sciendo

Art History & Criticism / Meno istorija ir kritika 18
ISSN 1822-4555 (Print), ISSN 1822-4547 (Online)
https://doi.org/10.2478/mik-2022-0010

Huriye Armağan DOĞAN
Institute of Architecture and Construction, Kaunas University of Technology, Kaunas, Lithuania

A CRITIQUE ON AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY IN RECONSTRUCTION: PERCEPTION OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE AND CITIES OF POSTWAR ERA FROM EUROPE

Summary. Interaction with heritage objects, which represent the transition between the past and present, is part of people's daily lives in historical cities. However, even though heritage is a cultural asset, it is also the outcome of the social and political conditions regarding the selection, protection, and management of heritage objects. After the Second World War, different European countries developed diverse approaches regarding the rebuilding process of their cities, which were heavily destroyed due to air raids. While some followed the strategy of constructing a modern city from scratch, some decided to reconstruct the prior structures before the cities were demolished. Furthermore, there are examples where the authorities have selectively chosen what they wanted to remember and build. When these strategies are analysed in today's conditions, they raise the question of how these different approaches affected the appreciation of these cities in the contemporary world, concerning their perceived authenticity and integrity, since perception can vary regarding the issues related to heritage objects. In most cases, while experts emphasise the protection of the environment and safeguard the authenticity of the historical objects, for the general public, the visual integrity and the impact of the changes to their daily lives might be more critical, which establishes a difference towards the social value of the authenticity. Therefore, this paper aims to demonstrate the possible diversity of ethical and aesthetic approaches to restoration and reconstruction, from the perspective of authenticity and integrity, by comparing three cities from different parts of Europe with similar demographics. The selected cities in this research are Coventry (United Kingdom), Dresden (Germany), and Gdańsk (Poland), which were all damaged by air raids during the Second World War and implemented different reconstruction approaches to their cities after the war.

Keywords: integrity, authenticity, reconstruction, postwar era, Europe.

INTRODUCTION

According to Jenkins (1996), identity helps people distinguish their social relations with other individuals and collectivities.[1] Therefore, a person's identity is how they express themselves towards others, that construes them in the past, present, and future, which establishes continuity. Cultural heritage is one of the ways to reflect the identity of both individuals and communities. However, while in some approaches protecting the cultural heritage can be used for reinforcing communities, in other strategies it can be used for identity building. Especially after wars and conflicts, the meaning of cultural heritage can become more evident for the people in society and people who have political power. According to Rowntree and Conkey (1980), war and political upheaval also lead to change in meanings attached to cultural heritage, as control over particular buildings or sites crosses from group to group.[2] However, it is not only the protection of cultural heritage, but restoration or reconstruction can also facilitate this process.

As described in the document "ICOMOS Guidance on Post Trauma Recovery" (ICOMOS, 2016), reconstruction responds to distinct situations and, in the case of World Heritage properties, to the specific attributes that convey the outstanding universal value of the artefact.[3] Therefore, it requires to contain particular conditions to be accepted. These conditions should be supportive of the Outstanding

Universal Value (OUV) of the World Heritage, and they should be based on detailed evidence. However, the same document states that *"reconstruction has been accepted ... in cases where reconstructions ... were seen to give meaning to the designated landscape, or where intensive restoration and reconstruction were considered as a means of having an idealised image that could forge a national identity."* The statement regarding the idealised image that can establish a national identity is an alluring topic, since the national identity can be relative to the political factors of the time. Therefore, it can not only be the outcome of history, but it can be the direct reflection of the governing power, their decisions, and their actions. In that regard, it is possible to state that the management of cultural heritage is not only related to the protection of the past or history, but it is in the intersection of identity, sense of community and politics. Therefore, protection and continuity can occasionally be subjective, and it is crucial both for communities of today and future societies.

