the French Canadians, form the historical basis of Canadian nationhood (McNaught, 1970:59). "It is the principal root of the Canadian national identity and iconography, dominating public national history, conserved historic sites, flags, heraldic symbols, monuments and the like" note Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996:181), agreeing on that with Bell (1970). Thus, it is not far from truth to say that early Canadian national identity was formed as a result of a Loyalist counter-revolution and out of maintaining ties with the Crown (Lipset, 1990). The idea of loyalty in post-Confederation Canada had become more assimilative and nationalist in a result of the political evolution of the nation but a majority of Canadians remained committed to the British-Canadian tradition (Mills, 1988:13, Grant, 1991:33). Nation building in its cultural unity and symbolic context was developing toward the British model and this was reflected in the cultural character of public institutions, in the symbols used to depict the society and its way of life. The British model of identity and its symbolic system was aimed at cultural homogeneity. In the process of acculturation, immigrants were merged

into a collective identity and an institutional system of British symbolic order, though considered Canadian.

"To Canadians not revolution but empire has meant liberty", notes Morton (1965:32) "Whatever the restraints empire might impose, the restraints were for the common good" (ibidem). But the consequence was that Canadians have in most of their history sought not liberty in independence, but self-government within the British Empire. Canadian adhesion to the Empire can be understood though as the means of defending independence. Only a strong ally could protect a newly formed federation from the danger of American attempts to absorb it. The evolution of Canadian national values as a result of this attitude, argues Lipset (1990) created a society more conservative than Americans.

Immigration, growing strongly through the twentieth century under government patronage, and consequently ethnic diversity, brings to political prominence all the previously excluded ethnic groups. The long-established French population, mainly in Quebec, with its Acadian component was the first to become active. The French, who had been defeated by the British in 1759, had their rights to maintain their culture and language guaranteed by the treaty of 1763 and had been accommodated within Confederation primarily through an autonomous Quebec (McNaught, 1970). Soon the Quebecois began to see annoying signs of Anglophone domination. The Riel rebellion, and then the long conflict over the right of Francophones in Manitoba to be educated in French, became a source of ethnic identification for the French. In the same quarter century, the call to Empire in support of British troops in the Boer War, South

Africa, resulted in strong opposition on behalf of the French Canadians. Future events such as the Ontario Schools Question and First and Second World War conscription prompted French Canadians to believe that the Confederation agreements would not be honoured in a spirit compatible with French Canadian nationalism. The French Canadian nationalism would not become a threat to the British oriented conception of society until the 1940's. In the decades that followed changes within Quebec society known as the 'quiet revolution' transformed "a rural, traditional and deferential people into an urban, commercial society whose newly emerging educated elite resented the anglophone domination" (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996:183). Acadians did not develop nationalism like Quebec although Acadian political ambitions once included the establishment of a separate Acadian province, but the reality of the spatial distribution of the Acadian population and the threat of Quebec separatism made their official lobby group federalist.

French Canadian nationalism, more particularly Québécois, posed a great challenge to Canadian unity. The response came from the federal government. The founding of Bicultural and Bilingualism Commissions in the 1960s led to a new conception of Canadian society based on the idea of two founding cultures: English and French. Canadian symbols were adopted: the Canadian flag with its maple leaf motif and the national anthem. The new symbols bear Canadian, not British Canadian, features.

In the late 1960s, Canada underwent radical transformation of its values as well as institutional structures. Among them were loosening of the ties with

Britain, domination by American culture and economy, increase in non-British immigration and along with growing French Canadian nationalism, an Aboriginal movement. Native groups began to assert themselves in the late 1960s with the formation of national organisations such as the Assembly of First Nations. The federal government recognising aboriginal and treaty rights and acknowledging the Métis as a distinct group led to another conception of Canada, as a country founded on three distinct cultures.

In 1971 (Fig 5.3.6) the government introduced a policy of multiculturalism. Breton (1984:134) noticed that "one of its objectives was to affirm symbolically that Canadian society was open to all cultural identities, indicating its recognition of them all, and the implications of cultural equity". The values of diversity, egalitarianism and collective efforts became the essence of Canadian identity. While the individual is still valued, the reality of multicultural society demands from the citizens a high degree of tolerance with the ability to compromise and accommodate differences. In response, the Canadian government undertakes numerous initiatives to improve the conditions of disadvantaged groups, including ethnic minorities. This policy encouraged widespread affirmative initiatives and required creation of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which accompanied the 1982 Constitution.

During the last fifty years Canadian foreign policy has been constantly trying to reaffirm in Canadian citizens the feeling of national identity through the international role of Canada as a promoter of human rights, democracy, and free-trade associated with multicultural values. Official multiculturalism as a means of

Fig 5.3.6
Canada in 1977 and 1999
(photos www.canadiangeographic.ca)

reconciling unity and diversity has been criticized as ideological and counterproductive (Lacorne, 2000). But despite the doubts expressed as to whether multiculturalism is the remedy for the problems of modern Canadian society, there is no doubt that in various ways it now defines Canadian national identity. Probably, as Cole Harris (2001:205) has recently argued, there are "the enormous variety and the many scales of identity of which Canadian life is composed".

It seems a paradox particularly with the international spread of cultural diversity that the Canadian multicultural nation shows such strong determination to differentiate itself from other nations, especially Americans: "Canadian history is not a parody of American, as Canada is not a second-rate United States" (Morton, 1965:93). Ignatieff explains it by examining the phenomenon of national identity. Since identity is relational, observes Ignatieff(1995) in his article *"Nationalism and the Narcissism of Minor Differences"*, a nation cannot define itself except in relation to other nations and vice versa. Ashworth (1993:19) sees "Canadian obsession with differentiating themselves from others" as related to the absence of differentiating features, such as language, religion, folklore, so dominating in the initial creation of the European nation states.

There is, then, a bit of truth in the ironic portrayal of Canada and the United States as 'two nations divided by the same language'. This immediately brings associations with globalisation and the cosmopolitan ethic. Globalism brings nations together; it destroys boundaries of identity and frontiers between states. People react by insisting ever more diligently on the margins of difference

that remain. There are two observable results, argues Ignatieff (1994), of the collapse of multiethnic states, and within developed nation states, the fragmentation along ethnic and religious lines. In the Canadian case these differences are interwoven in the nationally formulated concept of multiculturalism and supposedly constitute a core of Canadian 'united identity'.

In order to put Canadian heritage conservation into perspective it is necessary to consider the American and British experience with care for historic relics. Great Britain and the United States provide a particularly revealing comparative background for the Canadian case. All three nations share a common language and primarily Anglo-centric culture. It would be valuable to examine how conservation policy was adopted and evolved to suit these different social contexts. This brief review will concentrate now on Great Britain and the United States, leaving Canadian issues to be discussed in their context.

Heritage conservation poses different problems in Britain than in the United States. As generally perceived, British heritage relics and sites outnumber American, their antiquity is unquestionable and may go back to pre-history. The United States, on the contrary, is a relatively new nation. While British tradition treasures Roman, Saxon and Tudor inheritance, Americans take pride in pioneer settlements and the American Revolution. For these reasons, the United States' conservation movement is focused on relatively recent times, while British efforts in preserving the past embrace much more conspicuously the whole spectrum of historic relics inherited through the ages.

British motives behind the earliest conservation were primarily artistic and intellectual; it was a result of the spreading among intellectuals and artists of interest in the past, specifically in historic architecture and scenic beauty. The Commons Preservation Society, founded in 1865 by John Ruskin, John Stuart and William Morris, had for its purpose helping to protect historically significant sites. Soon criticism of conservation came from those who protested against 'barbarous' alteration of historic monuments and buildings, as discussed earlier. This was represented by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, created in 1877. Public support for monument protection resulted in the foundation of the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty in 1895 (England, Wales and Northern Ireland). Scotland founded its own trust in 1931. Like the National Trust, the National Trust for Scotland is dedicated to the preservation of sites and buildings of historic or picturesque qualities.

The National Trust was incorporated as a public, non-profit organisation seeking to protect historic sites through ownership or covenant. Initially its focus was on every historic property or open space of historic merit or 'natural beauty'; in time though, the emphasis was on qualities related to national significance. The changing scope of Trust concerns and activities is reflected in creation of different programs aiming to protect a variety of historic heritage. In the post-World War II years the Country House Scheme program saved many large country estates, especially difficult to maintain in the years after the war. The creation of a Garden Scheme in 1948 led to preservation of numerous gardens and consecutive initiatives in the 1950s and 1960s established the world's first

complex protection scheme for industrial heritage. In 1996 the National Trust held more than 570,000 acres, making it Britain's largest landowner. Other organisations, such as SAVE Britain's Heritage (founded in 1975) and English Heritage (1984) concentrated their efforts on preservation of architectural and archaeological heritage, adaptive reuse of historic buildings and care of historic gardens and landscapes; while the Georgian Group (1937), Victorian Society (1958) and Twentieth Century Society, formerly the Thirties Society, (1979) take interest in structures of specific periods (Tunbridge, 1981; Barthel, 1996).

In the United States the origins of heritage conservation were patriotic and didactic rather than aesthetic. The first major preservation accomplishment was saving the residence of President George Washington in Mount Vernon. The purpose of this project, initiated in 1835 by South Carolinian Ann Pamela Cunningham, was inspiring patriotism in future generations. Other sites saved in the early years of American conservation that conveyed patriotic messages include the Carpenter's Hall (site of the First Continental Congress), the Hermitage (Jackson's home, 1856) and Washington's headquarters in Morristown, New Jersey (1873) (Hosmer, 1965).

The first American conservation efforts were private. Washington's home was acquired by subscription (1856). The Heritage Foundation, established in 1867 at Old Deerfield, Massachusetts, to protect historic buildings also acquired them through ownership. The most prominent private conservation initiatives were sponsored by American major industrialists. The multimillion-dollar restoration and reconstruction of colonial Williamsburg, Virginia (1926), was

financed by John D. Rockefeller. In 1929 Henry Ford provided funds for the restoration of Greenfield Village (1929), that was his own version of history (Hosmer, 1981)

Federal involvement in conservation remained minimal until the early 1930s. The necessity to provide work for the unemployed due to the economic depression resulted in extensive federal relief projects. The National Park Service, established in 1916 within the Department of the Interior, formed the Historic American Buildings Survey to create a record of the nation's historic buildings and provide work for the unemployed professionals in the field. The survey itself opened a new platform for communication among conservation activists and professionals (Hosmer, 1981).

There is a great variety of conservation legislation at US federal, state and local levels. This is understandable; in a country with such architecturally and historically different backgrounds and such jurisdictional division it would be impossible to have an overall national legislative framework. The first legal document relating to conservation in the USA was the federal Antiquities Act of 1906 by which the responsibility of protecting heritage relics was charged to the Department of the Interior. The National Park Service (NPS), created ten years later within the Department, took responsibility for guiding the conservation of historic properties, managing the national parks and operating the Antiquities Act. At the city level, the first local conservation law was passed in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1924 (Hosmer, 1981). The law contributed to creation of the Old and Historic Charleston District within which any development required special

architectural approval. These first initiatives prepared ground for similar laws at the federal and states levels. Among them a noteworthy document is the Historic Sites Act (1935) that set terms for federal acquisition and surveying of historic properties; the Historic American Buildings Survey was started in 1933 (ibidem).

Government patronage did not last. At America's entry to World War II, President Roosevelt turned against conservation. Conservationists realised that American care of historic relics might be better handled by an agency independent from government, and operating at the national level to overcome the localism that had made co-ordination so difficult. It was for this reason that in 1949 Congress founded The National Trust for Historic Preservation (Barthel, 1996). The Trust's main functions are educational and advisory. Modelled on the British Trusts, it was to be a non-profit organisation with educational purpose but unlike the British Trusts it was not expected to be a large landowner. While there is no declared political agenda in the British Trusts that state their mission as strictly dedication to conservation of heritage, the American Trust incorporated political themes into its program by aiming its efforts at preserving diverse American heritage and integrating the nation of different racial and ethnic origins (ibidem).

In Britain conservationists have until recently been less preoccupied with the cultural diversity issues, more with architectural values. Lowenthal (1992) assesses British conservation as elitist since the upper classes historically have always dominated the conservation movement and it is debatable if an image of the past projected by them holds 'truth' or represents just another narrative. For

example, Prince Charles' attempts to restore the architectural integrity of the English countryside can be seen as a romanticised vision (Jencks, 1991;15).

Barhtel (1996:31) argues that the early American conservation movement was helpful in writing "cultural narratives for people without king or crown". The patriotic themes in the first conservation projects indicate "mid-nineteenth century fascination with the nation's founding" (ibidem). The later projects, following the transformation of America into a modern urban society, communicated to the nation a new set of values expressed in the American way of life. The freedom of the American citizen from interference by the federal government is very present in the areas of land use planning and the conservation of historic properties, notwithstanding the federal initiatives alluded to above.

Dynamic urban redevelopment in the sixties spared very few buildings in Western Europe and North America. In Europe it resulted in the establishment of conservation legislation and state-controlled systems for conservation, and at the international level, it resulted in adoption of the principal doctrinal document, the Venice Charter of 1964. In the United States, in 1966 the National Historic Preservation Act created a National Advisory Council for Historic Preservation and authorised the Federal Government to give maximum support to conservation initiatives. The introduction of new tax policies (The Tax Reform Act, 1976; The Economic Recovery Act, 1981), formulated in favour of spending on preservation and restoration of historic properties, facilitated numerous conservation initiatives. Among such reforms were tax credits discouraging the demolition and encouraging the rehabilitation of historic buildings. The principal

activity at federal level since 1960 has been to establish conservation legislation and policies. In 1967, there was a national gathering in Williamsburg resulting in the establishment of principles and guidelines published by the National Trust the same year (Williamsburg, 1967). The Advisory Council for Historic Preservation remained active in developing conservation policies and its efforts resulted in the formulation of the Standards for Historic Preservation Projects, including the Standards for Rehabilitation and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1980). The Standards introduced a new approach to conservation projects and broadened the scale of the conserved relics from single landmarks and monuments to architectural historic complexes and sites (Cullingworth, 1997).

In Canada, similarly to Great Britain and the United States, heritage conservation reflects pluralism in the social structure and in its ideology. The following is a review of the initiatives, legislation and financial commitments in regard to heritage conservation in Canada. The first observation that should be made here is that all the responsibilities and powers must be considered at the three levels of government: federal, provincial, and municipal. The federal policies must be national and should serve all Canadians equally; they cannot bypass the provinces and municipalities to answer to the needs of individuals. The provinces may select and adapt a particular federal legislation for provincial aid or benefit as they choose, as well as create their own. This may result in varying implementation of federal programs and policies in different provinces. Municipalities in turn receive direct or enabling legislation from the provincial

government. Within the municipality are the citizen groups forming a fourth level e.g. historic conservation organisations. These also operate provincially and nationally.

In Canada, throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries preserving and promoting heritage was tied to nationalism (Osborne, 1996). Similarly to British and American early conservation efforts, the heritage movement in Canada started as the manifestation of the work of local organisations united at the national level through the Royal Society of Canada and the Historic Landmark Association in the second half of the nineteenth century. These first organisations were dominated by the local elite and well-educated citizens and were concerned with promoting cultural ideas and nationalist ideology. The nationalist ideology was used to gain federal support for historic sites. In Ontario, where nationalism was associated with the Loyalist tradition, the activities of local heritage groups were co-ordinated at the provincial level by the Ontario Historical Society (Killan, 1976). Quebec had its own nationalist agenda, which prompted the selection and promotion of historic sites in that province. The formation of a national heritage movement in Canada dates back to 1887 when the restored Fort Chambly (Fig 6.2.0; map) was transferred from the Department of Militia and Defence to the Department of the Interior and placed under the care of the Department of Public Works as a historic site commemorating Canadian history. The inscriptions on the rebuilt entrance to the fort commemorated battles and wars associated with the French and British forts on the site (Taylor, 1990)

In the Maritimes at the turn of the century nationalist perspectives were not as prominent as in Ontario and Quebec. There was antiquarian interest in the past but without a dominant local nationalist perspective. This helps to explain developments at Annapolis Royal in Nova Scotia: before the 1920s, all the closely situated sites (the settlement and the fort) were popularly regarded as the symbol of the various historic events in that perceived birthplace of North American civilisation. The associations with Canadian history were ignored until 1917 when Fort Anne was acquired by the federal government as a national monument (Taylor, 1990) (Fig 6.2.0; map). In the West the main theme prevailed among the historic sites was that of the nineteenth century trading posts and forts associated with activities of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police but the first major conservation initiatives were not undertaken until after the Second World War.

The heritage movement gained national reach through the co-ordinating activities of the Royal Society of Canada. In 1901, as the result of collaboration of the Royal Society and the first British National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty, The Committee for the Preservation of Scenic and Historic Places in Canada was formed (Taylor, 1990). The committee was concerned especially with the preservation of historic sites. It soon became a driving force in the heritage movement, promoting acquisition and preservation of historic sites of national significance and leading to the formation in 1917 of the Historic Landmark Association, a separate national body. The new society took responsibility for designating historic sites and creating a national inventory.

Competing nationalist views complicated the process of selecting and interpreting historic sites. The Historic Landmark Association, though operating at the national level, had to ignore nationalist issues in order to avoid conflict. "Competing nationalisms", argues Taylor (1990:24)," while central to the development of a national heritage movement, presented problems for a national program commemorating local historic sites."

When at the turn of the century, outdoor activities gained in popularity across North America, the idea of creating national wilderness parks for their scientific value and commercial potential as a tourist attraction was supported by American and Canadian governments. The Canadian national parks service was created in 1911. Initially, the preserved forests and open spaces were designated for camping and other outdoor activities, but soon, in 1913, a new proposal presented by James Bernard Harkin, the creator and commissioner of national parks, suggested creation of historic parks that, similarly to natural parks, would serve as a recreational and educational tool. Historic heritage resources posed far different problems than natural parks, especially in establishing criteria for designation, commemoration and development. Responsibility for the identification and conservation of national historic sites was assigned to the Dominion Parks Branch of the Department of Interior which would be advised by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, a new advisory body founded in 1919, relying on the experts to provide advice for this new formal government heritage program. The private members of the board represented diverse orientations in regard to heritage approaches and had

among them quite different and sometimes contradictory views on how heritage issues should be dealt with. The differences were expressed in their attitudes towards the past and its commemoration or conservation. Those who were interested in heritage sites as resources to be preserved and developed were not concerned with nationalist histories commemorated in designated heritage. Likewise, those interested in preserving an historic landscape for its own particular merits did not regard with favour efforts to glorify Loyalist or French-Canadian tradition. The contradictory perspectives and opposing views toward the past were especially revealed in the commemoration of episodes of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French-English colonial wars. Nevertheless, the history of French Canada's defence against American aggression seemed to be compliant enough with the Loyalist tradition to let the board members accord an important role to French Canada in helping Canada become an independent British state in North America. In French Canada, though, there was growing concern with a British bias in the heritage program. All these divisions and different concerns did not affect the board's image as a separate corporate identity cooperating with the branch (Taylor, 1983).

The implementation of a federal program of heritage conservation took place in 1919 and was undertaken by the Dominion Parks Branch of the Department of the Interior. The branch had acquired two historic properties, Fort Anne and Fort Howe, as national parks and was planning on more acquisitions in the west. While the branch concentrated on conservation, the board was involved with the commemoration work. The board's efforts related mainly to the

Ontario and the Maritimes sites and there were complaints from around Canada about the lack of commemoration initiatives. Likewise, public opinion complained about ineffective conservation efforts on the part of the branch. Reorganization of the branch and board in the 1920s alleviated many of these problems but there was still no definite policy from the government accompanied by an operational budget that would allow a more comprehensive approach to historic sites.

The National Parks Act of 1930 accorded formal status to historic sites and parks. A new distinct category of national historic park was created. The heritage movement became more concerned with preserving historic architecture. Preservation and heritage development was gaining a greater public recognition than commemoration. The depression of the 1930s brought opportunities for conservation projects in the form of public works spending undertaken by government as relief measures. Conservation work, mainly on historic military sites, in the 1930s was greatly extended, but " was characterized by a lack of focus and clear policy" (Taylor, 1990:106). Restoration projects at Louisbourg, Beauséjour, Churchill, Fort Anne, Fort Chambly, and Fort Langley (Fig 6.2.0; map) were carried out using funds from the Public Works Construction Act. In 1940 a number of historic sites and national parks were classified national historic sites and the problem of establishing criteria for designation arose. Designation was made upon the size criterion and all sites that were extensive enough would be included in a new category of national historic park. The list of newly designated national historic parks included the Fortress of

Louisbourg, Port Royal Habitation, Fort Anne, Fort Beauséjour, Fort Chambly, and Fort Prince of Wales in Churchill (Fig 6.2.0; map). No one seemed to be concerned with the unbalanced distributions of designations among the provinces but soon competing regional perspectives made it difficult to choose a site that would represent national not regional characteristics. Ideological differences also blocked designation initiatives. Despite these difficulties, a number of sites that represented other historical themes besides battles, Loyalist tradition and the fur trade were designated. In 1943, of 285 designated national historic sites, more than one third commemorated battles and war and only one in four marked outstanding political events. Ontario housed one third and Quebec one fifth of national historic sites (Taylor, 1990). Thematic and regional imbalance forced the board to adopt broader criteria for further designations. In 1952, among the criteria for 'national interest' designation were still discovery and exploration, French and English settlement, and the Loyalist defence of Upper Canada. National significance of the military forts is revealed in the political message they sent and according to Ashworth (1993:46) "the political message is simple: the integrity of the nascent Canada was guaranteed by the service of Imperial forces". Public interest in historic military sites also justified the first major heritage development of the 1950s, that is the restoration of the Halifax Citadel (Fig 6.2.0; map).

In 1950, the execution of the federal heritage program became a subject of examination by the commission formed by Vincent Massey, Liberal party activist and patron of the arts. One of the main recommendations suggested by

the commission was more even representation of the historical themes, especially in regard to too few historical themes, and greater emphasis on the conservation of historic sites for purely architectural significance (Taylor, 1990). Although the federal government had no constitutional rights to legislate to preserve privately owned properties, the commission urged the provincial governments to take suitable legislative actions to protect privately owned historic sites of national interest. The initiatives undertaken in Great Britain and France were recommended as examples to follow (Litt, 1992).

Historic architecture did not receive recognition for its architectural merits exclusively until the Historic Sites and Monuments Act was passed in 1953. The act provided for the designation of buildings as national historic sites on the basis of architectural significance. Following this, an inventory of historic buildings has begun. The building inventory was supposed to form the basis for selecting buildings for designation. According to the board policy on architectural preservation, a building to be designated of national architectural significance should exist in original form, represent associations with events of national importance, and form an archetype influential in Canadian architecture (Dalibard, 1986a). The inventory efforts were carried out in the 1960s in association with the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada and the Public Archives, and since 1970 they were formally conducted under the Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings. The Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings, like its American counterpart, the Historic American Building Survey, aimed exclusively at the recording process and only in that respect facilitated heritage conservation. As

the first computer-based architectural inventory, its initial goal was to record about 100,000 buildings across the country. Thirty years later the Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings has evolved from this one-dimensional role to a modern information management centre. Today it not only preserves records and research on the built heritage, but also provides technological support for the government heritage agencies (Martineau, 1995).

During the 1950s the politics of historic sites became more complicated as provincial heritage programs became more active in adding their own designations into the national heritage. The question of 'national significance', critical to the selection and interpretation of sites, still remained the main concern at the federal and provincial level of designating but in practice, developing sites as national parks had often been influenced by practical or political considerations at the provincial/regional level. The decisions to restore forts in the Maritimes and Quebec, for example, were made under local pressure to have the federal parks services develop properties already owned by the government. Nevertheless, in the 1950s under the new policy the development of one large historic park project in each province or region and conservation of the best architectural heritage in each province took place. In the following decade the main concern of the national heritage program was on the interpretation of the site rather than display of artefacts. The concept of 'living history museums' dominated heritage activities of that period (Taylor, 1990).

In the 1960s the politics of historic sites began being affected by the rise of provincial heritage agencies. The provinces began to sponsor large heritage

projects of their own. In Ontario, the St Lawrence Development Commission undertook removal of historic buildings from the St Lawrence River front when it became obvious that the planned St. Lawrence Seaway would result in the flooding of numerous historic vernacular buildings. The buildings were relocated to a new site and restored to period condition (Upper Canada Village, Fig 6.2.0; map). This concept of outdoor museum, consisting of structures relocated onto the new site and animated by costumed guides, can be traced back to Swedish 'skansen'. A partial answer to competitive initiatives on the part of the federal and provincial governments was the creation of Heritage Canada in 1973. Beginning as a program initiated by the federal government created to support local initiatives to save individual buildings and preserve and develop heritage areas, Heritage Canada is an independent non-profit foundation that under the Canada Corporation Act, part 2, has the authority to acquire heritage properties (Dalibard, 1986 b). The foundation does not seek to institute national criteria for the selection of heritage buildings; its aim is to support local heritage initiatives and organisations. It was modelled after the National Trust for England, Wales, and Northern Ireland, but adapted to Canadian realities. "After all", says Dalibard (ibidem:41), "we have neither the death duties that make it advantageous to give property to the Trust nor the same kind of estates and great houses nor the British tradition of philanthropy and public commitment".

The 1960s were marked by the big conservation projects: the Halifax Citadel, the Fortress of Louisbourg, and Dawson. Since the reconstruction of the Louisbourg Fortress constitutes the case study of this thesis, only the basic

information will be presented in this chapter. The conservation works in the Louisbourg Fortress on Cape Breton and the Palace Grand Theatre at Dawson in Yukon involved extensive restoration and reconstruction works. The conservation works in Dawson stemmed from the government's interest in northern development. Developing the site was an answer to the growing public interest in the North and the gold rush in the Yukon as well as to economic demands of the underdeveloped region. Similarly as with the Palace Grand at Dawson, the decision to reconstruct the Fortress of Louisbourg emerged from concerns for regional economic development. Introducing the tourist industry as a possible alternative to coal mining which had just shut down seemed an appropriate program of development for the region. The labour-intensive conservation of the Louisburg Fortress which would serve as a tourist attraction provided an ideal solution. But it would be misleading or at best simplistic to consider the motive for the conservation in Louisbourg as one driven solely by the forces of economics. By 1960 there were long debates about developing the fortress and many plans for restoration and reconstruction works, but there was not immediate anticipation of their costly execution. The need for the regional economic development instrument created an opportunity to continue and extend the earlier intended labour-intensive conservation works. At the interpretative level, the reconstructed Louisbourg was to project the story of two Canadian founding nations (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996) befitting the national political importance of the time.

The period of the big conservation projects continued through the 1970s. In the Louisbourg Fortress and the Halifax Citadel the restoration and reconstruction works continued supported by considerable federal funds. In Newfoundland the site of an early Viking settlement was excavated and developed as L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Park (Ricketts, 1992), in Prince Edward Island the story-book setting of "Anne of Green Gables" was developed in the house of Lucy Maud Montgomery, author of the book (Falkner, 1976). Substantial restoration and reconstruction projects were undertaken at Les Forges St Maurice National Historic Park in Trois Rivières in Quebec, at the Rideau and Trent canals in Ontario and Fort Walsh in Saskatchewan (Fig 6.2.0; map). These developments were substantially limited in the 1980s due to a policy of government restraint that began in the late 1970s and continued into the 1980s. For the same reason, works at Louisburg, Halifax Citadel and Dawson has been cut back and no new initiatives contemplated in the near future. The eighties began with adding to the *Parks Canada Policy* of 1979 a new policy (*Federal Heritage Building Policy*, 1982) that stated the government's intention to develop new initiatives in the field of architectural conservation. Soon the newly established Federal Heritage Building Review coordinates efforts aiming at conservation of heritage buildings under federal jurisdiction. The provinces have undertaken comprehensive conservation policies and operate heritage programs of their own (Lothian, 1981). Since 1970, while traditional historical themes still prevailed in heritage designations, new themes recognising cultural diversity have appeared in promoting heritage and identity. In the 1971-1993 period, only

12 per cent of Historic Sites refer to military events (before 1940, nearly 50 per cent); the majority of heritage sites was dedicated to historic buildings (43 per cent), while the cultural category encompassed 20 percent of the sites (Osborne, 1996:37-38). The relatively large number of commemorations of activities associated with 'new Canadians' performed in this period can be seen as an attempt to advance multiculturalism in the effort of nation-building.

Against this background it is appropriate here to address the heritage of minorities. Since multiculturalism has encouraged immigrant minorities to express their cultural heritage, immigrants, dominantly urban, marked their communities with distinctive physical forms reflecting diverse architectural heritage suitable for preservation and interpretation. According to a 1981 policy directive from the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Parks Canada is committed to balance representation of minorities' heritage in designation of national historic sites. Contrary to the urban immigrant cultures, the aboriginal cultures did not create artifacts significant in the conserved built environment and therefore no building preservation efforts can be recorded. Native concepts of heritage are associated with land and resources and as such are mostly found in non-urban locations. Nevertheless, Parks Canada, as the federal agency within the Department of Canadian Heritage responsible for national parks and historic sites, has been dedicated to an inclusive representation of the native heritage through preservation of archaeological sites and artefacts and commemoration through plaques, in the absence of tangible historical remains (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

This section has explored how different attitudes and motives have played roles in forming conservation policy in Canada and set them against the British and American experience with care for heritage. It also examined how conservation was legitimated through different societal values. It was discovered that conserving and promoting historic relics was tied to nationalism. At the beginning of the conservation movement, the nationalist perspectives, associated with Loyalist tradition, were prominent in Ontario, while in the Maritimes antiquarian interest prevailed. In Quebec, the selection and promotion of historic sites was prompted by the province's own nationalistic agenda. In the West the main theme of the historic sites was that of the trading posts and forts. In the following decades, the question of 'national significance' became the main concern at the federal and provincial level, though more often conservation of the historic sites had been influenced by economic considerations. Since the 1970s, new themes recognising cultural diversity had been introduced to the conservation initiatives. Canadian conservation activists are critical of the heritage legislation and standards. "Unlike Europe, Britain, and even the United States, we do not have a positive approach to historic preservation nor even a philosophical policy view of heritage values", Ann Falkner (1976:20) wrote sixty years after the creation of the Canadian national parks service. She also cited the chairman of the Board of Governors of the Heritage Canada Foundation, who after reviewing heritage laws from a variety of countries, stated that Canadian heritage legislation was the weakest legislation in the western world. Twenty years later, in 1997, while acknowledging the considerable achievements of the

heritage conservation movement over the last twenty-five years, Christina Cameron, Director General of National Historic Sites at Parks Canada, noted that there are still no formally accepted conservation standards at the national level (Cameron, Fram and Cliver, 1998). She mentioned that the national instruments, the Appleton Charter, the Deschambault Declaration, the Parks Canada's Cultural Resource Management Policy and the Federal Buildings Review Office's (FHBRO) Code of Practice, together with professional models available such as the Venice Charter, could be used to formalise such standards. She also pointed out a need to establish a national register and to set national criteria for inclusion on the list. The existing Canadian Register of Heritage Properties, she suggested, might serve as a basis. A word of criticism from an outsider will complete this illustration of discontent with Canadian heritage legislation: Gregory Ashworth from the Netherlands preceded discussion of Canadian heritage conservation in his *On tragedy and renaissance* by revealing that "although there have been numerous pieces of federal government legislation with a direct or indirect relevance to historic building conservation ... there is no single piece of comprehensive structural legislation, establishing an overall framework that compares to the European model" (Ashworth, 1993:27).

This chapter (5.3) considered the evolution of attitudes towards conservation in Poland and Canada and established how national identity issues are reflected in heritage conservation set against the conservation movement in the East European countries and in the United States and Great Britain. While the attitudes towards conservation in Canada, Great Britain and the United

States have reflected their political, economic and cultural agendas and generally have moved in parallel directions, Eastern Europe shows a high degree of diversification in attitudes and approaches, perhaps, with the exception of one similarity, which can be perceived as the outstanding paradox of conservation under Communism. That is a refusal of the communist states to eradicate the monuments that were erected in the pre-communist era. This could have been justified, since such monuments were the relics and symbols of 'contemptible' ideologies. In fact historic monuments in Eastern Europe were highly esteemed by the nation as symbols of national culture. The Communist governments protecting national heritage aspired to act as the natural heirs of national history and sought to seal their political legitimation. In some cases such government patronage in the East secured better legislation and financial treatment of monuments than the largely local and unofficial, rather than national and governmental, conservation movement in the West. Another reason for the more active conservation movement in Eastern Europe, especially in the post-war years, would be simply that a greater amount of destruction in the Second World War took place in the East than in the West. It could be also implied from this review that under socialism the state should be able to protect heritage relics. In the absence of land speculation, since the land was state-held, historic urban centres should have survived intact; conservational negligence or exploitation is so often regarded as a result of commercial interest of private enterprise that disregards public interest. Theoretically then, under socialism public interest was well protected by the most strongly held principle of the socialistic government,

that is public well-being. The planned development and continuing government financial support seemed to foster conservation as well. In practice, however, heritage conservation was just as serious a problem in socialist as capitalist countries, especially when ever-present financial constraint and ill-conceived state planning yielded to current political pressures. Heritage conservation issues occasionally and spectacularly appeared on political agendas, but generally they belonged to many underinvested activities under the system.

6. RECONSTRUCTION PRACTICE IN POLAND AND CANADA

This chapter traces the history of reconstruction practice in Canada and Poland. The examples of completed architectural reconstruction projects from each country are selected as illustration of particular issues in the development of reconstruction philosophies. Setting the examples against an overview of the whole picture for each country allows overall attitudes towards reconstruction to be grasped. References to the leitmotifs of history, nationality and ideology and political/economic reality are made. The detailed investigation of two reconstruction projects, the Louisbourg Fortress in Nova Scotia and the Royal Castle in Warsaw, is conducted. Both reconstructions are linked through the role they played as a political and economic instrument in the policies of their proponents. The theme of each commemoration is linked to Canadian and Polish identity and history. The case studies further explore how each reconstruction was produced, including the initial reasons for commemoration, the preparatory process, and the interpretation programs.

6.1 Poland

6.1.1. Reconstruction projects in Poland

6.1.2 Case study: The Royal Castle, Warsaw, Poland

6.1.1. Reconstruction projects in Poland

The following review of Polish reconstructions reveals attitudes towards reconstruction practice in historical perspective. The reconstructions presented (partial or full) of historic relics include monuments and sites of national importance associated with national identity. Protection of these symbolic sites had always been a main concern of the Polish nation defending its identity in the times of tragic occupations and often their conservation exceeded the norms of established conservation guidelines. This makes the chosen cases especially illustrative of the changes in attitudes to national heritage interpretation and conservation (Fig 6.1.0).

Polish reconstruction practice has evolved from the conservation activities in their most advanced form of stylistic restorations of the nineteenth century, but in the early 1800s the architects and builders practising in the areas that later constituted contemporary Poland, were still ignorant about the conservation of historic objects and places. In the past, changes to medieval buildings were generally made in the manner of the epoch; churches would be redesigned to meet the current style or provided with additions in Baroque or Neoclassical form. There were, however, cases of continuation in the original style when the architects regarded the aesthetic integrity of the building, as did Jakub Fontana and Dominik Merlini, both architects, in their works on the Krasiński Palace in

Base 505077 (547779) 4-82

Fig 6.1.0

Poland in 1982

The places discussed in Chapters 6.1.1 are marked by red dots, by B.M.

(Source: The General Libraries at The University of Texas at Austin; UT Library Online; www.lib.utexas.edu)

Warsaw (#1, Fig 6.1.0) respectively in 1766-73 and 1782 (Mossakowski, 1962).

The historical consciousness of the nation under occupation provided a new approach to historic relics founded on a respect for the original style perceived as profoundly Polish that is associated with architecture of the nationally significant buildings such as the Wawel Castle in Cracow (#2, Fig 6.1.0). The historic architecture was granted significance as a representation of the nation's accomplishments. The buildings associated with events important for the formation of the nation, such as the castle of Wawel in Cracow, the Warsaw Royal Castle and the cathedrals of Gniezno (#12, Fig 6.1.0), Wawel and Warsaw were thus regarded as 'national monuments', and restored to their past glory. Nevertheless, the restorations and reconstruction works were in the hands of architects and builders still ignorant about medieval architecture. The case of the cathedral of Saint John Baptist in Warsaw showed clearly the lack of consideration for the original medieval form. The restoration works in the cathedral were conducted in 1836-40 by Adam Idźkowski, the architect who also prepared the plans. Idźkowski agreed with the principle of caring for authenticity, and that there should be no deception, but he believed that "the national pencil should be beautifying that familial shrine"¹ (Idźkowski, 1843:17). This resulted in extensive changes to the front elevation and interiors (Fig 6.1.1, 6.1.2). The Masovian Gothic, the style of the cathedral, seemed too rough to the architect educated in Italy, so his plans of transforming it into a more 'harmonious' style, repeating Gothic motives, should not be surprising. Though Idźkowski used the term 'restoration' in his writings, his understanding of restoration equalled merely

Fig 6.1.1
 The cathedral of Saint John Baptist in Warsaw,
 drawing by Z.Vogel, 1823 (photo Frycz, 1975)

Fig 6.1.2
 The cathedral of Saint John Baptist in Warsaw,
 the restoration design by Adam Idźkowski, 1823
 (photo Frycz, 1975)

restoration of stability, not restoration of the past form. Quite contrary, the front elevation of the cathedral was reconstructed in a new form which had never existed before (ibidem).

All through the 1850s a debate continued on the principles of restoration of antiquities. Polish conservators from all parts of the partitioned country expressed their opinions regarding conservation principles. There were those who supported preservation and there were those who favoured restoration or reconstruction. The discussions were summarized in the manifesto published in 1850 by the Cracow Scientific Society. The Society questioned reconstructing missing parts of the restored buildings since “ additions can often change the meaning of the subject matter”² (Odezwa Towarzystwa..., 1850:30). This comment referred to sculptures, but by favouring preservation of the original material over replication, it set a framework for discussing restoration and reconstruction issues in relation to architecture. At the same time, there were first attempts to form and clarify principles in architectural conservation. The committee established to assist restoration works at the Mariacki Church, Cracow in the 1860s hoped that “a debate on conflicting approaches to a particular restoration, when conducted in a calm manner and aiming at the merits, will constitute a guideline for similar restoration works in the future”³ (Odnowienie kościoła ... 1867:2). It did not happen and forty years later the need “to establish general principles, even tentative”⁴ (Raport I Zjazdu Delegatów..., 1901:3) was still emphasized by the restorers.

Looking at the debate from a general point of view, it can be noted that the principles of restoration, developed from the 1850s concept of minimum intervention, evolved to a more drastic complete restoration or reconstruction towards the end of the century. The Polish approach to architectural restoration and reconstruction coincided with the principles that were developing in France at the same time. Viollet-le-Duc was well known in Poland. He designed the altar in the St. Leonard Crypt at the Wawel Cathedral in Cracow as a part of the restoration works in the Crypt conducted in 1873-1878 (Frycz, 1975). He had even been told to influence some restoration works in Poland. According to Jakimowicz (1974) the manner of the works ascribed to him is in conflict with his restoration principles: the completed restoration work does not reflect the regional varieties of style, a restoration approach favoured by Viollet-le-Duc. However, Polish conservation practice was strongly influenced by Viollet-le Duc's concept of stylistic restoration. Demetrykiewicz (1886:5) approved principles of stylistic restoration as "recreation of the total structure in the original spirit in order to present it to the contemporary generation"⁵ and considered reconstructed structures an important tool in the educational process. Władysław Łuszczkiewicz, journalist of the Cracow's daily newspaper *Czas*, regarded the restoration initiatives as a sign of cultural maturity and welcomed a new trend of "renovating old churches in their original spirit in the name of belonging to the family of West European people"⁶ (Łuszczkiewicz, 1889a: 1). Łuszczkiewicz seemed to be aware that reconstructing belongs to a separate activity in contemporary architecture when he wrote: "as a result of thorough architectural

research, a specific form of architectural creativity in historic styles is introduced"⁷ (1888:1). Łuszczkiewicz considered the later Baroque and Neoclassical layers as "barbarian abuse of stylistic beauty"⁸ and noted that the styles of the stylistic "descent", as he considered Baroque, had overwhelmed beautiful lines of original Gothic architecture causing disharmony (Łuszczkiewicz, 1889b:1). He regarded it a "triumph of our epoch, that we can comprehend the style and reintegrate the missing parts of the past works in an appropriate spirit"⁹ (ibidem). This approach was increasingly placed under attack by preservationists. Paweł Popiel, Chief Conservator in the Cracow district, opposed re-establishment of the original form and argued that it is impossible to reconstruct the past form since "what is being reconstructed is not what it was in the past but what has originated in the artist's imagination"¹⁰ (Popiel, 1881:2).

The main conservation works of the second half of the nineteenth century and the early 1900s were conducted at the Wawel Hill in the royal palace and the cathedral. Reconstruction constituted a considerable part of these works. The first archaeological studies were conducted at the castle in the 1880s and their results led to the restoration recommendations issued by the Association of Polish Technical Engineers at their first congress conducted in 1882 in Cracow (Pierwszy Zjazd Techników ... , 1882). The Association integrated all Polish engineers and architects practicing in the areas that belonged to Poland before partitions. Tomasz Pryliński, the architect from Cracow, presented the restoration study recommending reconstruction of all the missing parts that had sufficient archaeological documentation (Fig 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.4a). The

Fig 6.1.3

Cracow (Kraków); the historic core (map of 1967)

(photo Łoziński and Miłobędzki, 1967)

The historic buildings discussed in Chapter 6.1.1 are marked by Roman numerals, by B.M.

I. The Wawel Hill; II. The Mariacki Church

Fig 6.1.4
The Wawel Castle, south elevation,
Inventory drawings by Tadeusz Pryliński, 1882 (photo Frycz, 1975)

Fig 6.1.4a
The Wawel Castle, south elevation,
The reconstruction by Tadeusz Pryliński, 1882 (photo Frycz, 1975)

presentation was accompanied by polemical debates about the most appropriate approach. Though to the architects involved in the restoration works, among them Sławomir Odrzywolski, stylistic restoration seemed to be the most suitable method, the members of the Association concluded: "a restoration plan for the cathedral had to be chosen in public competition"¹¹ (ibidem: 196). Stanisław Tomkiewicz, an art historian and Chief Conservator in the Cracow district, emphasized that restoration of the castle should meet society's expectations regarding the Wawel, that is returning the national monument to its past glory (Protokół z posiedzenia ..., 1909).