The development of the first international conventions regarding the protection and safeguarding of cultural heritage began in a global context in the early 20th century. The first focus in these conventions was protecting heritage objects and cultural sites in times of conflict. However, in the 1960s, when the construction of the Aswan Dam was suggested in Egypt, it threatened ancient sites which have an exceptional value for people around the globe. According to Alberts and Hazen (2010), this incident stimulated the concern towards heritage, previously seen as more of a local and a national issue.[4] However, cultural heritage is not always related to the artefacts that contain an outstanding value for humanity, as defined in UNESCO's convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted in 1972. Frequently, heritage objects, specifically architectural heritage, can be part of the everyday urban fabric, which citizens do not acknowledge in their daily lives.

As Bader (2015) states, *"most people do not stop to observe the architectural object as a work of art"*.[5] However, visitors' perception can be different from that of city residents, since their purpose of being in that city is different. According to Wang et al. (2015) in the early work of Boorstin, one of the major trends in tourism is replacing the objective authenticity with a staged one for the consumption of tourists,[6] hence these places can still be attractive for tourists to visit. However, trying to achieve integrity and compactness, which gives information about the original forms of architectural objects, can create a false authenticity, which would affect the value of those objects. On the other hand, even architectural objects that achieved heritage labels from the authorities might not be perceived as valuable by resident citizens when there is a conflict with, or an impact on, their daily lives. In that regard, the perception can become even more problematic for these cities.

Therefore, this paper aims to demonstrate and analyse the possible diversity of ethical and aesthetic approaches to restoration and reconstruction, concerning authenticity and integrity, by comparing three cities from different parts of Europe with similar demographics. The cities were selected attentively from Western, Central and Eastern Europe, and were chosen from cities which, while not the capitals of their countries, are nonetheless commonly visited by tourists. The paper begins by explaining authenticity and integrity according to various documents published by UNESCO and ICOMOS. Secondly, it provides information regarding Coventry, Dresden and Gdańsk, which implemented different approaches in the process of reconstruction after the Second World War. Furthermore, the paper attempts to establish a discussion about the different styles of reconstruction by comparing the outcomes of these approaches in the current status of the cities nowadays.

AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY

Reconstruction is a common practice in restoration when an individual building or a group of buildings are damaged or destroyed. One of the main aims of the restoration of the architectural heritage is

preserving and returning the structure to its previous state in order to protect authenticity. However, as Koshar (1998) states, sometimes reconstruction can enable the creation of a past which is more harmonious.[7] When the process of restoration or reconstruction occurs, the concern of the architect is conserving the authenticity of the building by following the evidence, and not making any changes to the artefact without any supporting documents. However, even though the architect follows the proofs, sometimes what the citizens remember, or what they want to remember, can be totally different. In that regard, preserving the building and the historic environment can get more complicated, because other factors such as social and cultural sustainability accompany the problem of the perception of the historic environment.

As explained in the Historic Urban Landscape approach of UNESCO, one of the most critical issues in historic urban environments is recognising the fact that cities are not only static monuments or groups of buildings, but they are subject to dynamic forces by various factors.[8] Therefore, cities require to continue changing form, and a historic context can interact with new developments while mutually reinforcing their roles and meanings. However, these might affect both the integrity and the authenticity of the city. According to ICOMOS, authenticity defines the link between the attributes and the Outstanding Universal Value. On the other hand, according to the same source, the definition of integrity is the completeness or the intactness of the attributes which are required to carry the OUV.[9] In that regard, while authenticity is a quality that the object has for being genuine, integrity demonstrates being whole. As stated in the "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention" (UNESCO, 2019) a site must "*meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding*".[10] Therefore, in UNESCO's evaluation for listing an object or a site as a world heritage, both of these definitions are implemented together. However, this explanation involves both natural and cultural heritage. When these two concepts are analysed from the perspective of cultural heritage (specifically architectural heritage), properties of authenticity and integrity might often not identify the same aspects or the conditions of the artefact, which tends to establish a problematic issue regarding both conservation and restoration.