One of the restoration plans submitted by Zygmunt Hendel for the public competition proposed extensive reconstructions of the seventeenth century forms that would considerably change the castle's silhouette: the roof was to be heightened and vertical forms, such as chimneys and tower roofs, were to be added (Fig 6.1.5). The members of the Association of Conservators in Cracow, which judged the submitted designs, accepted the design in 1908, only to abandon the idea two years later when Max Dvořák, Austrian Conservator General, criticized the plan as falsifying history. Protection and preservation of the original structures were recommended and a hope expressed that "the aim of the Castle restoration will be conservation not beautification", though "such conservation would not oppose removing additions from the partition times that represent no value"¹² (Uchwała Grona ... , 1909:298). Among the "additions of no value" were coverings of the court arcades and the window encasements, removal of which was discussed a year earlier at the meeting of the association

Fig 6.1.5
The Wawel Castle, south elevation,
The reconstruction by Zygmunt Hendel, 1908 (photo Frycz, 1975)

that took place in 1908 in the presence of Max Dvořák. Dvořák regarded all the Wawel's architectural layers, among them the additions from the partition times, of historic value and thus worth preserving. His approach was severely criticized by Tomkiewicz, who argued that the "Polish nation regards the Wawel Castle as a national monument. This has to be taken into consideration and as an exceptional Polish monument, the castle cannot be treated as any ruin...conservation principles applied to its restoration should go beyond accepted conservation norms"¹³ (Protokół z posiedzenia Grona... , 1908:302). The design by Hendel was accepted, however, reconstructions were limited to the court arcades, window encasements and architectural details. The reconstruction works at the Wawel Castle initiated a new approach to replicating, based on detailed archaeological research. The approach was applied to reconstruction works in Wawel's Cathedral. The restoration plans for the cathedral submitted in 1892 by Sławomir Odrzywolski (1901a) were based on detailed archaeological research prepared by the architect and reassessed during the completion process (Fig 6.1.6, 6.1.6a). Odrzywolski proposed reconstruction of the Silver Bells Tower's roof and the ambulatory to its Gothic form, aiming at returning aesthetic coherence lost in the thirteenth century when as a result of modification the ambulatory, the flying buttresses, the windows, and the gallery were covered. In support of this plan Tomkiewicz wrote "restoration, according to the principles and goals of the present-day art of conservation should aim at returning this beautiful Gothic structure to its original form"¹⁴ (Tomkiewicz, 1892:53). Final approval for the restoration was given in 1894 by

Fig 6.1.6
Wawel Cathedral, south elevation,
Before the restoration by S. Odrzywolski (photo Frycz, 1975)

Fig 6.1.6a
Wawel Cathedral, south elevation,
The restoration design by S. Odrzywolski, 1892 (photo Frycz, 1975)

the Restoration Commission which decided that the cathedral should not be altered in its architectural appearance. The general rule was to preserve all the various styles and irregularities acquired by the building over time. Odrzywolski accepted that decision and adjusted his design accordingly so all the previous layers were preserved. As a result, his restoration plan remained open to future conservation interventions, even drastic ones, so that "it would not make it impossible for future generations to re-establish the original form"¹⁵ (Odrzywolski, 1901b: 4).

The debates on the Wawel's restoration continued throughout the following years. The results of this debate were reflected in public awareness and in restoration practice, which was guided towards a more preservationist approach. In 1901, when the main restoration works at the Wawel were completed, a new debate began. This time, the debate divided restorers into two opposing groups, restorers and anti-restorers, and gradually led to the clarification of principles in architectural conservation regarding reconstruction practice. The restorers were mainly concerned about 'faithful restoration'. The anti-restorers, instead, were conscious of 'historic authenticity' and preservation of the genuine material. At the meeting of the Association of the Conservators (Grono Konserwatorskie) in 1901 regarding the Wawel Cathedral, the concept of preservation was favoured by Tomkiewicz, but opposed by other restorers who opted for more drastic interventions such as alterations of the ambulatory (Protokół z posiedzenia Grona ... , 1901). Among them were Feliks Kopera and

Leonard Lepszy, both art historians and conservators (Kopera and Lepszy, 1901).

The changes made to the Wawel Cathedral were the first to prompt a wider debate about conservation principles regarding reconstruction. The reaction to the reconstruction of the roof in the Cathedral's Sigismund Tower was not altogether positive. The critics did not approve the reconstruction works of the tower and offered their own alternatives. Some of the proposed alternative concepts were quite surprising: Kopera and Lepszy suggested reconstruction of the roof in the form of the Mariacki Church in Cracow (*ibidem*), while Puszet (1901:13) proposed the Royal Castle in Warsaw as a source of inspiration. Consciousness of what was historically valid, not to mention appreciation of authenticity of a form, simply did not exist in conservation practice. Thirty years later, in 1933, another conservator, architect Tadeusz Stryeński, again urged restoration of the cathedral. He published "A plea for restoring the cathedral presbytery to its original appearance"¹⁶ (Stryeński, 1933) and it became a summary of his restoration principles. The publication was inspired by the critique of the restoration works at the Wawel Cathedral. The debate continued after World War II when Adolf Szyszko-Bohusz, architect, presented new concepts for restoration of the cathedral. Apart from structural improvements, Szyszko-Bohusz generally aimed at the unification of the whole internal space. According to his design, the ambulatory was to be lowered to its Gothic form. He suggested some reconstruction works; rebuilding the flying buttresses and re-opening the windows and the gallery (Szyszko-Bohusz, 1949).

Reconstruction caused no less intense controversy, when in 1908 the Cracow local government accepted a motion to rebuild the city hall, torn down in 1820. The case of the Cracow city hall can be taken as an example of different approaches among professionals towards reconstruction practice. The idea of rebuilding that important city landmark was supported by the local conservation activists, Władysław Tetmajer, poet, and Ludomir Stasiak, publicist. They argued that "reconstruction of the structure would not be strictly building a new one. It would be completing the form by adding to the remaining part, that is to the existing tower, and such completion is strongly required"¹⁷ (Stasiak and Tetmajer, 1908:24). It was also supported by Zdzisław Mączyński (1908), architect, and Leonard Lepszy, art historian and restorer, who wrote "I came to the conviction, that there is no principle without exceptions, and this is the case when the exception should be taken into consideration"¹⁸ (Lepszy, 1908:468). There were reservations, however; Jerzy Warchałowski, art theoretician, objected to the practice of making exceptions for sentimental reasons and remarked that it could lead to the undermining of conservation principles and conservators' authority (Warchałowski, 1909). He agreed that reconstruction of the city hall would be considered "returning original inheritance, rehabilitating the past", however, "a copy, even a faithful one, would always be falsification"¹⁹ (ibidem: 30). These concerns were echoed five years later by Józef Muczkowski, art historian and conservator, in conservation principles formulated by him that were published in 1914 under the title *Protection of monuments (Ochrona zabytków)* (Muczkowski, 1914) and became a popular handbook for conservators, replacing

the earlier guides by Łuszczkiewicz (1869; 1887). Muczkowski rejected the practice of replicating either in a form of stylistic restoration or reconstruction of the whole building or its parts, calling such a practice an "illusion" of returning what had been lost (ibidem:5).

Too often there was a gap between theoretical intent and practical execution, and the diverse opinions mentioned above certainly added to the difficulty of interpreting the conservation policies in practice. Reconstruction was perceived as a controversial treatment, justified only in exceptional cases. The damage and destruction in the First World War changed Polish, as well as the whole European, conservation practice. Poland suffered severe damages; in some regions the entire towns lay in ruins. For example, in the ancient town of Kalisz (100km north of Wrocław) (#10, Fig 6.1.0), one of the settlements on the Amber Route during the Roman Empire, the whole central residential district was completely destroyed. Kalisz, which population in 1914 reached 70, 000 people, was destroyed at the very beginning of the war. In August 1914, it was subjected to continuous shelling by a Prussian army regiment for two weeks. The West European war correspondents regarded Kalisz as the most devastated of all the European towns. This act of barbarity took on a symbolic meaning to the Polish nation and was perceived as an assault on Polish culture and national tradition. The immediate emotional reaction was to return the town to its former glory. Since many of the principles of reconstruction developed at Kalisz were after World War II applied to the rebuilding of the Warsaw historic core, the

dissertation is concerned with as its case study, it is imperative to give a brief account of the reconstruction works completed at the Kalisz historic core.

The reconstruction of Kalisz started when the town was still under the Prussian occupation. The preparation works were launched by the Warsaw Association of Architects with cooperation of the National Committee for the Reconstruction of Kalisz. Reconstruction activities in the town itself were particularly difficult since the occupation authorities supervised the municipal authorities, limiting any construction activities. Nevertheless, the inventory of the damages started and soon it was realized that the extent of the destruction called for an urban plan to govern all the necessary rebuilding. As soon as in the end of 1914, a design competition was held for a master plan for the reconstruction. It was decided that the town would be rebuilt to its historical form with some modifications; the two main streets were to be widened to accommodate a tramway. The competition guidelines required preserving the character of the urban and architectural form of the town.

The competition provided an opportunity for a debate regarding urban planning which helped formulate conservation principles. The ideas put forward proved applicable not only in the particular case of Kalisz, but also, in more general context, in application to towns damaged by hostilities. Jan Heurich, chairman of the Association of Architects, stated, when announcing the results of the competition, that the presented urban solutions "will serve as a model and example to other towns, demonstrating how to start work on a correct reconstruction of the Polish town" (In Zarebska, 1981:81). The first prize was

won by Tadeusz Zieliński, whose design was judged as exceptional for its care for the surrounding of the historic core. The care for the authenticity of the urban fabric, so obvious in the contemporary conservation planning, was quite innovative at the beginning of the twentieth century. The second prize went to Zdzisław Kalinowski for a design evaluated by the jury as outstanding for its "artistic approach and successful realization of the ideas of preserving the character of a Polish town" (ibidem). Kalinowski proposed reconstructing all the late Renaissance merchants' houses as he considered them very characteristic features of Polish towns. For the same reasons, during the reconstruction of the Old Town in Warsaw, the rebuilt townhouses resumed their Renaissance form and decoration. The concept of preserving the traditional Polish character of towns was popular among Polish architects and planners as an expression of a protest against the cultural policy of the three super powers which had partitioned Poland. In the group of designs that won honorary distinctions, the work of Tadeusz Tołwiński was regarded remarkable for its care for authentic fabric. Tołwiński opted for preserving an Orthodox church erected by the Russian administration, while most other participants in the competition demanded that it be demolished as a symbol of political oppression. The reconstruction of the historic core of Kalisz, today overshadowed by the rebuilding of numerous towns after the Second World War, gave rise to many ideas that are still as valid as when they were formulated. During the rebuilding after WW II, they echoed in the formulation of the principles and methodological approaches in reconstruction practice (Fig 6.1.7).

1	5	Fig 6.1.7
	4	Kalisz
2	3	1. Kalisz; the historic core (map of 1967) (photo Łoziński and Miłobędzki, 1967)
		The historic buildings discussed in Chapter 6.1.1 are marked by Roman numerals, by B.M. I. The town Hall; II. The market square
		2. Zielinski's competition entry; 3. Kalinowski's competition entry;
		4. Tołwiński's competition entry; 5. The town hall in 1981
		(photos Zarebska, 1981)

In the post-war restoration projects of the late 1910s and 1920s, there was no longer a question of keeping strictly to preservation, but it was necessary to accept the reconstruction of the destroyed parts of damaged buildings or of the whole structures. The debate about reconstruction practice in the Polish conservation community was summarized in the principles published in 1915 by the Warsaw Association for Protection of the Monuments of the Past */Warszawskie Towarzystwo Opieki nad Zabytkami Przeszłości /* (Odbudowa Zabytków Architektury, 1915). According to the principles ruins should be excluded from reconstruction. Complete reconstructions of the whole structures were allowed only when there were 'serious reasons'. Additions from the later phases of the development, that did not survive intact and were evaluated as valueless, should be completely removed. Those parts that expressed individualism of the structure, once destroyed, should not be replicated, instead, they were to be redesigned in a contemporary form. Recommendations for the treatment of extremely damaged buildings permitted reconstruction only in the cases when there was 'sufficient' documentation. When there was no trace or document available, rebuilding was not recommended and a new design suggested. These recommendations facilitated a possible compromise between the passive (preservation) and active (restoration) approaches in architectural conservation.

After the First World War, despite the general feeling shared by many conservators that the destroyed buildings should be restored and rebuilt, there were still voices opposing the practice of reconstruction. Gerard Kowalski,

conservator from Cracow, accepted reconstructing "some of the most valuable monuments of our past" but warned that "reconstructed structures will forever remain copies, not originals"²⁰ (Kowalski, 1916:27). Considering the use of contemporary architectural forms in historic buildings and sites, he believed that any contemporary additions should express a national style. Recommendation to build in a national style referred to building in styles associated with the ancient Polish architecture from the period before partitions. Architectural motives characteristic for architecture of the countries which partitioned Poland were rejected. 'Stylistic purifications' in a national style were considered a top priority in the conservation works of this period and were accepted even when performed at the cost of the archaeological values (Piotrowski, 1916). In other cases, reconstruction was limited to minimum. Tadeusz Szydlowski, art historian and conservator, recommended reconstruction only in cases where the reconstructed structures constituted "essential parts of the building, without which the character and charm of the building is lost"²¹ (Szydlowski, 1919:201). Similar was the spirit of the pamphlet published in 1920 by the Ministry of Culture and Art, *The care of monuments and their conservation /Opieka nad zabytkami i ich konserwacja/*, that compiled the conservation rules and guidelines earlier presented in the documents issued by the Warsaw Association for Protection of the Monuments of the Past / *Warszawskie Towarzystwo Opieki nad Zabytkami Przeszłości* /. Generally, reconstruction practice was approved and even some of the reconstruction projects completed in France presented as examples, but

conservators were advised to apply rationality in approaching the complexity of reconstruction works (Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki, 1920).

Immediately after the First World War, rebuilding of the monuments ruined in the war was, obviously, the main concern of the Polish conservation services in the new, independent country. Another task that came up was of comparable importance. The former occupying powers had altered many of the historic buildings and restoration of those 'deformed' national monuments became a priority equal to rebuilding. " Participation in removing what the foreign rule imposed on our historic monuments should become an honourable duty of every citizen"²², Marian Lelewicz (1924:301) wrote in 1924. Consequently, the most nationally significant historic buildings were restored to their former glory: the elevations of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, remodelled by Coriott in the nineteenth century, were returned to their previous appearance dated back to the Vasa period (architect Kazimierz Skórewicz); the Pijar church in Warsaw, turned into an Orthodox sanctuary during the Russian occupation, was restored to its original form (architect Oskar Sosnowski); similarly, the elevations of the Staszic Palace in Warsaw altered in the Byzantine style resumed its original appearance (architect Marian Lelewicz); the collegiate church in Wiślica (architect Adolf Szyszko-Bohusz) (#4, Fig 6.1.0) and the fortified church in Brochów (architect Bruno Zborowski) (#2, Fig 6.1.0) were reconstructed.

The conflict between the conservation approaches, preservation and restoration (reconstruction), became especially apparent in the case of the relics considered national monuments. Though, generally, minimum intervention and

rejection of reconstruction was widely accepted among the conservators, the buildings of national significance were exceptions. "It is impossible to strictly obey the rules of pure conservation in the case of the monuments of high importance"²³ claimed Alfred Lauterbach (1927:261) in his lecture on *Historic and Romantic Conservation*, 1927. Indeed, an immediate reaction by many was the feeling that the destroyed national monuments should be reconstructed, even though this seemed to go against the established conservation guidelines.

Lauterbach made an important contribution to the conceptual basis of later reconstruction practice, especially as it emerged in Poland following the Second World War. While considering that each case of conservation had to be seen in its own right, he thought it was possible to unify the criteria and methods.

Lauterbach recognized the importance of the documenting material and studies as a basis for reconstruction and did not consider reconstruction damaging to the relic's integrity: "having photographs of the lost buildings and structural drawings, we are able to replicate ruined parts or even a whole structure ... replicating architectural details cannot be considered a crime against history and art"²⁴ (1930:330). He closed his *Reflections on conservation* with a daring conclusion that validation of reconstruction practice justifies new extensions to historic buildings in historic styles. In his later writings he went even further in allowing reintegration of ruined buildings by introducing historic or contemporary styles: "in the case of restoration of the destroyed building it is recommended to conduct restoration works with respect for historic and artistic values, but without restraining from introducing the styles of any period (contemporary style

included)"²⁵ (Lauterbach 1930:160). Interestingly, Lauterbach's theoretical considerations were far different from his practical approaches; in 1971 he did not approve the reconstructions of the ruined Warsaw national monuments (Lauterbach, 1971).

The Second World War (1939-45) was much more destructive than the first. War casualties in Poland totalled six million people and the material losses reached forty per cent of the national property. Many Polish towns were in ruins. The city of Warsaw suffered in 1939 from the first act of destruction and almost twelve per cent of buildings were destroyed. The Nazi policy in Warsaw was to destroy the city and to establish in its place a new settlement for Germans with a camp for slave workers on the other bank of the Vistula River. In February 1940, a Nazi townplanning team presented Hitler with a plan to transform Warsaw into a *New German City* (*Die neue Deutsche Stadt*) of 100,000 - 130,000 German colonists and 80,000 Polish slaves (Ciborowski, 1964:46). All historic districts were to be destroyed with the exception of the Old Town core, regarded by the Nazis as "typically German" (In Zieliński, 1999:10) (Fig 6.1.8). The Polish capital city with its landmark symbol of Polish nationhood, the Royal Castle, was to be destroyed by special orders of the Nazi administration. The programme of destruction was systematically carried out. After the uprising in August of 1944 half of Warsaw lay in ruins (Fig 6.1.9, 6.1.9a), but the last act of destruction was performed during the next three months when special troops were executing systematic demolition of the city. Historic buildings were destroyed under the supervision of Nazi scholars who were carrying out works started in 1939

Fig 6.1.8

Plan of transformation of Warsaw into a *New German Town (Die neue Deutsche Stadt)*,
February 1940
(photo and context Ciborowski, 1964)

(The Old Town is marked by letters 'O.T.', by B.M.)

Fig 6.1.9
The ruins of the Old Town in Warsaw, 1945
(photo Ciborowski, 1964)

Fig 6.1.9a
The reconstructed Old Town in Warsaw, 1959
(photo Ciborowski, 1964)

(Fig 6.1.10). The walls of the Royal Castle, burnt in September 1939, were blown up in December 1944 (Fig 6.1.11). It was estimated that ninety per cent of historic buildings were destroyed (Ciborowski, 1964:143) (Fig 6.1.11a). The awareness of and planning for the future rebuilding was very present from the immediate post-war period and the numerous ruins were protected from clearing by marking them with plaques that displayed the national emblem, an eagle, and indication that the ruins were 'heritage buildings' (Fig 6.1.12). In January 1945, by the decision of the Council of Ministers of the Provisional Government (Rząd Tymczasowy) in Lublin, the preparation works for reconstruction of the historic core of Warsaw started (Fig 6.1.13). The main reconstruction works of the Old Town was completed in 1953; rebuilding of the remaining blocks continued until 1962 (Fig 6.1.14, 6.1.14a). Reconstruction was based on all the available documentation gathered from possible sources: inventory drawings prepared before and during the war by the students and academics of the Department of Architecture at the Warsaw Polytechnic, photographs, saved architectural remains, and even the eighteenth century paintings by Bernardo Bellotto Canaletto (Fig 6.1.15, 6.1.16). Most of the reconstructed buildings maintained their previous residential function and were equipped with modern facilities. In order to improve living conditions some modifications were made to the replicated blocks; it resulted in lower density of housing. The remains of the fourteenth century city walls, embedded in the walls of surrounding eighteenth century buildings, were exposed and reconstructed (Fig 6.1.17). The conservation approaches to reconstruction developed at the

Fig 6.1.10

1. The Vernichtungskommando incendiary division in the streets of Warsaw, 1944
2. Krakowskie Przedmieście Street in Warsaw, 1944
- 3., 4. Warsaw Ghetto, 1942. Photographs from the report by J. Stroop, commander of the Ghetto Operation (photo Ciborowski, 1964)

1	4
2	
3

Fig 6.1.11

1., 2. The ruins of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, 1945

3. The ruins of the Castle Square (Plac Zamkowy), 1945
(photos Ciborowski, 1964)

1

2

3

Fig 6.1.11a
Warsaw, November 1946
(photo M. Nash, Associated Press)

Fig 6.1.12
The ruins of an eighteenth-century building with the plaque 'Heritage Building',
65 Krakowskie Przedmieście Street, Warsaw (photo by L.Sempoliński)

Fig 6.1.13

Warsaw; the historic core (map of 1967)

The historic buildings discussed in Chapter 6.1.1 are marked by Roman numerals

Black dotted line - The Old Town area

I. The Royal Castle; II. The cathedral of Saint John Baptist; III. The Branicki Palace

IV. The church of Saint Alexander; V. The Ujazdowski Castle (reconstructed in

1973-1987) (photo Łoziński and Miłobędzki, 1967)

Fig 6.1.14

The Old Town Square, Warsaw

1. In ruins, 1945 (photo K. Pęcherski)

2. After reconstruction (photo St., K. and R. Jabłoński)

1

2

Fig 6.1.14a
The Old Town Square, Warsaw
1. In ruins, 1945
2. After reconstruction
(photos St., K. and R. Jabłoński)

1

2

Fig 6.1.15

Warsaw in paintings by Bernardo Bellotto Canaletto, (1721-1780)

1. The Castle Square (Plac Zamkowy), Warsaw

2. Krakowskie Przedmieście Street, Warsaw,

Source: Museum of Royal Castle in Warsaw

(photos Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

1
2

Fig 6.1.16

Krakowskie Przedmieście Street, Warsaw

1. by Bernardo Bellotto Canaletto

Source; National Museum in Warsaw (photo Lorentz, 1971)

2. After reconstruction (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

1	4	Fig 6.1.17
2	5	The city walls, The Old Town, Warsaw
3	6	1., 2. Reconstruction works, 1954 (photo Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki, 1956)
		3., 4. The reconstructed Barbican (photo Lorentz, 1971)
		5. The reconstructed city walls at Podwale Street (photo Ciborowski, 1964)
		6. Reconstruction works at the city walls, 1959 (photo Ciborowski, 1964)

Old Town in Warsaw were later applied in the rebuilding of the Warsaw Royal Castle and will be discussed in depth in the next chapter.

Reconstruction of the churches favoured Romanesque or Gothic phases which were revealed in clearing works. Baroque interior decoration or neo-Gothic (considered a primitive imitation of Gothic) facades were not appreciated and, consequently, not acknowledged in the restoration and reconstruction works. This was technically easier and, what was more important from the standpoint of the restorers, the desired integrity of the highly valued styles was achieved. Even in the cases when there were intact relics of the later phases with no remains of the first, as in the case of the Saint Alexander church in Warsaw, the reconstructed structures tended to reflect the first phase (Fig 6.1.18, 6.1.18a). Similarly, the elevations of the cathedral of Saint John Baptist in Warsaw were not reconstructed to the pre-war neo-Gothic form by Idźkowski (1823) but "freely re-Gothicised" (Łoziński and Miłobędzki, 1967:219) to its early appearance (Fig 6.1.19, 6.1.19a).

Apart from such 'purifications', reconstructions were completed according to the following schemes: 1. reconstructing in the form immediately before the destruction, e.g. the Old Town in Warsaw (#1, Fig 6.1.0) that had not changed much from its original form over the centuries; 2. reconstructing in one of the forms in the relic's history e.g. the Old Market in Wrocław (#9, Fig 6.1.0) that was reconstructed according to a hypothetical concept based on archaeological and architectural research 3. reconstructing in the form 'optimal' for the relic as established by the restorers, e.g. the townhouses in the Main City in Gdańsk

Fig 6.1.18
The ruins of the St. Alexander Church, Warsaw, 1945
(photo Ciborowski, 1964)

Fig 6.1.18a
The reconstructed St. Alexander Church, Warsaw
(photo Ciborowski, 1964)

The cathedral of Saint John Baptist

Fig 6.1.19
Świętojańska Street , the Old Town, Warsaw.

Above: the outline of the ruins (in black) and
The inventory drawing before the WW II (in grey)
The cathedral of Saint John Baptist in its neo-Gothic form by A. Idźkowski
Below: the inventory drawing of the reconstruction;
The cathedral of Saint John Baptist reconstructed in the re-Gothicised form

(photos Zachwatowicz, 1956)

1	2
3	

Fig 6.1.19a

The Cathedral of Saint John Baptist, the Old Town, Warsaw

1. The cathedral in its pre-war neo-Gothic form

by Arch. A. Idźkowski

2. The ruins in 1939 ; 3. After the reconstruction

(photos St. K. and R. Jabłoński)

(#14, Fig 6.1.0). The main tendency of these arbitrary decisions can be easily detected in the character of the completed reconstructions: the majority of them were recreating the architectural form that existed around the middle of the nineteenth century. The later phases of the relics, dated from the late nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, as well as whole structures built in the styles of this period, were considered "decadent" and "capitalistic" and as such did not comply with conservation recommendations issued by the agencies of the Communist government. Besides, the Modern Movement, highly valued and popular among the Polish architects since the 1920s, condemned all nineteenth-century imitation styles as not rooted in function, therefore, superfluous (Pevsner, 1966:388). The appreciation of the artistic expression in architectural form created around the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century did not come to Poland before the 1960s when the first work on the art of Secession (Art Nouveau) by Mieczysław Wallis (1967) generated more interest in that art style underestimated even by professionals.

Polish literature on the early post-war conservation works displays awareness of the problem regarding the arbitrary decisions that had been made and the mistakes that had not been avoided. The reconstruction of the Branicki Palace in Warsaw (6 Miodowa Street) is an example of such an arbitrary decision. The palace, completely destroyed in the war, was not returned to its form immediately before its destruction. Instead, the restorers used the painting by Bernardo Bellotto Canaletto as a base for reconstruction and replicated the architectural form accordingly. It happened that the painting depicted not the

actual but the projected form of the building, then under construction, and since not all the planned architectural details were completed (some sculptures in the attica were not finished), the resulted reconstructed structure had no relevance to any historic phase in the building development (Bartczakowa and Malinowska, 1974). Even the reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, the most awaited and prestigious reconstruction in the post-war history of Polish conservation, was not free of 'imperfections'. Since the reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw constitutes the case study of this thesis, only the basic information will be presented in this chapter. The reconstruction of the Royal Castle was postponed for political reasons (that will be explained in the next section) until 1971 though enabling legislation for its rebuilding was passed in 1949. As early as 1974 the walls of the Castle had been erected but the reconstruction works in the interior lasted until the late 1980s. Ironically, "The only European Royal Palace to be built in our time" (Dobby 1978:92) was erected under the Communist government.

The reconstruction of the Warsaw Old Town, as well as many other historic sites in Warsaw, was prepared and executed by the Capital Rebuilding Bureau (B.O.S, for Biuro Odbudowy Stolicy) established by decree of the Polish National Council in February 1945. The abbreviation was translated by the spirited Warsawians as 'God rebuild the capital city' (Boże Odbuduj Stolicę) probably because the undertaking seemed impossible to complete without divine help. The Office's task, aside from rebuilding the city residential areas, covered a wide range of conservation activities: inventory of the war damages,

management of the rubble clearing and site preparation for reconstruction works, developing master plans for the reconstruction of historic sites and designs for the reconstruction of particular historic buildings. The Office was headed by Roman Piotrowski and Józef Sigalin, the Planning department by Wacław Ostrowski and Zygmunt Skibniewski, the Architecture Department by Bohdan Lachert, the Historic Architecture department by Jan Zachwatowicz; all architects. The contribution of all Poles to the work of capital rebuilding, expressed in the launching of the Social Fund for the Reconstruction of the Capital (S.F.O.S, for Społeczny Fundusz Odbudowy Stolicy) is noteworthy. The idea of the Fund, to be collected from voluntary contributions, was launched in Silesia in 1945 and met enthusiastic response from all Poles.

In the post-war period, the principles of architectural reconstruction were again brought into discussion, this time with reference to the recent drastic destruction. The reconstruction of the ruined historic buildings was justified by their national significance and should be understood as the emotional response of a nation deprived of its heritage (Zachwatowicz, 1965). More pragmatic explanation was offered by Stanisław Lorentz, the Director General of Museums and the Protection of Historic Monuments at the Ministry of Culture (Centralny Zarząd Muzeów i Ochrony Zabytków), who argued that reconstructing historic buildings helped save the authentic remains that were incorporated into the reconstructions (Pani, 1950). But not all the voices were supportive of the reconstruction practice even though reconstructing seemed to be justified by the emotional needs. In 1945, when Warsaw was nothing more than a sea of ruins,

Kazimierz Wyka (1945), publicist, expressed his doubts about the sense in reconstructing the historic core. Wyka, in his emotional article, pointed out the Polish lack of feeling for realism, which he considered a national characteristic, in regard to planning reconstruction of what had been lost beyond recall. He did not approved reconstructing for sentimental reasons but opted for new development instead of rebuilding in historic forms that he considered falsification:

"When speaking about rebuilding, as is Polish custom, we skip a few steps of the reality. Today we should talk about the destruction of Warsaw. Not the one started by the Germans, but the one we have to finish ourselves. Before the work of rebuilding starts, what is left of Central Warsaw and the Old Town will have to be completely destroyed ... I know, you will be trying to shout me down - the cult of the past, traditions, Or-Ot, Kiliński, antiquity value. I know it all, but we should think in categories of destruction versus survival. Do all your arguments still exist, or are they only ash and memories? Isn't it true that any such rebuilding would be simply falsification?"²⁶ (ibidem: 8)

The reasoning against reconstruction of Edward Osmańczyk, political activist and publicist of the Communist regime, who opposed rebuilding Gdańsk's historic architecture as foreign to Polish tradition was entirely different. Gdańsk, a city of an international 'Free City' identity (1919-39) but a product of two main cultures, Polish and German (Hanseatic), with numerous minority contributions characteristic of a port town, raised particularly controversial and sensitive issues of heritage identity. Osmańczyk rejected the idea of rebuilding Danzig (he intentionally used the German, not the Polish, term) and its 'Teutonic' heritage.

In the popular Polish understanding, the adjective 'Teutonic' connotes any German and German-associated origin and relates to the Teutonic Order that controlled Gdańsk and the territory at the mouth of the Vistula River in the fourteenth century until its defeat a century later. In his article *Gdański finał* (*Gdansk's finale*), published in 1945 in the periodical *Odrodzenie* (*Rebirth*), Osmańczyk (1945:7) wrote:

"Gdańsk was a mistletoe on the Polish tree. In the years under the occupation and of independence, the reach city of Gdańsk, or rather Danzig, had been impressing us, poor peasants. We were there merely as subtenants...All that has remained from Gdańsk is nothing more than what can be found in every international port: machines, shipyard, factories, and workmen's suburbs. We don't need anything more. We will build Gdańsk ourselves, after the Polish mould, not Teutonic arrogance. ... If all the historic nooks of Gdańsk are burnt down, in ruins ... if all the traces of the Teutonic power at the Vistula River mouth are gone, we will not rebuild that, and we will not cry over it either..."²⁷

Similar in tone were voices regarding the rebuilding of historic architecture of other formerly German cities in Poland, especially Breslau (Wrocław) (#9, Fig 6.1.0) and Stettin (Szczecin) (#15, Fig 6.1.0). "It is absurdity"²⁸, wrote Bohdan Drozdowski (1956:5) about the planned reconstruction of the palace in Żagań (#11, Fig 6.1.0), "to promote any Prussian rubbish to the dignity of the a 'Polish monument'..." There were however more unprejudiced opinions, as that of Mieczysław Walicki (1946:6), who was aware of Gdańsk's historic and artistic values and suggested that Gdańsk, "the prodigal son" that finally returned to "the family nest"²⁹ should be rebuilt in modern forms but according to the old street

grid. He warned that destroying the remains of the city would be a crime against European culture; however, preserving them as ruins would limit their educational value. He opted for reconstructing Gdańsk, which he considered "not Teutonic after all". Destruction of the Gdańsk town centre was estimated at ninety five per cent (Krzyżanowski, 1997). Although badly damaged, the outstanding works of architecture had survived. By the government resolution of 1952 the reconstruction of the Gdańsk's Main Town began in the following years. An economic analysis of restoring the Main Town's housing function revealed that reconstructing on the intact foundations and infrastructure would be similar in cost to constructing a modern residential district. Reconstruction of the townhouse blocks was completed but the density of housing was reduced by introduction of green space into the enlarged blocks' interiors. Medieval and Renaissance architectural styles were reconstructed in a selective manner, not surprisingly they emphasised the city's Polish Renaissance accents (Fig 6.1.20, 6.1.21). German streetscape iconography, as expected, was not replicated.

Reconstruction practice in the post-war years tended to extend beyond the accepted conservation norms. Jan Zachwatowicz (1981), restoration architect and Conservator General in the post-war Poland, in his 1981 retrospection, remarked that the devastating war tore down not only monuments but also conservation theories and methods. New approaches to the existing conservation principles had to be developed in order to face the tremendous effort of resurrecting the lost heritage. Reconstruction seemed to be the most effective solution especially when applied to the historic sites of national

Fig 6.1.20
Gdańsk; the historic core (map of 1967) (photo Łoziński and Miłobędzki, 1967)

The historic buildings discussed in Chapter 6.1.1 are marked by Roman numerals, by B.M.

I. The Golden Gate

II. The Speimann's House

III. Długi Targ (Long Market)

1	2	Fig 6.1.21
		Gdańsk
3	4	1. The Golden Gate according to R. Curicke, 1687 (photo Krzyżanowski, 1997)
		2. The reconstructed Golden Gate
		3. Długi Targ (Long Market)
		4. The reconstructed Speimann's House (built 1609-1619) (photos S. and K. Jabłoński,)

significance such as the historic core of Warsaw. The reconstruction of Warsaw's Old Town and the Royal Castle, symbols of Polish nationhood, was of the highest priority in the rebuilding effort. "The destruction of Warsaw was an attempt to destroy the Polish nation"³⁰, wrote Jan Zachwatowicz (1945:7) in his article *Przeszłość w służbie nowego życia* (*The past in the service of the new life*). He assigned to the reconstructed monuments a task of "full participation" in the consciousness of the post-war young generation as "the most potent documents of the national culture" (ibidem). This attitude was reflected in Zachwatowicz's conservation approach formulated and published a year later as *Program i zasady konserwacji zabytków* (*The program and principles of monuments conservation*) (Zachwatowicz, 1946). The point of departure of the program was abridged in a strong statement: "a nation and cultural heritage should be considered one entity" (ibidem: 48). Zachwatowicz argued that the nation cannot acquiesce in the deprivation of its cultural heritage expressed in historic architecture and declared that "we will reconstruct it, we will rebuild it from the foundations, in order to pass on the next generations, and if it cannot be authentic, let it be at least accurate, as kept in our memory and as documented in the accessible material"³¹ (ibidem). He emphasized the positive impact of architectural heritage on morale and attitudes of the future generations. Zachwatowicz was conscious of 'stylistic improvements' to the reconstructed structures but he liberally accepted it as returning the monuments to their past "full form and glory". He acknowledged openly that he was aware of this "tragic falsification committed during the reconstruction process" and hoped that "the

achievements of conservation thought will not be buried in these works and one day, after completing the necessary tasks, we can become a leader in par excellence conservation". To justify his position he explained that the magnitude of the "impact of an architectural form" and its "suggestive power" in awakening of the national pride and boosting patriotism, that can be seen as one of the main tasks of the reconstruction effort in post-war Poland, does not depend on *when* the form was created. Replicas will sufficiently substitute originals in this mission (ibidem). Zachwatowicz's program received strong criticism. Ksawery Piwocki (1946:57), art historian, objected to it by raising a question: "Won't these ad hoc extensive recreations of the monuments destroyed in the war project a distorted image of our artistic culture to the next generations, even though the reconstructive act is acknowledged?"³² Piwocki's objection was based on the conviction that replicas cannot convey artistic values of the destroyed relics, especially of architectural detailing. He accepted reconstruction of important landmarks in the urban landscape, but only in their overall form, without replicating architectural details which he considered pointless. He also warned against 'stylistic purifications' and extensive reconstruction of the interiors (Piwocki, 1948). Similar was the tone of *the National Program for Heritage Conservation (Narodowy program konserwacji zabytków)* formulated in 1946 by Antoni Karczewski (1946). The Program accepted reconstruction as a form of contemporary architectural expression that would maintain the old-character artistic and picturesque aspects of the monument, fully or partially reconstructed, but would not pretend continuity in the historic style by creating "stylistic

compositions"³³ (ibidem: 196). In the Program there were, though, remarks and suggestions that could not comply even with the most tolerant interpretation of the conservation principles. Giving as a justification the poor condition and scarcity of the architectural heritage in Poland as compared to other countries, Karczewski argued for extensive restoration and reconstructions, even if it involved acting against the rules of the international conservation agreements, which he considered of low applicability to Polish cases. Such lofty justification for stylistic improvements rooted in patriotism set a liberal mode in Polish conservation practice, especially articulated in approaches to conservation of the Polish architectural heritage in former German territories. The desire to reconstruct was motivated by the need to legitimate Polish reacquisition by selectively emphasising the earlier Polish heritage. Reconstruction as a conservation practice of a "high degree of flexibility" was considered useful in approaching such conservation problems where it would "return to the monuments their artistic value as intended by their creators, or as acquired in their historic development, and remove all the foreign modification, introduced, accidentally or intentionally, in order to depreciate their national character"³⁴ (Ciołek and Ciborowski, 1953:8); so as to free the monuments from "the accumulated historic layers that are foreign to the Polish mentality"³⁵ (Saski, 1962: 68). Jan Zachwatowicz reflected on these theoretical and practical dilemmas in Polish conservation approaches of the post-war years in 1965 in his writings summarizing Polish conservation practice of the 1940s and 1950s. He stated that the tremendous conservation effort in the post-war years should

always be seen in historical context; as an expression of the nation's determination to revive its cultural heritage under extraordinary and tragic circumstances. He noted, though, that the liberal reconstruction tendencies delineated in the post-war conservation were "contagious and dangerous and they are still sometimes present in the concepts of conservation projects"³⁶ (Zachwatowicz, 1965:45).

After the war rebuilding of the historic architecture was given as much priority as industrial development and housing and had to deal with the same problems as the rest of the construction industry. The demand for housing in the ruined country was tremendous. Skilled labour was scarce and the pace of construction often exceeded the ability to prepare sufficient documentation for the development projects. Especially vulnerable were the developments of historic sites. In some cases restoration works were conducted according to overloaded schedules that ignored completely the quality-demanding and labour-consuming conservation recommendations (Kalinowski and Zachwatowicz, 1968). In order to meet unrealistic expectations of the plans imposed by the authorities, many historic buildings were simply demolished. In Warsaw, the victims of this operation included such valuable landmarks as the Ujazdowski Castle, the City Hall and the Canoness Church in the Theatre Square (Plac Teatralny) as well as dozens of historic townhouses. Another threat to restoration efforts came unexpectedly from the evolution of public attitudes towards the conservation initiatives and their results. The perception of values, as represented by a historic relic and its reconstruction, had changed and public

taste favoured the replicated over the authentic. "It was realized that a structure reconstructed with high accuracy upon the original plans and drawings is more valuable to the nation than the most respected authentic ruin"³⁷, cried Goryński (1954:3) in his article under the ominous title *Mumifikacja czy twórczość* (*Mummification or creativity*). Nobody was then surprised when, in Nysa near Wrocław (#8, Fig 6.1.0), the completely destroyed Renaissance townhouse, housing the municipal scale, was reconstructed while the remains of the neighbouring historic townhouses were destroyed.

At the turn of the 1940s and 1950s architecture entered a period of pompous 'Historicism', the style of so called Socialist Realism (Socrealism, or Classicist Formalism, broadcasting a political message: 'palaces for the proletariat') that was imposed on architects as a style of the new political reality. Although, supposedly inspired by Polish national architecture, in reality Socrealism was little more than a copy of the Soviet model (Fig 6.1.22). In Warsaw it resulted in transforming the rebuilt city centre into the gigantic forum of architectural innovations of exaggerated proportions, completely alien to the traditional Warsaw architecture. The first residential housing erected in this style was completed in 1952 at the Constitution Square (Fig 6.1.23). "This showcase of the doctrine of a city 'national in form and socialist in substance' in reality amounted to the squalour of life under Communism concealed by palatial façades (Zieliński, 1999:25). Socrealism introduced to the restored or reconstructed urban centres new structures imitating historic styles and blending with historic relics. Sometimes whole areas of completely destroyed historic

1	2
	3
5	4

Fig 6.1.22

Socialist Realism

1. Moscow State University, Moscow (photo Jencks, 1991)

2. The Palace of Culture and Science, Warsaw, built in 1955, a gift from the Soviet people to Warsaw (photo S.K. and R. Jabłoński)

3., 4., 5. The Palace of Culture and Science; architectural detail (photos B. Myslinski)

- 1 2 Fig 6.1.23
 Constitution Square, Residential District MDM, Warsaw, built 1949-52
 3 4 1. Constitution Square in 1964 (photo Ciborowski, 1964)
 2., 3. Architectural detail; classical motives and monumental sculptures of labourers
 /presented by the Communist regime as role models/ (photos B. Myslinski)
 4. Constitution Square in the 1990s /and a new 'role model'/ (photo B. Myslinski)
 5. Constitution Square in the 1990s (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

buildings were rebuilt in this specific Historicism and called by the local governments, sponsoring the rebuilding, 'reconstructions'. Soon many small towns could have been proud of their 'reconstructed' Old Towns. For example, in Racibórz near Katowice, the attica of the townhouses of the Old Market Place were "rebuilt upon the Renaissance tradition"³⁸ (Kancierz, 1953:31) but in Socrealistic manner, and acquired the name of 'reconstruction'.

In his analysis of the conservation practice in the first decade after the war, Józef Dutkiewicz (1955), art historian and conservator, criticized the lack of authority of conservation services in developing the historic areas; the importance of documentation as a basis for any restoration or reconstruction was often overridden by the demands of hurried delivery. This caused falsifications and arbitrary interventions. Dutkiewicz did not approve reconstruction as a conservation treatment. He suggested excluding architectural reconstruction practice from the list conservation activities and proposed assigning to it a special status of a "contemporary scenography based on historic themes"³⁹ (ibidem: 508) that would belong to a separate architectural activity. He expected this would free the funds formerly assigned to the reconstruction projects and transfer them to restorations. In his analysis Dutkiewicz commented on the negative influence of Socrealism in perception of historic architecture. Some ten years later, architects would interpret the style of Socialist Realism as a "sort of architectural bridge between the architecture of old and modern Warsaw"⁴⁰ (Ciborowski, 1964:304), but in 1955 Dutkiewicz blamed the style for assigning to

the historic architecture a role of nothing more than a decorative element in the contemporary urban complexes (Fig 6.1.24). Consequently, historic architecture, either reconstructed or restored, was expected to comply with demands of new construction, not with conservation principles (ibidem).

The recognition of reconstruction as a specific type of activity within conservation as well as architecture is well established in Polish conservation writings in the post-war years. "Conservation activities belong to creative activities"⁴¹ stated Jan Witkiewicz-Koszyc in 1949 (1949:742) emphasizing that they are separate from the conservation purism. Józef Lepiarczyk considered architectural reconstruction a "specific type of creative activity, that can be termed 'conservation architecture' " (1954:34). He analyzed the reconstruction process from the perspective of a designer and concluded that "an architect-conservator, while working on the reconstruction project, on the one hand, has to comprehend a monument's expression, understand its character and learn about the monument's components, resigning from all creative ambitions, on the other hand, he has to rely on his knowledge and talent where there is a lack of documentation or a change needs to be introduced"⁴² (ibidem). Similarly, Juliusz Goryński considered reconstruction a form of contemporary architecture that he called 'conservation architecture' as opposed to the main body of architectural works, which he referred to as 'creative architecture' and advised that "'conservation' architecture should not be separated from 'creative' architecture"⁴³ (1954:3). His opinion was, no doubt, inspired by the situation in architectural designing at the turn of the 1940s and 1950s. At the end of the 1940s, when

1
2
3

Fig 6.1.24

1. Ministry of Agriculture, Warsaw (photo Ciborowski, 1964)
2. Marszałkowska Street, Warsaw (photo Ciborowski, 1964)
3. Muranów Residential District, Warsaw
(photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

conservation activities were performed through the whole country, historic architectural forms gained some popularity also in contemporary architecture. Designing in historic styles, expressed in monumental architecture of Socrealism, was widely accepted and the boundaries between designing in historic style for contemporary architecture and for conservation were undetectable. 'New' and 'new old' blended together in the rebuilding projects. Conservators expected that society would give to them, as to artists, the right to create, instead of limiting "in the name of wrongly understood pietism"⁴⁴ (Szyszko-Bohusz, 1949: 174).

Polish post-war reconstruction projects were discussed abroad, and in some cases used as a guideline in similar initiatives. Frigyes Pogany (1953) considered Polish reconstruction principles applicable in the rebuilding of Budapest. Walter Frodl (1966), conservator theoretician from Vienna, though very critical of extensive reconstructions, accepted Polish rebuilding projects on the basis of the extraordinary circumstances in Poland after the war. He opposed, however, reconstruction works completed on structures that did not suffer from war damage, such as the partial reconstructions at the Wawel Hill and the Nidzica Castle (#6, Fig 6.1.0). Considering the motivations behind Polish reconstruction efforts, and defending and building Polish national identity, he wrote:

" In the situation when the national component becomes the main value and when the monuments are raised to a status of national symbols, reconstruction will always be dominant over other forms of conservation. ... In Poland, the preference for 'rinovazzione' (rebuilding, B.M.) type of treatments is associated with circumstances that bear some features of mass psychosis, however application of this treatment can be found also

in other countries. There, the motivation is not as much in national feelings as in naïve conviction, similar to nineteenth century beliefs, that these treatments will allow the achievement of perfection and integrity of a style. Another reason would be some sort of sentimentalism and passion to prove the national identity"⁴⁵ (ibidem: 35).

In the 1960s, when the frantic time of rebuilding activities ended, the Polish conservation community could reflect on their experience with restoration and reconstruction. Dutkiewicz (1961:5) considered Polish "obsession" with reconstruction a result of the losses the nation suffered in the times of the wars and occupations. In his article under the title *Sentymentalizm, autentyzm, automatyzm* (*Sentimentalism, authenticity and automatism*) he wrote:

"That obsession, while originating in the literature at the turns of the nineteenth and twentieth century, after the First World War influenced the way monuments were valued ... The naive belief in eternalness of the old traditional institutions and their rebirth motivated reconstruction initiatives that aimed at returning the historic monuments to their former glory ... The introduction of the modern approaches to Polish heritage conservation in the years before the Second World War suppressed the reconstruction tendencies. The tendencies re-awoke after the war. The desire to rebuild the destroyed historic monuments was motivated by the feeling of inferiority of a country stripped of its heritage."⁴⁶ (ibidem:5)

Bukowski (1966) sees one of the reasons why reconstruction projects became so popular in the post-war years in Socrealism's incapability to produce original Modern architecture. He argues that the lack of applicable architectural form gave impetus to initiatives of the numerous reconstructions in the 1950s.

However, the popularity of reconstruction outlived Socrealism and in the following decades new reconstruction projects were scheduled. In the 1970s the decisions to reconstruct the totally destroyed Royal Castle in Warsaw (Fig 6.1.25, 6.1.26) and the Ujazdowski Castle, also in Warsaw (Fig 6.1.27, 6.1.28), whose full height ruins were dismantled in the 1950s, began a new epoch in Polish reconstruction practice. Soon, another reconstruction project was under consideration: the Krzyżtopór Castle in Ujazd (#3, Fig 6.1.0) that had been in ruins almost from the beginning of its existence (Fig 6.1.29). While reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw was expected, moreover impatiently awaited by the whole nation, the decision about reconstruction of the Krzyżtopór Castle in Ujazd was received with many doubts, especially in the conservation community. Wldemar Łysiak (1973), restoration architect and publicist, protested against this decision in his passionate article titled *Czy stać nas na makiety? (Can we afford models?)*. Although he described the rebuilding of the most valuable monuments in the post-war years as an "ideological and emotional phenomenon", he accepted the decision about the reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw as a postponed act of the post-war rebuilding and explained that:

"the regrettable decision to halt its rebuilding, rescinded by the new political leaders after almost twenty five years, caused a delay in rebuilding works - but this is still the same rebuilding, just postponed. In other words, in the case of the Royal Castle, by the rule of the accepted exception, the conservation rules from the after-war years were transferred in time to our days"⁴⁷ (ibidem: 15).

Fig 6.1.25
The ruins of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, 1945, (outlined)
(photo Lorentz, 1971)

Fig 6.1.26
The reconstructed Royal Castle in Warsaw, 1970s
(photo W.Stasiak)

Fig 6.1.27 The ruins of the Ujazdowski Castle, Warsaw, 1945;
The ruins were dismantled in the 1950s (photo St., K. & R. Jabłoński)

Fig 6.1.28 The reconstructed Ujazdowski Castle, Warsaw
(photo St., K. & R. Jabłoński)

Fig 6.1.29
The preserved ruins of the Krzyżtopór Castle in Ujazd (photos W. Wolny)

The planned costly reconstruction of the Krzyżtopór Castle he considered completely unjustified and immoral in the situation when there was a lack of funds for restoration works. He warned: "We will end up with Poland full of model fantasies pretending to be monuments and the monuments stripped of their original character due to the extensive reconstruction works" (ibidem: 15), and concluded with irony: "We are having more and more 'monuments' - and fewer originals" (ibidem: 16). The solution to this problem he saw in the English approach favouring preservation of ruins over reconstruction. The reconstruction of the Krzyżtopór Castle was never completed; the reconstruction of the Ujazdowski Castle dragged from 1973 to 1987 and was plagued by numerous changes to the master plan (Biegański, 1974).

In the 1970s yet another reconstruction was completed, but of a completely different character. What is now known as the Biskupin Settlement (#13, Fig 6.1.29) (Fig 6.1.30) had long been an archaeological site of a Lusatian fortified settlement built 2700 years ago and discovered in 1933 by a local teacher, Walenty Szwajcer. The settlement was constructed on a swampy peninsula near Biskupin and, as estimated, a tribe of around 1300 people inhabited it. The archaeological excavations conducted on the site from 1934 to 1974 revealed that the settlement had consisted of a few wooden houses covered by common roofs and enclosed by a rampart with a wooden palisade. In the 1970s, two rows of the houses and a part of the rampart with the entry gate were reconstructed. Also the interiors of two houses were recreated

<div style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">1</div> <div style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">2</div>	<p>Fig 6.1.30</p> <p>The reconstruction of the Iron Age settlement at Biskupin</p> <p>1. The remains of the settlement (the reconstructed gate in the background)</p> <p>2. The reconstructed gate with defensive walls and living houses (photos Polish National Tourist Office)</p>
---	---

(Lorentz, 1982: 60). This reconstruction was completed as a part of experimental archaeology project and served as an educational tool for the visiting groups of students and tourists. Though the Biskupin Settlement became a popular tourist attraction bringing some money to the region, its development was not motivated by an aspiration to create a regional tourist attraction; the limited individual tourism combined with the lack of free market economy in the Communist Poland of 1970s did not encourage a development of tourist industry.

Seen in historic perspective, Polish reconstruction practice evolved from the mid-nineteenth century restoration movement favouring the unity of style to full replication. The general tendency in reconstruction practice, especially regarding buildings of national significance, has been growing toward stylistic selectiveness emphasizing Polish origins. This has been motivated by the desire to affirm the national identity (as expressed in reconstructed monuments) in the times of tragic occupations of the Polish territories. Polish post-war reconstruction has been an extraordinary effort to reassert national heritage in the core regions and to legitimize it in those territories acquired from Germany. The approach to architectural conservation favouring reconstruction, known as the 'Polish School of Conservation', was the reaction to the deliberate near-total destruction of the Polish architectural heritage (Milobedzki, 1995). Interestingly, Jan Zachwatowicz (1981), regard as a father of the 'Polish School of Conservation', admitted: "I have never used and I am not using the term 'Polish School' in regard to the activities associated with protection, conservation and rebuilding of monuments"⁴⁸ (ibidem: 4). In his article *On the Polish School of*

rebuilding and conservation of monuments (O polskiej szkole odbudowy i konserwacji zabytków) he reviewed the development of the concept of conservation in Poland since the eighteenth century in an effort to find roots of Polish approaches in conservation. He did this by juxtaposing Polish restoration and reconstruction works with the similar projects in the neighbouring countries. In West Europe, especially in the late nineteenth century, various trends emerged in conservation methods, some of them displaying features of the Polish school. Almost all of these trends can be detected in the particular conservation works in Poland, but the resultant approach revealed that the operative principle that rested at the foundation of the Polish School could be expressed in the recommendation: 'preserve, do not restore'. The extent of the damage Polish heritage suffered during the wars made it impossible to apply preservation approaches and, as a result, extensive restorations and reconstructions had to be considered. Thirty-five years after he announced *The program and principles of heritage conservation (Program i zasady konserwacji zabytków)* (Zachwatowicz, 1946), Zachwatowicz reflected on the post-war rebuilding effort : "It was conscious, with no hypocrisy, abandonment of Riegel's theory. It was not creating a new doctrine, but devising a method that would be appropriate under the extremely dramatic and specific circumstances"⁴⁹. Nevertheless, he wrote, these extraordinary measures should not be taken as any specific conservation theory, " It is better not to use the term 'Polish School of Conservation', since it is not any doctrine, but actually an exception to a doctrine"⁵⁰ (ibidem: 9). The reconstruction projects in Italy, France and Germany

that had been completed against the accepted conservation principles prove, he noted, that Poland was not the only country in post-war Europe replicating the destroyed historic relics. This observation confirms, he argued further, that the use of reconstruction should not be taken as descriptive of the Polish School. Zachwatowicz identified some other features that he considered characteristic of the Polish approach such as conservation planning in historic town centres, comprehensive preparatory studies and professional training. Nevertheless, the term Polish School of Conservation is associated, and probably will remain so, with extensive reconstructions.

Polish reconstruction practice, while arousing controversy in Poland, was accepted abroad as a specific feature of Polish conservation. The reconstruction of the historic centre of Warsaw is complimented in the field literature as "unbelievable" so that "Warsaw recreated must be seen to be believed" (Tschudi-Madsen, 1986:151), or "meticulously reproduced" and considered "an exemplary and unique effort of successful post-war restoration" (Von Droste B. and U. Bertilsson, 1995:9). Moreover, the Polish conservation effort was rightly acknowledged by including the historic centre of Warsaw on UNESCO's World Heritage List in 1980. The inclusion was considered an exception to the rule requiring authenticity but the exception was made to recognize an extraordinary effort of post-war restoration (ibidem).

Notes

-
- ¹ Polish text quoted: "krajowym ołówkiem rodziną ozdobić świątynię"
(Idźkowski, 1843:17)
- ² Polish text quoted: "bo dopełnienie bardzo często może zmienić treść przedmiotu"
(Odezwa Towarzystwa..., 1850:30)
- ³ Polish text quoted: "iż spór w sprawie rozstrzygnięcia różnicy zdań, przeprowadzony spokojnie i jak najtreściwiej będzie zarazem wskazówką dla podobnych restauracji." (Odnowienie kościoła ... 1867:2)
- ⁴ Polish text quoted: "ustanowienia zasad ogólnych choćby na dany okres obowiązujących." (Raport I Zjazdu Delegatów ..., 1901:3)
- ⁵ Polish text quoted: "idea odtworzenia całości w duchu pierwotnym dla okazania jej dzisiejszym pokoleniom" (Demetrykiewicz, 1886:5)
- ⁶ Polish text quoted: "odnawiania starych kościołów w duchu pierwotnym, w imię należenia do rodziny ludów zachodu" (Łuszczkiewicz, 1889a:1)
- ⁷ Polish text quoted: "sumiennem badaniem arcydzieł dawnej architektury wprowadzono samoistną twórczość w duchu przeszłości" (Łuszczkiewicz, 1888:1)
- ⁸ Polish text quoted: "To jest napad barbarzyński na piękno stylowe", "To co wniosły tu epoki upadki sztuki, a przede wszystkim barokko, zapanowało nad pięknymi liniami pierwotnej architektury, a przyczepione do zrębu w odmiennej zasadzie pomyślanego, tworzy dysharmonię" (Łuszczkiewicz, 1889b:1)
- ⁹ Polish text quoted: "triumf naszej epoki, że potrafimy się wtajemniczyć w charakter stylowy i dopełnić we właściwym duchu prace przeszłości" (Łuszczkiewicz, 1889b:1)
- ¹⁰ Polish text quoted: "Nie to się buduje co było, ale co wyobraźnia artysty widzi"
(Popiel, 1881:2)
- ¹¹ Polish text quoted: "jedyną drogą do uzyskania planów na restaurację Wawelu jest droga publicznej konkurencji" (Pierwszy Zjazd Techników ... , 1882)
- ¹² Polish text quoted: "przewodnią ideą restauracji Zamku będzie nie upiększać ale konserwować", "konserwatyzm taki nie sprzeciwia się usuwaniu bezwartościowych ... dodatków epoki porzobiorowej" (Uchwała Grona ... , 1909:298)

-
- ¹³ Polish text quoted: "Społeczeństwo polskie uważa Wawel za pomnik żywy. Z tym trzeba się liczyć i nie można tego najprzedniejszego w Polsce zabytku traktować jako pierwszej lepszej ruiny ... W konserwowaniu zatem należy tu pójść dalej niż przy wielu innych zabytkach." (Protokół z posiedzenia Grona... , 1908:302)
- ¹⁴ Polish text quoted: "restauracja według wymagań sztuki i pojęć dzisiejszych powinna koniecznie dążyć do przywrócenia pierwotnego stanu pięknej niegdyś gotyckiej budowy" (Tomkiewicz, 1892:53)
- ¹⁵ Polish text quoted: "aby przyszłym polkoleniom nie zagrozić w niczem drogi do uzupełnień" (Odrzywolski, 1901b:54)
- ¹⁶ Polish text quoted: "O przywrócenie katedry do dawnego wyglądu" (Stryeński, 1933)
- ¹⁷ Polish text quoted: "...rekonstrukcja gmachu nie byłaby w ścisłym znaczeniu budową nowego. Byłaby tylko uzupełnieniem fragmentu, który, jako wieża, pozostał, i tego uzupełnienia stanowczo wymaga." (Stasiak and Tetmajer, 1908:24)
- ¹⁸ Polish text quoted: "Po dłuższym zastanowieniu przychodzę do przekonania, że ma reguły bez wyjątku, że tu właśnie ten wyjątek zachodzi i uwzględnionym być powinien" (Lepszy, 1908:468)
- ¹⁹ Polish text quoted: "przywróceniem pierwotnego stanu posiadania, rehabilitacją przeszłości", "a kopia, nawet najwierniejsza, będzie zawsze falsyfikatem" (Warchałowski, 1909:30)
- ²⁰ Polish text quoted: "...niektórych cenniejszych pomników naszej przeszłości...", "...zrekonstruowane dzieła sztuki będą zawsze kopiami, ale nie oryginałami" (Kowalski, 1916:27)
- ²¹ Polish text quoted: "... istotną składową część budowli, bez której traci ta ostatnia właściwy swój charakter i wdzięk" (Szydłowski, 1919:201)
- ²² Polish text quoted: " Powinno stać się dumą każdego obywatela wzięcie udziału w usunięciu tego wszystkiego co okupacja obca narzuciła naszemu historycznemu zabytkowi" (Lelewicz, 1924:301)
- ²³ Polish text quoted: "Jest zupełnie niemożliwym ściśle przestrzeganie zasad czystej konserwacji w przypadku zabytków ważnych" (Lauterbach, 1927:261)

-
- ²⁴ Polish text quoted: "Posiadając plany i zdjęcia architektoniczne jesteśmy w możności dać dokładne powtórzenie zrujnowanych części a nawet całego zabytku ... Powtórzenie wymiarów i profili nie może być poczytane za występki przeciwko historii i przeciw sztuce" (Lauterbach, 1930:330)
- ²⁵ Polish text quoted: "W razie konieczności restauracji na skutek zniszczenia zabytku, zaleca się poszanowanie pozostałego dzieła historii i sztuki bez zakazu wprowadzania stylu jakiegokolwiek epoki (to jest również dzisiejszej)" (Lauterbach 1930:160)
- ²⁶ Polish text quoted: "Mówiąc o odbudowie polskim obyczajem przeskakujemy parę najbliższych ogniw rzeczywistości. Dzisiaj należy mówić przede wszystkim o zburzeniu Warszawy. Nie tym, które rozpoczęli Niemcy, ale tym, które dokończyć musimy sami. Nim rozpocznie się odbudowa Warszawa Śródmieścia i Starego Miasta musi być do szczytu zburzona. ... Wiem, że mnie zakrzyczycie - kult przeszłości, tradycje, Or-Ot, Kiliński, wartość zabytkowa. Wszystko to wiem, ale myślmy kategoriami zniszczenia. Czy te wszystkie argumenty istnieją jeszcze, czy jest z nich tylko popiół i wspomnienie? Czy każda odbudowa według takich schematów nie byłaby pospolitym fałszerstwem?" (Kazimierz Wyka, 1945)
- ²⁷ Polish text quoted: "Gdańsk to była jemiola na polskim drzewie. W latach niewoli i w latach niepodległości imponował nam, chudopachołkom polskiego bogactwa, bogaty na polskiej arendzie Gdańsk, a właściwie nie Gdańsk lecz Danzig. Myśmy w Gdańsku zaledwie byli sublokatorami. ... Jeśli spłonęły, padły w gruzy wszystkie zaułki starego Gdańska, ... jeśli zginęło to wszystko co przesyczone było krzyżackim charakterem władztwa w ujściu Wisły, to my tego odbudowywać nie będziemy, ani nad zgliszczami łez ronić." (Osmańczyk, 1945:7)
- ²⁸ Polish text quoted: "to idiotyzm byle pruską rudere awansować do rangi 'zabytku polskości' ..." (Drozdowski, 1956:5)
- ²⁹ Polish text quoted: "Gdańsk, syn marnotrawny, wrócił do rodzinnego gniazda" (Walicki, 1946:6)
- ³⁰ Polish text quoted: "Zniszczenie Warszawy- to jedna z prób zniszczenia narodu polskiego", "Udział zabytku w nowym życiu musi być pełny" , "ku pełnej wyrazu formie usprawiedliwiającej nazwę dokumentu kultury narodowej" (Zachwatowicz, 1945:7)

-
- ³¹ Polish text quoted: "naród i pomniki jego kultury to jedno", "będziemy je rekonstruowali, będziemy je odbudowywali od fundamentów, aby przekazać pokoleniom, jeżeli nie autentyczną to przynajmniej dokładną formę tych pomników, żywą w naszej pamięci i dostępną w materiałach", "do pełnej formy i świetności", "tragizm popełnionego w trakcie rekonstrukcji fałszu konserwatorskiego", "zdobycze myśli konserwatorskiej nie zginą w tych pracach i kiedyś może, po wykonaniu zadań koniecznych, stanimy jeszcze na czele konserwatorstwa par excellence", "wymowa kształtu architektonicznego", "siła sugestywna" (Zachwatowicz, 1946:48)
- ³² Polish text quoted: "Czy zbyt pochopnie i szeroko odtwarzane zabytki, zniszczone w czasie obecnej zawieruchy wojennej, nie dadzą przyszłym pokoleniom wypaczonego obrazu naszej kultury artystycznej, choć nawet będą wiedzieć, że mają do czynienia z rekonstrukcją niepowrotnie zniszczonego dzieła?" (Ksawery Piwocki, 1946:57)
- ³³ Polish text quoted: "dokomponowywali 'stylowo' nieistniejące budowle lub ich części." (Karczewski, 1946:196)
- ³⁴ Polish text quoted: "rekonstrukcję cechuje walor wielkiej elastyczności", "przywrócenie obiektom zabytkowym ich właściwych wartości plastycznych zamierzonych przez ich twórców, bądź nabytych w czasie ich historycznego rozwoju, z odrzuceniem wszelkich nalotów obcych, przypadkowo lub świadomie wprowadzonych dla zdeprecjonowania ich charakteru narodowego" (Ciołek and Ciborowski, 1953:8)
- ³⁵ Polish text quoted: "nawarstwień dokonanych w duchu obcym mentalności polskiej" (Saski, 1962: 68).
- ³⁶ Polish text quoted: "Tendencje restauratorskie były zaraźliwe, niebezpieczne i jeszcze do dziś występują niekiedy w przedstawianych projektach konserwatorskich" (Zachwatowicz, 1965:45)
- ³⁷ Polish text quoted: "uświadomiono sobie, że większą wartość dla narodu posiada zrekonstruowany wiernie według zachowanych planów i rycin historyczny budynek niż najbardziej czcigodna kupa autentycznych gruzów", "nie należy oddzielać architektury 'konsewatorskiej' i architektury 'twórczej'" (Goryński, 1954:3)

-
- ³⁸ Polish text quoted: "odbudowane według przekazów renesansowych" (Kandlerz, 1953:31)
- ³⁹ Polish text quoted: " współczesnej scenografii na tematy zabytkowe" (Dutkiewicz, 1955:508)
- ⁴⁰ Ciborowski commented on the architectural works built in Socrealism style: "The period of Classicist Formalism has left behind some important architectural projects in Warsaw ... When we examine these projects today, after the passage of time, against the background of the further development of Warsaw architecture, we begin to see that - apart from a few glaring misunderstandings - the buildings erected between 1950 and 1955 constitute a sort of architectural bridge between the architecture of old and modern Warsaw" (Ciborowski, 1964:304)
- ⁴¹ Polish text quoted: "Praca konserwatorska jest pracą twórczą" (Witkiewicz-Koszyc, 1949:742)
- ⁴² Polish text quoted: "specjalny rodzaj twórczości, którą by można nazwać architekturą konserwatorską", " Architekt-konserwator pracując nad rekonstrukcją musi się z jednej strony wśluchać niejako w wymowę zabytku, przeniknąć jego charakter i poznać wszystkie elementy rezygnując z ambicji wyciskania osobistego piętna, z drugiej zaś strony musi posiłkować się wiedzą i talentem tam gdzie zawodzi dokumentacja lub konieczna jest zmiana" (Lepiarczyk, 1954:34).
- ⁴³ Polish text quoted: "Nie należy oddzielać architektury 'konserwatorskiej' I architektury 'twórczej' " (Goryński, 1954:3).
- ⁴⁴ Polish text quoted:" obowiązkiem społeczeństwa jest dać artyście tworzyć a nie tylko imitować w imię złe zrozumianego pietyzmu" (Szyszko-Bohusz, 1949:174)
- ⁴⁵ Polish text quoted: "W takiej sytuacji kiedy komponent narodowy staje się wartością zasadniczą, kiedy zabytki urastają do rangi symbolów narodowych - wtedy prawie zawsze rekonstrukcja wypierać będzie inne metody. ... W Polsce preferencja zabiegów typu 'rinovazione' wiąże się z istnieniem całkowicie określonych przesłanek posiadających pewne cechy masowej psychozy, jednak przykłady stosowania tej metody spotkać można i w innych krajach. Tam przyczyny leżą nie tyle w uczuciach narodowych ile w naiwnej dążności do perfekcjonizmu i do uzyskania scalonego wrażenia w guście historyzujących poglądów XIX wieku. Do tych elementów dochodzi oczywiście pewien sentymntalizm i pasja potwierdzenia swojej osobowości" (Frodl, 1966: 35)

-
- ⁴⁶ Polish text quoted: " Niefortunna decyzja wstrzymania jego odbudowy, odblokowana po niespełna ćwierćwieczu przez nowe kierownictwo polityczne kraju, spowodowała, że przesunęła się ona w czasie - jest to po prostu powojenna odbudowa z poślizgiem. Inaczej mówiąc: Zamek Królewski przeniósł w nasze lata zasady konserwatorskie tamtego czasu na prawach owej akceptowanej wyjątkowości", " Grozi nam wybudowanie ... Polski bajkowych makiet udających zabytki i zabytków odartych z autentycznego charakteru przez duże rekonstrukcyjne uzupełnienia", " 'Zabytków' mamy coraz więcej - autentyków coraz mniej" (Łysiak, 1973:15)
- ⁴⁷ Polish text quoted: " Niefortunna decyzja wstrzymania jego odbudowy, odblokowana po niespełna ćwierćwieczu przez nowe kierownictwo polityczne kraju, spowodowała, że przesunęła się ona w czasie - jest to po prostu powojenna odbudowa z poślizgiem. Inaczej mówiąc: Zamek Królewski przeniósł w nasze lata zasady konserwatorskie tamtego czasu na prawach owej akceptowanej wyjątkowości", " Grozi nam wybudowanie ... Polski bajkowych makiet udających zabytki i zabytków odartych z autentycznego charakteru przez duże rekonstrukcyjne uzupełnienia", " 'Zabytków' mamy coraz więcej - autentyków coraz mniej" (Łysiak, 1973:15)
- ⁴⁸ Polish text quoted: "Na wstępie pragnę zaznaczyć, że osobiście nigdy nie używałem i nie używam określenia "polska szkoła" w odniesieniu do działalności związanej z ochroną, konserwacją lub odbudową zabytków" (Zachwatowicz, 1981: 4)
- ⁴⁹ Polish text quoted: " Było to więc świadome, bez hipokryzji, odejście od doktryny riegłowskiej. Nie było ono tworzeniem nowej doktryny, lecz tylko przejściem metody postępowania w okolicznościach szczególnych, dramatycznych." (Zachwatowicz, 1981: 8)
- ⁵⁰ Polish text quoted: "Lepiej zatem nie mówić o 'polskiej szkole konserwacji zabytków', gdyż to nie jest żadna doktryna, lecz właśnie wyjątek" (Zachwatowicz, 1981: 9)

6.1.2 Case Study: The Reconstruction of the Royal Castle, Warsaw, Poland

Warsaw, after 16th century engraving (photo Lorentz, 1988)

The Royal Castle in Warsaw, Poland

Fig 6.1.31

- 1 Painting by J. Steydilitz, 1852, Source: National Museum in Warsaw (photo B. Rogaliński)
- 2 In the 1930s (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)
- 3 In 1945 (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)
- 4 After reconstruction in 1971-84 (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

6.1.2 Case Study:

The Reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, Poland, 1971-1984

A quarter of a century elapsed between the demolition of the Royal Castle in Warsaw by the Nazis and its reconstruction, though the surrounding Old Town, to which the Royal Castle complex belongs, was rebuilt immediately. The reconstruction of the Royal Castle was postponed as the result of political decision and, 27 years later, initiated by another political decision. During those 27 years, the preparatory research, inventories and studies did not stop, though the decision to begin reconstruction was postponed several times. Finally, when the reconstruction works started, the research effort could be employed. The final result is a proud testimony to the Polish past.

The reconstruction of the Royal Castle, though postponed, belongs to the same post-war rebuilding effort as the reconstruction of the Old Town (1945-53) and other structures integrated with the Castle (the Tin-Roofed Palace, the King's Library, and the Bacciarelli's Atelier, reconstructed 1960-62). This is why discussion of the reconstruction of the Royal Castle will be carried out in the context of the Old Town's post-war rebuilding. Specific areas of comparison and contrast between the two will be noted, together with comments on the reconstruction practice shaped in the course of these two projects.

Relevance to national history and identity

The Royal Castle and the Old Town enclosed within the mediaeval defensive walls were the nucleus of the urban agglomeration of Warsaw, which developed over the centuries (Fig 6.1.32). Thus, the Old Town complex constituted the historic core of the city, valued for its original spatial system and historic architecture associated with important events in the city's history.

Warsaw, a small provincial town in the thirteenth century, soon evolved into the urban centre of the Duchy of Masovia and by the end of the sixteenth century became the capital of East-Central Europe's biggest power (Biegański, 1956). The years that followed brought numerous wars, much devastation and, consequently, a gradual decline of the city's political importance. The end of the eighteenth century coincided with the demise of the First Polish Republic which was wiped off the map after being partitioned by three neighbouring powers. The Napoleonic era, when Warsaw became the capital of the ephemeral Grand Duchy of Warsaw (1807), brought a short period of prosperity, again followed by stagnation. After the Congress of Vienna in 1815, it was a capital of a semi-autonomous Kingdom of Poland under the rule of the Russian tsar. The following decades, marked by successive insurrections, witnessed the city's gradual decline under a tsarist bureaucracy. It was not until the First World War that a temporary shift from Russian to German occupation gave Warsaw hope to regain its former status. Following the defeat of Austria-Hungary and Germany as well as the collapse of the Russian empire, in November of 1918 Warsaw again became the capital of an independent state, the Second Polish Republic.

1	Fig 6.1.32
2	The Old Town in Warsaw
3	1. In the 15 th century.
	2. In 1656.
	3. In 1771.

Material drawn from Biegański (1956) indicating historical development of Warsaw.

Merely two years later, that independence had to be defended at the gates of the city again, when Bolshevik hordes attempted to spread their bloody regime throughout Europe. For the next nineteen years Warsaw could enjoy peaceful development. During these years, a great deal was done to transform the former garrison town of the occupation forces into the capital of the one of Europe's more populous countries. Plans for a new, modern, urban agglomeration were drafted and soon gradually implemented. The design of Warsaw's urban development won a gold medal at the World's Fair in Paris in 1936. The exhibition *Warsaw as it will be* projected a vision of a beautiful, modern city rich in well preserved heritage architecture. Warsaw had intended to undertake the duties of host to the World's Fair in 1944. That was the year the city ceased to exist (Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994) (Fig 6.1.32a).

"At no time in their history have the Old Town and Royal Castle been subject to such a great catastrophe as during World War II. The persistence and the premeditation with which the Germans carried out the work of destroying the heart of Warsaw was unprecedented in the history of the civilised world. The programme of the total destruction of everything which could evidence the culture of the Polish nation was beyond human imagination" (Biegański, 1988:20)

Seven centuries of Warsaw history lay in ruins. Together with the city, the Royal Castle, a symbol of Polish nationhood, ceased to exist. The Old Town and the Royal Castle were among the most treasured monuments of Polish culture.

"How to explain this especially vicious destroying passion of the Nazi criminals

Fig 6.1.32a
Warsaw in 1939
(photo Ciborowski, 1964)

towards those aged monuments?". Jan Zachwatowicz (1945:7), architect and conservator, posed this question in 1945, and answered: "the answer can be found in the belief they preached: 'The nation lives as long the works of its culture live'. This is whence the German passion for destruction doubtless stems."¹ (ibidem: 7).

The ruins of the Old Town were the first to be cleared in the ruined city, though there was no urgency to do it. Unquestionably, rebuilding the Old Town became a priority to the nation, and as such, an expression of the spontaneous protest against the crime committed against the city. From the beginning of its rebuilding, the Old Town was the place of mass pilgrimages; people saw in recreation of the nation's monuments, the recreation of the nation itself (Fig 6.1.32 b).

The chronicle

The history of the Royal Castle in Warsaw is as long and turbulent as the history of the city. The Castle, adjacent to the town (the Old Town), was not created as a dominating structure in the town's silhouette, but rather as one of the elements of the defensive system; it took the role of the southeast bastion in the town fortifications (15th century). It is worth noting that this historically developed feature was suggested to be 'corrected' in the reconstructed Castle after World War II (as discussed in the next section of this chapter).

The process of transferring the centre of power from Cracow to Warsaw opened a new chapter in the architectural development of the Royal Castle. In 1596, the King Sigismund III from the Swedish Vasa dynasty established

Fig 6.1.32b
 Warsaw in 1945
 Marked brown are the surviving buildings,
 Red - destroyed
 (photo Ciborowski, 1964)

Warsaw as the capital and began remodelling the Castle. The work took many years and was continued by Sigismund's son, King Ladislaus IV in the 1630s who also erected a monument called the Sigismund Column which later became the most famous landmark of the Old City and the Royal Castle complex. Under the rule of King Sigismund III, the Castle was extended, acquiring the outline it would have until 1939. The simple cubic architectural form was typical of the Polish period called the 'Vasa style': the five-sided courtyard was formed by three storey wings with centrally located gates topped with tall towers. The tallest Clock Tower dominated the Castle complex and became a characteristic landmark in the city's silhouette. In turn, the interiors had splendid decorations. Particular fame was gained by the Marble Room, a subject of reconstruction effort 370 years later; multi-colour marble lined the walls, ceiling paintings presented glorious moments from Polish history and a gallery of the Polish kings' portraits decorated the walls. During this phase, two small towers accentuating corners of the west elevation were built. The towers were removed during the alterations in the middle of the eighteenth century and were put back in the 1970s reconstruction (Lorentz, 1988).

During the Swedish wars (1655-60 and 1702-09), Warsaw and its Old Town were to a large extent destroyed. The Royal Castle was looted and vandalized; all the precious items were either taken away to Sweden or destroyed. Even today, Swedish art collections include works of art brought from Poland during the Swedish invasion in the seventeenth century (Lorentz, 1988:37). After the first Swedish war, the Old Town was rebuilt and new

elevations were introduced to many houses. The construction works at the Castle were carried out under the reign of King Jan Sobieski III. In the early eighteenth century, the Tin-Roofed Palace was constructed south of the Castle (later integrated with the Castle). In 1703 Warsaw was again occupied by the Swedes and the Castle was looted again (Zachwatowicz, 1988:11).

Under the Saxon dynasty in the first half of the eighteenth century, the Castle underwent great transformations. The King, August III, commissioned Saxon architects to expand the northeast wing and to design new monumental garden façades (1741-46) that subsequently dominated in the panorama of the town. Further modifications of the Castle, undertaken by King Stanislaus August, were carried out in 1763-1788. During this period the magnificent interiors of the Stanislaus halls filled with works of art were created (Zachwatowicz, 1988). The famous Marble Room, neglected from the day of its creation, was repaired and, while generally retaining the original idea of design, was restored in a new shape with new paintings and decorative motives. The reconstruction of 1971 recreated the Marble Room as it appeared after this restoration. The King's Library was erected in a separate wing and the Tin-Roofed Palace was integrated with the Castle (Lorentz, 1988). These two buildings miraculously survived until the end of the war.

The loss of independence in 1795 marked the beginning of a long and tragic history of the Castle. The Prussians looted the Castle, taking almost all its furnishings. The inventories conducted at this time showed entries: "Gone with the Prussians" (ibidem: 48). When, in December 1806 and January 1807,

Napoleon stayed in the Castle, the furniture for the Emperor's apartment had to be borrowed from private places. Renovations and modification works at the Castle began in 1817, when it became a seat of the Grand Duke Constantine, the Governor of Russia. The Saxon Chapel was turned into an Orthodox Chapel and the Parliament Halls were renovated. In the same year a demolition of the city hall in the Old Town Square was ordered. The Old Town started losing its significance as a central, representative district. The composition of the Old Town population also changed; the residences of the departing patrician families were taken over by poor inhabitants overcrowding gradually decaying townhouses. The housing density grew and even the remains of the fortifications were incorporated into the newly constructed houses. After the failure of the November Uprising (1831) against Russia, the Castle became a seat of the Russian Governor General. The systematic devastation of the interiors began; the Marble Room was dismantled and the Senate Hall was converted into apartments for Russian clerks. The collection of paintings (among them the Canaletto's works) was taken away to St. Petersburg. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the elevations of the Castle, except for the Baroque garden façade, were modified (Lorentz, 1988).

In 1915, the Germans took over the Castle to house the offices of the German Governor General. A group of Polish architects managed to carry out inventory works and when World War I ended, the restoration works aimed at restoring the Castle to its former glory began. After the war, in the independent Poland, the Royal Castle became the residence of the President and state

ceremonies were held here (from 1926). The Old Town and the Castle were returned to their previously held status of the most prestigious places in Warsaw (Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994:1003).

In the 1920 s and 1930s the Royal Castle, as well as the Old Town, underwent extensive restoration treatment. The town authorities bought three townhouses in the Market Square, restored them and installed in them the Museum of Old Warsaw. Many other houses, acquired by institutions and private persons, were modernized and renovated. The remains of Renaissance and Baroque architectural detailing and decoration uncovered during the restoration works were preserved and reconstructed. At the Royal Castle, the restoration works continued throughout the period between the wars, first under the supervision of Kazimierz Skórewicz and later under Adolf Szyszko-Bohusz. Skórewicz returned the former appearance to the interiors of the Vasa Chambers and the Stanislaus Rooms, and also restored the elevations altered in the nineteenth century elevations. During the restoration works in the courtyard (1921) he uncovered and preserved Gothic remains. Szyszko-Bohusz, who replaced Skórewicz in 1928, introduced many changes to the architectural form and the detailing of the Castle. He substituted the tile roofing with sheet cooper, remodelled the Grodzka Tower and reinforced the construction of the roofs with new materials. The Castle regained its former splendour and the historic interiors were open to the general public (Zachwatowicz, 1988:12).

The Nazi invasion reached Warsaw in September 1939. During the siege of Warsaw, the Royal Castle was heavily bombarded with incendiary shells. The

roofs of the Castle burnt down, the ceiling over the Ballroom painted by the king's painter, Marcello Bacciarelli, collapsed (Fig 6.1.33). On October 4, 1939, one week after the Nazis had conquered Warsaw, Hans Frank, the Nazi Governor of Poland, wrote in his diary:

"The Führer discussed the situation with the Governor General and approved his actions, particularly the demolition of the Castle in Warsaw, the decision not to reconstruct the city, and the removal of works of art."
(in Ciborowski, 1964:44)

Another act of destruction began. After looting the Castle's interiors, the occupant drilled thousands of holes in its walls in which explosives were to be placed. Before the Castle was totally destroyed the employees of the National Museum, with the help of ordinary people, managed to save from the gutted Castle pieces of architectural ornaments, parts of profiles and bits of textiles. In this way a substantial amount of architectural details and finishes, so essential in the reconstruction of the Castle, were saved. For example the complete portal of the Grodzka Gate was retrieved from the ruins.

On August 1, 1944, an uprising broke out in Warsaw. A few days later, on August 5, Hans Frank wrote in his diary:

"Almost all Warsaw is a sea of flames. To set houses afire is the surest way to deprive the insurgents of their hiding places. When we crush the uprising, Warsaw will get what it deserves - complete annihilation".
(In Ciborowski, 1964:48)

After the insurgents surrendered, the entire population of left-bank Warsaw was driven into exile. The last act of destruction was performed on the ruined capital

1	<p>Fig 6.1.33 The Royal Castle, Warsaw</p> <p>1. In September 17, 1939 (photo Petrozolin- Skowrońska, 1994)</p> <p>2. In 1939 (photo H. Śmigacz)</p> <p>3. In 1941 (photo S. Proszowski)</p>
2	
3	

in 1944 by special troops who were systematically demolishing the city. After being carefully numbered, buildings were blown up in the order of their importance to Polish culture. This applies in particular to valuable historical monuments indicated by the Nazi art historians: the Royal Castle, churches palaces. The same criteria were applied in destroying the museums and archive collections (Zieliński, 1999). The Old Town lay in ruins. The burnt shell of the Warsaw Royal Castle, a symbol of Polish statehood and important document of Polish history and culture, was blown up (Fig 6.1.33a).