As stated by Nassauer (2011), visible evidence of care and attention towards the landscape evokes an aesthetic response that makes the viewer feel good.[11] The same applies when it comes to the evaluation of heritage buildings. When buildings are abandoned, the emotions of the observers towards them might be different from witnessing this structure when it is maintained. Furthermore, it is possible to state that nostalgia is one of the reasons people (both inhabitants and tourists) prefer to see the heritage buildings intact as well. Frequently, when an architectural object is in ruins, it is not easy to imagine the original status of the structure. However, maintenance can be mixed with integrity in most cases, and furthermore, when the object is completed, it can lose its authenticity.

According to Labadi (2013), the traditional definition of authenticity regarding cultural heritage protection and management highlights the requirement to preserve the sites in their historical state, which involves the original form, design, workmanship, and material of the object.[12] Therefore, authenticity is not necessarily about the intangible characteristics of the artefact, but it is more about its physical qualities. However, it also raises the question of whether it is still possible to define an object as authentic if all of these characteristics can be fulfilled by reconstruction. In that regard, not only the sustainability but also the social and cultural value of authenticity derives as a question as well.

When the Nara Document of 1994 explained the term value, it determined the initial characteristics and characteristics that the object gained postliminary, which resulted in some authors connecting it with the social construct at a specific time.[13, 14] Therefore, due to social impacts, the perception of authenticity can be dynamic, but at the same time,

it can be selective and relative. Furthermore, it can change as a result of society or the opinions of the decision-making institutions. In that regard, the dynamic authenticity can destroy the originality of the artefact by creating modern interpretations which can affect the perception of the cities.

After the Second World War, there was a requirement to restore the cities demolished by the air raids. Therefore, all over Europe, countries began to reconstruct their bombed cities either immediately or after a period of time. However, the diverse approach of these practices revealed the issue of authenticity and integrity, especially in the current status of these cities.

DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CITIES

When the cities of Coventry, Dresden and Gdansk are analysed, it is possible to state that, even though they were all damaged by the air bombing of the Second World War, their approach towards the same issue was different. Architect Donald Gibson, who was the city architect of Coventry at the time, proposed to reconstruct a new city, convenient for the standards of the new era. However, when looking at Dresden, the architects of Germany decided to reconstruct the city to its state before the bombings. Furthermore, the authorities in Gdansk chose a totally different approach, which was rebuilding the city from a specific period that was not the state of the city before the bombing. Therefore, there was a diversity of ethical and aesthetic approaches in each of these different European cities.

Coventry is a city with a population of 438,732 citizens, according to the 2021 statistics.[15] It is one of the most visited cities in the West Midlands of the UK, and was designated as the UK city of culture in 2021.[16] When Coventry is analysed, it might be possible to state that the approach to reconstruction was comparatively different from the other two cities. According to Pendlebury (2003), in the UK, demolition of the cities was seen as an opportunity to rebuild them with modern amenities. Hence, it could help to design the environment with streets in which it would be easy to drive cars, rather than the medieval layout.[17] In that regard, the concern was not the past but more the present and the future of the people who inhabit the cities, which can be stated as a similar approach to the discourse of the Modern Movement era. However, while the plans and the ideas of post-war planning in the UK were rarely implemented, the city of Coventry was one of the examples in which the plans were applied.

However, in the case of Coventry, the urban planning of the city in a modern manner and the redevelopment of the city centre was already being discussed by the city authorities, even before the Second World War, in the Gibson urban planning proposal. As stated by Stephens (1969), the damage caused by the air raids gave rise to new problems, such as the virtual elimination of the shopping centre, even though the proposal existed. But Gibson had the responsibility for creating a new schema for the city.[18] According to Larkham and Lilley (2003), the approach of the UK at the level of municipalities and local authorities was to embrace modernity and establish a modern reflection, rather than being a city stuck in the past.[19] Furthermore, the city itself wanted to boost the economy as fast as possible, and with the conditions of the time, it was possible and manageable with the new planning. In that regard, the proposal of the Gibson plan was logical as a solution for the problems which were caused by the shortage of offices and shops in the city centre as well. It might be possible to state that, since the interventions had a direct impact on the improvement of the quality of life according to the authorities, they made choices not for the protection of the cultural heritage, but for regeneration, which was found to be also beneficial for controlling and planning future growth. However, it should be noted that, especially in the case of Coventry Cathedral, even though a new cathedral was built, the ruin of the old structure was kept as a remembrance, and both buildings formed one church[20] (Fig. 1).