Reasons for reconstruction, promoters and supporters; early efforts

The barbarous destruction of the capital and its historic core was aimed at depriving the Polish nation of its cultural roots associated with Warsaw. After the liberation, Polish society was determined not only to preserve what survived, but also to return all the lost monuments to their former glory. Reconstruction of historic buildings in Warsaw became an emotional and moral issue as well as historical and political. The idea of rebuilding the Castle of the 'King himself and the Commonwealth', as it had been formerly called to emphasize that it was the residence belonging to the king as well as to the representation of the nation, was very present in the post-war awareness. "The rebuilding of its walls was something more than the conservation of the surviving fragments", wrote Aleksander Gieysztor, historian and head of the archaeological commission of the Civic Committee for Reconstruction of the Castle. "From the beginning, this undertaking was understood to be a national duty. The Castle, which had been

Fig 6.1.33a
The Royal Castle, Warsaw, 1945
(photos L. Sempoliński)

destroyed with premeditation as a symbol of Polish statehood and culture, was to be reborn as evidence to their full vitality" (Gieysztor, 1988:53)

The decision to rebuild the Warsaw historic core was undertaken by the government as early as in January 1945. The reconstruction works included the Old and New Towns and the adjacent areas, Krakowskie Przedmieście and Nowy Świat Streets; only the Royal Castle remained in ruins. The preparatory works aiming at rebuilding the Castle began as early as 1945 and continued despite the lack of any decision regarding reconstruction. On June 6, 1946, the Atelier for the Reconstruction of the Castle, a subdivision of the Heritage Architecture Division at the Capital Rebuilding Bureau (B.O.S), was formed and the reconstruction design for the Old Town Complex prepared by Wacław Podlewski (Biegański, 1956:11) (Fig 6.1.34). The Castle grounds were cleared and many fragments of architectural details and interior finishes were retrieved from the rubble. From the retrieved stone blocks, as a symbol of hope and readiness for rebuilding the Castle, the Grodzka Tower was reconstituted and the restored sculpture of King's Sigismund (the Sigismund Column) was re-erected on the new pedestal (Fig 6.1.35). In November 1947, the architectural team of Jan Dąbrowski began design work aiming at reconstructing the Castle to its 1939 appearance. While there was no decision about reconstruction of the castle, the rebuilding works on the surviving Tin-Roofed Palace, the extension to the Castle, began (Fig 6.1.36). Finally, on May 2, 1949, the Parliament called on the Government to rebuild the Castle (Gieysztor, 1988:53). Interestingly, the new proposed design did not consider reconstructing the historic form; instead,

Fig 6.1.34

The Old Town complex in Warsaw

Design prepared in 1946 at the Heritage Architecture Division of the Capital Rebuilding Bureau (B.O.S) by architect Wacław Podlewski and his team, implemented in 1951-54 (photo and context Biegański, 1956)

The structures discussed in Chapter 6.1.2 are marked by numbers

1. The Royal Castle
2. The Tin-Roofed Palace and the King's Library
3. The Bacciarelli's Atelier
4. The Sigismund's Column
5. The Market Square
6. The medieval bridge of the Cracow Gate
7. The city walls

1

Fig 6.1.35

The Royal Castle, Warsaw

2

3

1. The Grodzka Gate, 1947; restituted from the fragments retrieved from the ruins (photo A. Wierzyński)

4

5

2., 3. The Grodzka Gate; the remains of the gate incorporated into the reconstructed Castle (photos W. Stasiak)

4. The ruins of the south-west corner, 1945 (photo L. Sempoliński)

5. The preserved ruin of the south-west corner in 1956, later incorporated into the reconstruction (photo Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki, 1956)

Fig 6.1.36

The Tin-Roofed Palace and the King's Library
at the Royal Castle complex, Warsaw

1	
2	5
3	4
1. The Old Town and the Royal Castle, Warsaw, 1945 (photo M. Świerczyński)
 2. The Tin-Roofed Palace and the King's Library, 1945 (photo Ciborowski, 1964)
 3. The King's Library; interiors after restoration (photo K. Kowalska)
 4. The Tin-Roofed Palace and the King's Library after restoration (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)
 5. The Bacciarelli's Atelier after restoration (photo Marek, 1971)

contemporary architecture was suggested. Soon, though, the new design was rejected in favour of reconstruction. The reconstruction design, prepared by restoration architects led by Jan Zachwatowicz, was supplemented by a historical study edited by Stanisław Lorentz. The archaeological excavation, conducted in 1949-52 under supervision of Aleksander Król, revealed an underground room located beneath the garden near the surviving shell of the King's Library which occupied a separate south wing of the Castle. The conservation works at this room and the restoration of the King's Library were completed in 1966 (Fig 6.1.36). Also, the partially survived building in a north wing of the Castle, which in the eighteenth century housed an atelier of the king's painter, Marcello Baciarelli, was restored (*ibidem*) (Fig 6.1.36).

In 1951, as a result of restructuring of the conservation services, the Atelier for the Reconstruction of the Castle became a part of the multidisciplinary workshops for conservation of monuments, created in 1950 (*Pracownie Konserwacji Zabytków PKZ*). It was decided that the best means to obtain a design for the surroundings of the reconstructed Castle would be through a competition for invited architects and their teams. In 1954, the Association of Polish Architects held a closed competition (number 193) to design a Castle precinct: the square in front of the Castle and the adjacent part of the Old Town. The commission that worked out the conditions of the competition had to take a stand on the fundamental question of whether the former urban and architectural form was to be reconstructed, or the opportunity taken for some modifications. The opinion of the commission was twofold: "the reconstructed Warsaw Castle

should maintain its former floor plan outline and architectural form" and "the Warsaw Castle should be reconstructed as a dominant in the silhouette of the Old and New Town"² (in Biegański, 1971:356). The commission also adopted a position regarding the execution method; architecturally, the reconstructed Castle should constitute a separate form from the rest of the Old Town complex and should be significantly more elevated above the level of the Castle Square (Plac Zamkowy) than originally. The projected vision included erecting the Castle on the elevated basement, 'correcting' this way the overall proportions of the Castle and the Old Town. It would not be a mistake to understand this aspiration to elevate the Castle and to turn it into a dominant landmark in the urban landscape, as a wish to elevate the role of the Castle in the Polish cultural landscape under the Communist regime. The result of the competition was disappointing and the commission announced that "none of the submitted works deserves a first prize", but "despite the fact that none of the designs was considered a *ready to apply* basis for the *implementation*, in the commission's opinion, all of the works contributed to establishing the guideline for the specific, as well as general approaches to the design of the Old Town complex"³ (in Biegański, 1971:356). Two second prizes went to Romuald Gutt and Jan Bogusławski. Both architects elevated the reconstructed Castle, as expected by the competition guideline, and designed the Castle Square (Plac Zamkowy) accordingly. The changes to the proportions and traffic pattern of the Square resulting from elevating the Castle, as well as changes to the overall interrelations of the architectural forms of the Old Town complex (the elevated

Castle overwhelmed the complex), led to reassessment of the guideline regarding changing the original setting of the Castle. It was decided that the reconstructed Castle should not be elevated and it should appear in its original historical forms, not altered by modifications. This conclusion echoed the earlier decisions undertaken in the preliminary design prepared in 1948. The approach of the Architectural Conservation Commission, formed by the Ministry of Culture and Art in 1955 to manage the reconstruction project, was similar.

Despite all these activities, no formal action initiating reconstruction of the Castle was undertaken by the government. In the early 1960s, the remains of the Castle were preserved as a ruin (Fig 6.1.37).

The reconstruction of the Old Town

Meanwhile, at the Old Town, the last reconstruction works were completed. As early as 1945, a team of architects led by Jan Zachwatowicz, Piotr Biegański and Mieczysław Kuźma drafted the plans for the reconstruction of the Old Town and the surrounding area. The basic reference material they used in preparation for the replication works was a series of Warsaw landscapes painted by Bernardo Bellotto Canaletto in the eighteenth century, some photographs, and a collection of inventory drawings prepared in the 1930s by the students of the Architecture Department, Warsaw Polytechnic. The inventory drawings constituted a part of their practical training in history of architecture, a tradition carried on until today. During the years under the Nazi occupation, the Department continued its work underground and aspiring architects secretly continued recording the Warsaw historic architecture. The precious drawings

Fig 6.1.37
The preserved ruin of the Royal Castle, Warsaw, 1960 (Ciborowski, 1964)

were smuggled out of the burning city after the defeat of the Uprising in 1944 and hidden until the end of the war. The reconstruction of the Old Town was mainly based on these drawings.

The first phase of the Old Town Market Square's rebuilding was finished in 1953, but the reconstruction of the remaining quarters dragged on until 1962 (Zieliński, 1999:25). In many aspects, such as implementation schemes of the conservation program and technicalities of execution, the reconstruction of the Old Town became a conservation guideline for the reconstruction of the Royal Castle. Especially, the established criteria for selection of the phases in the buildings' development that were to be reconstructed provided a basis for the respective criteria in the Castle's reconstruction. Replicating the various historical layers revealed by the archaeological research resulted in architectural forms very different from those destroyed during WW II. "This was particularly the case when in the preserved parts of an object a several historical stages occurred and when each of the stages deserved attention because of its artistic value", wrote about the rebuilding of the Old Town Piotr Biegański (1988: 24), architect responsible for the post-war reconstructions in Warsaw and Conservator General for Warsaw in 1947-54. Artistic and informational values of the relics uncovered in the ruins during the archaeological excavations were especially appreciated in the reconstruction of the Old Town townhouses.

The reconstruction works at the Old Town were preceded by detailed archaeological research. The ruined Old Town resembled a gigantic archaeological dig and the archaeological research carried out provided a

primary basis for reconstruction. It was discovered that the mediaeval layout of the residential complex could be clearly detected and replicated. Moreover, after removal of the ruined houses at the perimeter of the Old Town complex, the remains of almost the whole medieval defensive system, including relics of the towers, gates, barbican bridges, previously integrated into the dense residential housing, were uncovered. The city walls survived nearly intact and this made it possible to reconstruct a part of the defensive system with the Barbican, the gates and the bridges spanning over a moat (Fig 6.1.38, 6.1.38a, 6.1.39). These discoveries prompted reconstructing of the Old Town complex in its mediaeval shape. Consequently, when in 1977, during the rebuilding of the Royal Castle, the remains of the mediaeval city gate and bridge were uncovered in the Castle Square (Plac Zamkowy), a decision was made to reconstruct the bridge as a subsequent part of the earlier replicated fortification system. The gate (the Cracow Gate/Brama Krakowska), torn down in 1808-18 with other buildings in the Front Court (Dziedziniec Przedni) to create a spacious square in front of the Castle (the Castle Square/Plac Zamkowy/), was not reconstructed and the shape of the Castle Square remained unchanged.

Replicating the Old Town in its medieval urban form permitted elimination from the reconstruction of the late fifteenth century buildings inside the blocks. As a consequence, spacious courts, resembling the oldest phase of the development, appeared. It helped to improve living conditions in the Old Town area (Biegański, 1988:24). Exceptions were made for two blocks: Świętojańska at Piwna Streets and Market Place (Kotłataj Side) and Piwna Street; here the

Fig 6.1.38
The Old Town, Warsaw, 1945; the ruins of the 14th and 15th century defensive city walls and the 18th century townhouses in Podwale Street,
(photo St. K and R. Jabłoński)

Fig 6.1.38a
The Old Town, Warsaw; the city walls in Podwale Street after reconstruction
(photo St. K and R. Jabłoński)

Fig 6.1.39
The Old Town, Warsaw; the city walls after reconstruction
(photos K. Jabłoński)

historical value of the latest phase of the development was decisive in reconstructing the blocks as they appeared in 1939 (*ibidem*: 29). The practice of clearing the inside courts of the blocks was extended also to the cases in which no replicating of the mediaeval block pattern took place; simply, in order not to reproduce poor living conditions (ill-lit, unsanitary) in the rear courts of the reconstructed houses, some of the outhouses (mainly nineteenth century additions) were removed or the depth of the building was reduced (Ciborowski, 1964:284, 291; Biegański, 1988:29). In such enlarged courts trees and shrubs were planted (Fig 6.1.40). For the same reason, many houses have been rebuilt with features, such as dormer windows, that had not existed before (Fig 6.1.41, 6.1.42, 6.1.42a). Biegański (1956:13) referred to this practice as "searching for compromise in approaching contemporary residential standards and authenticity of the urban form"⁴.

"Probably, it would have been most consistent, in keeping with the plan assumed for the Old Town district, to attempt to restore also, within the defensive walls, the Gothic character of construction forms ...", wrote Biegański (1988:24), "However, neither the number of preserved mediaeval remains, nor iconographic material justified the reconstruction of the Old Town in the Gothic convention". The decision was made, that the townhouses would be reconstructed in their late Renaissance and Baroque form. "In this way", concludes Biegański, "on a mediaeval plan, a new Baroque, and partly late Renaissance, town arose" (*ibidem*). Reconstruction of the houses as they appeared before the destruction was not considered; only the stages in the houses' development perceived by the

1945

1964

Marked black are the surviving buildings,
 Grey - destroyed
 (Black dotted line -location of the city walls,
 R. C. - the Royal Castle, by B.M.)

Fig 6.1.40

The Old Town in Warsaw

Comparison of the housing density before World War II and after the reconstruction.
 (photos and context Ciborowski, 1964)

Fig 6.1.41
The Old Town Market in Warsaw, the Zakrzewski Side

Above: the outline of the ruins (in black) and
the inventory drawing before WW II (in grey)
Below: the inventory drawing of the reconstruction;
new dormers are introduced

(photo Zachwatowicz, 1956)

Fig 6.1.42
The ruins of the Old Town Market in Warsaw, the Zakrzewski Side
(photo Ciborowski, 1964)

Fig 6.1.42a
The reconstructed Old Town Market in Warsaw, the Zakrzewski Side
(photo Ciborowski, 1964)

conservators as remarkable for their artistic values were designated for replication. For the same aesthetic reasons, newly designed polychromatic painted finish in seventeenth century manner was added to front elevations or a new, contemporary architectural detail was introduced (Fig 6.1.43, 6.1.44). The adaptation of the burgher houses, which in the seventeenth century were used by one family only, to the contemporary crowded multifamily dwellings (according to the housing standards in the 1950s, a family of three would occupy 35 m² /400 ft²; B.M.), required transforming them into a set of two or three room apartments. Also some adjustments to the design had to be made in order to accommodate modern standard facilities and equipment. The stress in the redesigning process was on maximum protection of the authentic fabric and preservation of the historic layout. It was decided that the ground floors would be converted into the services space, while the upper floors maintained their original housing function. Some space was reserved for social institutions, restaurants, cafes and tourist services. Traffic was removed from the Old Town area and redirected through the adjacent streets and a newly constructed (1947-49) tunnel under the Castle Square, called the East-West Route (Trasa Wschód-Zachód/ W-Z). Consequently, the Castle Square was freed from transit traffic, historically intersected at the square (Fig 6.1.45). This changed the urban character of the Square and its surroundings (including the later reconstructed Castle) from a 'passed by place' to an undisturbed 'destination place' (Fig 6.1.45a). In order to achieve an effect of 'travelling in time', street events like street entertainers and cart rides were introduced, and elements of street architecture such as flower

Fig 6.1.43
The Old Town, Warsaw; polichromatic painted finish on the
reconstructed townhouses
(photo K. Jabłoński)

Fig 6.1.44

The Old Town, Warsaw; Piwna Street after reconstruction

1. The contemporary designed (1953) portal of the building at 6 Piwna Street; the design of the portal was inspired by a character, an old woman who had been feeding pigeons in Piwna Street. (photo B. Myslinski).

2. The 'Pigeon Woman', 1950 (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

3. Piwna Street after reconstruction (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

1	2
3

Fig 6.1.45

The Old Town, Warsaw; the traffic pattern in the area

1. The Royal Castle and the Pancer Viaduct, painting by J. Steydltz, 1852-55,
Source: National Museum in Warsaw (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

2., 3. The Pancer Viaduct, 1920s (photos Ciborowski, 1964)

4. The East-West Route (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

5. The tunnel of the East-West Route (photo w. Stasiak)

Fig 6.1.45a
 Warsaw in 1982

(photo Encyklopedia Popularna PWN, 1982)

Interestingly, the map shows a bridge (most northern) that has never been built but only planned to be built in the 1970s by the Gierek Government

vendors stands, streetlights, signage, and road paving were executed in a manner complementing the ambience (Fig 6.1.46).

The reconstruction of the Old Town established inter-disciplinary cooperation in the design and implementation of the restoration and reconstruction projects. Further, it provided an opportunity for methodological debate and helped formulate principles and influence conservation legislation. The close cooperation between architects, archaeologists and engineers resulted in an approved consensus regarding conservation principles and their implementation. A similar approach was later adopted in the reconstruction of the Royal Castle.

Reasons for reconstruction of the Royal Castle, promoters and supporters

The reconstruction of the Castle was postponed mainly for political reasons, though economic reasons, so often emphasized in the official statements as the only cause (Zachwatowicz, 1988:19), were also of some consideration. Apparently the political leaders of the new Communist regime were resentful of the idea of rebuilding the symbol of the Polish democratic political heritage. The riots in the Baltic coastal cities in December 1970 prompted and accelerated appropriate decisions in favour of reconstruction. Evidently, the politicians estimated that such a benevolent gesture would calm the political unrest and, at the same time, legitimate the Communist government as the rightful heir of Polish history. Dobby (1978:86), quite rightly, deduces that "the politicians must have assumed a relationship between the Castle, with its long association with famous monarchs, and national unity". Indeed, the

Fig 6.1.46
The Old Town, Warsaw, after reconstruction
(photos Z. Świątek)

reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw was regarded as a " typical 'unifying' project"⁵ (Londyńczyk, 1971:78) and an idea of national unity under the banner of the Castle's reconstruction was supported by both opposing sides: the Communist government and the Polish nation represented by the intellectual elite. It is clearly expressed in the Civic Committee's appeal to the nation , that became a founding document for the reconstruction, as well as in the statement delivered by the Communist government (discussed later in this chapter).

It was finally in January 1971 that the government decided to undertake the reconstruction (Fig 6.1.47). The project was to be implemented by means of voluntary work and donations. The Civic Committee for the Reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw had been appointed to supervise the reconstruction works and funds collection. The Committee consisted of representatives of all social circles. The representatives were formed into commissions of five subcommittees which would supervise work in five different fields: history, archaeology, architectural conservation, economics and public relations. The Chairman, Józef Kępa, Executive Secretary with the Communist Party, stated at the first opening meeting on January 26, 1971:

"The rebuilt Castle will be a monument of the national culture and science. It should be accessible to all the citizens as a historic monument and museum. It will be a symbolic expression of the connection between all the Poles around the world. As an effect of our work on its rebuilding, there will be new values created that would belong to all of us. Millions of Poles will have their contribution to this work. The work will reinforce our unity."⁶ (Krzysztoforski, 1979:5)

Fig 6.1.47
The reconstruction works at the Royal Castle, 1970s
(photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

It is clear from the way Kępa promoted the rebuilding of the Castle, that the Communist government took this opportunity to present itself as a part of the nation, a participant in its culture and a heir to the nation's heritage. It was important to the new Gierek government, that took leadership in the time of the political unrest in 1970, to gain the nation's support. Facilitating a common effort of reconstructing the most treasured historic monument seemed to be a perfect political move.

The Committee for the Reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw addressed to all Poles, at home and abroad, an appeal for support. An appeal of the Committee was emphasising unity of all Poles around the globe in a common rebuilding work, but generally the tone and message of the appeal was different from the government's statement. It presented the Castle as a symbol of the Polish historical past, independent statehood and continuity of Polish nationhood:

"Fellow countrymen, Poles at home and Abroad,

Varsovians living in the reborn capital,

Varsovians dispersed all over Poland,

Varsovians living in various parts of the world,

The Civic Committee for the Reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw addresses to all of you a cordial appeal:

The Royal Castle will be reconstructed. We shall raise it from ruins by a common, national effort. No one feeling and thinking Polish can shun this great cause ...The invader not only destroyed the burnt walls but wanted to obliterate the Castle for all times as a symbol of the Polish independence and statehood. He wanted to deprive us forever of a great document of the lasting character, independence and pride of the Polish nation...

The Castle ... will become, just as it was during the past centuries, a monument linking the past, present and future generations of Poles, a testimony to the continuity of national history...

The Civic Committee for the Reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw appeals to all Poles at home and all over the world to participate together in the implementation of this great task. We shall reconstruct the Castle with our own means collected by the community and by our works...

Despite all the historical storms, the Royal castle, monument of our independent statehood, will once more tower over the steep bank of the Vistula River." (Lorentz, 1971:supplement; English version)

The appeal was met with an extremely warm response in Poland as well as abroad (Krzysztoforski, 1979). The work done by volunteers was estimated to be worth 36 million zloty (Gieysztor, 1988:55); an average monthly salary in the 1970s was: 1971- zloty 2,358.00, 1,983 - zloty 14,1475.00 (Obwieszczenie..., 1990). It is worth noting that many valuable gifts, including artworks, were donated to the Castle by individual persons, national or foreign institutions and foreign governments (Gieysztor, 1988:55). Ordinary people were donating small sums. A huge glass box was placed in the Castle Square, in front of the Castle under reconstruction, for the collection of money. It was not unusual to spot a wedding ring through the glass (from personal observation). In total, almost one billion Polish zloty and about 820,000 American dollars had been collected. This covered the cost of the reconstruction without help from the government.

The Poles abroad were equally enthusiastic, though there were some sceptical voices. "There is no Pole in the country or abroad that would oppose rebuilding the Royal Castle, which constitutes a historic symbol of the Royal

Capital City of Warsaw. Warsaw without the Castle is not the complete Warsaw."⁷ the editors of *Kultura*, a periodical published in Polish in Paris (Londyńczyk, 1971:78), stated in March, 1971. The editors expressed their concerns regarding economic aspects of the reconstruction project: "Where to get money from? Certainly, an eternal scheme will be favoured; donations in the country and from abroad - 'voluntary' self-taxation of labourers, clerks, teachers etc."⁸ (ibidem). They suggested that the reconstruction should be sponsored by "those who blew it up, i.e. the Germans"⁹ (ibidem), since the decision about destruction of the Castle did not belong to any military operation and as such should be classified as an act of vandalism on the part of the Third Reich. In a result, concluded the editors, the DBR (West Germany) as well as DDR (East Germany) were responsible for covering the cost of the rebuilding. The editors expressed the belief that Chancellor Brand would not decline this opportunity to normalize his government's relationship with Poland¹⁰. Other voices from abroad were more concerned with the pragmatism of the reconstruction project and not believing in the officially stated 'voluntary donations' from the Polish factories and enterprises, regarded the reconstruction of the Castle as a luxury which Poland could not afford (Adamski, 1971:99).

The preparatory research and preliminary design process

As mentioned earlier, the preparatory research began soon after Warsaw had been freed from the Nazi occupation. The National Museum in Warsaw drew up the inventory list of all the saved relics; a few thousand architectural and sculpted pieces, more than sixty sculptures, sixteen fireplaces, hundreds of

pieces of furniture, and more than three hundred paintings. These remains, as in the case of the reconstruction of the Old Town, played an important role in the decision making process regarding the development of the reconstruction plans for the Castle, wrote Biegański (1971:354) in the year the reconstruction works began. The only difference, he said, was that the amount of the salvaged fragments was much greater than in the case of the Old Town. "As a result of this", stated Lorentz (1988:51) upon the reconstruction works' completion, "it was not only possible to reconstruct the Castle with complete accuracy ... but also it is to a large extent authentic". The remains of the Royal Castle were on display in the halls of the Warsaw National Museum in a special exhibition organized in March 1971, just two months after the decision to reconstruct the Castle was made.

In 1971, on the basis of the inventories, as well as three thousand photographs and the pre-war restoration design, the immense task of planning the reconstruction started. The reconstruction design was drawn up by the Atelier for Monuments Conservation (PKZ), under the supervision of Prof. Jan Bogusławski, architect. On behalf of the Civic Committee it was approved by a commission headed by Prof. Jan Zachwatowicz, architect. The construction works were preceded by archaeological excavations that resulted in discovery of the earlier structures from the Vasa period. The excavated remains as well as the ones preserved in the post-war years were planned to be integrated into the reconstructed structure. Regarding the remains of the architectural detail made in stone and not identified as belonging to the particular location, such as window

encasements, the decision had been made to incorporate them into the structure not in clusters, but dispersed in such manner that they could be visible to the visitors (i.e. at sight level) (Protokół Komisji..., 1971). Despite the efforts aimed at preserving as much as possible of the authentic material, a substantial amount of it was lost during the construction works on the foundations. In order to meet contemporary construction standards, the foundation walls had to be partially replaced or reinforced. The cellars were deepened and widened so as to house service rooms. Similarly, the design of the reconstructed building had to be adapted to accommodate contemporary equipment, for example, the walls of the Clock Tower (Sigismund Tower) were constructed thinner but stronger than originally in order to enclose the air conditioning system.

The decisions regarding reconstruction works were supplemented by on-going archaeological and historical research. Archaeological research continued throughout the entire period of the architectural reconstruction works (1971-78) and its output was accommodated accordingly. In 1977, the archaeological team working in the Castle Square uncovered the remains of the medieval bridge, as noted earlier. The reconstruction of the bridge in 1982-83 added to the emerging new shape of the Castle Square (Fig 6.1.48). The results of historical research resulted in adjustments to the design of the Castle's architectural form; in the first year of reconstruction works, a roof for the Grodzka Tower was redesigned.

The reconstruction

"The decision made as to what the reconstructed Castle should be consists firstly in the restitution of its architectural form, secondly, in the

1 | 2
—
3

Fig 6.1.48
The Castle Square, Warsaw; the medieaval bridge uncovered during the archaeological research in 1977 and reconstructed in 1982-83 (photos 1. Polish National Tourist Office; 2. K. Jabłoński; 3. Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

reproduction of its ideological contents", wrote Gieysztor (1988:57) in the first years after completion of the reconstructed work, "This can be achieved by the most careful possible equipment of the Castle interior as a great sequence of former reception, official and living rooms". It seems here appropriate to refer again to a definition of the term 'restitution'. In the conservation literature the term *restitution* connotes rebuilding of the structure with the use of the remains of its authentic material (Chapter 2.3) but is often criticized as a pretext to reconstruct on the basis of just a few pieces of original material (Jokilehto, 1999:188). The use of the term 'restitution' in regard to the reconstruction of the Royal Castle has stemmed from the conviction among the members of the Reconstruction Committee that the amount of authentic material surviving, such as the foundation walls and the fragments of architectural detail, interior finishing, decoration and furnishing (integrated into the reconstruction) is sufficient to call it restitution. It is understandable, that the rebuilding of the highly esteemed monument was preferred to be perceived as a conservation activity, rather than reconstruction, a practice excluded from conservation activities by the Venice Charter. It is arguable that the recreated Royal Castle in Warsaw would be classified as restitution when compared to other restitutions completed under similar conditions (e.g. the ruined ancient temples of Aegina and Bassae in Greece, the front elevation of the ruined Celsus Library in Ephesus, now Turkey). It seems, however, appropriate to take application of the term 'restitution' in regard to the recreation of the Castle as a *goal* rather than the *method*. However some specific restitution took place in the reconstruction work

on the Royal Castle. In the result of reconstructing the architectural form, as well as reproducing the interiors and re-furnishing them with the salvaged artworks, the place was returned to its material frame and, consequently, resumed its symbolic meaning; in this respect it has been restituted. The restitution of its symbolic meaning was influenced by the arbitrary choices of those who decided which features were to be reconstructed and how they were to be interpreted.

The process of reconstruction of the Castle took fourteen years to complete. During those years Poland was undergoing important changes. Władysław Gomułka, who came to power in 1956 in the liberal atmosphere of the 'Polish October', soon suppressed political pluralism. Gomułka was against rebuilding the Castle which symbolized the political tradition antagonistic to the Communist regime (Londyńczyk, 1971:78). Edward Gierek, who replaced him as a party chief in 1970, modernized the Polish economy at the price of high credits from the West. The reconstruction of the Castle began in the climate of the political liberalization and prospective economical prosperity. The undertaking of the long postponed reconstruction was itself a proof of this change. Upon the beginning of the reconstruction project in 1971, it was decided that the Castle would be rebuilt in the same architectural form as it was in 1939, with a few modifications; two towers and four dormers were added to the west elevation, the Grodzka tower, which was initially to be rebuilt with a Baroque roof, was to be reconstructed to its form dating back to the pre-Vasa period when the tower's roof was integrated with the rest of the Castle building. The Saxon Annexe was not to be replicated and the elevations altered during the 1920s restoration,

questioned by the post-war conservators, were 'returned' to their architectural uniformity (Zachwatowicz, 1988).

The questioned restoration works conducted in the 1920s, after Poland regained its independence, had been aimed at removal of the alteration designed by Coriot and introduced in the period of the Russian occupation. "It should become a pride of every citizen to participate in removal of what the foreign occupation imposed on our nation"¹¹, wrote architect Marian Lalewicz (1924:301). Consequently, the alterations were removed and the elevations restored to the form consistent with the intact part of the north elevation. Fifty years later, the historical research conducted during the reconstruction of the Castle proved that the changes to the elevations designed by Coriot were not "imposed" but, quite contrary, were consistent with the architectural form of the annexe designed in the eighteenth century by Jakub Fontana (Kwiatkowski, 1976:76). The elevations resulting from the 1920s restoration works, evaluated in the 1970s by Jan Bogusławski as erroneous and based on "unrestrained interpretations of historical documents"¹² (Krzysztoforski, 1978:8), were not replicated and the adjustment was made to return them to the "proper character and architectural form" (Zachwatowicz, 1988:268). The decision most criticized in the pre-war years that is the covering of the Castle's roof with tin sheets was corrected and reproduction ceramic shingles were installed. The ceramic shingles also replaced the tin roof of Bacciarelli's Atelier. Achieving balance of forms and materials from different phases of the historical development in a new 'eclectic integrity' was set as a main goal of the reconstruction works. The

criteria were arbitrarily established by the conservators. Similarly, the stages in the architectural development of the Castle were evaluated based on their perceived quality of style and historical significance. This resulted in reconstructing the most treasured architectural phases in the Castle's development, and removal of the features that had been considered "redundant accretions"¹³ (Krzysztoforski, 1978:8). In its final shape, the reconstructed Castle represents an early Baroque form, and although it contains some elements from the earlier phases of its development, all the characteristic features refer to this period (Fig 6.1.49, 6.1.50).

The most controversial issue in the Castle's reconstruction was replication of the Gothic remains uncovered in the 1920s in the Great Court. The voices strongly opposing replicating the remains argued, that while rebuilding the overall architectural composition of the Castle was acceptable, recreating the archaeological remains would undermine the credibility of the reconstruction project. The opponents further maintained that since the authentic relics retrieved from the ruins were planned to be incorporated into the reconstructed building, creating an illusion of incorporating the Gothic remains would cause a devaluation of the principle of the entire conservation effort. The decision was made in favour of replicating the Gothic remains on the ground of their educational use as a medium in facilitating comprehension of the destroyed relic (Fig 6.1.51).

In 1974, for Poland's thirteenth anniversary as a 'People's Republic (July 22) the shell of the reconstructed Castle was completed. "We have achieved

1	5
2	6
3	7
4	

Fig 6.1.49

The Royal Castle in Warsaw

1. In 1920s (photo Ciborowski, 1964)

2. In 1938 (photo Ciborowski, 1964)

3. In 1930s (photo Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994)

4. In 1939 (photo Ciborowski, 1964)

5., 6., 7. After reconstruction (photos 5. W. Stasiak; 6. Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994; 7. K. Jabłoński)

Fig 6.1.50

The Royal Castle, Warsaw

1. The garden elevation, 1924 (photo H. Podębski)

2. The garden elevation after reconstruction
(photo K. Jabłoński)

3. In 1924, (photo H. Podębski)

4. After reconstruction (photo K. Jabłoński)

1
2

Fig 6.1.51
The Great Court at the Royal Castle, Warsaw
 1. The Gothic remains before 1939 (photo H. Poddębski)
 2. The reconstructed Gothic remains (photo K. Jabłoński)

quite extraordinary results"¹⁴, Lorentz summed it up (In Krzysztoforski, 1979:58), emphasizing that the multi-disciplinary and cooperative approach that was observed in the decision making process was reflected in the integrated implementation of the project. The multidisciplinary approach to reconstruction of the Castle, like in the first post-war years at the Old Town, resulted in complex operations on the construction sites; reassessment research required ongoing designing work and flexible implementation: "Historical research was coordinated with completion of the working drawings, construction works were synchronized with archaeological excavations" ¹⁵(ibidem).

The next phase of the reconstruction project, reconstruction of the interiors, started in 1974. Many valuable pieces of furniture and artworks presented to the Castle by individual persons, national and foreign institutions and foreign governments helped complete reconstruction and added to the splendour of the Castle interiors. Among the gifts were an Arras tapestry from the Jagiellonian series and artworks once taken away by Tsarist Russia and now returned by the Soviet Union. The design and reproduction of works was based on the preserved remains, old inventories, and photographs. For example, the Marble Room, the decoration of which had been removed in 1835 by the Russian occupant, was reconstructed to its original form based upon the inventories from 1771 by J. Ch. Kamsetzer (Fig 6.1.52). "Since all the essential elements of the Marble Room - paintings, sculptures, even a console-table and a clock - survived, Kamsetzer's water colours permit a strict reconstruction of its architecture, including the equipment" (Lorentz, 1988:43).

Fig 6.1.52

The Marble Room at the Royal Castle, Warsaw

1. In 1920s (photo H. Podębski);

2. Inventory drawings by J.Ch. Kamzetter, 1771 (photo B. Rogaliński)

3. After reconstruction, 1980s (photos K. Jabłoński)

The Castle's interiors, like its architectural form, were rebuilt with some modifications; rather than recreating them as they appeared in 1939, stripped of their original decoration long before this year, they were re-designed in historic styles. This sometimes resulted in rearrangement of the interior details. For example, the salvaged fireplace mantle that belonged to the Green Room, completely redesigned in the reconstruction, was installed in the Officers' Room (Król, 1971:157). Apparently, the reconstruction team did not approve of the restoration of the room in the style of the early nineteenth century (conducted by Kazimierz Skórewicz in the 1920s) but they felt that the salvaged relic had to be integrated somehow into the reconstruction. This example implies that, while the questioned original design was either corrected or completely abandoned during the reconstruction process, the relics from those disqualified interior arrangements were valued for their authenticity and treasured as symbols of the heroic salvaging effort.

Similarly, the Parliament Halls in the west wing were recreated not as they appeared in 1939; the Senate Chamber was reconstructed as it looked in the famous years of the passing of the Third of May Constitution (1791). In order to do that, the preserved eighteenth-century designs and inventory were used to reconstruct interior decoration. Likewise, the New Chamber of Deputies was reconstructed as it appeared in the times of the Kingdom of Poland. The reconstruction of The King's Chapel, located in the Grodzka Tower, also differed from its appearance in 1939. The architectural form of the Chapel was replicated thoroughly, moreover the original fragments of the interior decoration (eight

green Corinthian stucco columns) were incorporated to the reconstructed interior, but the furnishing was arranged quite differently. Before World War II, as shown on the picture taken in the 1920s (Fig 6.1.53), the altar with the crucifix decorated according to the Catholic tradition occupied a central part of the interior, while after the reconstruction in the 1970s/80s the interior was furnished with an empty altar and a painting of the Madonna with the Child Jesus (from the atelier of Peter Paul Rubens) (Fig 6.1.53). The interior had lost its religious, Catholic character. The new addition to the interior was an urn with the heart of Tadeusz Kościuszko (1746-1817), a great Polish and American military hero. The change to the interior interpretation under the Communist regime is obvious; hostility and ignorance towards religion was on the Communist agenda. After the collapse of the Communist government, the Chapel was rearranged; the altar received decoration in accordance with the Catholic tradition and a kneeling-chair was added to the room to complete the ambience of a Catholic chapel (Fig 6.1.53).

In 1984, the Castle's interiors were completed, except the Assembly Hall (Ball Room), where replicating the stucco columns proved to be a challenging experience (B.M.). The year 1984 is officially accepted as marking the completion of the reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw (www.zamek-krolewski.art.pl).

The interpretation programmes

As early as February 1971, the Committee for the Reconstruction of the Royal Castle decided that the Royal Castle complex should be considered "the Monument of the National Past and the Museum of the National Culture"¹⁶

1	2
	3

Fig 6.1.53

The Chapel at the Royal Castle, Warsaw

1. In 1920s (photo M. Moraczewska)

2. After reconstruction, 1980s (photo K. Jabłoński)

3. In 1990s (photo M. Bronarski and P. Kobek)

(Raport z Posiedzenia ..., 1971:1). Lorentz stated that the decision reflects public opinion regarding the use and function of the reconstructed Castle (Krzysztoforski, 1979:27). The public debate followed presentation of the proposal for the use of the Castle (March 23, 1971) and lasted for six weeks. The majority of the respondents regarded the reconstructed Castle as a national monument and suggested using its interiors as a museum space. Many expected the Castle to become the residence of the government agencies and serve other official state functions (Krzysztoforski, 1979:16-17). In 1978, the official name of the Castle complex was announced as "The Royal Castle in Warsaw - a monument of the history of national culture"¹⁷ (Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994:1003). The decision was made that the Royal Castle would serve representative and cultural purposes; it provides a setting for cultural events and official state ceremonies.

The interpretive themes accepted and implemented in 1977 for the first visitors to the completed interiors included nine exhibitions: the Jagiellonian Rooms, the Old Delegate's Chamber, the Vasa Rooms, the Jan III Sobieski, the King's Apartment, the Historical Paintings of Jan Matejko, the Parliament Halls, the Chamberlain's Rooms, and the Apartment of Stanisław Żeromski, the great Polish novelist, who was honoured with an apartment at the Royal Castle where he spent the last years of this life (1924-25). The interior was recreated under the supervision of Monika Żeromski, the writer's daughter. (Krzysztoforski, 1979:87) (Fig 6.1.54). The exhibitions were focused almost exclusively on displaying the reconstruction works as well as the returned paintings, sculptures,

Fig 6.1.54
The Royal Castle, Warsaw
The reconstructed apartment of Stefan Żeromski
(photo M. Bronarski and P. Kobek)

Fig 6.1.55
The Royal Castle, Warsaw
The animated presentation at the Castle
(photo M. Bronarski and P. Kobek)

and original or reproduced pieces of furniture. The exhibitions mainly reflected the historical development of the Castle's space and documented selected historical events associated with the constituting of the Polish State in the eighteenth century. In addition to the permanent exhibitions, there were temporary exhibitions, such as the display of the artworks purchased for the Castle (1982/83), the historical exhibitions *The Commonwealth at the Times of Jan Sobieski III* (1983), *The Constitutions in the Polish State* (1984), the exhibition devoted to the memory of Ignacy Paderewski, composer and statesman (1985) and presentation of the history of the Renaissance city of Zamość (1985). Of extraordinary significance was the thematic exhibition in 1983 under the title *The Castle in the Warsaw Uprising* which heralded new times in disclosing Polish history, until then strictly guarded by the Communist regime; the Warsaw Uprising of 1944 had been regarded by the Communist regime as an anti-Communist rebellion and, indeed, the aim of the anti-Communist resistance was to liberate the city from the Nazis before the Soviets could do so. Until the 1990s, for the obvious political reasons, in the interpretative themes there was neither reference to the Second Republic of 1918-39 (at war with the Soviet Union in 1920), nor to the Polish Government-in-Exile in the war-time and post-war years. These themes were added after 1989, when the Communist regime collapsed. The exhibition in the President Ignacy Mościcki Study commemorates the period 1926-39 when the Royal Castle was the residence of the head of the Polish state. The interior includes the original furnishing of the Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland and

portraits and photographs of politicians from the period 1918-39. The exhibition in the Room of the Polish Government-in-Exile commemorates the years when the Polish Government took refuge in London (located during the years 1945-90 at 43 Eaton Place). The interior is furnished with original furniture which belonged to the London headquarters. On display here are the insignia of the President of the Republic of Poland handed over by Ryszard Kaczorowski, who fulfilled that function in exile, to President Lech Walesa in 1990.

In addition to exhibitions and guided tours there are museum workshops and educational programs for schoolchildren. The museum workshops encourage visitors to be active and creative. The workshops' themes are inspired by selected aspects of history, artworks or interior decoration. The participants can express themselves in different artistic activities; painting, music, dance. A special educational program has been created for young visitors. During the academic year, the Royal Castle Educational Department offers programs organized according to the age group and the school curriculum. Students are given the opportunity to become acquainted with the Museum exhibitions and to participate in animated rehearsals (Fig 6.1.55).

The detailed account presented above explored activities of the Royal Castle reconstruction and set them in the political, economical and cultural context. It was demonstrated how architectural reconstruction of the national monument was implicated in the process of formulation and propagation of nation building ideas. The reconstruction of the Royal Castle represents the considerable effort of one generation of Poles. It played a significant role in

defending a national identity under the generally hostile communist regime imposed by the imperialistic Soviet Russia, by unifying all the vital national forces in the effort to rebuild a Polish symbol of sovereign nationhood. From the conservation standpoint, the reconstruction of the Castle can be regarded as a postponed phase of the post-war rebuilding effort, methodologically based on the schemes established during these early years, particularly in respect to the multi-disciplinary interaction in the preparatory and implementation stages of the project. However, the meticulous archaeological and historical research, in both cases of the post-war reconstruction of the Warsaw historic core and the Royal Castle, had produced a rich data utilized with different goals while the reconstruction of the Old Town aimed at recreation of arbitrarily chosen phases in the area's development, mainly for their perceived artistic and informational values, the reconstruction of the Royal Castle sought the 'perfect' form, as perceived by the conservators, in accordance with artistic, historical and archaeological standards, as well as the appropriate frame for the presentation of chosen themes in the building's history, generally those associated with glorious moments in Polish history. The 'perfect' form was characterized as free of foreign influences, consistent with the Castle's long glorious past (including reconstruction of the Gothic remains) and conforming with the architectural taste of the 1970s that favoured some forms such as of the Vasa period and condemned others like some favoured in the restoration of the 1920s. Especially, the recreation of a particular phase in the interiors' decorative development served the purpose of creating a background to an interpretation

theme, in this case, the glorious days of Polish statehood in the eighteenth century. Some themes in the decoration were modified. This applied especially to the religious motives, unwelcome to the Communist supporters of the reconstruction.

It is understandable that the tremendous human and financial resources (all from voluntary donations) allocated to the Royal Castle project were expected by the nation, and the conservators themselves, to be employed in achieving the most magnificent result. An architectural purism influenced by stylistic preferences and patriotic political affirmation had been allowed to prevail in the reconstruction of the Castle, where everything that did not conform with the intentions of the conservators was removed and replaced with selected features that corresponded with the arbitrarily created image of the reconstructed relic. The conservators were aware of exceeding the norms of established conservation guidelines and postulates in the extensive reconstruction works in Warsaw. Zachwatowicz (1988:19) expresses this awareness as follows:

"The scope and the range of the reconstruction of the historic objects in Warsaw exceeded the assumptions and postulates of conservation work, bringing into the foreground the question of authenticity of monuments. However, the destruction of Warsaw was not a natural process, but an act of conscious barbarity. Therefore, it is possible to deviate from assumptions which would be respected in any other case. It is in this way that the reconstruction of the historic objects of Warsaw, an expression of the decided will of society and the concerned effort of those who carried it out, should be understood."

The consequence of this attitude have had an impact on the development of reconstruction practice; there are other 'postponed' reconstructions completed such as the City Hall in Warsaw (1995) (discussed in Chapter 2.2, Fig 2.10) and planned such as reconstruction of the Saxon Palace in Warsaw destroyed in 1944 (only the fragment containing the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, 1925, survived). The post-war reconstruction effort is judged a half century later as inadequate:

"None of the urban places have been truly restored to their former splendour. To this day they await an architectural setting that would do them justice, and other important Warsaw landmarks still remain to be rebuilt. ... The process of restoring the most important historical monuments has yet to be completed. ... One can hope that Warsaw will soon regain the splendid palaces in Piłsudski Square. Its Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is situated beneath what was left of the colonnade of one of those structures - the old Saxon Palace. ... A more difficult task will be to eradicate the results of the inept town-planning schemes implemented after 1956." (Zieliński, 1999:28-30)

The newly created reconstructions, completed and planned, have been conceived in the same scheme as the old ones, as a protest against the violent eradication of the symbolic landscape components represented by architectural heritage.

Notes

- ¹ Polish text quoted: "Czym tłumaczyć to szczególne natężenie niszczycielskiej pasji niemieckich zbrodniarzy w stosunku do sędziwych zabytków? Odpowiedź znajdziemy w haśle przez nich samych głoszonym: 'Naród żyje tak długo, jak długo żyją dzieła jego kultury'. Tu tkwi bez wątpienia uzasadnienie niszczycielskiej pasji niemieckiej." (Zachwatowicz, 1945:7)
- ² Polish text quoted: "odbudowany Zamek Warszawski powinien zachować obrys rzutu i architektury Zamku dawnego", "Zamek Warszawski powinien być dominującym elementem w sylwecie Starego i Nowego Miasta" (in Biegański, 1971:356)
- ³ Polish text quoted: "żadna z nadesłanych prac nie zasługuje na wyróżnienie I nagrodą", "pomimo, że żadna z prac nie została uznana za *bezpośrednią* podstawę do opracowań *realizacyjnych*, to jednak, zdaniem Sądu, wszystkie prace przyczyniły się do ustalenia poglądu Sądu Konkursowego na kierunek rozwiązań poszczególnych elementów objętych zadaniem, a tym samym - na całość rozwiązania zespołu staromiejskiego" (in Biegański, 1971:356)
- ⁴ Polish text quoted: "należało szukać kmpromisów zarówno w odstępstwie od normatywów, jak i od autentyczności układów przestrzennych..." (Biegański, 1956:13)
- ⁵ Polish text quoted: "{Odbudowa zamku jest} typowym projektem 'zjednoczeniowym' " (Londyńczyk, 1971:78)
- ⁶ Polish text quoted: "Odbudowany Zamek będzie pomnikiem nauki i kultury narodowej. W swej części historycznej powinien być dostępny dla wszystkich jako wielki zabytek historii i muzeum. Będzie symbolicznym wyrazem więzi Polaków na całym świecie. We wspólnej pracy nad odbudową Zamku, stworzymy nowe wartości, które staną się własnością nas wszystkich. Miliony Polaków i Polek będą miały swój wkład i swój udział w dziele, którego się podejmujemy. Scementuje to jeszcze bardziej naszą jedność" (Krzysztoforski, 1979:5)
- ⁷ Polish text quoted: "Nie ma Polaka w Kraju i za granicą przeciwnego odbudowie Zamku, który stanowi historyczny symbol królewskiego stołecznego miasta Warszawy. Warszawa bez Zamku nie jest w pełni Warszawą" (Londyńczyk, 1971:78)
- ⁸ Polish text quoted: "Skąd na to wziąć pieniądze? Oczywiście faworyzowany będzie odwieczny schemat. Składki w Kraju i za granicą - 'dobrowolne' opodatkowanie robotników, urzędników, nauczycieli, itd." (Londyńczyk, 1971:78)
- ⁹ Polish text quoted: "którzy wysadzili go w powietrze, tzn. Niemcy" (Londyńczyk, 1971:78)

¹⁰ However, the editors further explained, before it could happen, the Polish government should support DBR in requesting the Soviets to admit to the crime of murdering Polish Army officers. The massacre took place in Katyń, near Smolensk in Russia, where in 1940 on Stalin's orders, the NKVD shot and buried over 4000 Polish service personnel that had been taken prisoner when the Soviet Union invaded Poland in September 1939 in support of the Nazis; a crime blamed by the Soviet propaganda on the Nazis. In 1989, with collapse of Soviet Power, Gorbachev finally admitted that the Soviet NKVD had executed the Poles, and confirmed two other burial sites.

¹¹ Polish text quoted: " Powinno stać się dumą każdego obywatela wzięcie udziału w usunięciu tego wszystkiego co okupacja obca narzuciła naszemu historycznemu zabytkowi" (Lalewicz, 1924:301)

¹² Polish text quoted: "[Przedwojenne prace] dość swobodnie interpretowały przekazy historyczne" (Krzysztoforski, 1978:8)

¹³ Polish text quoted: "naleciałości" (Krzysztoforski, 1978:8)

¹⁴ Polish text quoted: " Uzyskałiśmy zupełnie wyjątkowe rezultaty" (Krzysztoforski, 1979:58)

¹⁵ Polish text quoted: "Badania naukowe współgrały z tworzeniem dokumentacji, roboty budowlane szły w parze z wykopaliskami archeologicznymi" (Krzysztoforski, 1979:58)

¹⁶ Polish text quoted: "Pomnik Przeszłości Narodowej i Muzeum Kultury Narodowej" (Raport z Posiedzenia ..., 1971:1).

¹⁷ Polish text quoted: "Zamek Królewski - pomnik historii kultury narodowej" (Petrozolin-Skowrońska, 1994:1003)

6.2 Canada

6.2.1 Reconstruction projects in Canada

6.2.2 Case Study: The Louisbourg Fortress, Nova Scotia, Canada

6.2.1. Reconstruction projects in Canada

This review of Canadian reconstruction practice discusses Canadian projects of national significance, that is assigned the status of a National Historic Site developed either by the federal government. Therefore the review traces the reconstruction projects (Fig 6.2.0) completed by the Canadian Parks Service and the provincial agencies and places them in the context of related historical events.

According to Shannon Ricketts (1992:22), the first known act of architectural reconstruction in Canada was the rebuilding of three gates in the walls at Québec City in 1875. The gates, which had been designated for demolition during the improvements works in street access but later saved, were rebuilt to accommodate the new traffic requirements. They were redesigned in a picturesque medieval style. It has been suggested that this reconstruction was influenced by French restorer Viollet-le-Duc's reconstruction of the fortified city of Carcassonne in southwest France initiated in the 1850s. The reconstruction of the gate was representative of the views of Governor General Lord Dufferin who initiated the project than of Canadian attitudes towards architectural conservation (*ibidem*).

Before the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries commemoration, not restoration or reconstruction, was the predominant activity associated with

Fig 6.2.0

Canada in 1994 The places discussed are marked by red dots and numbers (some by letters), by B.M.
(Sources: The General Libraries at The University of Texas at Austin; UT Library Online; www.lib.utexas.edu)

the care of heritage. A growing awareness of the deteriorating condition of historic sites inspired protection and maintenance of the neglected historic sites and occasionally limited restoration. Reconstruction did not occur, though the intention to reconstruct was brought up, for example, by the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park Commission with regard to Fort Erie (#14, Fig 6.2.0). As early as in 1914, John Jackson, Superintendent, suggested in the Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Q.V.N.F. that:

"At Fort Erie there is the remains of the old fort of one hundred years ago, which is falling more into decay as each passing year goes around. The task of ascertaining the outline and the form of this old structure might well be undertaken in order that it may be restored to something of its original condition and it is hoped that at least the history of the matter may be followed up to the end that the ruins may be rebuilt when occasion warrants it." (in Way, 1946:267)

Almost certainly the model for this contemplated reconstruction came from the American reconstruction of Fort Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain (#2, Fig 6.2.0) completed in 1907-9. The Commission, created by the Ontario government in the 1890s to control the development of public land near Niagara Falls, sponsored a few important restorations and reconstructions in the next decades but at the beginning of the century it took responsibility only for the maintenance and stabilization of the historic sites in the area. In Canada the idea of reconstruction did not develop until the 1920s and the first extensive reconstruction projects were undertaken in the 1930s (Taylor, 1990).

The first phase of reconstruction history in Canada coincided with the reconstruction initiatives undertaken in the United States, such as the spectacular reconstruction of Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia (#1, Fig 6.2.0), that started in 1926 and became a great popular success when opened in 1933. The decade of the 1920s was marked by significant changes in the Canadian heritage conservation movement. The federal government became increasingly involved in the practice of conservation through the establishment of National Historic Sites by the Parks Branch (1913), and the foundation of the conservation philosophy through the agency of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board (1919). Although the commemoration of the sites continued, it was restoration and, later in the 1930s, reconstruction that became the focus of conservation activities. The economic potential of historic sites was of increasing importance to the government. Historic sites, viewed from an economic perspective, were increasingly seen as cultural resources to be developed into tourist attractions and their development in the form of reconstructions as an employment opportunity for depressed areas. This trend intensified after the First World War when the country underwent economic stagnation, especially experienced in the Maritime region which did not recover from the post-war recession.

Another significant factor in the development of heritage conservation and later reconstruction practice was provided by the growing interest in history and archaeology. The continuing professionalization of the disciplines of history and archaeology since the turn of the century had resulted in increasing numbers of trained historians and archaeologists capable of detailed research. This

encouraged Park Service officials to attempt conservation of the historic structures since, as James Harkin, first Parks Commissioner put it: "book history never can fire the imagination like physical object lessons" (Harkin, 1914:40). Harkin encouraged preservation and, influenced by Ruskin's conservation philosophy, strongly objected to reconstruction practice. He expressed his view in the debate about the potential development of the Louisbourg Fortress in the early 1920s when he stated that " if there is nothing but a pile of stones, it is not considered good policy to erect a fort on the lines of the original one" (in Taylor, 1990:80). This approach, echoing Ruskin's philosophy, was favoured by many British architects and urban and landscape architects practicing in Canada at this time. Among them was esteemed British planner Thomas Adams, advisor to the Parks Branch, who at Harkin's request inspected the Louisbourg Fortress in Nova Scotia in 1923. Adams was impressed with the site but strongly opposed its reconstruction and advised the Branch to conserve it as a ruin in order "to give the site the appearance of not having been tampered with by 'restorers' and only suffering from natural decay and the effect of time" (in Johnston, 1983:18). He expressed concerns that historic sites might lose their national significance in the process of drastic development by turning into mere tourist attractions and, consequently, he recommended minimal interventions to the Louisbourg ruin, such as enhanced landscaping and removal of obstructing additions (Taylor, 1990:66).

The conservation philosophy of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada accounts for another important factor in shaping the development of

reconstruction practice. The Board policy was against reconstructions and considered reconstruction practice as contrary to conservation philosophy (Schmeisser, 1985 :17). Since representation on the Board was primarily by region, the regional differences in approach to historic sites were also reflected in the formulation of policy in regard to reconstruction practice. The anti-reconstruction position was held by the Ontario representatives while the representatives of the Maritimes were supportive of reconstruction projects. Especially influential for the Board policy was the position of E.A. Cruikshank, Chairman of the Board, who like Harkin, head of the Parks Branch and also a member of the Board, regarded reconstructions as "absurd and a mere waste of money", as he expressed in his comments regarding plans for reconstruction of the habitation in Port Royal, Nova Scotia (in Taylor, 1990:116). Maritime members challenged this view and their protest developed in the 1920s into a conflict. The Maritimers perceived the Board's and the Branch's attitudes not as conservation issues but as an expression of the federal government's restrictions aimed at the Maritimes. They criticized designations made by the Board. "To be frank I am not greatly impressed with the breadth of view of some of our Upper Canadian colleagues", Walter Crowe who represented Nova Scotia shared his frustration with John Clarence Webster from New Brunswick, "I think the time must soon come when some ginger must be infused into our discussion. I recently went over some of their projects - they are not national in the sense I take out of that word. But if they are to persist in their interpretation then they must not invoke the broad meaning of the word against our Provincial projects."

(in Taylor, 1990:76). According to Crowe "all the events associated with early struggles between the French and English were of national importance" (ibidem). He noted with sarcasm that the Board's decisions had proved that national importance is "an elastic term". The definition of 'national importance' was soon reviewed by the Board and though Crowe's definition raised some support, the Board did not accept such general criteria, recommending an individual approach to each case.

The question of reconstructing Fort Erie was again raised in 1927 and the Historic Sites and Monuments Board was expected to undertake the anticipated reconstruction project, but no action was taken at this time. There were more proposals for reconstructions and they were mainly coming from the Maritimes; the submitted proposals considered reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg (#3, Fig 6.2.0) and Forts Beauséjour (#4, Fig 6.2.0), Gaspereaux (#5, Fig 6.2.0), and Piziquid (Edward) (#6, Fig 6.2.0) in the Maritimes; and Fort Pelly (#7, Fig 6.2.0) in Saskatchewan. None of these sites however, was fully reconstructed at the time. Generally, the anti-reconstruction approach in conservation practice predominated during this early stage of the conservation initiatives undertaken by the federal government.

The 1930s brought an economic crisis that resulted in substantially reduced public spending. The Depression created opportunities for conservation projects since the departmental expenditures, initially reduced, were soon compensated by relief measures in the form of public works spending. In 1934, the Canadian federal government, following the precedent of U.S. President

Roosevelt's New Deal, passed the Public Works Construction Act to provide funding for the construction of public buildings across the country. Through this program the Parks Branch financed reconstructions at various historic sites. Military sites were the understandable preference for development; other types of buildings were not as straightforwardly acknowledged for their national significance. Reconstruction works took place at Fort Anne in Annapolis Royal (#8, Fig 6.2.0), Nova Scotia and Fort Prince of Wales (#9, Fig 6.2.0) located across the Churchill River from Churchill, Manitoba.

Fort Anne (Fig 6.2.1), located in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, was designated a National Historic Site in 1917. The site commemorates the role of the fort in the clash for empire between France and Britain in North America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and in the history of Acadia and Canada. The site has been fortified since 1629 when the Scots who came to colonize 'Nova Scotia' (New Scotland) built Charles Fort. After the colony reverted to France in the 1630s, the French gradually extended the fortifications and in 1702 constructed the earthworks that survive today. In 1710, during the War of the Spanish Succession, the fort fell to British and New England troops. British regiments and their families occupied the fort until 1854 (Coleman, 1988). The site consisted of earthwork ruins, underground remains of various building foundations from all the phases of construction, restored powder magazine (built 1708), underground storehouse, sally port and reconstructed field officers' quarters (built 1797) (*ibidem*). The original wooden officers' quarters could not serve the purpose of the museum planned at the site, not bring fireproof, and a

1	<p>Fig 6.2.1 Fort Anne, Nova Scotia</p> <p>1. The reconstruction of the Officers' Quarters 2. The exhibition in the Officers' Quarters 3. The restored powder magazine (photos Parks Canada)</p>
2	
3	

new museum building was contemplated. In 1935, modernization was planned so the structure could meet the required standards. The floors were to be made in concrete, the interior walls lined with lath and plaster and the exterior ones with cement formed like clapboards. J.C. Webster supported the plan and, not being particularly considerate of the original fabric, recommended replacing the exterior walls with stone. He deemed the original building as a "remnant of the English occupation" of "no historic importance" (In Coleman, 1988:180). The modernization works conducted in 1934-35 amounted to a reconstruction. The building was literally gutted and very little original fabric was retained. The new introduced structures and forms, such as Georgian entrances with columns and pedimented roofs, moulded cornices, window shutters and six-panelled doors had no historical confirmation. The fact that the conservation works on the site are today classified as reconstruction and not restoration is indicative of how perceptions and definitions that describe conservation activities have evolved over the last century (Coleman, 1988).

In 1930 another military site, Prince of Wales Fort (Fort Churchill) in Manitoba, was scheduled for development (Fig 6.2.1a). The former fur trade depot situated on Hudson Bay near the mouth of the Churchill River was among the first sites designated as a national historic site. The initiative to conserve the fort came from the provincial government which, with the almost completed Hudson Bay Railway, planned on developing tourism in the area. Development of the site was possible thanks to the availability of Public Works Construction Act funds. The site commemorates the role of Prince of Wales Fort in the

Fig 6.2.1a

Fort Prince of Wales (Fort Churchill), Manitoba

1. before reconstruction in the 1930s

2., 3., 4., after restoration and reconstruction in the 1950s
(photos 1., 2., 3., 4. Parks Canada, PWF Collection)

5. The restored and reconstructed Fort Prince of Wales in 1966
Source: Provincial Archives of Manitoba (photo Kalman, 2000)

imperial and commercial rivalry centred on Hudson Bay in the eighteenth century. The fort, which construction began in 1731, took the shape of a star, a layout popular in Europe, with four protruding bastions, outer walls divided from the inner wall by earthen rampart and the main gate protected from direct attack by a stone ravelin (Kalman, 2000:29-30). This impressive construction belonged to the most elaborate examples of stone fortification built in connection with the fur trade in Canada. The fort suffered from severe damage by the French in 1782, but even though in ruin it remained one of the oldest existing forts in the country. The restoration and reconstruction works were conducted between 1934 and 1937. The walls were reassembled and given a protective concrete cap. This modest treatment was a result of fiscal restraint rather than consciously chosen conservation method. The gateway was reconstructed with modern materials but blended with original fabric; the cement use was coloured to resemble ashlar. The restoration and reconstruction works continued in the 1950s (Robinson, 1992).

Depression relief funds were also available to the provinces and in Ontario resulted in reconstruction of Fort Henry National Historic Site in Kingston (#10, Fig 6.2.0) (Fig 6.2.2). This massive structure of dressed stone was built from 1829 to 1842 to replace an existing fortification from the War of 1812. Located atop Point Henry, the Fort guarded the naval dockyard at Point Frederick and the entrance of the Rideau Canal and Kingston. Following the First World War, Fort Henry fell into complete disrepair. The restoration and reconstruction of Fort Henry was undertaken in 1936 through a cost sharing agreement between the

1	Fig 6.2.2
Fort Henry, Kingston, Ontario	
1. View of the fort	
2	2. The West Tower (photos Parks Canada)

federal government and the province of Ontario. The restoration works were supplemented by a significant amount of reconstruction. The south curtain wall, removed in the 1890s, was rebuilt with new stone and other walls, though intact, were rebuilt with the re-laid original material. The interiors were refurbished and furnished with antiques and period reproductions. In 1938, Prime Minister Mackenzie King opened the Fort pronouncing its commemoration "in the name of all the British soldiers who served there" (Parks of the St. Lawrence, 2001:1). The opening ceremony was enhanced by a military demonstration performed by university students dressed in British nineteenth-century military uniforms who, later, also executed military drills for the tourist. It was the first animation of a historic site in Canada, which later became a part of interpretation programs at many other sites (Bradford, 1988; Mecredy, 1989).

In the 1930s the provincial government of Ontario, through the Niagara Parks Commission, sponsored four reconstructions: Navy Hall at Niagara-on-the-Lake (#11, Fig 6.2.0), the William Lyon Mackenzie House at Queenston (#12, Fig 6.2.0) and two forts, Fort George (#13, Fig 6.2.0) and Fort Erie (#14, Fig 6.2.0). The character of the development of these historic sites was a result of the Niagara Parks Commission's policy aiming at beautifying the area by creating scenic drives, romantic and antique routes and also at promoting tourism in the area. The first two projects, Navy Hall and Mackenzie House, were initially planned as restorations but by the extent of the treatment applied classify as reconstructions. Navy Hall, a monument from the British military establishment at Niagara, underwent in 1937 quite uncommon treatment. The conservation

works on the structure can be considered an example of how the planned restoration extends during the conservation process into reconstruction. William Somerville, architect, who also became involved in other reconstruction projects in Ontario, performed the reconstruction. The works started with producing several designs for the structure; the first one respected the cladding frame of the original, while the second proposed a stone veneer instead. The second design was chosen to be used as guidance in the restoration works as the fireproof qualities of the stone were considered more suitable for the exhibition contemplated in the building. In the first phase of the conservation treatment, the original structure, a ruin of the large wooden building that had once again been moved from its original location, returned to its site. A new foundation was built where the original frame of the structure had been positioned and new floor joists constructed. All the exterior walls were clad in stone. Many construction parts were replaced with new material; the roof and wall frames, floors, and window casements (Shemdin, 1974; Ricketts, 1988; Flemming, 1982). The resultant appearance of the building was completely different from the original one. The substantial use of new material as well as the changes introduced to the form of the structure does not qualify the works as restoration; in regard to the applied approaches and used techniques it is rather closer to reconstruction.

Similarly, the restoration works on the early nineteenth century stone mansion at Queenston, once inhabited by rebel publisher William Lyon Mackenzie, grandfather of Prime Minister King, amounted to reconstruction. The planned restoration of the house was, according to Prime Minister King's

wish, to take the form of a stabilized and protected ruin. King favoured a picturesque setting with ruins and has embellished his estate at Kingsmere with 'fake ruins'. The Ruskinian approach, represented by King, was overtaken by the growing pro-reconstruction approach at the Niagara Parks Commission. The plan of stabilizing the Mackenzie House ruins was rejected and the structure was reconstructed in 1936 according to the design by Somerville. New materials and technologies were extensively used, for example, the subfloors were constructed in concrete (Taylor, 1990).

A third project was completed at the site of another British military establishment at Niagara, Fort George. Fort George was built by the British between 1796 and 1799, destroyed by Americans in 1813 and finally abandoned as a useless ruin in the 1820s. In 1920 the Historic Sites and Monuments Board declared the site, at this point in a ruinous state except for the powder magazine, to be of national significance for its role in the War of 1812. The reconstruction of eleven of fourteen buildings, bastions and stockades, completed between 1937 and 1940, claimed to be based upon historical research and to return the structures to their appearance in the late 1790s. The claimed accuracy of the reconstruction works should be understood as an aspiration to validate reconstruction as a form of conservation treatment and as an ambition to set reconstructions above other forms of interpretation. In fact, the reconstruction of Fort George, as acknowledged by Ronald Way, Niagara Parks historian, did not attempt to recreate a historic form of the structures, even a hypothetical one, and was based largely on a concept of a typical period building. The purpose of the

reconstruction was strictly educational (Way, 1946; 1973). Since accuracy in the 1930s was of very limited importance (archaeological research was not considered mandatory), the reconstructed fort reflected more the aesthetic preferences of the officials involved in the project than any findings of limited historical research. For example, the log structures had not been finished as originally with weatherboarding, instead they were left exposed for the 'frontier look' preferred by the Parks officials (Watson, 1992). Moreover, due to the lack of archaeological research, the reconstructed buildings are not in their original locations, some buildings are missing while other structures, which had never been on the site, have been added. A 1975 report considers the reconstruction as "historically, archaeologically and architecturally inaccurate" (Shemdin, Panjwani, Whitefield and McConnell, 1975:6).

A fourth project was Fort Erie, reconstructed in 1937-39. The reconstruction works were sponsored jointly by the Ontario and federal governments. The fort was rebuilt to the 1812-1814 period and officially opened in 1939 with the hope expressed by the General Manager of the Queen Victoria Niagara Park Commission, McQuesten, that "the fort can be turned into a money-maker" (in Wilson, 1992:110). As at Fort George, the lack of archaeological research resulted in misinterpretation of the layout which did not correspond to any actual period in the historical development of the fort. As at Fort George, reliance on detailed research in conducting the reconstruction was claimed, but examination of the reconstruction process indicates that it should be regarded as

a declaration of intent rather than actual faithfulness to the historical records (Wilson, 1992).

Reviewing the reconstruction projects completed in the 1930s suggests that respect for the original fabric or accuracy in replication was not the immediate goal. Though, in the light of later reports (Shemdin, Panjwani, Whitefield and McConnell, 1975), the completed reconstructions are regarded as 'inaccurate' due to the undeveloped archaeological techniques, a closer examination of the declared aims of the projects reveals that achieving historical accuracy was not the concern at all. Quite the contrary, adherence to the historical records was overwhelmed by the wish to create a monument and a tourist attraction that would tend to specific needs and expectations. Significant in that respect is the explanation of the objectives set for the completion of the Fort Erie reconstruction, stating that the "purpose was not the commemoration of a victory or the rehabilitation of a noble structure ... it is a memorial to the courage and self-sacrifice of those who gave their lives in order that Canada might be the free nation that she is today" (Way, 1946:268).

Around the same time, a parallel project was initiated near Annapolis Royal in Nova Scotia (#15, Fig 6.2.0). The site commemorated the first successful attempt by the French to establish a habitation on mainland North America north of Florida at Port Royal in 1605 (Fig 6.2.3). During the 1920s, wealthy American summer residents became supportive of the idea of reconstructing the site. The American Associates of Port Royal funded historical and archaeological research and collected money for future reconstruction

Fig 6.2.3
The reconstruction of the Habitation of Port Royal, Nova Scotia
(photos Parks Canada)

works. The initial impetus to commemorate the site now known as the Habitation of Port Royal, as in most cases of Canadian historic sites conservation, came from a local historical organization, the Annapolis Royal Historical Association. The site was declared a national historic site in 1924 and in 1938, after the acquisition of the land comprising the original site by the Dominion government, the reconstruction works started. The conclusions about the original structures were based upon available, though limited, archaeological and historical data. This was a considerable improvement over the total lack of archaeological research at Fort George but even so many reconstructed buildings were built according to false assumptions. Discrepancies in archaeological and historical evidence were ignored and a combination of conjectures led to the reconstruction of a highly speculative structure. Reconstruction works were carried out under the supervision of K.D. Harris, restoration architect with the Surveys and Engineering Branch of the Department of the Interior (Jeffreys, 1939). There was no specific documentation in regard to the construction techniques of the past and the hired local craftsmen recreated the structure imitating the old techniques based on examples from Northern France. Archaeological investigations conducted in the 1960s concluded that the reconstruction was completed on the wrong site and, moreover, destroyed important archaeological evidence. Nevertheless, the Habitation of Port Royal began a new pro-reconstruction approach to conservation and interpretation of historic sites within the federal government. Schmeisser (1985:36) calls this first complete reconstruction a "milestone in the Canadian preservation movement".

Thus in the years before World War II the National Parks Branch (later Parks Canada) was inclined towards reconstruction projects and the reconstruction of military fortifications became the predominant element. The changes in the composition of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, as well as in the Parks Branch, created a pro-reconstruction policy. F.H.H. Williamson, Controller of the National Parks Bureau, contrary to J.B.Harkin, did not discourage reconstruction practice in conservation approaches. The Chairman of the Board, E.A. Cruikshank, retired in 1932 and with his departure very few anti-reconstruction voices were left among the Board members. Soon reconstruction became the most often applied form of development for the economically exploited historic sites. This appears to have occurred for several reasons. At the philosophical level, the gradual shift from the restoration to reconstruction approach prepared the ground for more reconstruction initiatives. In many cases there was a lack of respect for the original fabric and the difference between restoration and reconstruction was not obvious to those involved in the conservation projects. Reconstructions, as a treatment based on applying the old, time-consuming, handwork techniques, and the extensive scale of intervention, required large numbers of workers and were especially popular as a form of unemployment relief. The success of reconstructions in the United States in attracting tourists provided a new model for development of the historic sites also in Canada. Promoting tourism became a motivation behind many developments at the Canadian historic sites.

After the Second World War, conservation activities declined until the 1950s when the Canadian economy finally improved and the quickly developing cultural agencies again inspired heritage conservation at the provincial and federal levels. The postwar years began a new era in the history of reconstruction practice; the concept of the outdoor museum was gaining popularity and reconstructions were considered a powerful interpretation tool enhancing attractiveness of the historic site to tourists. In Ontario during the 1950s and early 1960s, the most favoured theme was the 'pioneer village'. The 'pioneer' trend was reinforced by patriotic responses to the celebration of Canada's centennial. While Upper Canada Village (#16, Fig 6.2.0) was the most recognized such site, Doon (d, Fig 6.2.0), Black Creek (b, Fig 6.2.0), Fanshawe (f, Fig 6.2.0) and Westfield (w, Fig 6.2.0) pioneer villages were also appreciated for preserving relocated historic vernacular buildings as well as replicas. The idea of creating Upper Canada Village was conceived when the St. Lawrence Seaway, planned in the 1960s, became a threat to flooding numbers of historic buildings. Typical examples were removed from their original sites and relocated to the 'pioneer village-outdoor museum' where they received restoration and reconstruction treatment (Fig 6.2.4) (Way, 1961). Equally ambitious was the reconstruction of Sainte-Marie near Penetanguishene (sm, Fig 6.2.0) where the headquarters of the seventeenth century Jesuit mission to the Huron Nation was replicated (Ricketts, 1992).

In the West the main theme prevailed among the reconstructed sites was that of the nineteenth century trading posts and forts associated with activities of

Fig 6.2.4
Upper Canada Village, Morrisburg, Ontario
(photos B. Myslinski)

the Hudson's Bay Company and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In the 1950s reconstruction works were conducted at Fort Langley (#17, Fig 6.2.0), which belonged to the Hudson's Bay Company network of fur trading posts across what is now Western Canada. The fur trade post of Fort Langley, established on the Fraser River approximately east of Vancouver, was named in honour of Thomas Langley, a director of the Company. In 1858 the "Big House" at Fort Langley provided the background for the official ceremony proclaiming the establishment of British Government on the Pacific mainland. The fortifications on the site had been present since 1827 but the structure known from the present reconstruction was erected in 1840. During the 1858 Gold Rush, Fort Langley achieved world fame as the starting point for the Fraser River gold fields. The structures slowly were falling into disrepair and finally, in 1886, Fort Langley ceased operations as a company post. In 1923 the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada declared Fort Langley to be of national historic importance. The site was commemorated for its associations with the fur trade activities of the Hudson Bay Company and for its role in reinforcing British/Canadian political interest on the Pacific Coast. Initially only the commemorative plaque was erected, but in 1927 limited restoration works on the last remaining building were conducted. In 1955 Fort Langley was established as a National Historic Park and restoration and reconstruction works begun for celebration of the centennial of the Colony of British Columbia. The only intact building on the site, the Storehouse, was restored and some sections of palisades were reconstructed. Four other buildings were rebuilt on the

approximate, but not exact, footprints of original structures. The decision was justified by the need to provide "a functional link to historic activity on this side of the fort and provide a sense of enclosure" (Fort Langley NHS, 1998:2). The incomplete archaeological records of the original layout did not set limits on reconstruction development of the site; the completion of presentation goals was the prime consideration (Whiting and Swannack, 1990).

Among the Royal Canadian Mounted Police posts reconstructed in the West were Fort Walsh in Saskatchewan (#18, Fig 6.2.0), and Alberta forts at Macleod (#19, Fig 6.2.0), Lethbridge (#20, Fig 6.2.0), Red Deer (#21, Fig 6.2.0), Calgary (#22, Fig 6.2.0) and Edmonton (#23, Fig 6.2.0). Similarly, in British Columbia, the former RCMP post at Fort Steele (#24, Fig 6.2.0) was developed with reconstructed buildings. Another British Columbia site, the gold-rush town of Barkerville #25, Fig 6.2.0), was restored and partially reconstructed to evoke a unique streetscape. By the end of the 1960s many historic sites in the West were developed into outdoor museums. The animated 'living' museum, an extended idea of the outdoor museum, replaced the outmoded regional museum collections as the favoured mode of interpretation within the conservation services. Reconstructions became the most favoured presentation device in 'living museums' which were quickly gaining popularity.

Subsequently, the reconstruction treatment became an officially recognized form of 'conservation treatment' when it was included in the 1967 National Historic Sites Policy under the preservation section. Reconstructions continued to proliferate within the Canadian Parks Service throughout the 1970s

and into 1980s. The success of reconstruction as an interpretive tool ensured its continued popularity and desirability. Many of the large conservation projects pursued by the Canadian Parks Service during the 1960s included reconstructions. The elaborately interpreted historic sites recreated with extensive use of reconstructions became a recognized approach in heritage conservation beyond the 1960s. The Canadian Parks Service's effort was aimed at increasing its professional capabilities to ensure that reconstruction projects would be conducted within controlled guidelines and upon detailed archaeological, historical and architectural documentation. Nevertheless, the conflict between conservation approaches aimed at historical veracity and pragmatic approaches intended for project delivery was still present as it had been earlier in the 1930s at the reconstructed sites such as Fort George. Fort George, though, had its chance to correct the old mistakes when in the 1980s it underwent maintenance treatment, this time based on detailed historical and archaeological research. The decision was taken to "utilize this maintenance program as an opportunity, where possible and practical, to increase the accuracy of the structures" (Watson, 1992:45). This was an interesting case of restoration and reconstruction works at the reconstructed site. The restoration works included the corrections of the doors and windows placement, the replacement of the rotten structural parts and adding clapboard to the log structures. Since some structures were found to be in a very poor condition, such as the guardhouse reconstructed in 1938, the recommendation was made that it be completely torn down and rebuilt. Watson commented as follows::

"A Project Initiation and Planning System approval document was prepared recommending this approach, and it was rejected on the grounds that you can't reconstruct a reconstruction. At that point, Ontario Region decided they would never use words that began with 're' anymore." (Watson, 1992:45-46)

It is worth noting here, that since 1991 all federal buildings 40 years or older have been considered under the Federal Heritage Building Policy (FHBRO) and many reconstructed buildings falling into this category have been determined to have heritage value in their own right as either 'recognized' or 'classified' buildings (Ingram, 1992:42). The powder magazine at Fort George, an original historic structure, was 'classified', and most of the other buildings on the site were 'recognized' for their expression of the 1930s attitudes in heritage conservation. Reconstructions at Fort Anne were similarly judged and the reconstructed officers' quarters building was classified in 1988 as "a monument to the 1930s approach to preservation" (Coleman, 1988:183-184). The reconstructed officers' quarters building "has now become an artefact in its own right, sitting in the midst of 18th-century earthenworks", and should be awarded a "Classified designation, not on the basis of its status as a 1797 officers' quarters, but as an excellent example of the conservation ethic of 1935" argued Bill Naftel (1991:49) in 1991 against recommendations to 'reconstruct' it again.

At other historic sites historical accuracy yielded to the pragmatic goal of developing the site to meet contemporary standards and expectations; for example, the site of the Louisbourg Fortress and the Palace Grand Theatre in Dawson had to be developed very quickly to meet commitments at the ministerial

level and conservation works were 'abridged' at the expense of the authentic fabric that had to be sacrificed. Consequently, the Palace Grand Theatre was demolished and reconstructed according to contemporary fire and safety standards, and most important, to the time schedule. Similarly at the Louisbourg Fortress, in order to quickly build a replica, original fabric did not receive a proper treatment and had to be destroyed. Taylor (190:170-171) argues that it was the "suddenness with which they were presented and the operational problems they posed" that placed the "enormous stresses on the historic agency". Gradually the Parks Service assumed control of the project and implemented its own policies regarding development. Nevertheless, these two big projects belonged, with all their insufficiencies as well as qualities, to the next phase in the development of Canadian reconstruction practice that began in the 1960s.

The 1960s opened the "Era of Big Projects" (Taylor, 1990:169) that lasted well into the next decade. The historic sites program became dominated by a number of large projects: reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg and the Halifax Citadel in Nova Scotia, restoration and partial reconstruction of the Yukon boomtown of Dawson. All these projects were aiming at creating economic opportunities in the regions. Tourism was sought as a possible prospect, especially in the regions where traditional employment was limited or did not exist any more such as in Nova Scotia when the Cape Breton coal mines had closed down. Developments of historic sites, that proved to be such tourist attractions, were expected to result in employment for the region, establishing a

continuing tourist industry. The historic site at Louisbourg provided a perfect solution as a labour intensive project.

The Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Park, designated in 1940, is Canada's most extensive reconstruction project (Fig 6.2.5). Since the Fortress of Louisbourg has been chosen as one of the case studies, its reconstruction will be discussed in depth in Chapter 6.1.1. In this section, however, the characteristics of the project that are relevant to the development of attitudes towards reconstruction are discussed. The Louisbourg reconstruction was unique in the history of Canadian reconstruction practice. For the first time a multi-disciplinary approach was applied in the decision making process. It was a departure from previous practice that was generally based on arbitrary decisions. In 1961 a \$25 million dollar project aimed at conservation of the site. At the conceptual stage of the master plan there were concerns regarding the conservation of the historic remains and commemorative integrity of the site. The opposing views were split among the Parks historians and engineers involved in the project; not surprisingly, historians opted for conservation of the ruins and limited reconstructions that were less damaging to the archaeological remains, while, engineers, motivated by an engineering challenge, supported a total reconstruction of the site. The option for partial reconstruction was selected and construction works commenced in 1962. By the 1967 the approach had been replaced by the plan of total reconstruction, to the extent of a quarter of the original town and fortifications (MacLean, 1995).

Fig 6.2.5
The reconstructed Fortress of Louisbourg, Nova Scotia
(photos Parks Canada)

As with the Louisbourg Fortress, the decision to undertake conservation works at Dawson City (#26, Fig 6.2.0) stemmed from the federal government's concerns for regional economic development. Similarly as at Louisbourg, the development of Dawson as a historic site commemorating the role of Dawson as the 'Metropolis' of the Klondike gold fields involved disagreement between the historic site division and the Board, whose main concerns related to conservation principles, and on the opposite side, the engineers, who considered the project more as a tourist development. Once again, time and money were of the essence and, and once again elaborate, costly and time-consuming restoration yielded to quick and less expensive reconstruction. The Parks Service recommended that the decayed buildings be demolished and replicated with new structures erected according to contemporary fire and safety regulations (Taylor: 1990:172-73). As at the Louisbourg Fortress, in order to facilitate reconstruction, original fabric had to be destroyed (Fig 6.2.6).

The reconstruction of the Halifax Citadel (#27, Fig 6.2.0) stands out as a significant engineering undertaking (Fig 6.2.7). The present Citadel, completed in 1856, is the fourth in a series of forts since 1749 to occupy the hill overlooking the harbour. It is an outstanding example of a nineteenth century star-shaped bastion fortification complete with defensive ramparts, ditches, musketry gallery, powder magazine and signal mast. During the 1950s works the walls were rebuilt and the buildings were stabilized and restored. As at Louisbourg, there was a disagreement among historic and engineering divisions over the priorities in the reconstruction process: archaeologist and historians insisted that their

1	4	Fig 6.2.6 Dawson City, Yukon 1., 2., 3. Streetscape; 4. Location of the city; 5., 6. The Palace Grand Theatre (photos Parks Canada)
2		
3		
5	6

Fig 6.2.7
Halifax Citadel, Nova Scotia
(photos Parks Canada)

research should precede development, while engineers maintained priority of the development works. Finally, in the mid 1960s the development works were stopped to draw up a development plan that would accommodate archaeological and historical evidence (Taylor, 1990).

The era of the big projects continued through the 1970s. In 1976 Canada, through Canadian Parks Service, became a signatory to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (The World Heritage Convention). By this act, the federal government committed itself to safeguarding world heritage sites within Canada and to respecting the international conservation standards articulated by the Venice Charter in 1964. Since reconstruction, according to the Venice Charter, should "be ruled out a priori" (ICOMOS Canada, 1990:15), Canadian reconstruction practice had to adopt some new approaches in order to survive. The first indication of a different attitude towards implementation of reconstruction treatment was conservation of the earliest known European settlement in North America at L'Anse aux Meadows in Newfoundland. The site, discovered by Norwegians Helge and Anne Stine Ingstad in 1960, was designated a National Historic Site in 1968 and was the first historic site in Canada to be entered on the World Heritage list. This international significance resulted in forming an international advisory committee responsible for research and conservation at the site in 1970. The remains of Viking sod houses were excavated, stabilized, and reburied in situ for protection (Fig 6.2.8). The burial of the remains for protection met one of the fundamental conditions for inclusion on the world heritage list: protection of the significant

Fig 6.2.8
L'Anse aux Meadows, Newfoundland
The reburied remains of Viking sod houses (photo B. Myslinski)

Fig 6.2.9
L'Anse aux Meadows, Newfoundland
The reconstructed Viking sod houses (photo B. Myslinski)

resource. Later in the 1970s, a replica was built of the three Viking sod houses (Fig 6.2.9). The difference in the approach was that, this time, the reconstructions were built away from the archaeological remains leaving them undisturbed (Ricketts, 1990; Parks Canada 2000).

Another innovative approach to reconstruction as demonstrated by Parks Canada experts at two National Historic Sites in Quebec, Fort Chambly and the Forges du Saint-Maurice north of Trois-Rivières. In both cases volumetric reconstruction was used. Volumetric reconstruction, by limiting replicating works to the recreation of the volume of the structure, is based strictly on the evidence of ruined walls and excavated foundations. It has been suggested that the application of that treatment in Fort Chambly in 1982 was inspired by a similar approach implemented at the Castle of Visegrad in Hungary where contemporary material was used to create the outline of the historic relic (Galt, 1984:13). This type of treatment seemed to be the most suitable for protecting the ruins from further deterioration in a manner that enabled interpretation. Consequently, both conservation and interpretation could be accomplished legitimately. The first conservation works at the fort started around 1890 (Faucher, 1986:71) when Joseph-Octave Dion, journalist and history enthusiast, obtained government funds to stabilize the ruin of the buildings abandoned by the British army in 1851. Chambly was one of a series of forts built by the French on the Richelieu River as a defence system against Iroquois intrusion from the south and it also served as a defensive outpost against the British. The phase of 1750 in the site historical development was chosen by Parks Canada for conservation and

interpretation (Robinson, 1992:30). Parks Canada's development concept for the restoration, dated 1976, states that:

" the purpose of the work is to reproduce the main architectural lines of the structure as it appeared around the middle of the 18th century. The material used in the volumetric replication would be different from those in the existing structure and should make the old shell stand out so as to avoid confusion between old and new." (In Galt, 1984:15-16)

Under the direction of Parks, a private architectural firm, Blouin, Blouin and Associates of Montreal, was awarded a contract and presented a few restoration design options which were reduced to two alternatives. The first alternative proposed a translucent shell, on three of the four walls surrounding the central courtyard while the second option, less expensive, suggested similarly located walls but constructed in masonry like that that used in the original structure. Exterior and interior details would be contemporary (i.e. all the window openings would be sealed with single panes of glass). Both options included restoration of the curtain walls and reconstruction of the entire south wing, though this kind of solution did not comply with the volumetric philosophy and, moreover, was against the Venice Charter recommendations. Probably, Parks Canada still considered reconstruction as an attractive interpretation tool expected by the public. The second option was chosen and in 1980 reconstruction works started (Fig 6.2.10). Though the reconstructed south wing, which Paul Faucher, the architect in charge for the project for Blouin, chooses to call " a 'modern' copy"

1	Fig 6.2.10 Fort Chambly, Quebec
2	
3	1. View of the fort 2. The entrance gate (photos Parks Canada)
4	3. Period reconstruction (on the right side) and volumetric reconstruction (on the left side) (photo Florès at Fils Inc.)
	4. View of the fort; visible the remains of the previous structures (photo Florès at Fils Inc.)