One of the latest examples of choosing urban regeneration was seen in the UK, in the city of Liverpool, which resulted in the removal of the city from the

World Heritage List of UNESCO. Liverpool first achieved its place in the World Heritage list in 2004; however, since 2012 the city was continuously warned by the UNESCO committee. The mayor of Liverpool, who was in charge of the city when it lost its label in 2021, stated that the city is proud of its history and heritage. However, this does not mean that the city and its inhabitants should not do anything and allow the city to become a museum.[21] Therefore, the loss of the label gave the impression that it did not cause a significant impact on the responses of the municipal government and the public.

A similar situation occurred in Dresden, another city which was deleted from the UNESCO list in 2009 (Fig. 2). Dresden's last recorded population was 543,825 citizens.[22] It was the capital of Saxony before the Second World War, and was described as the "Florence of the Elbe Valley". More an administrative than an industrial city, Dresden was a fascinating example of 18th century urbanity, with baroque architecture and an alluring cultural life; hence it was a favourite place for artists.

As stated by Paul (1964), after the war, Dresden's appearance and its cultural life changed in the sense that it no longer measured up to its pre-war status.[23] In 1945, due to the targeted air raids, 85 per cent of Dresden was destroyed, which included the centre and the residential areas. After this date, the reconstruction of the city witnessed long debates and different approaches in its urban planning strategies. According to Diefendorf (1990), when the reconstruction began in the city, the authorities decided to remove the ruins and demolish the remaining façades, rather than restoring them as essential elements which required to be preserved. However, the approach followed involved the principles that respected the former spatial and dimensional structures in the reconstruction process.[24] As stated in the paper of von Beyme (1990), the German Democratic Republic of the Russian zone attempted to dictate new urban planning criteria based on the prototypes of Moscow's development. This was aimed at establishing a socialist state, which involved the creation of new socialist parade squares and towers.[25] However, there was local resistance that tried to prevent the construction



Fig. 1. A photograph of Coventry Cathedral, Coventry, UK. Photograph from the official website of Coventry City Council



Fig. 2. A photograph of Dresden Cathedral, Dresden, Germany. Photograph taken by the author in 2009

of the elements which the central government wanted to be added.[26] According to Paul (1990), in the programmes of the government and the competitions of 1953, the Frauenkirche was suggested to be restored; however, it was left to decay during the Soviet period.[27] After the reunification of Germany, a call for Dresden took place that constituted an urgent appeal from the citizens of Dresden for the reconstruction of the Frauenkirche.[28] Therefore, the inhabitants supported the reconstruction process and wanted to rebuild the monuments of the city as even more robust, to give the city what it deserved.

Dresden applied for inscription on the World Heritage List in 1989 for the first time with an application relating to Dresden Old City and its baroque architecture. However, UNESCO rejected the application on the basis that the buildings lacked the necessary authenticity, since the city was rebuilt after the Second World War.[29] In 2003, a new application was submitted, which focused on the unique cultural landscape that had developed around the banks of the Elbe and its natural surroundings. In this new attempt, the city managed to get the label which it had been trying to achieve for fifteen years. However, in 2009 Dresden was removed from this list. When the construction of the Waldschlösschen Bridge began to be mentioned, the conservationists and UNESCO warned the government that it would ruin the authenticity of the cultural and natural landscape. However, according to Schoch (2014), the construction of the bridge was supported by both local public opinion polls and German court decisions.[30] The urban planners argued that the construction of the bridge would solve the problem by reducing traffic congestion in the city. In that regard, it raised the question about the debate between authenticity or practicality for daily life. As stated in the same article, polls demonstrated that a majority of Dresden residents did not think the World Heritage title was something their city required to maintain. Therefore, people who lived in the city were more concerned about their comfort rather than protection. In that regard, it might be possible to state that if the protection of an environment directly impacts the life quality of the citizens and their daily life activities, the protection of the environment might take second place in their evaluation.