(Faucher, 1986:72) rather than period reconstruction, could have been a perfect background to the costumed, animated presentation of a everyday life at the fort, it was used as a display hall. The costumed animation was installed in the volumetric interior of the east wing. Faucher regrets " disassociation which occurred between the museal content and the envelope we had prepared for it. Particularly in the south wing which loses much of its meaning because it is not explained in context and because the evocative content planned for it (life in the 1750's fort) is simply not there" (Faucher, 1986:73). Galt predicts that conservation works at Fort Chambly will be regarded in the future as an "interesting early Canadian example of hybrid volumetric restoration" (Galt, 1984:17).

Another approach to volumetric reconstruction has been applied at the Forges du Saint-Maurice. The site commemorates the birth of the Canadian iron industry. After several years of archaeological and historical research and initial stabilization that had lasted through the 1970s, a complex development plan was created in 1981 and a variety of interpretive methods were implemented over the next several years. They included a volumetric reconstruction of the blast furnace complex (Fig 6.2.11). The archaeological remains of the blast furnace and of La Grande Maison were topped with volumetric representations of the original structures in order to protect and display them. The ruins and underground spaces were enclosed but remained visible to the public. The framework of metal tubing was designed to provide a sense of the exterior volumes of the various buildings which at one time surrounded the blast furnace.

Fig 6.2.11

Forges du Saint-Maurice, Quebec

1., 2. The volumetric reconstruction of the blast furnace

3. View of the central furnace area. The former arch openings of the furnace is represented by the curved metal tubes

4. The scale model of the blast furnace

5. View of the interior showing the roof structure

(photos 1., 2., 3., 5. Roy and Goulard, 1986; 4. Parks Canada)

1	4
2	
3	5

To express the industrial processes which took place within the original structures, the replicas of machinery were constructed using contemporary materials. The volumetric representation of La Grande Maison (1990), like in Fort Chambly, visually recreated the original appearance of the exterior walls while offering a modern interior space used as an interpretive centre. This solution, a combination of period (exterior) and modern (interior) look, was applied in response to an expressed public wish for a form of reconstruction more traditional than a steel frame outline (Ricketts, 1992:28).

Through its development reconstruction practice has been a hotly debated procedure due to the competing demands of conservation and presentation. Seen in historical perspective, Canadian reconstruction practice was generally driven by a desire to enhance the presentation of a historic relic, often at the expense of restoration treatments. The question of historical accuracy, as demonstrated by the first Canadian reconstruction projects, was not of main concern: reconstructions were considered merely a background for interpretative schemes e.g. of the 'living museum' type. In the later reconstruction works, historical accuracy was often compromised for pragmatic economic and political reasons. Among the numerous methods of interpretation reconstruction has been in Canada one of the most popular; it appeals to the politicians and general public as tangible interpretation of the past and therefore has a potential as a tourist attraction, it requires less money than costly restoration projects and presents fewer problems regarding compliance with contemporary fire and safety standards. There is a noticeable economic influence determining preference of

reconstruction over any other form of conservation and presentation activities; more extensive projects are implemented when substantial funds are available. Alternatively, when the economy slows down, reconstruction projects become a suitable form of public works. In search of the alternative to reconstructing, which is not permitted by the Venice Charter, a volumetric representation technique was created setting up the new trend in the Canadian reconstruction practice.

Shannon Ricketts (1992:28) argues that we are witnessing the beginning of "the era of reconstruction reconsidered". She distinguished three major stages in the development of reconstruction practice in Canada: the Era of the Military Site, 1920s-1940s; the Era of the Outdoor Museum, 1950s-1960s; and the Intellectualization of Interpretation, 1970s-1980s. While, no doubt pointing out true features of the reconstruction practice in Canada, this periodizing lacks consistency; the first stage is descriptive of the historic site type reconstructed, the second suggests a manner of presentation, while the third implies a manner of rationalization. From the standpoint of reconstruction practice development, that is regarding internationally comparable approaches to and methods of reconstructing, Canadian reconstruction evolved from stylistic restoration through hypothetical reconstruction towards the advanced form of replicating based on archaeological and historical research. The latest development introduced a contemporary type of presentation in the form of volumetric reconstruction.

It is worth noting that since 1990 proposed reconstructions are considered after evaluation of their relation to the commemorative integrity of the historic

site. The concept of commemorative integrity was first devised for the 1990

State of Parks report for national historic sites that stated:

"A national historic site may be said to possess commemorative integrity when the resources that symbolize or represent its importance are not impaired or under imminent threat, when the reasons for its national historic significance are effectively communicated to the public, and when the heritage value of the site is respected" (in Ingram and Bennett, 1992:15)

In the case of proposed reconstructions, this would mean the evaluation of how the proposed reconstruction relates to resource protection and the communication of the reasons for the national historic significance of the site.

6.2.2 Case Study: The Reconstruction of the Louisbourg Fortress, Nova Scotia, Canada

Louisbourg Fortress, drawing by Verrier, 1731 (photo Mac Lean, 1995)

Louisbourg Fortress, Nova Scotia, Canada

Fig 6.2.12

1. Louisbourg under the Second Siege in 1758. Source: the Public Archives of Canada (photo Downey, 1965)
2. The stabilized ruins of the King's Bastion (photo Fry, 1984)
3. The reconstructed King's Bastion (photo Parks Canada)
4. View of the reconstructed Louisbourg Fortress (photo Parks Canada)

6.2.2 Case Study:

The Reconstruction of the Louisbourg Fortress in Nova Scotia, Canada, 1961- 1982

Two hundred years elapsed between the fall of the Louisbourg Fortress and its reconstruction as a Canadian historic site, but its historical significance was acknowledged throughout this period in the commemorative efforts, written histories and fiction. The desire to reconstruct the site had been present since the end of the nineteenth century but, when it was finally decided to reconstruct, the decision was motivated not by conservation but by economic necessities pertaining to the crisis in the Canadian coal industry; the development of the Louisbourg Fortress provided a perfect solution as a labour intensive project to employ redundant miners. Nevertheless, these circumstances did not diminish in any respect the heritage significance and the merits of the reconstruction project, as they did not compromise the exceptional quality of the conservation work. The final result presents the most ambitious outdoor museum and historic site in Canada (Fig 6.2.13).

Fig 6.2.13
The reconstructed Louisbourg Fortress, Nova Scotia
(photos Parks Canada)

Relevance to national history and identity

When in 1928 the Louisbourg Fortress (Fig 6.2.14, 6.2.14a) was declared a National Historic Site, its significance was interpreted very broadly. Taylor (1990:18) finds it "typical" for the federal government interpretations represented by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board. The Fortress was said to be important for defending the Atlantic approach to New France and its collapse in 1758 was considered a significant event leading to the fall of Quebec the following year. Generally, the historical significance of the site was justified in terms of its importance to British imperial history. There were, however, parallel efforts to promote the French-Canadian aspects of the site that would present the fortress as a symbol of the greatness of French-Canadian civilization in North America. The significance of Louisbourg in this context was also reported to the Royal Society in 1891 by John Bourinot in his paper, *Cape Breton and its Memorials of the French regime* (ibidem). The French significance of the site was further promoted by J.S. MacLennan, general manager of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and historian of the Fortress. MacLennan conducted extensive historical research that resulted in uncovering original plans of the fortifications later used in their reconstruction. After the First World War, he published his findings in his major work *Louisbourg, from its Foundation to its Fall, 1713-1750* (MacLennan, 1969) in which he commemorated the site's pre-British past.

Fig 6.2.14
Location of Louisbourg (photo McM. Larrabee, 1971)

Fig 6.2.14a
Fortress of Louisbourg and surrounding area (photo McM. Larrabee, 1971)

National significance of the Louisbourg Fortress was a major motive for its reconstruction when economic circumstances finally facilitated development of the site. In the report prepared for the federal government in 1959 (regarding use of cultural resources in the Cape Breton region affected by economic decline due to the crisis in its coal industry) by I.C. Rand, the Louisbourg Fortress was assigned national significance as a "scene of one of the striking events in the historical course of things that has led to the Canada of today" (Rand, 1960:47). Rand expressed a belief that nothing could be

"more stimulating to the imagination or instructive to the mind, not only for the people of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, but of Canada and the Eastern portion of the United States, than to look upon a symbolic reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg ... That site marks a salient occasion in the transplantation of a civilization significant to the history of Canada; and to allow it to sink into ruin and obliteration would be a grave loss to the civilizing interests of this country" (Rand, 1960:47).

The expectations and recommendations expressed by Rand were echoed later in the reconstruction of the Fortress; the interpretation program implemented by Parks Canada was "based on those aspects of a site's history that are of national significance" (Fortress of Louisbourg NHS of Canada (N.S.), 2001:2). Among them are: Louisbourg in the Anglo-French Rivalry in North America, 1713-68; the Louisbourg Fisheries, 1713-58; Louisbourg and its Trade, 1713-58; Society and Culture at Louisbourg, 1713-68.

The chronicle

The history of the Louisbourg Fortress is brief but momentous. The French came to Louisbourg in 1713, after ceding Acadia and Newfoundland to the British by the terms of the treaty of Utrecht, which ended the War of the Spanish Succession. France's only remaining possessions outside Quebec were Isle Royale and Isle Saint-Jean, today Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island. The French exploited the islands as a base of the profitable cod fishery of the Grand Banks. Louisbourg became the capital of Isle Royale colony in 1718 and a year later extensive fortifications and sea batteries designed to protect the town and harbour were under construction. The fortified town soon developed into the east coast trading centre for New France and an important strategic military and naval base for the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Quebec. "It was a town prepared for the making of war, fortified on a scale unprecedented in North America, and so each siege became a slow and gruelling struggle in which endurance tended to outweigh heroism", wrote Christopher Moore (1982:vii), one of the researchers who worked at the preparation stage of the Louisbourg reconstruction.

The construction works at Louisbourg continued until the outbreak of war in 1744. The first attack came in 1745 following a declaration of war between Britain and France. The New Englanders captured the fortress within 46 days of their invasion and it was occupied until 1749, when Cape Breton was returned to France after the Treaty of Aix-La-Chapelle. The French strengthened the fortifications during the early 1750s. In 1758 Louisbourg was besieged a second time. Attacking with 150 ships and 16 000 troops, a British army captured the

fortress in seven weeks. Determined that Louisbourg would never again become a fortified French base threatening Britain's colonies, Prime Minister William Pitt ordered the systematic destruction of its fortifications. British sappers and miners completed the act of destruction in the summer of 1760 and Prime Minister William Pitt could report that " the fortress at Louisbourg ... together with all the works and defences of the harbour, be most effectively, and most entirely, demolished..." (In Johnston, 1990:1). The British abandoned Louisbourg after the Seven Years War (1756-63) in favour of Halifax, established in 1749 as the capital of the British colony of Nova Scotia.

With so turbulent an existence and so fierce a demise, not surprisingly the Louisbourg Fortress has been remembered for its dramatic conflicts and combats. It was not until the first years of the research undertaken as a part of the reconstruction project that the town behind the fortress walls and the life of the people who lived and worked there was revealed. From the rich sources that survived to our times, the project archaeologists and historians could discover about the life of the ordinary people who lived in an eighteenth-century garrison town. None of those people had had much influence over the course of history but learning about their lives belongs to those rare occasions when history can be explored from other than the king's and hero's perspective, as Moore (1982:viii) noted in the introduction to his book portraying some of the Fortress's ordinary inhabitants. 'Animated' portraits of some inhabitants of the Fortress have been incorporated into the interpretation programs of the site and have offered a unique insight into the history and everyday life of the fortified town. They are

also a reminder, as Moore (1982:viii) observed, that "like ourselves the people of Louisbourg lived in tumultuous times. Immigrants, sometimes refugees, often pursued by economic upheaval or the threat of war, they sought with varied success to achieve a little security in a disorderly world". Introducing real characters from the past and presenting their life in the animated setting of the reconstructed town invited the visitors to 'experience' their lives, even to identify with them, and to understand their times. Evoking life of the ordinary and the undistinguished people shed light on history from a non-traditional angle. The nature and impact of such interpretation created an unusual experience to the public, a kind of 'participant observation', in which the role of a 'foreign country' is taken by the past (Fig 6.2.15).

Reasons for reconstruction, promoters and supporters

As early as in the 1880s, there was interest in preservation of the site; John Stewart McLennan and George Monro Grant wrote: "Should not some memorial be raised which would show that Canadians, living when these animosities are dead, are still mindful of the great deeds done on Canadian soil? There could be no fitter site than the old burying ground of Louisbourg, where French and English dust commingles in peace, and where the ashes rest of many a brave New Englander who fought and fell in the gigantic strife between two great races" (McLennan and Grant, 1882:846). The historical significance of Louisbourg's was first officially recognized in 1895, not by Canada but by the United States when a 26-foot high column was erected at the site to mark the 150th anniversary of the successful New England siege in 1745. The American

1 | 2
| 3
| 4

Fig 6.2.15
Louisbourg interpretation program: 'animated portraits'
(photos 1. J. Steinhart;
2., 3., 4. www.fitzgeraldstudio.com, 2001)

deed angered Canadians and in 1902 Senator Pascal Poirier expressed his dissatisfaction with Louisbourg being invaded by tourists and requested federal assistance in preventing further American developments of the Louisbourg site and harbour by proposing the acquisition of the site. The government showed no interest in acquiring or developing the site. A year later, the part of the site with the King's Bastion casemates was purchased by D.J. Kennelly, retired Indian Navy captain and manager of the Sydney and Louisbourg Coal and Railway Co., who began some works that aimed at developing and, by his standards, protecting and preserving the remains; the ruins were stabilized and a building to house a restaurant was built. The extent of the required works on the site was too large for private undertaking and in 1908, J.S. McLennan, while addressing the Nova Scotia Historical Society, stated that the development should be conducted by the government. In his report McLennan revealed the existence of the original plans of the fortress and expressed his belief that its reconstruction would be possible. He recommended, as an immediate measure, reconstructing the Intendent's house, which would serve as a museum, and suggested indicating with some markers the outlines of the buildings and the street grid.

The Canadian acknowledgement of the Louisbourg site came along with formation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in 1919; Louisbourg was one of the first historic sites to be considered by the Board. Although no reconstruction works were approved in the 1920s, the land of the site was acquired by the federal government, part of the ruins was stabilized and the contemporarily built structures removed. Finally in 1926, the site received its first

recognition from the Canadian Government with the introduction of commemorative plaques with text written in English and French.

The early attempts to reconstruct the Fortress were initiated by McLennan and two Historic Sites and Monuments Board members, Walter Crowe, representative of Nova Scotia and John Clarence Webster from New Brunswick. As a result of their combined lobbying, the site was declared a National Historic Site in 1928. McLennan and Webster hoped for the reconstruction of some major buildings, a part of the fortifications and construction of a museum. The replica was supposed to take the role of a "monument -not only of the historic past - but to the intelligence and goodwill of all concerned in bringing it into existence", as McLennan put it (In Johnston, 1990:24). Some of these recommendations, especially regarding repairs and restoration, were adopted by the Board, but no reconstruction treatment was considered at this time.

In 1940, the site was designated as a national historic park but development works did not occur until the 1960s. The decision to reconstruct the long-vanished town was announced in June 1961 by John Diefenbaker's Conservative government and was a consequence of the political, economic and cultural situation in Canada, and particularly the events in Nova Scotia where the plight of the coal industry resulted in high unemployment. The re-creating of Louisbourg would not only put hundreds of unemployed back to work but also would establish a tourist industry in the region. Preliminary recommendations for the site development were provided by the Royal Commission led by I.C. Rand in his report presented to government in August 1960 (Rand, 1960). In his report

Rand provided an economic analysis of the Canadian coal industry, with particular reference to Cape Breton, and concluded that the use of cultural resources would provide employment for the region and would stimulate the tourist industry. Of the sixteen recommendations in the report, one directly addressed the issue of developing the Louisbourg site:

"That beginning not later than in the year 1961 work on a scheme of reconstructing the ruins of the Fortress of Louisbourg as an historic site be commenced and that it be carried through to an appropriate completion; that assistance be given to the Government of Nova Scotia in completing a modern highway between Louisbourg and Point Tupper as incidental to the reconstruction of the site; that at the same time measures be taken to exploit fully the attraction possibilities of the Cape Breton Highlands National Park; that both projects be planned in substantial dimensions to extend over a period of from 15 to 20 years, during each of which not less than approximately an expenditure of \$1, 500 000 will be contemplated." (Rand, 1960:53).

Rand regarded a "symbolic reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg" as a potential cultural resource of significant value. Apart from the economic value already explained in his report, he emphasized an informational value of the reconstruction which he considered "a revelation of European life of that century and a reminder of the vicissitudes of North America's development" (Rand, 1960:47). According to Rand's report "not that each item in the total scene should appear but sufficient to furnish a comprehensive representation of the material and cultural forms set up in a strange land inviting settlement" (Rand,

1960:47). What he was saying suggests that he considered it possible to selectively reconstruct Louisbourg to correspond with the image of "comprehensive representation" as arbitrarily established by the authorities managing the reconstruction process. He gave priority to interpretation goals over historical accuracy. In accepting Rand's recommendation the Federal Cabinet of Canada emphasized an importance of interpretation of the site and stated that the development works at the site will allow future generations to understand the role of the Fortress in Canadian history. It was also suggested that animation be introduced as a part of interpretation. The reference to animation implied a direction for the site development based on the scheme of an outdoor museum, which became a principal basis for the development of an interpretation program aimed at providing a comprehensive and detailed presentation of eighteenth-century Louisbourg. (Taylor, 1990).

Although MacLean (1995:19) argues that "the principal impetus for major site development was socio-economic, not historical or cultural" and suggests that "any attempt to understand the scope and the pace of the project must begin with that premise", it seems, especially in the light of the historical development of the Canadian conservation movement presented in the previous section (6.2.1), that a more comprehensive context of the events that led to reconstruction of the Louisbourg site should be considered. Johnston (1990:5) offers his explanation, that seems to comprise all the decisive factors that influenced occurrence of the development at the Louisbourg site:

"the combination of a heightened public interest in heritage matters, a federal government sympathetic to nation building, and an increasingly desperate unemployment problem in Cape Breton led to the suggestion that a portion of the fortress be reconstructed".

The reconstruction works were completed in 1982 and in the end the twenty-two-year undertaking cost approximately \$26 million (Johnston, 1990:8).

The preparatory research and preliminary design process

The hope to create employment and pressure to show progress at Louisbourg had been present from the beginning of the reconstruction works. These expectations were difficult to satisfy since the National Parks Branch for the first time faced a challenge to launch such an ambitious project and the lack of experience delayed time limits. This was especially detectable in the scheduling of workplans guiding the various researchers and occupational groups hired to complement the existing Parks team; the lack of comprehensive planning was evident. The task of organizing work in the initial stage was assigned to the Park's Engineering Division. The priorities and research requirements identified by the engineers were conceived in isolation from the professionals in archaeology and history. It was soon realized that integrated workplans and comprehensive planning would be required for such a massive undertaking. Nevertheless it took ten years to form a comprehensive planning scheme based on a consultative process that was eventually formalized as a committee body.

The principal basis for the reconstruction and interpretation of historic Louisbourg to the public was formed on historical research that was "focused,

specific, and anything but academic", as described by MacLean (1984:29) in regard to the King's Bastion Research Program. The main goal of the initial historical research was to provide information for the archaeological investigation and architectural designing of the buildings selected for reconstruction. The substantial historical records left by the original French inhabitants and by New England and British conquerors, stored in archives in France, Great Britain and Canada, included over 500 relevant plans and maps, around 750, 000 pages of documents such as shipping, transaction, court records, siege journals etc. (MacLean, 1995:33). Since Louisbourg ceased existence not in violence and flames but in orderly capitulation, so its records left the Fortress with the exiled inhabitants and eventually found their destination at what became the National Archive of France. It was fortunate for the researches that eighteenth-century France was a centralized state with the extensive administrative apparatus that kept records of every aspect of its responsibilities. French colonial authorities acquired the same habit; dossiers, maps, plan censuses and statistical tables accompanied written reports sent to France. This resulted in an abundance of various documents that allowed the identification and description of most individuals who lived in eighteenth-century Louisbourg. Similarly, the surviving collection of original maps and plans (Fig 6.2.16) provided information on the town arrangement, features of properties and construction structures (Fry, 1984).

The most valuable cartographic evidence that became a starting point for studies of Louisbourg fortifications and residential quarters included plans drawn in 1731 by the chief engineer at Louisbourg, Etienne Verrier and his son

- 1 | 2 Fig 6.2.16
 1. Dauphin Gate, revised design by Verrier dated 1733.
 Source: Archives Nationales, Paris
 3 2. Dauphin Gate, construction of éperon, drawing by Verrier dated 1734
 Source: Archives Nationales, Paris
 3. King's Bastion, construction progress, drawing by Verrier dated 1724
 Source: Archives du Génie, Vincennes
 (photos Fry, 1984)

(Fig 6.2.17, 6.2.18). The plans, accompanied by watercolour views, provided accurate (when compared to other plans) and detailed information on urban and architectural features, especially on the waterfront where most reconstructed buildings were to be situated. The second source of information, of parallel importance, consisted of the survey drawings prepared in 1734 by Francois Vallee. Interestingly, the system of identifying properties employed by the survey was adopted by the reconstruction project staff to designate planned and already reconstructed structures (MacLean, 1995:34). This outstanding source allowed development of an accurate point of reference to the colonial town and facilitated understanding of its concept and design. Another plan useful in the study of town occupancy and architectural evolution, especially in identifying buildings erected by the British in the place of original French structures, was a 1768 British plan accompanied by a detailed, written survey of all buildings (the fortifications had been demolished by the British in 1760). These plans were invaluable for visual conceptualization of the original shape of the town. All research and design disciplines used the collection of historical maps and plans comprehensively (Fig 6.2.19, 6.2.20). The project archaeologist, architects and engineers relied on the documents in their site work and "on a technical level they relied even more on the specific detail the collection could provide" (MacLean, 1984: 36).

The development of the comprehensive research program, integrated with operational programs, has become the most distinguishing feature of the Louisbourg research and development process. Ronald Way, general

Fig 6.2.17

Louisbourg Fortress, plan by Verrier dated 1731

Source: France, BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE (photo MacLean, 1995)

Fig 6.2.18

Louisbourg Fortress, plan by Verrier dated 1730

Source : ARCHIVES DE LA FRANCE D'OUTRE MER, DEPOT DES FORTIFICATION DES COLONIES (photo MacLean, 1995)

1	3
2	4
5	

Fig 6.2.19

Dauphin Gate, Louisbourg Fortress

1., 2. Dauphin Gate, drawings by Verrier 1729-33

Source: Archives Nationales, Paris (photos Fry, 1984)

3. The reconstructed Dauphin Gate (photo J. Steinhart)

4., 5. The reconstructed Dauphin Bastion (photos Parks Canada)

1	3	<p>Fig 6.2.20 Frederick Gate, Louisbourg Fortress 1. Frederick Gate, drawing by Verrier dated 1741 Source: Archives du Génie, Vincennes (photo Fry, 1984) 2., 3., 4., 5. The reconstructed Frederick Gate (photos 2. J. Steinhart; 3. 4. Parks Canada; 5. C. Readron)</p>
2	4	
	5	

management consultant to the Louisbourg project, considered a comprehensive research program in history and archaeology a basis for accuracy in restoration and reconstruction works. According to Way's recommendation, a historical research program was to be developed at two levels: an emergency program aiming at providing information tending to the 1962 construction works and a comprehensive long-term research founding a base for museum programs (MacLean, 1995). Subsequently, research and reporting methods had to be tailored accordingly. To meet these specific development objectives, new approaches that were neither commonly used nor known to academic historians, had to be introduced. Adaptation to the requests of archaeologists, architects and engineers required historians to change their usual inquiry from posing general questions as parameters for research to asking specific questions at the outset of the research. In consequence, answering detailed questions regarding, for example, dimensions of the structures, locations of the cannons, was of higher priority than investigating the rules of the eighteenth-century construction policies. Other equally significant change concerning the manner of conducting historical research concerned the chronological limits imposed on the studies; recreation of the Fortress as it appeared in 1745, requested information related directly to the period under consideration. Ultimately, historical research was focusing only on the period close to this date. A third major change involved the type of source material and manner of presenting evidence. Academic historians had to work with materials, such as plans and maps, material specifications, that were a domain of geographers and architectural historians. Consequently, the

reports included mostly iconography while text was kept to a minimum. Instead of traditional academic analytical manuscripts, historians presented other forms of reports such as brief reports or meeting minutes that met immediate requirements for easily applicable information. MacLean (1995:53) considers the teamwork developed in the use of historical evidence, as well as the combined study of literary and non-literary source material, the most important characteristics of the historical research conducted by Louisbourg staff.

The interpretation programs and the reconstruction works

The reconstruction of the eighteenth-century fortress that vanished two hundred years ago was a complex and difficult task that required establishing research and construction programs at a scale unparalleled in the Canadian heritage conservation field. The Louisbourg site, unlike the other historic sites developed by Parks Canada that comprised a few buildings or a mere fort, was an entirely fortified town including almost two hundred buildings that occupied a sixty acre area (Fig 6.2.21, 6.2.22). Consequently, the most important task at the initial stage of the project was to determine the extent of the reconstruction to be undertaken. The earlier commemorative efforts and developments at the site did not serve as much inspiring guidance, so desperately needed by project staff during the initial stage between 1961 and 1964. Philosophical frameworks such as those by McLennan or Rand and strategic goals from politicians seeking for employment creation could not substitute for a guideline. Soon a debate over approaches to reconstruction started and its uneasy and intense course reflected the complexity of the work required. Taylor (1990:177-187) gives a fascinating

Fig 6.2.21
Louisbourg Fortress, plan used in the reconstruction works, 1961
(photo McM. Larrabee, 1971)

Fig 6.2.22
Vertical aerial photograph of the Louisbourg Fortress taken in the spring of 1961
(photo McM. Larrabee, 1971)

account of the internal controversy over the reconstruction of Louisbourg within the Canadian Parks Service. The opposing views split up among historians and engineers and coalesced around two rivals in the National Park Branch: the historic site division headed by J.D. Herbert, and the engineering services division under G.L. Scott. The historians, aware of the destructive influence of reconstructive works on archaeological remains, supported preservation of the ruins and limited reconstruction. The selected reconstructed blocks were expected to recreate all periods of the site's history, including the destruction of the Fortress by the British in the 1760s. The engineering division, motivated by a greater engineering challenge, favoured a total reconstruction of the site as it appeared at a single period before its fall. In response to the suggestion of total reconstruction, Herbert, representing historians, criticized the 'static' interpretation for capturing only a single period in the site's past and, consequently, compromising the site's commemorative integrity. He expressed his disapproval at a planning meeting held in May 1960 when he stated that:

" an overall recreation of the fortress as it was in a certain year would not constitute a sound interpretation of history. This would be static in that it would show only the situation and the scene at a certain time - it would not demonstrate the process of history and the changes wrought by time and the fortunes of war. (In Taylor, 1990:177)

The engineers criticized this approach by arguing that the national significance of the site should be conveyed by a commemoration theme that is not associated with the conflict between the French and the English (identifiable if all phases of

the historic development are reconstructed) but with " a glorious example of the courage, resourcefulness and faith that men had in the new world" (ibidem: 177). According to them the reconstruction project would constitute " a study in human history and would be more of a monument to such than a monument to a conflict between two nations" (ibidem:177). The third voice in the debate over the commemoration theme belonged to Ronald Way, also involved in the restoration of Fort Henry and the creation of Upper Canada Village, who presented his position in *Recommendations Concerning the Louisbourg Restoration Project* (1961). He criticized Herbert's interpretive scheme and opted for reconstructing the site to its appearance at a single point in time. As the central historical theme presented at the site he recommended " the story of the progress of Canada's two major races from armed hostility to their national partnership and unity in the Canada of today" (ibidem: 180).

The last 'battle' fought over Louisbourg ended in 1962 when cabinet selected the option for a partial restoration. Construction commenced in 1962, heading for the completion of a substantial part by centennial year 1967. Similarly to other projects completed by Parks Canada in the past, which started as restoration with partial reconstruction but ended as full reconstructions, the initial plans of the Louisbourg project broadened to full reconstruction of a quarter of the original town. The original plan had been abandoned in 1967 and the new course of approach was set by John Fortier, the site's superintendent. Fortier's plan included a total reconstruction of the selected portions of the town, thereby shifting interpretation from the military motives towards the social history

(ibidem;186-187). Consequently, the reconstructed project portrays a living period environment in the summer of 1744. As in other Parks projects, costumed animation was chosen as a fundamental part of the interpretation (Johnston, 1990:7). Together, the period presentation of reconstructed properties and costumed animation are the principal interpretation medium (Fig 6.2.23).

The decision regarding the selection of the properties to be reconstructed was determined on the basis of the extent of the gathered information and by the specific interpretation objectives set for the project that can be summarized as attempting to recreate a convincing precinct of the original fortified town. The extensive archaeological program was carried out to provide a basis for accurate reconstruction (Fig 6.24). Archaeology was required to provide specific information about structures planned to be reconstructed; consequently the output was heavily oriented towards structural information. Excavation conditions at the Fortress were evaluated generally as ideal; the site had not undergone any development since its fall (Johnston, 1990:6). However, many of the most important parts of the town had been affected by some uncontrolled excavations and restoration works in the past: in the 1910s, several casemates of the flanks at the King's Bastion were cleared from the accumulated material and the arches of three casemates were repaired; in 1904, road construction crossed the ruins; between 1928 and 1931, the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century houses erected over the Fortress areas were demolished. During the 1930s, the entire outline of the Château (a long masonry building in the King's Bastion; for a long time the whole structure was referred to as the Château St.

Fig 6.2.23

Louisbourg interpretation program; 'living history'

Together, the period presentation of reconstructed properties and costumed animation are the principal interpretation medium
(photos www.fitzgeraldstudio.com, 2001)

1	4
2	3
5	8
6	7

Fig 6.2.24

Dauphin Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress

- 1., 2. Barracks after excavations in the 1960s (photos Fry, 1984)
3. Powder magazine after excavations in the 1960s (photo Fry, 1984)
4. The reconstructed barracks and powder magazine (photo J. Steinhart)
5. Dauphin Bastion, undated, unsigned plan probably 1720s
Source: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (photo Fry, 1984)
6. The reconstructed Circular Battery (photo Parks Canada)
7. Circular Battery and cavalier ramp retaining wall before reconstruction (photo Fry, 1984)
8. The reconstructed Dauphin Bastion (photo C. Reardon)

Louis, but recent research concluded that there is no basis for this name), the south row of rooms in the hospital (Block 13) and the Intendent's house (Block2) foundations were stabilized above ground level. Similar practices continued through the 1940s and into mid-1950s (Fig 6.2.25). Thus, by the end of the 1950s, numerous of the most valuable and significant structures had been affected by these early unprofessional (from the standpoint of contemporary standards) conservation works.

Despite the mass of cartographic evidence and historical data available, a majority of the reconstruction works at the Fortress relied on the results of archaeological research. The alignments and slopes of the walls, the details of appearance of the stonework, brickwork, mortar, building hardware and furnishing came from archaeology. A major aspect of the archaeological program, developed in 1963-64, was bringing archaeological and historical studies into an ordered and sequential exchange oriented to provide pertinent information towards the accuracy of the ongoing reconstruction. Reconstruction of the *guérite* (sentry box) can serve as a convincing illustration of a successful application of this interdisciplinary approach (Fig 6.2.26). *Guérites* were a hallmark feature of any Vauban-designed work; they set at the flanked angle provided a vantage point projecting beyond the parapet for a sentry to survey the ditch along both faces of a bastion and along an entire front of fortification. Historical research on the King's Bastion plans revealed three *guérites*, but later more precise research confirmed only one. Historical sources also gave general description and illustrations of *guérites*. These sources, however, did not provide

1	2
3	4

Fig 6.2.25
 The Right Flank casemates, King's Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress
 1. not later than 1901
 2. in 1907
 3. in 1926
 4. in 1957
 (photos Walker, 1971)

1 2 3 4 5	<p>Fig 6.2.26</p> <p>Guérite, King's Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress</p> <p>1. Brouage (Charente-Maritime), France. <i>Guérites</i> on the ramparts (photo Fry, 1984)</p> <p>2. King's Bastion <i>guérite</i>, conjectural model; note stones found during excavation and incorporated to the reconstructed structure (marked red) (photo Fry, 1984)</p> <p>3. King's Bastion. Representation as it should look when completed; <i>guérites</i> at each shoulder angle. Plan by Verrier, 1725
Source: Archives Nationales, Paris (photo Fry, 1984)</p> <p>4., 5. The reconstructed King's Bastion <i>guérite</i> (photos Johnston, 1991)</p> |
|---|---|

information sufficient for reconstruction. A supplemental research conducted on extant *guérites* in France allowed the identification of four stones found among the rubble in the ditch near the flanked angle as coming from a pentagonal *guérite*. This led to hypothetical reconstruction of the King's Bastion *guérite* form. Access to the structure and its position in the Bastion was designed by reference to the 1730 plan (Fry, 1984).

The Louisbourg project, officially inaugurated in 1961 as the Fortress of Louisbourg Restoration Project, began with the reconstruction of the town at the King's Bastion (Fig 6.2.27). It was decided that it was historically appropriate to begin where the French themselves had begun. The King's Bastion was reconstructed to its appearance in 1745, as it was then in its most impressive and complete state (Fry, 1984:61). Other reasons also supported this decision; the citadel was well documented historically, had surviving casemates and stabilized foundations of the barrack (that would help identification and location of the adjacent structures) and, perhaps, more importantly, could provide work for over 200 labourers whose employment belonged to the main political commitments of the project (Fry, 1984).

The entire reconstructed project occupies 16 of 60 acres within the walls and includes 50 of 180 major buildings identified on the site and a few smaller structures, the fortifications, gardens, yards and streets. Approximately two miles of fortifications have been reconstructed including two curtain walls, 2 of 7 bastions: the King's Bastion and the Dauphin Demi-Bastion and some outer defensive works. Louisbourg's defences were designed and built according to

3 Fig 6.2.27
 King's Bastion, Louisbourg Fortress
 1 King's Bastion, drawing by Verrier, probably from the late 1720s
 Source: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
 2., 3., 4., 5., 6. The reconstructed King's Bastion
 (photos 1. Fry, 1984; 2. J. Steinhart; 4. C. Reardon;
 3., 5. Parks Canada; 6. www.fitzgeraldstudio.com, 2001)

the general fortification principles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries perfected by Sebastien Le Preste de Vauban, the chief engineer of Louis XIV. Vauban fortresses were intended to take maximum advantage of local terrain. In analyzing the site, however, Louisbourg's designers made a fatal mistake. Since the land surrounding the town was boggy, they assumed that all attacks would come from the sea. Consequently, they erected two batteries, the Island Battery and the Royal Battery, which defended the harbour. As history would prove, the cannon did not protect the Fortress from a land attack.

Architecturally the Fortress represented a colonial variant on eighteenth-century French vernacular. Since many of the original inhabitants came from Brittany and Normandy, the homes and storehouses assumed distinctive features characteristic of these regions: flared roofs, distinctive dormers and shutters and fleur-de-lis finials. The King's Bastion barracks, a dominant element in the reconstructed landscape, once belonged to the largest buildings in North America. It contained the Governor's apartment, officers' quarters, a chapel, a prison and bunkrooms for more than five hundred soldiers. All these interiors were reconstructed except for several soldiers' rooms; they housed a display of artefacts excavated by archaeologists and a presentation of the Louisbourg reconstruction process. Other exhibits illustrating life in Louisbourg are scattered throughout the Fortress.

The Louisbourg Fortress could not compare with elaborate European defences but by eighteenth-century North American standards it was massive and sophisticated. While the usual defences in the New World were earthworks

and palisades, Louisbourg had nearly two miles of perimeter walls with seven bastions and four monumental gates, five guardhouses, two outlying batteries, and more than one hundred cannons. Approximately one-quarter of the town properties within the original fortifications trace and one-third of the town fortifications have been reconstructed. All reconstructed structures, with one exception, were recreated on the original eighteenth-century foundations. That exception was the fisherman's house, which perished under water (today's sea level is higher by 1 meter) (Johnston, 1990). Interiors were furnished with original or reproduced period antiques; more than 8,000 pieces were acquired (Fig 6.2 28). Some structures were reconstructed to the exterior only and their interior was not open to the public. Their purpose was, while complementing the streetscape, concealing within all the standards facilities and equipment required by modern: transformers, garages fire tracks, supplies etc. After 1978, due to major funding cuts, even some buildings (on Block 3 and 4 and on the Ile du Quay at the eastern end of the waterfront) that were not designated to contain modern services were reconstructed to the exterior only. MacLean (1995:108) observes that "this compromise ... had the silent benefit of allowing project staff to concentrate and to consolidate efforts to furnish and otherwise interpret properties west of blocks three and four, without detracting from the overall impact of exterior reconstruction and cultural landscape interpretation." The care for historical accuracy displayed in the effort to preserve, study and make use of the authentic fabric was a guiding rule for the reconstruction works (Johnston, 1990) (Fig 6.2.29). All fragments salvaged from the rubble were inventoried,

Fig 6.2.28
Louisbourg Fortress; period interiors
(photos Parks Canada)

1	2
3	4

Fig 6.2.29

Louisbourg Fortress, archaeological excavations: cut stones were numbered, recorded *in situ*, and then removed to a storage building for further study, to be finally incorporated into the reconstructed structures

1.King's Bastion. Doorway reassembled from stones recovered during excavation (photo Fry, 1984)

2.King's Bastion. Right Flank casemate: doorway surround (photo Fry, 1984)

3.King's Bastion. Reassembled angle at rear of the Right Flank (photo Fry, 1984)

4. Reassembling of the excavated cut stones in a storage building (photo McM. Larrabee, 1971)

protected and incorporated into the reconstructed structure. At the same time, the effort was aimed at salvaging any information that was inevitably destined to be destroyed by that reconstruction (McM. Larrabee, 1971).

The debates surrounding the question of historical accuracy, present in every reconstruction project, were also inevitable in Louisbourg. According to the enthusiastic reports in the preparatory stage, the reconstructed Fortress was envisioned as a magnificent and impressive work:

"Truly the work proposed will be stronger and better built than the original. It will be built as envisaged by the early designers, of them as of men today their grasp exceeded their reach. Too, the Fortress will be built as was seen by the attackers, as a strong and formidable redoubt. It will be a true restoration." (In Krause, 1987b:3).

The guiding principle for rebuilt features was expressed in the expectation:

"It is believed the restoration should be a replica of the original works and so true or authentic in manner that it will achieve genuine respect from all who visit and appreciate such work" (ibidem).

The meaning of historical accuracy, in these reports often referred to as 'authenticity', was not clearly identified. In December of 1963, the Deputy Minister stated that the development project intended works "done as accurately as, in the opinion of the Minister or the officer designated by him for this purpose, he shall determine" (In Krause, 1987c:1). Endorsing flexibility of the accuracy description, as well as, sanctioning arbitrary opinions regarding historical accuracy, established a very specific framework in which the indisputable by its

definition criterion of historical accuracy could be adjusted according to the arbitrarily defined degree and extent (by "the Minister or the officer designated by him for this purpose"). To complicate the issue, the limited funds made the economics of the project a priority issue and the criterion of historical accuracy was perceived, especially by the engineering services division, as an obstacle retarding productivity. As early as January 1965, the Assistant Deputy Minister reminded that "the project was never to be uneconomical" and that "the Minister now wants a maximum amount of restoration for the money spent" (In Krause, 1987c:2). The level of historical accuracy was translated into monetary value, as one of the regional directors put it, suggesting importing forms for reconstruction from the heritage structures in France:

"with reasonable financial expenditures, we should be, say, 85% truly accurate and authentic. Anything above that we can properly go to France for the typical and not be censured. I am not prepared to spend, say, another \$100,000.00 to do research and archaeology to make it 86% authentic ..." (In Krause, 1987c:2)

Similarly, the Park Superintendent, John Lunn, while stating that the limited budget and rigid delivery deadlines had forced compromise, noted the compromise could be achieved, "provided we are prepared to accept the premise that it is better to create a Park that is 75 % accurate at a price and within a time limit we can afford, rather than create a Park that is 85% accurate at a price and over a length of time we cannot afford." (ibidem). Ronald Way, general management consultant to the Louisbourg project, observed that the approved budget, merely adequate for approved development, was insufficient to finance a

reconstruction "geared to the ambitions of the research section" (In Krause, 1987c:3). It was soon realized that the construction works started prematurely in regard to available results of archaeological and historical research. The program was modified and when, in 1965-68, the Research Section increased its size, hence its output, and the delays in construction caused by a lack of applicable historical information were no longer the case, doubtful compromises were easier to avoid. Bruce W. Fry, archaeologist responsible for directing the entire archaeological program, recalls that pragmatic approaches to research and hectic schedules did not permit synthesis and the presentation of all the recovered archaeological evidence but finally:

"As the reconstruction phase of the Louisbourg project neared completion, it became time to attempt - at least retrospectively - to return the research horse to its proper place before the developmental cart and to offer in one report a comprehensive interpretation of the fortifications and their significance." (Fry, 1984:5)

The problem of historical accuracy has been a fundamental consideration in the approach to the reconstruction of Louisbourg from the first days of the project. The dogmatic standard that stipulated reconstruction as accurately as possible could not have been accepted as a working principle for practical reasons. Without any measurable standards of historical accuracy, in the case of introducing modern intrusions, "the only control ... was the exercise of common sense within the context of rebuilding Louisbourg as accurately as possible ... In essence, then, what constituted an acceptable level of compromise for rebuilt

Louisbourg became the battlefield " (Krause, 1987a: 2). The operating meaning of historical accuracy was defined by political pragmatism; "Louisbourg was to be rebuilt within budget; productivity was to be the measure; compromise the tool" (ibidem). Most often historical accuracy yielded to the necessary structural changes introduced in order to meet contemporary standards. For example, the dining room in the reconstructed Chief Engineer's house, which originally had only one doorway, was given a second door to assist traffic flow. Similarly, the second storey subfloors in the reconstructed buildings had to be strengthened to accommodate visitors' access. Such compromises within reconstructed buildings were kept to a minimum and concealed behind period features and facades. According to MacLean, "the result is a comparatively realistic cross-section of eighteenth century architecture and material culture in an outdoor museum setting, one that is best appreciated and evaluated by studying the general art and architecture of the period as well as the local research conducted by project staff" (MacLean, 1995:107).

What made Louisbourg special and different from most other reconstructed historic sites and outdoor museums was that the site had not been subsequently enclosed by a modern city. This remoteness to the modern world has given the interpretation program an extraordinary opportunity to present the past in its original, undisturbed setting and to create the illusion of time travel. In order to achieve an effect of 'traveling in time' undisturbed by the structures erected later than the fortress, any traces of nineteenth and twentieth century occupation within the site and in the immediate surroundings have been cleared

away. This was also the rationale for the location of the tourist facilities, constructed away from the reconstruction area, so the period appearance and ambience presented to the visitors was undisrupted.

The recreation of a cultural landscape posed a complex undertaking, distinctively different from the traditional selective and, consequently, limited method of presenting 'period rooms' in a museum setting. The interpretation program was intended to create a cohesive and comprehensive presentation of the history of colonial Louisbourg. A research based, contextual interpretation program has been designed to utilize architecture, artefacts, plants, and animals in a living history spectacle played by the costumed actors (Fig 6.2.30). The goal was to offer visitors a glimpse of civilian and military life as it is thought to have appeared on the eve of the first siege in 1745. The summer of 1744 was accordingly chosen as the 'moment in time' designated for animated presentation.

The formation of the interpretation program, that started as early as 1963, began with an acknowledgment, expressed by John Lunn, Park Superintendent, that "Interpretation needs to be done here on a greater scale than anything previously attempted at any National Park or Historic Site in Canada" (in MacLean, 1995:116). Lunn used the word 'interpretation' in the meaning of the 1950s, that was the traditional display with glass cases holding artefacts, explained by labels. The systematic archaeological and historical research on Louisbourg has continuously provided resources that eventually led to

Fig 6.2.30
Louisbourg interpretation program; 'living history' (photos Parks Canada)

developing a new format for period presentation. Consequently, the initial, 'traditional' stage in interpretation planning and implementation was replaced in the 1970s by the set of six interpretation themes that were interpreted on the site in two manners; first, as an introduction in the reception centre with use of static displays, and then, in more depth, in the reconstructed architectural setting. When first formulated, the military themes presenting Louisbourg as a fortress and a naval port dominated the list. By the time of the completion in 1981, the sequence emphasised more social themes: Louisbourg as a capital, fishing base, trading centre, fortress, naval port and community (MacLean, 1995:115). As the reconstruction expanded in the late 1970s and early 1980s and the project progressed from development to operation as an outdoor museum, the interpretation programs improved, at considerable financial cost. More thematic tours along the marked routes were developed, offering a non-guided form of interpretation that provided comfort of individual exploration. Among them were walks through the ruins in the unreconstructed areas within the original fortress and town. The school tours for students and teachers and special tours for professionals, traditionally included in the site's interpretation program, incorporated current interpretation literature (Fig 6.2.31, 6.2.32).

The Louisbourg interpretation, as stated by Parks Canada (Parks Canada; parkscanada.pch.gc.ca, 2001), is based "on those aspects of the Site's history that are of national significance". They include Louisbourg in the Anglo-French Rivalry in North America, 1713-68; "The Louisbourg Fisheries, 1713-58;

1

Fig 6.2.31

Fortifications of Louisbourg

2

1. Excavations and reconstruction. The Dauphin Bastion is at an early stage of excavation (foreground); the King's Bastion and barracks are under reconstruction (background)

2. After reconstruction
(photos Fry, 1984)

Fig 6.2.32

Model of the Louisbourg Fortress, by Katharine McLennan, Honorary Curator of the Louisbourg Museum, where the model is displayed.
(photo Downey, 1965)

Louisbourg and Its Trade, 1713-58; Society and Culture at Louisbourg, 1713-68; Preservation and Commemoration, 1767-1980. The preservation and commemorative initiative of the 1960s is recognized to-day for its "in-depth, interdisciplinary research" that "produced an historical and archaeological data base on one particular 18th-century settlement that offers and unrivalled 'window on the past'; and for establishing "a model that has had great influence on the Canadian heritage field" (Fortress of Louisbourg NHS of Canada (N.S., 2001:4).

The Louisbourg reconstruction represents the remarkable conservation achievement of one generation of Canadians. It has developed beyond merely historic presentation to display a major case study contributing to individual and collective sense of time and place as well as to the understanding of the concept of nation as it has evolved in the historical development of Canada. In addition to being a major historic site and outdoor museum, the Louisbourg reconstruction has provided the basis for varied studies of eighteenth century French culture in North America. Since Louisbourg has had no continuum in its development into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the archaeologists, historians and restoration architects were given in the 1960s a unique opportunity to study and preserve the undisturbed relics of a community significant in North American history. The interdisciplinary methodological approach became the most distinguished feature of the Louisbourg research and development process. The formalized and systematic planning process of research and development, elaborated as a result of scheduling problems in the early years, facilitated undisturbed research and construction coordination. The high research

standards allowed a very high degree of accuracy in reconstruction works that validated the reconstruction and its interpretation to the public. It seems, however, appropriate to take application of the term 'historical accuracy' as a *goal* rather than the *result* since replicated features often represent hypothetical reconstruction with the highest degree of historical accuracy that could be achieved. Some of the reconstructed structures, such as King's Bastion barracks, were rebuilt to their most visually impressive and complete stage of development. The limits to reconstruction, regarding its accuracy and extent, were set by the economic and political pressures to provide tangible results for the millions of dollars being spent on the site development. Within Parks Canada the project became a model for historic site development. The teamwork ethic and practices developed at Louisbourg in the early 1960s were later formalized and integrated with the regular park organization to provide a comprehensive approach to historic site development. That system became the most prominent characteristic of the Louisbourg research and development process and was followed by Parks Canada agencies in the Canadian historic site development field.

7. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Results and analysis of research findings

7.2 Conclusions

7.2.1 Summary

7.2.2 Review of the purpose of the thesis and limitations

7.2.3 Areas for further research

7.2.4 Relevance to contemporary geographical concerns

7.1 Results and analysis of research findings

The previous chapters have demonstrated that architectural reconstructions, by imitating heritage relics, are a *resource* upon which extensive activities or industries have been based. First there is the use of reconstructions as a *political resource* in the creation or support of states and the legitimating of their governments and dominant ideologies. The reconstructed relics, similarly to their originals, can acquire, or can be endowed with, a symbolic relationship with specific political entities. The depth of this relationship and its significance to individuals and groups is best demonstrated by the efforts undertaken to recreate that relationship when it becomes disrupted; the decision to reconstruct the Royal Castle in Warsaw was undertaken by the government as early as in January 1945 (Warsaw was liberated on January 17, 1945), and postponing of the reconstruction works by the government due to the changing political situation was as significant as a persistence of the political opposition in the effort to pursue the Castle's rebuilding. Finally, when it happened, the reconstruction of

and, at the same time, a counter interpretation (opposing the Communist regime and identifying with democratic political traditions) was developed by an opposition group with the objective of resisting and removing from power the existing regime. The immediate assumption of a patronage over reconstructing the Castle in 1945 by the Communist regime taking over in Poland, and its reassumption in 1971 by the new Communist leaders, was an act of appropriating to itself control over heritage. Reconstructions, by replicating heritage, are especially vulnerable to political exploitation and manipulations; during selection of the conveyed messages some information can be concealed or simply not reconstructed while some other is emphasized. Especially reconstructions of 'national monuments' are often loaded with political values and can be conceived as a question of national pride. Such values can provoke reconstruction of desired features and the elimination of those that are contrary to political goals. Reconstructions can be an effective interpretive and ideology-supportive instrument, a nation building and consolidating tool, and a political agenda vehicle.

Architectural reconstructions become incorporated into culture on the basis of their informational, symbolic, and artistic values. Since at the very base of the significance of heritage relics as cultural resources is their ability to serve as tangible links to the past from which they have survived, architectural reconstructions by replicating heritage relics assume their role as *cultural resources*. This quality makes reconstructions powerful as symbols of, or mnemonics for, the past. For example, the reconstruction of Warsaw after the

Second World War grew out of a passionate conviction that what had been destroyed during the war was so significant and symbolic to the Poles that the reconstruction represented a gesture well beyond the mere re-creation of a unique cultural landscape. However, the vision of the past which architectural reconstructions evoke is highly conditioned, if not determined, by the selection of the replicated features and themes; the reconstructed Louisbourg Fortress was assigned a new symbolic repertoire associated with social rather than, as tradition had it, military history.

Architectural reconstructions as *cultural resources* are utilized in many different ways. In historical and archaeological research architectural reconstructions, as tangible objects, supplement inquiry when theoretical constructs are proved to be insufficient. They can suggest important historical context otherwise impossible to reveal and translate historical data into physical reality by recreating bygone spatial relationships, patterns of use, technologies. Moreover, reconstructions serve as a means of ascertaining whether particular historical assumptions were plausible. Thus, architectural reconstructions serve as models of historical data. The reconstruction of the Louisbourg Fortress produced a large data bank of information about building technology of the eighteenth century. It further encouraged extensive archaeological and historical research. Since architectural reconstructions have such great potential in terms of explaining the past and testing historical assumptions as 'applied-history models', they are employed as powerful interpretation and educational tools. As interpretive devices architectural reconstructions enhance the presentation of a

historic site and permit public understanding of site history. This makes them a very effective form of commemoration.

An extreme manifestation of architectural reconstructions, transcending limits imposed on them by the fact that they constitute mere replicas occurs, when they assume a role of the relics they replicate and function as an icon. For example, the Warsaw Royal Castle does not function as a simple reconstructed model of historical data. As an instant icon (even during its reconstruction), it has moved beyond that to become a symbol of ideas and identities shared by Poles. It confirms that ideas and perceptions can be expressed as effectively in reproductions as in original artefacts. The reconstructed Louisbourg Fortress also becomes an icon as it transcends specific physical appearance and becomes an expression of a Canadian national commitment to heritage.

Architectural reconstructions can be seen as a product of their time, reflecting changing attitudes to heritage interpretation and to conservation. In many ways, each reconstruction represents an outcome of aesthetic perception and tendencies of its time. An analysis of the reconstruction projects completed in Poland and Canada revealed that the approaches applied reflect the spirit of their times as accurately as does contemporary architecture. Moreover, contemporary architecture and architectural reconstruction (and restoration) have been going through similar developmental phases and have been interchanging approaches, trends and styles.

The most obviously important use of architectural reconstructions as an *economic resource* is as the basis for heritage tourism. Architectural

reconstructions are popular as a tourist attraction; they 'freeze' historic sites in time whereas the original relics they replicate had been constantly changing and they offer a 'trip in time' to 'visit' the past. Animated reconstructed sites are very popular tourist attractions. This argument, most frequently advanced in support of reconstructions, has broad consequences for heritage management; such development of historic sites is perceived as more profitable than promoting heritage restoration. It is interesting to notice that the reconstructed sites adopt a 'corporate' manner of management (as expressed by programs for enhanced profile, better marketing, improvement of facilities and service, strategies for improved visitation, etc.). Apart from generating profits as a tourist attraction, reconstruction projects and activities they involve are a source of community building and economic development. The reconstruction works at the Louisbourg Fortress generated work for the region and have served as an impetus to the local heritage movement.

The way in which the architectural reconstruction process has been defined and analysed in this thesis places emphasis upon its most distinctive characteristic: selective recomposition and interpretation of the elements that convey attributed themes and messages. The simple model outlined in Chapter 4 (Fig 4.1 and 4.2) explained connections between values as identified in architectural heritage and examined their transfer into architectural reconstruction. It is now appropriate to test the model in relation to the studied cases.

According to the model, the identified values of historic relics replicated in both reconstruction projects can be arranged in four groups: intrinsic values (original relic), derivative values (rooted in the historic relic considered as a material object: artistic and informational values), acquired values (linked with the relic through associations such as symbolic values) and economic values that reflect the relic's potential as a heritage resource. In both cases, as a result of the differential political, economic, and cultural conditions under which the reconstruction projects were completed, there has been a corresponding diversity in motivation for undertaking them. This resulted in the selection of specific features of the relics perceived as values and replication based upon their influence. Deducing from the model, the values of architectural reconstructions, both abstract and monetary, are decided in the present. This accords with a general observation that heritage is the contemporary use of the past.

In the case of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, the intrinsic value of the relic was rooted in the original building of the Castle before its demolition. The original building as a material object was a source of other perceived values: derivative and acquired. The derivative values, artistic and informational, were revealed from formal research and from studying aesthetic and craftsmanship qualities of the original building. Among informational values were those revealing the history of the Castle's architectural development and among artistic values were those represented by the preserved or restored architectural features. Symbolic values of the Castle were associated with the role of the

building in history: the Castle as a residence of the King and the President was a symbol of Polish nationhood and symbolized Polish democratic traditions; hence its acquired (symbolic) values. Destruction of the building caused intrinsic values to lose their basis in the historic relic. Derivative values, impossible to establish when the building is destroyed, were retrieved from the historical records and preserved remains that formed a basis for the reconstruction. Acquired (symbolic) values survived, sustained in the cultural tradition. The site of the Castle (and ruins) was preserved and aided in perpetuating symbolic values. During the reconstruction process the reconstructed building was formed under the influences of the acquired (symbolic) values and recorded derivative (informational and artistic) values. These values, however, were re-assessed and transferred onto the reconstruction selectively. Generally, this 're-evaluation' is performed according to criteria that can be completely different from those applied to the original relic. This suggests that the reconstructed relic is expected to conform to a new programme driven by political, economic (tourist industry) or artistic goals. Therefore, during the reconstruction of the Royal Castle some architectural forms (e.g. from the restoration in the 1920s) were not replicated as they were regarded as aesthetically worthless, though it is highly doubtful that any changes of this nature would have been made if the Castle had survived intact. Similarly, some historical information was not conveyed in the reconstructed building; for the obvious political reasons, the interiors of the offices of the President of the Second Republic (1918-39) were not reconstructed. There was understandable controversy around reconstruction of

the Gothic remains uncovered and preserved in the 1920s. Since the informational values associated with a material form of the relic cannot be fully transferred (only to the extent which is recorded in the replica; the reconstructed relic reveals no more than the source its replication is based upon) it was argued that replicating the Gothic remains would be pointless. The remains uncovered in the 1920s were left exposed to serve as a source of information about Gothic form and their replica would never serve this purpose. Nothing new can be revealed about material and dimensions of the brick since the reconstructed brick was contemporarily manufactured. Similarly, nothing new can be revealed about architectural form of the relics since working drawings from which the replica was made had been prepared contemporarily. Moreover, reconstructing the Gothic remains would undermine the credibility of the use of the original fragments salvaged from the ruins; the replica of the Gothic remains would make a false impression of being retrieved from the ruins and incorporated into the reconstruction. It was decided, however, that the remains would be reconstructed to serve as an educational tool in facilitating comprehension of the destroyed relics. Transfer of the symbolic values associated with the Royal Castle was relatively unaffected; the building was recreated and could assume its function as a symbol of Polish nationhood. However, the selective reconstruction concealed some features and led to limitations in the symbolic repertoire, for example, it excluded motifs associated with the Second Republic. It is important to note that according to the initial declarations the Castle was to be rebuilt to its form in 1939 (the year of its destruction) but with 'some modifications' which kept being added

to the design during the course of the reconstruction works. Their purpose, according to the conservators, was to give the reconstructed building its 'best' and 'correct' form. This attitude reveals a strong tendency towards selecting for reconstruction only the highly esteemed phases in the building's development while concealing others. This specific selectivity was performed within the acceptable limits of historical accuracy arbitrarily defined by the conservators involved. There is no record of the expected economic profits from the reconstructed Royal Castle; economic values of the original Castle were limited to its utilitarian values and its reconstruction was undertaken as a last stage of the post-war rebuilding motivated by other than economic factors. Nevertheless, the reconstruction project provided employment to the capital region in times under an inefficient economy with a high hidden unemployment rate.

In the case of the Louisbourg Fortress, there was a significantly larger gap between its demolition and reconstruction. Moreover, the Fortress had never functioned as a heritage relic before its demolition; it was the ruined fortified town that was commemorated as a historic site. The reconstruction was mainly motivated by expected economic benefits for the region and was highly influenced by its potential economic values. The ruins substituted as a basis for the intrinsic values. The derivative values were retrieved in the process of extensive historical and archaeological research. The symbolic value was traditionally associated with dramatic conflicts and combats and the relic was considered a military historic site. During the reconstruction process the first selective treatment was aimed at the symbolic values. The site was assigned a

new symbolic repertoire that shifted from the military themes towards the social history. Another selection was performed on derivative values; the fortified town was replicated as it appeared not the day it was demolished but in the arbitrary chosen moment in its development that coincided with its richest, most impressive and complete state. Financial considerations (and expectations) highly influenced the reconstruction process and steered the project towards complying with the economic objectives.

The key point which has emerged from this analysis is that architectural reconstructions, as replicas of heritage, remain an essential component in the construction of identity, while, simultaneously, they function as heritage resources. Their effectiveness as means of regional and urban development was illustrated especially by the Louisbourg reconstruction project. Investigation of architectural reconstructions as a purposeful activity revealed that they can be part of processes of empowerment, favouring particular (official) standpoints and notions. At the same time, they can carry alternative (unofficial) meanings. The reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw provides an excellent example; the Communist government, initiating the reconstruction of the Castle as an act of political legitimation, attributed to the reconstructed Castle a symbolism of national unity under the Communist leadership, while the opposition regarded the same reconstructed Castle as a symbol of Polish sovereignty, democracy and unity against the Communist regime. Popular memory transmitted in the Castle reconstruction functioned as a means to construct and share identity in the face

of elite power and as a means to social action against nationality deprivation in Poland under the Communist rule.

Considering as data the events and persons commemorated in the reconstructed sites, the present inquiry demonstrates how the significance of historical events changes according to a changing array of societal problems and needs. Collective remembering involves placing parts of the past in the service of needs, expectations and conceptions of the present. The process of architectural reconstruction as identified in its key stages (deconstruction, selective recomposition and interpretation) can serve as a template for examination of heritage formation. It demonstrates that recollection of the past is an active, constructive and *selective* process, not a simple matter of retrieving information.

7.2 CONCLUSIONS

7.2.1 Summary

In overview, this thesis has explored the multidimensional aspects of the architectural reconstruction process seen in a historical perspective. It was undertaken through an examination of architectural reconstruction projects. Specifically, it has related architectural reconstructions to the propagation of nation-building ideas and beliefs in the context of Polish and Canadian societies. It has further investigated the particular production of two reconstructions (Polish and Canadian) in an effort to analyze a process of replicating historic relics. Chapter 1 began by setting a central problem of architectural reconstruction

within the context of broader phenomena associated with the notion of heritage and architectural conservation. Following an introduction to the concept of architectural reconstruction situated against the broader background of different social-cultural contexts and physical realities in Chapter 2, and its relation to the place identities and to the uses of heritage in Chapter 3, the essential dimensions of architectural reconstruction which derive from cultural, political and economic contexts of its uses were outlined in Chapter 4. The concept of authenticity in relation to architectural reconstruction was explored and analytical connections between values as identified in the architectural relics and architectural reconstructions were established in the model developed in 4.3. These frameworks were further used in the subsequent chapters to examine reconstruction projects through cases drawn from Canada and Poland. First, in Chapter 5, a genealogy and a wider context of reconstruction practice in architectural conservation was discussed and a broader political context was presented for each country in relation to the identity issue and the political and administrative structures potent to shape it.

From this broader perspective, the focus was narrowed in Chapter 6 principally to the consideration of two reconstruction case studies and the issues related to their processes of production. The two were chosen primarily since they represented similar scale initiatives undertaken around the same time period. There were several key areas of inquiry. Firstly, the discussion contextualized the importance of the reconstruction to the nation and presented the proponents with their specific goals for the reconstruction project. Both

reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw and the Louisbourg Fortress in Nova Scotia were linked through the discussion of their national significance and the role they played as political and economic instruments in policies of their proponents. Secondly, the analysis discussed the preparation process including the negotiation that led to the formulation of the guidelines for the architects. Thirdly, a detailed account of the reconstruction process was presented. Of central importance was the selective character of the reconstruction process in respect to replication of the identified features. The last area of inquiry in the production phase described construction of the interpretive themes. Here, also, selectiveness in formulation of the interpretation programs was discussed.

7.2.2 Review of the purpose of the thesis and limitations

The broad aim of this thesis was to explore the physical and human dimension of architectural reconstruction. The history of attitudes toward and motives for the reconstruction of historic sites were investigated. Attitudes towards reconstruction as a conservation activity were examined as an expression of national identity and a product of historical experience. It was demonstrated that architectural reconstructions function as political, cultural and economic resources.

The most fundamental task was to establish what is happening in the process of architectural reconstruction and how does the product of this process fit into heritage formation and conservation. In the course of the inquiry, three identified formative phases of the reconstruction project were explored: formation

of ideological objectives of the reconstruction initiatives, identification and selection of the values perceived in a destroyed relic and transferred to a reconstruction, and completion of the reconstruction project from the perspective of conservation practice. The extremely negotiated process of architectural reconstruction was demonstrated in the detailed analysis of the formulation of the reconstruction guidelines and execution of the design. It has been established how selection of the values identified in the reconstructed relic and their transference to the reconstruction entails negotiation.

The theoretical challenge was to identify the mechanics of the reconstruction process in relation to values transfer. This was done by developing a model that traced analytical connections between these values. The model allowed the user to determine a specific configuration of value relations as identified in heritage relics, and examine how these values have been transferred into reconstruction. The model was tested in relation to the studied cases and the implications were formulated.

The study explored the identified technical problems posed by reconstruction projects and examined the conservation principles formulated as the result of approaching and solving them. The issues of authenticity and historical accuracy in relation to heritage relics and their reconstructions were explored.

This work represents the first comprehensive attempt to place architectural reconstruction in a multidimensional geographical context. The nature of architectural reconstruction, however, makes the line of inquiry

unavoidably open to challenge. Architectural reconstruction can be conceptualized as an artefact, as meaning and as both a cultural and an economic good. These multiple roles and uses are so complexly interlinked that they are considered together here because they cannot effectively be separated. However, this makes any attempt at synthesis so complex and obligated to constant qualification. No claim has been made that this thesis represents a definite attempt of conceptualizing architectural reconstruction; rather it is a provisional account that brings together the many domains of architectural reconstruction into a single coherent analysis centred ultimately on a reconstruction process. Nevertheless, the basis for comprehensive inquiry has been laid and the framework for the conceptualization of the reconstruction process outlined.

It was impossible in the space of this thesis to analyse all the reconstruction projects that have been completed in Canada and Poland, thus the necessary focus on single case studies. However, more comprehensive national comparative studies might illustrate wider dimensions of the reconstruction practice. Among them is the issue of scale. While the majority of reconstruction projects have been completed at the national scale and their interpretation programs accentuate the identity associations of nationalism (which in a postmodern world of diversely constructed identities remains as one of the most powerful expressions of the diversity of belonging), reconstructions produced in other scales, such as sub-national or regional, might be found to operate different iconographies of belonging. Such analysis would also reveal

how the differential territorial scale in which the reconstruction projects have been produced is reflected in the employed iconography of belonging and, subsequently, how the issue of scale is reflected in the reconstruction process.

7.2.3 Areas for further research

The nature of architectural reconstruction classifies it as a dynamic social phenomenon that continues to emerge with new scope and implications which open new directions for investigation. The focus of the present thesis is on the total process of reconstruction production from its conception until its completion. Among areas that need to be explored further are the issues associated with the performance of completed reconstructions taking on the role of heritage resources. In particular there are three areas of study which are in need of further investigation and for which much of the basis required for such research has been laid in this study: 1. reception of the completed reconstructions by visitors; 2. changes to the symbolic repertoire and interpretation programs of completed reconstructions introduced by those controlling/managing them; and 3. problems associated with maintenance of aging reconstructions.

The account presented by the thesis and the lines of approach on which it is based is strongly producer (those performing reconstruction) oriented, that is it concentrates on the promotion of place identities rather than upon their reception by consumers (visitors to the reconstructed sites). It would be interesting to address the issue of whether visitors to the reconstruction projects are reading into the replicas any of the messages intended by the reconstruction producers

and how this reading is modified and influenced by continuously changing political, economic and cultural conditions. This line of inquiry would be particularly useful in investigating issues associated with dominant ideology and legitimization. A wider research would allow examining consumer's reactions to projected political messages. One of the major areas would be to investigate further how different personal characteristics (e.g. ethnic origin, gender, age) affect reception of the reconstructions. In addition to examining a changing perception of completed reconstruction projects, it would be interesting to trace the development of a new layer of their symbolism related to the fact that reconstructions become symbols of the reconstruction act and conservation philosophy of their times and therefore monuments in their own right. An investigation should trace how reconstructions function as a heritage resource with their own symbolism and how this symbolism is related to the reconstruction process. For example, the reconstructed Royal Castle might symbolize a persistence of the Polish nation in pursuing the reconstruction project, while the reconstruction of the Louisbourg Fortress can be symbolic in shifting away from the commemoration of the dramatic conflicts and combats between two founding nations towards commemorating a human endeavour in the new world. Both projects reflect conservation theory and principles of the times of their completion.

Another area that needs to be explored further includes the issues of interpretation, especially changes introduced to the interpretation program by those who control and manage reconstruction sites, seen in the changing

political, cultural and economic context. For example, the changes to the commemorative themes at the Royal Castle in Warsaw introduced after the collapse of the Communist regime (the refurnishing of the Chapel, reconstruction of the interiors commemorating the Second Republic) reflect a new political reality and social awareness.

One more important area of research that should be investigated involves a wide range of theoretical and practical issues associated with conservation of aging reconstructions. The conservation challenges posed by existing reconstructions present a very complex problem to heritage resource management. In Canada, the structures designated for reconstruction are ones that were not originally built for permanence (which contributes to the reasons why they are lost). They were mostly frontier buildings or defensive works constructed in materials never intended to last. Their reconstructions must, paradoxically, be intended to last but even wide-ranging compromises implemented in the construction process such as substituting materials (concrete instead of wood) to prolong their survival do not protect reconstructed sites from deterioration. Similarly, in Poland, the post-war reconstructions completed within the limited budget and means of a country destroyed by the war pose a serious conservation problem. Reconstructions are by definition contemporary work and have no historical value of the relic they replicate, but because of their special character the principles and practice of heritage resource management may apply to them. Moreover, many reconstructed buildings have heritage values in their own right as they express attitudes in heritage conservation (e.g. the

reconstructed officers' quarters building at Fort Anne classified in 1988 as a monument to the 1930s approaches to conservation) and though their conservation should be guided by the same rules which apply to other heritage buildings, there are still many questions to be posed and answered. Among them are: the problem of correction to the reconstructed works (many of the existing reconstructions contain known inaccuracies), the question of modification prolonging their life, and the approaches to their maintenance.

It is hoped that further investigation with respect to the outlined topics can approach a comprehensive account of architectural reconstruction activities seen as an ongoing social practice.

7.2.4 Relevance to contemporary geographical concerns

In closing, this thesis has attempted to advance the scope of geographical inquiry into the production of architectural reconstructions. Moreover, it has sought to integrate the study of heritage, as represented by architectural reconstructions, into the wider realm of contemporary political, cultural and economic geography. It was demonstrated that architectural reconstruction by imitating architectural heritage is intrinsic to the contemporary use of the past, and, similarly to architectural heritage, architectural reconstructions are defined and constructed through present circumstances. It was specifically shown that architectural reconstruction is used as a political instrument in support of ideas of dominant ideology and legitimation as well as an economic instrument in policies of regional and urban development and regeneration. It was further illustrated by

the case studies that architectural reconstruction is a spatial phenomenon, characterized by location, distribution and scale, and as architectural heritage, it belongs to attributes that contribute to place identities and to the identification of individuals and groups within them. As such, architectural reconstruction is of equal importance to architectural heritage for contemporary cultural geography concerned with signification, representation and the essential issue of identity. Similarly, a study of architectural reconstructions seems to be central to understanding how geographical identity is formed. In light of the resource commitment involved architectural reconstruction may even very well constitute the most potent statement of identity to be found in the built environment.

REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. and Turner, B.S. (1980) *The dominant ideology thesis*. London: Allen and Unwin
- Adams, P.C. (1995) A reconsideration of personal boundaries in space-time. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 1995, pp. 267-85
- Adamski B. (1971) Ludowy Zamek ? (The Castle of the working class?) *Kultura, Paryż* (Paris), 285(6), pp.98-101
- Agnew, J.A. and Duncan, J.S. (eds) (1989) *The Power of Place: Bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations*. Boston: Unwin Hyman
- Agnew, J.A. and J.S. Duncan (1989) Introduction. In Agnew, J.A. and Duncan, J.S. (eds) *The Power of Place: Bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, pp 1-8
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Press
- Arendt, H. (1958) *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Ashworth, G.J. (1984) Urban conservation and urban renewal: partners or opponents in the West European city. In Lichtenberger, E. and Heinritz, G. (eds) *Crisis in the city*. Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag (the revised 1990 edition)
- Ashworth, G.J. (1993) *On tragedy and renaissance: the role of Loyalist and Acadian heritage interpretations in Canadian place identities*. Groningen: Geo Pers
- Ashworth, G.J. (1996) Realisable potential but hidden problems: a heritage tale from five Central European cities. In Purchla, J. (ed.) *The historical metropolis. A hidden potential*. Cracow: International Cultural Centre
- Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge, J.E. (2000) *The tourist-historic city: retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*. London: Elsevier
- Atwood, M. (1972) *Survival. A thematic guide to Canadian literature*. Toronto: Anansi

Baker, A. (1992) Introduction : On Ideology and Landscape. In Baker, A. and Biger, G. eds. *Ideology and Landscape in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-14

Bartczakowa, A. and Malinowska, I. (1974) *Pałac Branickich. (The Branicki Castle)* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe

Barthel, D. (1996) *Historic Preservation: collective memory and historical identity*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press

Barthes, R. (1986) Semiology and the urban. In Gottdiener, M. and Lagopoulos, A.P. (eds.) *The city and the sign: an introduction to urban semiotics*. New York: Columbia University Press

Bell, D.V.J. (1970) The Loyalist tradition in Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 5, pp. 22-33

Berdoulay, V. (1989) Place, meaning, and discourse in French language geography. In Agnew, J.A. and Duncan, J.S. (eds) *The Power of Place: Bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, pp. 124-139

Biegański, P. (1956) Odbudowa Starego Miasta w Warszawie jako dzielniczy mieszkaniowej. In Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki *Stare Miasto w Warszawie. Odbudowa. (The Old Town in Warsaw. The Rebuilding)* Centralny Zarząd Muzeów i Ochrony Zabytków, Teka Konserwatorska, Zeszyt 4, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Budownictwo i Architektura, pp. 7-18

Biegański, P. (1971) Problemy odbudowy Zamku Królewskiego w Warszawie. (The rebuilding of the Royal Castle in Warsaw) *Architektura* 286(9), pp. 354-356

Biegański, P. (1974) Zamek Ujazdowski. (The Ujazdowski Castle) *Architektura*, 6, pp. 262-264

Biegański, P. (1988) *The rebuilding of the Old Town*. In Lorentz, S. (ed.) *Stare The Old Town and the Royal Castle in Warsaw*. Warsaw: Arkady

Biegański, P., Gieysztor, A., Lorentz, S. and Zachwatowicz, J. (1988) *Stare Miasto i Zamek Królewski w Warszawie. (The Old Town and the Royal Castle in Warsaw)* Warszawa: Arkady

Bodnar, J. (1994) *Public Memory in an American city: Commemoration in Cleveland*. In Gillis, J. (ed.) *Commemorations: the Politics of National identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Boulting, N. (1976) *The law's delays: conservationists legislation in the British Isles*. In Fawcett, J. (ed.) *The Future of the Past*. London: Thames and Hudson

Bradford, R. D (1988) *Historic Forts of Ontario*. Belleville, Ontario: Mika Publishing

Brandi, C. (1977) *Teoria del restauro*. Torino: Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi

Breitling, P. (1981) *The origins and development of conservation philosophy in Austria*. In Kain, R. (ed.) *Planning for Conservation*. London: Mansell

Breton, R. (1984) *The production and allocation of symbolic resources; an analysis of the linguistic and ethnocultural fields in Canada*. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 21(2), pp.123-144

Brown, W. and Senior, H. (1984) *Victorious in defeat: the Loyalists in Canada*. Toronto: Methuen

Brunette, P. and D. Wills, (1994) *The Spatial Arts: An Interview with Jacques Derrida*. In Brunette, P. and Wills, D. (eds) *Deconstruction and the Visual Arts. Art, Media, Architecture*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Brunette, P. and Wills, D. (1994) *Deconstruction and the Visual Arts: Art, Media, Architecture*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press

Brückner, A. (1946) *Dzieje kultury polskiej. (The History of Polish Culture)* Kraków-Warszawa

Bukowski, M. (1966) *Granice interwencji konserwatorskiej w zabytkach architektury. (The boundaries of intervention in the case of architectural conservation)* *Sprawozdanie z posiedzeń komisji PAN 1965*, vol. 1-6, Kraków

Burtenshaw, D., Bateman, M. and Ashworth, G. (1991) *The European City, A Western Perspective*. New York, Toronto: John Wiley & Sons

Cameron, C., Fram, M. and Cliver, E.B. (1998) *A National Register and Conservation Standards: Meeting the Need*. In *Lightening the Burden: Taxation, Regulation and Heritage Property*, Summary of Conference Papers The Heritage Canada Foundation, 1997, Annual Conference, October 16-18, 1997, Ottawa, Ontario, The Heritage Canada Foundation, pp. 9-10

Canadian Parks Service, (1990) *Canadian Parks Service Interim Policy on Cultural Resource Management March, 1990*. Environment Canada, Ottawa

Carr, E.H. (1961) *What is history?* London: Macmillan

Carter, F.W. (1981) *Conservation problems of historic cities in Eastern Europe*. Department of Geography, University College and School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, England

Casey, E. (1993) *Getting Back into Place*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press

Cherry, G.E. (1975) The conservation movement. *The Planner* ,61, pp. 3-5

Ciborowski, A. (1964) *Warsaw. A City Destroyed and Rebuilt* . Warsaw: Polonia Publishing House

Ciołek, G. and Ciborowski, A. (1953) Problemy urbanistyczne odbudowy zespołów zabytkowych. (Urban planning in heritage conservation) *Miasto* ,7, pp. 8-16

Cliver, B.E. (1972) Reconstruction: Valid or Invalid? *Historic Preservation*, 24 (4), pp. 22-25

Cloke, P., Philo, C. and Sadler, D. (1991) *Approaching Human Geography: An Introduction to Contemporary Theoretical Debates*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing

Coleman, M. (1988) *Officers' Quarters, Fort Anne National Historic Park, Annapolis Royal N.S.* Federal Heritage Building Review Office, Building Report, pp. 88-56

Collins, R. (1986) *Weberian Sociological Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Cook, R. (1971) *The Maple Leaf Forever. Essays on Nationalism and Politics in Canada*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada

Connerton, P. (1989) *How societies remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Cullingworth, B (1997) Historic Preservation in the USA. *Built Environment*, 23(2), pp. 137-143

Czacki, T. (1881) Rapport J.W. Czackiego Sty Nowogardzkiego Komisji Rzplitej Skarbu Koronnego Komisarza do prowincji krakowskiej delegowanego. Prześwietnej Komisji podany 26 kwietnia 1791 r. (Report by Honourable Starost of the Nowogrodzki District, the Delegated Commissioner of the Republic Crown Treasury Commission to the Cracow District. To the Honourable Commission submitted on the 26 day of April 1791) *Czas*, 160, p. 1

Dalby, S. (1992) Security, Modernity, Ecology: The Dilemma of Post-Cold War Discourse. *Alternatives*, 17(1), pp. 95:134

Dalby, S. (1997) The Threat from the South?: Geopolitics, Equity, and Environmental Security. In Deudney, D. and Matthews, R. (eds) *Contested Grounds: Security and Conflict in the New Environmental Politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Dalby, S. and Mackenzie, F. (1997) Reconceptualizing Local Community: Environment, Identity, Threat. *Area*, 29(2), pp. 22-108

Dalibard, J. (1986a) Laws are not enough. *Canadian Heritage*, (August - September), pp. 6-7

Dalibard, J. (1986b) Why we need a national heritage review. *Canadian Heritage*, (October-November), pp. 38-43

Davis, F. (1979) *Yearning for Yesterday: A sociology of Nostalgia*. London: Collier Macmillan

Dehio, G. and Riegl, A. (1988) *Konservieren, nicht restaurieren. Streitschriften zur Denkmalpflege um 1900*. Braunschweig, Vieweg :Bauwelt Fundamente (first edition 1900)

Demetrykiewicz, W. (1886) Konserwatorstwo dla zabytków archeologicznych. (The art of conservation in regard to archaeological monuments) Kraków: Z.Czyżewski

- Denslagen, W. (1994) *Architectural restoration in Western Europe: controversy and continuity*. Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Press
- Dobby, A. (1978) *Conservation and Planning*. London: Hutchinson
- Downey, F. (1965) *Louisbourg: key to a continent*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice-Hall
- Drozdowski, B. (1956) Rzecz o milczących murach. (About the silent walls) *Życie Literackie*, 32, pp. 5 and 10
- Duby, G. (1985) Ideology and History. In Le Goff, J. and Nora, P. (eds) *Constructing the Past: essays in historical methodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 151-165
- Duncan, J.S. (1989) The power of place in Kandy, Sri Lanka: 1780-1980. In Agnew, J.A. and Duncan, J.S. (eds) *The Power of Place: Bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, pp. 185-201
- Dutkiewicz, J.E. (1955) Naukowy dorobek konserwatorstwa w okresie X-lecia. (The scientific output of the conservation activities in the first decade after the war) *Materiały do studiów i dyskusji z zakresu teorii i historii sztuki*, vol. 3-4, pp. 492-513
- Dutkiewicz, J.E. (1961) Sentymentalizm, autentyzm, automatyzm. (Sentimentalism, authenticity, and automatism) *Ochrona Zabytków*, 1, pp. 3-16
- Eco, U. (1986) Function and sign: semiotics of architecture. In Gottdiener, M. and Lagopoulos, A.P. (eds) *The city and the sign: an introduction to urban semiotics*. New York: Columbia University
- Encyklopedia Popularna PWN (1982) Warszawa: PWN
- Entrikin, J.N. (1991) *The Betweenness of Place: Towards a Geography of Modernity*. London: Macmillan
- Environment Canada, Parks Service (1990) Cultural Resource Management Policy. In *Canadian Parks Service : Proposed Policy*. Ottawa Section 3.5.2.
- Evans, J. (1956) *A History of the Society of Antiquaries*. Oxford, London: Batey

Falkner, A. (1976) *Without our past? A handbook for the preservation of Canada's architectural heritage*. Ministry of State for Urban Affairs, Canada

Faucher, F. (1986) The medium is the message: Perceptions of the consulting architect on the restoration of Fort Chambly. *APT*, 18 (1-2), pp.69-73

Fawcett, J. (ed.) (1976) *The Future of the Past: attitudes to conservation*. London: Thames and Hudson

Fawcett, J. (1976) A restoration tragedy: cathedrals in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In Fawcett, J. (ed.) *The Future of the Past*. London: Thames and Hudson

Feifer, M. (1985) *Going Places*. London: MacMillan

Feilden, B.M. (1994) *Conservation of Historic Buildings*. Oxford: Butterworth Architecture

Flemming, D. (1969) Navy Hall, Niagara-on-the-Lake. *History and Archaeology*, No 8, Ottawa: National Historic Parks and Site Branch, Parks Canada, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

Flowerdew, R. and Martin, D. (1997) *Methods in Human Geography*. Essex: Longman

Foote, K. (1988) Object as Memory: the Material Foundation of Human Semiosis. *Semiotica*, 69(3/4), pp. 243-68

Ford, L.R. (1978) Continuity and change in historic cities: Bath, Chester and Norwich. *Geographical Review*, 68(3), pp. 253-73

Fort Langley NHS (1998) *Management Plan: Analysis of Current Situation*, Parks Canada, July, 2001

Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Site of Canada (N.S.) (2001) In *Louisbourg Institute. The Official Research Site for the Fortress of Louisbourg*. Parks Canada; http://fortress.uccb.nc.ca/parks/fort_e.html

Fram, M. (1988) *Well preserved. The Ontario Heritage Foundation's manual of principles and practice for architectural conservation*. Erin, Ont: The Boston Mills Press

Franklin, D. (1998) The Role of Government in Heritage Preservation. *Heritage*, 1(1), pp. 20-21

French, R.A. (1988) *Conserving the Past in Soviet Cities*. Occasional paper. The Kennan Institute of Advanced Russian Studies, Washington D.C.

Frodl, W. (1966) *Pojęcia i kryteria wartościowania zabytków. (The concept of and criteria of evaluation of monuments)* translated by M. Arsyński, Warszawa: Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki

Fry, B.W. (1984) 'An appearance of strength'. The Fortification of Louisbourg. *Studies in Archaeology, Architecture and History*, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Environment Canada

Frycz, J. (1975) *Resturacja i konserwacja zabytków architektury w Polsce w latach 1795-1918. (Restoration and conservation of the architectural monuments in Poland during 1795-1918)* Warszawa: P.W.N.

Galt, G. (1984) The Battle for Fort Chambly. *Canadian Heritage*, 10(1), Feb/Mar, pp. 13-17

Geertz, C. (1964) Ideology as a Cultural System. In Apter, D. (ed.) *Ideology and Discontent*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 47-76

Gellner, E. (1964) *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson

Gieysztor, A. (1988) The Reconstruction of the Royal Castle. In Lorentz, S. (ed.) *The Old Town and the Royal Castle in Warsaw*. Warszawa: Arkady (second edition) pp. 53-60

Goryński, J. (1954) Mumifikacja czy twórczość. (Mummification or creativity) *Przegląd Kulturalny*, 6(76), p. 3

Goss, J. (1988) The built environment and social theory: towards an architectural geography, *Professional Geographer*, 40(4), pp. 392-403

Goss, J. (1993) Placing the market and marketing place: tourist advertising of the Hawaiian Islands, 1972-92. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 11, pp. 663-688

Grabowski, J. (1948) Warszawa panopticum czy Warszawa przyszłości? (Warsaw the panopticon or Warsaw the city of the future?) *Stolica*, 1, p. 5

Graham, B., Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge, J.E. (2000) *A Geography of Heritage. Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Arnold

Grant, G.M. ed.(1882) *Picturesque Canada; The Country as it Was and Is*. Toronto: Belden Bros.

Griswold, C. (1993) The Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Washington Mall: Philosophical Thoughts on Political Iconography. In Senie, H. and Webster, S. (eds) *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*. New York: Harper Collins

Gruszczyński, W. (1953) Wawelska teza. (The Wawel thesis) *Architektura*, 3, pp. 69-70

Gruszecki, A. and Łysiak, W. (1974) Propozycja nowej wersji Karty Weneckiej. (Proposal for the new version of Venice Charter) *Architektura*, 1/2, pp. 3-11

Gutman, R. (1988) *Architectural Practice*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press

Haider, G. (1996) Muslim Space and the Practice of Architecture. A Personal Odyssey. In Metcalf, B. D. (ed.) *Making Muslim space in North America and Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Halbwachs, M.(1980) *The Collective Memory*. New York:Harper Colophon

Harkin J.B. 1(914) Memorandum Regarding Dominion Parks, Their Values and Ideals, Ottawa, March 20 1914 National Archive, MG 30 E169, Harkin Correspondance, Volume2

Harris, C. (2001) Postmodern patriotism: Canadian reflections. *The Canadian Geographer*, 45(1), pp. 193-207

Harvey, D. (1991) *From Space to Place and Back Again: Reflections on the Condition of Postmodernity*. text for UCLA GSAUP Colloquium, May 13, 1991

Harvey, D. (1998) *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Hayden, D. (1976) *Seven American Utopias*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press

Hearn, M.F. (1992) *The Architectural Theory of Viollet-le-Duc. Readings and Commentary*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press

Höcker, C. (2000) *Architecture*. Hauppague, N.Y.: Barron's Educational Series

Hosmer, C.B. (1965) *Presence of the Past - A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States Before Williamsburg*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons

Hosmer, C.B. (1981) *Preservation comes of age: from Williamsburg to the National Trust 1926-1949*. Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia Press/
National Trust for Historic Preservation

Hutchinson, J. and Smith, A. (1994) Introduction. In Hutchinson, J. and Smith, A. (eds) *Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-13

ICOMOS Canada (1990) *Preserving Our Heritage: Catalogue of Charters and Other Guides*. Quebec: International Symposium on World Heritage Towns

Idźkowski, A. (1843) Kościół archikatedralny Śgo Jana w Warszawie. (The St. John archicathedral church) *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 4, pp. 1-18

Ignatieff, M. (1994) *Blood and Belonging: Journey into the New Nationalism*. New York, Toronto: Penguin Book

Ignatieff, M. (1995) Nationalism and the Narcissism of Minor Differences. In Ignatieff, M. *Ethnicity, Nationalism: 21st Century Time Bombs*. Queen's Quarterly

Ingram, G. (1992) Issue One. What Are the Challenges CPS Faces with Existing Reconstructions? In *Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop, Hull, Quebec 11-13 March, 1992*. National Historic Sites, Parks Service, Environment Canada, pp. 41-42

Ingram, G. and Bennett, G. (1992) The Cultural Resource Management Policy and the Reconstruction Imbroglio. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop, Hull, Quebec 11-13 March, 1992*. National Historic Sites, Parks Service, Environment Canada, pp. 13-16

International Symposium on World Heritage Towns (1990) *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*. ICOMOS Canada

Ito, N. (1995) Authenticity Inherent in Cultural Heritage in Asia and Japan. In Larsen, K.E. (ed.) *Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Conventiom, 1-6 November, 1994*. Proceedings. UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Jakimowicz, T. (1974) Viollet-le-Duc, architekt-konserwator i jego związki z Polską. (Viollet-le-Duc, architect-conservator, and his associations with Poland) *Ochrona Zabytkow*, 3, pp. 9-11

Jankowski, M. (1946) Miasto którego nie należy odbudowywać. (The city that should not be rebuilt) *Skarpa Warszawska*, 19, p.8

Jeffreys, C. W. (1939) The Reconstruction of the Port Royal Habitation of 1605-13. *Canadian Historical Review*, 20(4), December, pp. 369-77

Jencks, Ch. (1991) *Language of post-modern architecture*. New York: Rizzoli

Johnson, P-A. (1994) *The Theory of Architecture*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold

Johnston, A.J.B. (1983) *Preserving History: The Commemoration of 18th Century Louisburg, 1895-1940 , January 1983*. A Fortress of Louisburg, Preliminary Report.

Johnston, A.J.B. (1990) *Louisbourg. The Phoenix Fortress*. Halifax, N.S.: Nimbus Publishing Limited

Johnston, A.J.B. (ed.) (1991) *Louisbourg. An 18th-Century Tow*. Halifax, N.S.: Nimbus Publishing

Jokilehto, J. (1999) *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann

Kain, R.J.P. (1975) Urban conservation in France. *Town and Country Planning*, 43, pp. 428-32.

Kalinowski, W. and Zachwatowicz, J. (1968) Odbudowa zabytkowych zespołów urbanistycznych. (Rebuilding of urban complexes) In *Materiały do zagadnień muzealnictwa i konserwatorstwa polskiego*. Warszawa: Ośrodek Badań i Dokumentacji Zabytków

Kalman, H. (2000) *A concise history of Canadian architecture*. Oxford: University Press

Kancierz, F. (1953) Notatka z Raciborza. (Notes from Racibórz) *Miasto*, 12, pp. 31-32

Karczewski, A. (1946) Narodowy program konserwacji zabytków. (The National Program for Heritage Conservation) *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki i Kultury* vol.VIII, 3-4, pp. 193-197

Kieniewicz, S (ed.) (1968) *History of Poland*. Warszawa: PWN

Killan, G. (1976) *Preserving Ontario's Heritage: A History of the Ontario Historical Society*. Ottawa: Ontario Historical Society

Kopera, F. and Lepszy, L. (1901) Katedra na Wawelu, jej przeszłość i obecna restauracja. (The Wawel cathedral, its past and present restoration) In *Życie i Sztuka* (supplement), *Kraj*, 15, pp. 159-171

Kowalski, G. (1916) *O naszą kulturę – uwagi o odbudowie kraju i ratowaniu zniszczonych wojną zabytków*. (To save our culture – remarks on rebuilding and saving of the heritage relics destroyed by the war) Published by the author. Kraków: Eugeniusz i Dr. Kazimierz Koziński

Krassowski, C. (1971) Głosy w dyskusji. In *Oryginał, Replika, Kopia. Materiały III Seminarium Metodologicznego Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki, Radziejowice 26-27 września, 1968*. Warszawa: Arkady, pp. 194-198

Krause, E. (1987)a *Historical authenticity and the use of evidence in reconstructing and maintaining the Fortress of Louisbourg: Preface*. Fortress of Louisbourg Library, Report Number H F 89, Parks Canada

Krause, E. (1987)b *Historical authenticity and the use of evidence in reconstructing and maintaining the Fortress of Louisbourg: The Rand Commission*. Fortress of Louisbourg Library, Report Number H F 89, Parks Canada

Krause, E. (1987)c *Historical authenticity and the use of evidence in reconstructing and maintaining the Fortress of Louisbourg: Where lies the value*. Fortress of Louisbourg Library, Report Number HF 89, Parks Canada

Król, A. (1971) *Zamek Królewski w Warszawie. (The Royal Castle in Warsaw)* Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy

Krzysztoforski, W. (1979) *Odbudowa Zamku Królewskiego w Warszawie. (The Rebuilding of the Royal Castle in Warsaw)* Ośrodek Informacji PP PKZ

Krzyżanowski, L. (1997) *Gdańsk, Sopot, Gdynia*. Warsaw: Festina Publishing House

Kwiatkowski, M. (1976) Oficyna przy Bramie Grodzkiej Zamku Królewskiego w Warszawie. (The annexe near the Grodzka Gate of the Royal Castle in Warsaw) *Kronika Warszawy*, 4, pp. 79-88

Lacorne, D (2000) *Le multiculturalisme en question. (France, Etats-Unis, Canada)* A paper presented at the conference The Canadian Distinctiveness into XXI Century Ottawa: University of Ottawa

Lalewicz, M. (1924) *Stan robót inwentaryacyjnych i konserwatorskich na Zamku Królewskim w Warszawie*. Warszawa: Towarzystwa Opieki nad Zabytkami Przeszłości

Lancaster, O. (1976) What should we preserve? In Fawcett J. (ed.) *The Future of the Past*. London: Thames and Hudson

Larrabee, E. McM. (1971) Archaeological Research at the Fortress of Louisbourg 1961-1965. In *Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History*, No 2, National Historic Sites Service, National and Historic Parks Branch, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa, pp. 8-43

Lauterbach, A. (1927) O konserwacji historycznej i romantycznej. (Of historic and Romantic conservation) *Architektura i Budownictwo*, 3(8-9), pp. 261- 287

Lauterbach, A. (1930) Rozważania konserwatorakie. (Reflections on conservation) *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki i Kultury*, 1938, vol.6, pp. 330-342

Lauterbach, A. (1932) Międzynarodowa konferencja ochrony zabytków. (The international conference on heritage conservation) *Architektura i Budownictwo*, 5, pp.158-161

Lauterbach, A. (1971) Zniszczenia i odbudowa Warszawy zabytkowej. (The destruction and rebuilding of the historic Warsaw) *Kronika Warszawy*, 4, pp. 47-68

Le Carre, J. (1991) *The Secret Pilgrim*. Toronto: Penguin Books

Lelewicz, M. 1924 Stan robót inwentaryzacyjnych i konserwatorskich na Zamku Królewskim w Warszawie. (Inventory and conservation works at the Royal Castle in Warsaw) In Sprawozdanie komisji Towarzystwa Opieki nad Zabytkami Przeszłości (Report by the The Association for Protection of the Monuments of the Past) *Przegląd Techniczny*, vol. LXII, 26, pp.301-303

Lepiarczyk, J. (1954) *Konserwacja zabytków architektury*. (*Conservation of architectural heritage*) Kraków: PWN

Lepszy, L. (1908) Ze świata sztuki. (From the art world) *Przegląd Powszechny*, Grudzień, pp. 468-469

Letocha, D. (1986) The Dialectics of Tolerance in Sixteenth-Century Poland. Proceedings of the Unitarian Universalist Historian Society. 20(2)

Lipe, D. (1984) Value and meaning in cultural resources. In Cleere, H. *Approaches to the archaeological heritage. A comparative study of world cultural resource management systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lipset, S. (1990) *Continental Divide*. New York, London: Routledge Press

Litt, P. (1992) *The muses, the masses and the Massey Commissio*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Londyńczyk (1971) Zamek i Katyń. (TheCastle and Katyń) *Kultura*, Paryż (Paris), 282(3). pp.78-79

Lorentz, S. (1988) The History of the Royal Castle. In Lorentz, S. (ed.) *The Old Town and the Royal Castle in Warsaw*. Warszawa: Arkady (second edition), pp. 32-51

Lorentz, S. (1956) Działalność Stanisława Kostki Potockiego w dziedzinie architektury. (Architectural activities of Stanislaw Kostka Potocki) *Rocznik Historii Sztuki*, vol. 1, pp.155-156

Lorentz, S. (ed.) (1971) *Stare Miasto i Zamek Królewski w Warszawie*. (The Old Town and the Royal Castle in Warsaw) Warszawa: Arkady

- Lorentz, S. (1982) *Przewodnik po muzeach i zbiorach w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Interpress
- Lothian, W.F. (1981) *A History of Canada's National Parks*. Ottawa: Parks Canada, 1976 -1981
- Louch, A. R. (1969) *Explanation and Human Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Lounsbury, C.R. (1990) Beaux-Arts Ideals and Colonial Reality: The Reconstruction of Williamsburg's Capitol, 1928-1934. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 9(4), December, pp. 373-389
- Lowenthal, D. (1983) Conserving the heritage: Anglo-American comparisons. In Patten, J. ed. *The expanding city: essays in honour of Professor Jean Gottma*. London: Academic Press
- Lowenthal, D. (1985) *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lowenthal, D. (1992) A Global Perspective on American Heritage. In Lee, A.(ed.) *Past Meets Future*. Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press
- Lowenthal, D. (1994) Identity, Heritage, and History. In Gillis, J. (ed.) *Commemorations: the Politics of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Lowenthal, D. (1995) Changing Criteria of Authenticity. In Larsen, K.E. (ed.) *Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Conventiom, 1-6 November, 1994*. Proceedings. UNESCO World Heritage Centre
- Lowenthal, D. (1996) *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Toronto: The Free Press
- Łoziński, J. and Miłobędzki, A. (1967) *Atlas Zabytków Architektury w Polsce. (The Guide to Polish Architectural Heritage)* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Polonia
- Łuszczkiewicz, W. (1869) *Wskazówka do utrzymania kościołów, cerkwi i przechowywanych tamże zabytków przeszłości. (Guide to the maintenance of the churches and orthodox temples with remarks regarding historic relics in their possession)* Kraków

Łuszczkiewicz, W. (1887) *Poradnik dla zajmujących się utrzymaniem i restauracją kościołów i kościelnych sprzętów.* (*Maintenance and restoration of churches and their furnishing*) Warszawa

Łuszczkiewicz, W. (1888) Restauracja kościoła katedralnego na Wawelu.(Restoration of the cathedral at Wawel) Supplement, 1888. *Czas*, p.1

Łuszczkiewicz, W. (1889)a Restauracja wnętrza prezbiterium Kościoła Panny Maryi w Krakowie. (Restoration of the Saint Mary Church interior in Cracow) *Czas*, 31, p. 1

Łuszczkiewicz, W. (1889)b Do dziejów reatauracji prezbiterium kościoła Panny Maryi w Krakowie. (On the history of the restoration of the presbytery in the Saint Mary Church in Cracow) *Czas*, 194, p. 1

Lynch, K. (1972) *What Time Is This Place?* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press

Lynch, K. (1960) *Image of the city*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press

Łysiak, W. (1973) Czy stać nas na makiety? (Can we afford models?) *Perspektywy*, 26, pp.15-16

Mackintosh, B. (1992) The Case against Reconstruction CMR. *Cultural Resources Management Bulletin*, 15 (1), pp.17-18

MacLean, T. (1995) *Louisbourg Heritage. From Ruins to Reconstruction*. Sydney, Nova Scotia: University College of Cape Breton Press

Maczeński, Z. (1907) Odbudowa kościoła św.Michała w Hamburgu. (Rebuilding of the St. Michael church in Hamburg) *Przegląd Techniczny*, 20, pp. 263-264

Maczeński, Z (1908) Średniowieczny Ratusz m.Krakowa. (The medieval city hall in Cracow) *Przegląd Techniczny*, 25-29, pp. 26-29

Malpas, J. (1998) Finding Place: Spatiality, Locality, and Subjectivity. In Light, A. and Smith, J. (ed.) *Philosophy and Geography III: Philosophies of Place*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Mamuszka, F. (1972) *Droga królewska w Gdańsku*. (The Royal Road in Gdańsk) Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy in.Ossolińskich, Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe

- Marek, D. (1971) Pałac Ślubów w Warszawie. *Architektura*, 279(2) pp.38-41
- Martineau, R. (1995) The Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings: Expanding its Horizon and Creating Synergy. *Heritage Canada*, May/June, pp. 12-13
- Massalski, R. and Stankiewica, J. (1969) *Gdańsk, jego dzieje i kultura*. (Gdańsk, its past and culture) Warszawa: Arkady
- Massey, D. (1991) A Global Sense of Place. *Marxism Today*, June, pp. 24-29
- Massey, D. (1995) The conceptualization of place. In Massey, D. and Jess, P. (eds) *A Place in The World? Places, Cultures and Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Massey, D. and Jess, P. (eds) 1995 *A Place in the World? Places, Cultures and Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press
- McClelland, M. (2000) Excursions in the Cultural Landscape Canadian. *Architect*, 45(9), pp. 21-23
- McLennan, J.C. (1969) *Louisbourg, from its Foundation to its Fall, 1713-1750*. Sydney, Nova Scotia: Fortress Press
- McNaught, K. (1970) *The History of Canada*. Toronto: Bellhaven House
- Mecredy, S.D. (1989) The Fort Nobody Wanted: The Restoration of Fort Henry Fifty Years Ago - 1936 to 1938. *Historic Kingston*, 37, pp.59-83
- Mills, D. (1988) *The Idea of Loyalty in Upper Canada, 1784-1850*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Milobedzki, A. (1995) *The Polish School of Conservation*. Krakow: International Cultural Centre
- Miłobędzki, A. (1988) *Zarys dziejów architektury w Polsce*. (*The history of Polish architecture*) Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna
- Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki (1920) *Opieka nad zabytkami i ich konserwacja*. (*Heritage conservation and protection*) Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Ministerstwa Kultury i Sztuki
- Moore, C. (1982) *Louisbourg Portraits. Life in an eighteenth-century garrison town*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada

Morton, W.L. (1965) *The Canadian Identity*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press

Mossakowski, S. (1962) Pałac Krasińskich w Warszawie w świetle inwentarzy z roku 1763(65) oraz kilka uwag na marginesie jego odbudowy. (The Krasinski Palace in the inventories of 1763(65) with a several comments on its rebuilding) *Ochrona Zabytków*, 15(1), pp. 3-13

Muczkowski, J. (1904) Jak konserwować zabytki przeszłości? (How to conserve monumens of the past?) *Architekt*, 9, pp. 136-144

Muczkowski, J. (1914) *Ochrona zabytków. (Protection of monuments)* Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński

Muthesius, S. (1981) The origins of the German conservation movement. In Kain, R.(ed.) *Planning for Conservation*. London: Mansell

Naftel, B. (1991) The Fort Anne Officers' Quarters; A Reconstruction Case Study. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop, Hull, Quebec 11-13 March, 1992* National Historic Sites, Parks Service, Environment Canada, pp. 48-50

Nara Document on Authenticity (1995) In Larsen, K.E. (ed.) *Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention, 1-6 November, 1994*. Proceedings. UNESCO World Heritage Centre, pp. xxi-xxv

Newcomb, R.M. (1979) Planning the Past: Historical landscape resources and recreation. In *Studies in Historical Geography*, Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books

Norberg-Schultz, C. (1980) *Genius loci. Towards a phenomenology of architecture*. New York: Rizolli

Oakes, T. (1997) Place and the Paradox of Modernity. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 1997, pp. 509-31

Obłąk, J. (1957) Materiały do działalności kulturalnej Ignacego Krasickiego i jego stosunku do sztuki i zbiorów artystycznych. (Ignacy Krasicki's attitudes and activities in regard to art and art collections) *Studia Pomorskie*, 2, pp. 408-25

Obwieszczenie Prezesa Głównego Urzędu Statystycznego z dnia 25 maja 1990 w sprawie przeciętnego miesięcznego wynagrodzenia pracowników w gospodarce uspołecznionej w latach 1950-1989 oraz w kolejnych kwartałach 1989r. (1989) (Report on monthly salaries in the nationalized sector of economy) M.P., Nr 21, poz. 171, Warszawa: Główny Urząd Statystyczny

Odbudowa Zabytkow Architektury, (1915) (Rebuilding of architectural monuments) Warszawa: Towarzystwo Opieki nad Zabytkami Przeszłości

Odezwa Towarzystwa Naukowego Krakowskiego z Uniwersytetem Jagiellońskim połączonego. (1850) (The Programme of the Cracow Scientific Association) Kraków

Odnowienie Kościoła N.P.Maryi w Krakowie (1867) (Renovation of the Saint Mary Church in Cracow) *Czas*, 32, p. 2

Odrzywolski, S. (1901)a Restauracja katedry na Wawelu. (Restoration of the Wawel Cathedral) *Architekt*, 6, pp. 81-89

Odrzywolski, S. (1901)b Restauracja katedry na Wawelu. (Restoration of the Wawel Cathedral) *Architekt* , 4, pp. 50-54

Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (1994) UNESCO

Osborne, B.S. (1996) Figuring Space, Marketing Time: contested identities in Canada. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 1&2 ,2, pp. 23-40

Osmańczyk, E. (1945) Gdański finał (Gdansk's finale) *Odrodzenie*, 23, p. 7

Pane, R. (1950) Some Considerations of the Meeting of Experts held at UNESCO House, 17-21 October, 1949. *Museum*, 1, pp. 49-89

Papageorgiou-Venetas, A. (1981) Conservation and architectural heritage of Greece: means, methods and policies movement. In Kain, R. (ed.) *Planning for Conservation*. London: Mansell

Parks Canada Policy (1979) Ottawa: Parks Canada

Parks Canada (2000) *L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Site of Canada*. http://parkscanada.pch.gc.ca/parks/newfoundland/anse_meadows

Parks of the St. Lawrence (2001) *Fort Henry* , Parks Canada

Perks, W.T. and Jamieson, W. (1991) *Planning and Development in Canadian Cities*. In Bunting, T. and Filion, P. (eds) *Canadian Cities in Transition*. Toronto/New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press

Petrozolin-Skowrońska, B. (1994) *Encyklopedia Warszawy (The Warsaw Encyclopaedia)* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN

Pevsner, N. (1943) *An Outline of European Architecture*. Seventh edition. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1963.

Pevsner, N. (1966) *An Outline of European Architecture*. Penguin Books (first edition 1943)

Pevsner, N. (1972) *Some Architectural Writers of the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Pevsner, N. (1976) Scrape and Ant-scrape. In Fawcett, J. (ed.) *The Future of the Past*. London: Thames and Hudson

Phillips, D. (1997) *Exhibiting Authenticity*. Manchester, Great Britain: Manchester University Press

Pierwszy Zjazd Techników w Krakowie (1882) (The First Congress of Technical Engineers in Cracow) *Inżynieria i Budownictwo*, 18(4), pp. 196 -197

Pilch, J. (1986) *Pracownie Konserwacji Zabytków 1951-1986*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa PKZ

Piotrowski, J. (1916) *Ochrona zabytków a odbudowa kraju*. (Protection of monuments and re-establishing the state) Lwów: Gubrynowicz i Syn

Piwocki, K. (1946) Uwagi o odbudowie zabytków. (Remarks on monument rebuilding) *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki i Kultury*, 1-2, pp. 53-59

Piwocki, K. (1948) Uwagi o odbudowie zabytków. (Remarks on architectural rebuilding) *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki i Kultury*, 1-2, pp. 49-59

Piwocki, K. (1970) *Sztuka żywa. Szkice z teorii i metodyki historii sztuki*. (Living art. Papers on theory and methodology in art history) Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN

Podgorecki, A. (1984) *A Glimpse of Polish Society*. Departmental Working Paper 84(2), Carleton University, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Podgorecki, A. (1994) *Polish Society*. London: Praeger

Pogany, F. (1953) Metoda odbudowy zabytków w Polsce i wnioski w stosunku do zabytków Węgier. (Method in rebuilding the monuments in Poland and conclusions in relation to the monuments in Hungary) *Miasto*, 12, p. 6

Polo, M. (2001) Viewpoint. (editorial column) *Canadian Architect*, 46(3), p.4

Popiel, P. (1881) Z powodu artykułu o Sukiennicach Krakowskich. (Because of the article on the Sukiennice in Cracow) *Czas*, 141, p. 2

Pred, A. (1984) Place as Historically Contingent Process: Structuration and the Time-Geography of Becoming Places. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 74, pp. 279-97

Protokół Komisji Architektoniczno-Konserwatorskiej Obywatelskiego Komitetu Odbudowy Zamku Królewskiego w Warszawie (1971) (The Report of the Architectural Conservation Commission of the Civic Committee for the Reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw) No 3, 60, 81

Protokół z posiedzenia Grona Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej 6 grudnia 1901r. (1901) (Minutes from the meeting of the Association of Conservators of West Galicia, December 6, 1901), *Teka Grona Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej* (The File of the Association of the Conservators of West Galicia), vol. 2, pp. 379-380

Protokół z posiedzenia Grona Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej 18 lipca, 1907r. (1909) (Minutes from the meeting of the Association of Conservators of West Galicia. July 18, 1907) *Teka Grona Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej* (The File of the Association of the Conservators of West Galicia) 1909, vol. 3

Protokół z posiedzenia Grona Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej, 21 czerwca, 1908. (1908) (Minutes from the meeting of the Association of Conservators of West Galicia, June 21, 1908) *Teka Grona Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej* (The File of the Association of the Conservators of West Galicia) vol. 3, pp. 310-314

Pruszyński, J. (1989) *Ochrona zabytków w Polsce. Geneza, Organizacja, Prawo*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe

Puszet, L. (1901) *Nowe klejnoty stołecznego miasta Krakowa. (New jewels of the city of Cracow)* Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński

Rand, I.C. (1960) *Report of Royal Commission on Coal.* Ottawa: Roger Duhamel, F.R.S.C. Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery

Rapoport, A. (1980) Cross-Cultural Aspects of Environmental Design
In Altman, I., Rapoport, A. and Wohlwill, J.F. (eds) *Human Behavior and Environment*, vol.4, New York: Plenum Press

Raport I Zjazdu Delegatów Kół Architektonicznych Polskich w Krakowie (1901) (Report from the 1st Congress of the Polish Architectural Associations) *Architekt*, 1, p. 3-4

Raport z Posiedzenia Komisji Naukowej Obywatelskiego Komitetu Odbudowy Zamku Królewskiego w Warszawie w dniu 17 lutego 1971 (1971)
(Report from the meeting of the Scientific Subcommittee of the Civic Committee for the Reconstruction of the Royal Castle in Warsaw, February 17, 1971)

Ray, J. and Goulard, L. (1986) Les Forges du Saint-Maurice Blast Furnace Complex. *APT*, XVIII, 182, pp.32-37

Revision of the Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage.
(1992) Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. World Heritage Committee, Sixteenth Session, Santa Fe, United States of America, Dec 7-14, 1992. Report. UNESCO

Richardson, M. (1989) Place and culture: two disciplines, two concepts, two images of Christ, and a single goal. In Agnew, J.A. and Duncan, J.S. (eds) *The Power of Place: Bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations.* Boston: Unwin Hyman

Ricketts, S. (1988) *Navy Hall, Niagara-on-the-Lake.* Federal Heritage Building Review Office Building. Report. pp.88-147

Ricketts, S. (1992) 'Raising the Dead': Reconstruction within the Canadian Parks Service. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop, Hull, Quebec 11-13 March, 1992.* National Historic Sites, Parks Service, Environment Canada, pp. 21-29

Riegl, A. (1903) *The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin*. In *Oppositions*, (Institute for Architectural and Urban Studies, Harvard University), Fall 1982(25), New York:Rizzoli, pp 21-25

Robinson, M. (1992) *CPS Reconstructions across the Country*. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop, Hull, Quebec 11-13 March, 1992*. National Historic Sites, Parks Service, Environment Canada, pp. 30-33

Rokowski, Z. (1931) *Obronny kościół w Brochowie i jego odbudowa*. (Defensive church in Brochow and its rebuilding) *Ochrona Zabytków Sztuki*, 1-4, pp. 103-113

Rose, G. (1995) *Place and identity: a sense of place*. In Massey, D. and Jess, P. (eds) *A Place in The World? Places, Cultures and Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press

Ruskin, J. 1849 *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1967

Ryden, K. C. (1993) *Mapping the Invisible Landscape: Folklore, Writing, and the Sense of Place*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press

Said, E. W. (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Panthenon Books

Saski, K. (1962) *O konserwacji zabytków w P.R.L. (On heritage conservation in the Polish People's Republic)* *Biuletyn Informacyjny Zarządu Muzeów i Ochrony Zabytków*, 40, pp. 68 -78

Schatz, J. (1991) *The Generation: The Rise and Fall of the Jewish Communists of Poland*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Schmeiser, B. (1985) *Port Royal Habitation, 1928-1938: A Case Study in the Preservation Movement*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, May 1985, Montreal

Schmeisser, B. (1979) *The Creation and Development of Fort Beausejour*. Manuscript. National Historic Park, Canadian Inventory of Historic Building, Architectural History Branch, National Historic Site Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Hull, Quebec

Schwartz, B. (1982) The Social Context of Commemoration: a Study in Collective Memory. *Social Forces*, 61, pp. 374-402

Shemdin, G. (1974) *Navy Hall, Niagara-on-the-Lake: Present Status*. Report. Restoration Services, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, 1974

Shemdin, G., Panjwani, P., Whitefield, C., and McConnell, D. (1975) *Fort George Natinal Historic Site, Niagara-on-the-Lake: Conceptual Development, Plans and Potentials*. Report, May 1975, Restoration Services Division, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Government of Canada

Shurmer-Smith, P. and Hannam, K. (1994) *Worlds of desire, realms of power: a cultural geography*. London: Edward Arnold

Smith, J. (1986) Avoiding Compromise. *APT*, 18(1/2), pp. 11-12

Stasiak, L. and Tetmajer, W. (1908) *Odbudowa Starego Ratusza. Pomnik Kościuszki na Rynku Krakowskim*. (The Rebuilding of the Old City Hall. The monument of Kościuszko in the Cracow Market Square) Warszawa, Kraków: Gebethner i Wolff

Stovel, H. (1995)a Working towards the Nara Document. In Larsen, K.E. (ed.) *Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Conventiom, 1-6 November, 1994*. Proceedings. UNESCO World Heritage Centre, pp. xxxiii-xxxvi

Stovel, H. (1995)b *Considerations in Framing the Authenticity Question for Conservation*. In Larsen, K.E. (ed.) *Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention, 1-6 November, 1994*. Proceedings. UNESCO World Heritage Centre, pp. 393-398

Strike, J. (1994) *Architecture in Conservation. Managing Development at Historic Sites*. London and New York: Routledge

Stryjeński, T. (1933) O przywrócenie katedry do dawnego wyglądu. (A plea for restoring of the cathedral presbytery to its original appearance) *Czas* 1933 (supplement)

Szydłowski, T. (1919) *Ruiny Polski*. (The ruins of Poland) Warszawa, Kraków: G. Gebethner i Spółka

Szyszek-Bohusz, A. (1913) Stosunek sztuki nowoczesnej do konserwacji zabytków. (The relation of modern art towards heritage conservation) *Rocznik Architektoniczny*, 1912/13, pp. 10-12

Szyszek-Bohusz, A. (1949) Wawel pod okupacją niemiecką. Wspomnienia z lat 1939-1945. (Wawel under the Nazi occupation. Memories from 1939-1945) *Rocznik Krakowski*, 1949-1957, vol. XXI, pp. 153-182

Taras, D. (1987) Introduction. In Mandel, E. and Taras, D. (eds) *A Passion for Identity. Introduction to Canadian Studies*. Toronto: Methuen, pp.10-16

Tatarkiewicz, W. (1976) *Dzieje Sześciu Pojęć. (The History of the Six Notions)* Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe

Taylor, C.J. (1983) Some Early Problems of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. *Canadian Historical Review*, 64(1), pp. 3-24

Taylor, C.J. (1990) *Negotiating the Past. The Making of Canada's National Historic Parks and Sites*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press

Tchudi-Madsen, S. (1986) Architectural Conservation. In Yudhishtir Raj Isar (ed.) *The Challenge to Our Cultural Heritage. Why Preserve the Past?* Proceedings of a Conference on Cultural Preservation, Washington, D.C., 8-10 April 1984. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, pp. 143-154

Till, K. (1999) Staging the Past: Landscape Designs, Cultural Identity, and Erinnerungspolitik at Berlin's Neue Wache. *Ecumene*, 6, pp. 251-83

Tomkiewicz, S. (1892) Rozpoczęcie robót restauracyjnych w Katedrze na Wawelu. (The beginning of the restoration works at the Wawel Cathedral) *Kalendarz Krakowski Józefa Czecha*, Kraków, pp. 51-55

Torańska, T. (1985) *Oni (They)* London: Aneks

Toudouze, G. (1904) L'impérativité des restaurations. *Le Musée*, I, Paris

Tunbridge, J.E. (1981) Conservation trusts as geographic agents: their impact upon landscape, townscape and land use. *Transactions Institute of British Geographers*, NS, 6, pp. 103-25

Tunbridge, J.E. and Ashworth, G.J. (1996) *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons

Uchwała Główna Konserwatorów i Korespondentów Komisji Centralnej dla Galicji w Krakowie w sprawie zamierzonej restauracji Zamku na Wawelu. Raport z dnia 17 marca, 1908. (1909) (Resolution of the Association of Conservators and Correspondents of the Central Commission for Galicia in Cracow regarding the planned restoration of the Wawel Castle. Report dated March 17, 1908)
Teka Główna Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej , 3, pp. 298-300

UNESCO (1985) *Conventions and Recommendations of UNESCO Concerning the Protection of the Cultural Heritage*. UNESCO, Paris

Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage

Urry, J. (1995) *Consuming Places*. London: Routledge

Uzzell, D. L. (ed.) (1989) *Heritage Interpretation*. London: Belhaven Press

Von Droste, B. and Bertilsson, U. (1995) Authenticity and World Heritage. In Larsen, K.E. (ed.) *Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention, 1-6 November, 1994*. Proceedings. UNESCO World Heritage Centre, pp. 3-15

Walicki, M. (1945) Kiedy po miastach stały ratusze. (When there were city halls in the towns) *Skarpa Warszawska*, 1, pp. 5-6

Walker, I.C. (1971) An Archaeological Study of Clay Pipes from the King's Bastion, Fortress of Louisbourg, 1965. In *Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History*, No 2, National Historic Sites Service, National and Historic Parks Branch, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa, pp. 56-122

Wallace, I. and Knight, D.B. (1996) Societies in Space and Place. In Hampson, F.O. and Reppy, J. (eds) *Earthly Goods: Environmental Change and Social Justice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 75-95

Wallis, M. (1967) *Secesja*. Warszawa: Arkady

Waller, E.V. (1988) *Placeways. A theory of the human environment*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press

Warchałowski, J. (1909) Odbudowa dawnego ratusza w Krakowie. (The rebuilding of the old city hall in Cracow) *Architekt*, 2, pp. 29-32

- Ward, R. (1998) Parodies of the Past. *Heritage*, 1(2), pp. 4-9
- Watson, M. (1992) *Fort George*. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop, Hull, Quebec, 11-13 March, 1992*. National Historic Sites, Parks Service, Environment Canada, pp. 45-46
- Way, B.W. (1961) Upper Canada Village. *Canadian Geographical Journal*, vol. LXII, 6, pp. 218-233
- Way, R. (1946) *Ontario's Niagara Parks; A History*. Hamilton: Niagara Parks Commission
- Way, R. (1973) The Reconstruction of Fort George, 1936-1940. Manuscript . Architectural History Branch, National Historic Site Directorate, Canadian Parks Service, Hull, Quebec
- Wethered, C. (1875) *On restoration by E. Viollet-le-Duc and a Notice of his Works in Connection with the Historic Monuments of France*. London: Sampson Low, Marston Low and Searle
- Whiting, D. and Swannack, J. (1990) Contemporary Buildings within Historic Zone: An Alternative to the Reconstruction of Missing Structures at Fort Langley. In *Proceedings of the Canadian Parks Service Reconstruction Workshop, Hull, Quebec, 11-13 March, 1992*. National Historic Sites, Parks Service, pp. 67-69
- Williamsburg, (1967) *Historic Preservation Tomorrow, Revised Principles and Guidelines for Historic Preservation in the United States*. Second Workshop, Williamsburg, Virginia, Colonial Williamsburg: National Trust for Historic Preservation
- Wilson, L.J. (1992) *The Origins of Historic Reconstruction in Canada: Preservation Principles and Practice in Ontario and the Maritimes Before the Second War*. Carleton University, M.A. Thesis
- Witkiewicz-Koszyc, J. (1949) Konserwacja zabytków. (Heritage conservation) In Poniż, W. and Nechay, J. (eds) *Podręcznik Budowlany* Warszawa: Trzaska, Evert i Michalski
- Wyka, K. (1945) Miecz Syreny.(The Mermaid's Sword)*Odrodzenie*, 22, p.8

Zachwatowicz, J. (1945) *Przeszłość w służbie nowego życia.* (The past in service of the new life) *Skarpa Warszawska*, 2, p. 7

Zachwatowicz, J. (1946) Program i zasady konserwacji zabytków. (The program and principles of monument conservation) *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki i Kultury*, 1-2, pp. 48-52

Zachwatowicz, J. (1955) W sprawie konserwacji Sukiennic. (On the conservation of Sukiennice) *Ochrona Zabytków*, 3, pp. 192-194

Zachwatowicz, J. (ed.) (1956) *Stare Miasto w Warszawie.* (*The Old Town in Warsaw*) Teka Konserwatorska, vol. 4, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Budownictwo i Architektura

Zachwatowicz, J. (1965) *Ochrona zabytków w Polsce.* (Heritage protection in Poland) Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Polonia

Zachwatowicz, J. (1967) *Architektura polska.* (*Polish Architecture*) Warsaw: Arkady

Zachwatowicz, J. (1981) O polskiej szkole odbudowy i konserwacji zabytków. (On Polish School of rebuilding and conservation of monuments) *Kwartalnik Ochrony Zabytków*, 1-2, pp. 4-10

Zachwatowicz, J. (1988) The Old Town and the Royal Castle. In Lorentz, S. (ed.) *The Old Town and the Royal Castle in Warsaw.* Warszawa: Arkady, (second edition), pp. 7-19

Zarebska, T. (1981) The reconstruction of Kalisz, Poland, following its destruction in 1914. In Kain, R. (ed.) *Planning for Conservation.* London: Mansell, pp. 75-96

Zieliński, J. (1999) *Warszawa zburzona i odbudowana.* (*Warsaw ruined and rebuild*) Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Festina

GLOSSARY OF ARCHITECTURAL TERMS

AMBULATORY A passageway around the **APSE** of a church. Designed for use in Processions.

APSE A semicircular (or nearly circular) or semipolygonal space in a church, terminating an axis and intended to house an altar.

ARCADE A series of arches supporting or attached to a wall.

ASHLAR Stone that has been cut square and dressed (smoothed on the face).

ATTICA A balustrade-like wall along the rim of a roof; conceals the edge of the roof.

BARBICAN In military architecture, a tower projecting over the fortifications of a castle, in particular over a gateway.

BAROQUE Baroque architecture, broadly speaking, is the architecture of Europe and its Latin American colonies in the 17th and the first half of the 18th centuries. The Baroque style is characterized by an expressive pathos and richness of ornamentation, by swirling lines and light-and-shadow effects, and by excessive decoration including gilded plaster ornaments and brilliant colour. Its late phase is called Rococo.

BASTION In military architecture, an angular and pointed projection, often diamond-shaped and usually located at a corner, that enabled gunners to defend the ramparts and **CURTAINS** of a fortification.

BUTTRESS A vertical strip of heavy masonry applied to the wall of a building to provide structural reinforcement against lateral forces. When the buttress is a free-standing **PIER** attached to the wall by one or more arches, it is called a flying buttress.

CASEMATE In military architecture, a vault or chamber in a bastion, having opening for the firing of weapons.

CHOIR The part of a church between sanctuary and the nave reserved for singers and clergy.

CITADEL In military architecture, a **STRONGHOLD** inside or near a fortified city.

CLERESTORY In a Gothic cathedral, the upper section of the **NAVE** with its banks of windows

CURTAIN WALL In military architecture, a wall running between two towers or bastions.

DORMER A window that projects from a sloping roof, with a small roof of its own.

FINIAL An ornament at the top of e.g. a spire.

FLANK In military architecture, the flank or side of a defensive work, such as that of a bastion from the salient point (the forward projecting point of a bastion) to the curtain wall, used to provide a position for flanking fire which defends another defensive work along the length of the work.

FORT A fortified place of exclusively military nature.

FORTRESS A fortification of massive scale, generally of monumental character and sometimes including an urban core; also called **STRONGHOLD**.

GALLERY In medieval architecture, especially Gothic churches, a passage above the side aisle and below the **CLERESTORY** window that provide access to the roof over the side aisles.

GOTHIC The style which emerged in Europe in the 12th-century and lasted until the 16th century. Its great works are cathedrals, characterized by the pointed arch, the **RIB VAULT**, the development of exterior flying buttress, and the gradual reduction of the walls to a system of richly decorated fenestration.

MASOVIAN GOTHIC The Gothic style in the central part of Poland (Masovia).

MOAT A deep, wide ditch filled with water that surrounds and protects e.g. a fortifications or a castle.

NAVE In a Roman basilica, the taller central space lit by **CLERESTORY** windows; in a Christian church, the taller space in the western arm, lit by clerestory windows.

NEO-CLASSICISM The Neoclassical style dominated the arts from about 1750 until the mid-19th century. It originated in Britain, France, Italy, and Germany and was disseminated throughout the rest of Europe as far as Russia and to the United States. The term neo-Classicism describes works heavily influenced by the art of classical antiquity and Renaissance. It was a reaction against the ornamental playfulness of Baroque and Rococo. The Neoclassical style is characterized by monumentality, strict use of the orders, and sparing application of ornament.

PALISADE A fence of stakes forming a defence barrier.

PIER A solid support, often rectangular or square in plan and thick relative to its height.

PRESBITERY The actual sanctuary of a church beyond the choir and occupied only by the officiating clergy.

RAMPART In military architecture, an earthen or masonry defence wall of a fortified site.

RAVELIN In military architecture, a freestanding triangular outwork.

REFECTORY A monastic dining room.

RENAISSANCE The style developed in the early 15th century, in Italy, during the rebirth of classical art. It succeeded the Gothic as the style dominant in all of Europe after the mid-16th century. The Renaissance style is characterized by the use of the classical orders, round arches, and symmetrical composition.

ROMANESQUE A style that emerged in Europe in the early 11th century and lasted until the advent of GOTHIC architecture in the middle of the 12th century. This style derived its name from the fact that it drew much of its influence from Roman architecture. The Romanesque style is characterized by rounded arches, squat, massive pillars, small windows and simple, carved decoration.

SOCIALIST REALISM Socialist realism was the Soviet Union's official doctrine on literature since it was first formulated by the Communist party in 1932 and then articulated by Maxim Gorky, a writer, at the First Congress of the Union of Soviet Writers in 1934. According to this doctrine, all literature had to serve the purposes of Soviet society by educating the working masses in the principles and practices of socialism; literature had to be realistic and comprehensible, not experimental or negative, as in bourgeois societies. The doctrine also influenced the plastic arts in the Soviet Union and was adopted by other Eastern-Bloc countries. In architecture, that 'imperial style for proletarians' is characterized by motifs drawn from the ancient classic world, the Renaissance and the Baroque.

STOCKADE In military architecture, a defensive barrier; logs or timber driven into the ground to form an enclosure.

STRONGHOLD See FORTRESS.

WEATHERBOARDING A type of wood siding commonly used in the early United States as a exterior covering on a building of frame construction (same as clapboard)