On the other hand, when Gdańsk is analysed, the approach regarding the reconstruction of the city developed in an entirely different way. Gdańsk is a harbour city, located next to the Baltic Sea, with a population of 465,742, according to the 2021 statistics.[31] According to Lorens and Bugalski (2021), it grew during the medieval and renaissance eras due to its important location for trade between Poland and Western Europe.[32] Furthermore, it played a significant role in the relationship of Polish-German affairs before the war; therefore, a dominant impression of the Prussian period was established in the architecture of the city, especially around the Long Market area of the old town (Fig. 3).

As Lorens and Mironowicz (2020) state, the historic core of the city developed on the medieval structure until the plan was drafted in cooperation with Josef Stubben for the urban development of the western front; nonetheless, the heart of the city still survived with its original form up until the Second World War.[33] However, the air raids of the war destroyed the city. According to the data given by different sources, between 80 and 95 per cent of the structures in the city were destroyed in this period.[34, 35] Therefore, it was required to make a decision regarding the future of the city. As stated by Rampley (2012), in Gdańsk, most of the robust structures were constructed in brick, which was not welcome in the post-war period due to its creating the impression of the Prussian spirit.[36] Furthermore, according to Gawlicki (2012), the newly formed Polish government tried to develop a narrative for the future of the city, where the periods belonging to Prussia or the German Empire would not be mentioned.[37] Equally, according to Bukal and Samól (2017), after the destruction, citizens of the city did not want to reconstruct it from the Prussian period either.[38] While there are different views about this issue, the city started the era of reconstruction by using the patterns and buildings of the Hanseatic period. The construction of the city continued until the 1960s.

According to Frederich (2014), even though the main streets, routes and characteristics of the city were recreated in the process, the features of the buildings were radically changed by adapting them



Fig. 3. A photograph of Gdańsk, Poland. Photograph taken by the author in 2019

according to modern socialist doctrines and this made the buildings suitable for the working class.[39] Furthermore, as Tolle (2008) states, in the process of reconstructing in the central city, only a few structures were rebuilt with their original structural scheme, and most of them were converted into socialist housing estates behind the historical street façades.[40] Therefore, the district turned into an area which was created for the socialist working class quarters with political intentions.

In that regard, it might be possible to state that the aim was not mainly rebuilding the original buildings that used to be there, but it was more about creating a historic city. Therefore, the project of Gdańsk was not a restoration project but more of reconstruction of the whole city in a period which was selectively chosen. Even though the usage of the selective past gives integrity to the city, it establishes crucial questions on the authenticity of the place. However, historical buildings and architecture can trigger most of the cultural travel to the cities; in that regard, the new form of the city attracted the tourists.

DISCUSSION

The concepts of authenticity and integrity are difficult to identify fully, and at the same time, depending on the different cultures, different perspectives, and even different disciplines, they are open to interpretation. Especially in the field of heritage tourism, it is a long-debated subject by scholars. [41, 42, 43, 44] Most of the time, the primary intention of tourists can be regarded as sightseeing, taking photographs and observing the environment. Therefore, it is possible to state that the visual identity is more important to the tourist perception. In that respect, the reconstruction of the selective past as a strategy would not be inconvenient for the visitors.

However, visual identity can be necessary for the citizens of some cities as well. According to Hagen (2005), in the case of Germany, reconstruction of the historical places after the Second World War symbolised the belief that, even though there was a military and political defeat, German society still possessed a rich cultural history.[45] Therefore, for the citizens, it solidified the feeling of being a nation. On the other hand, while authenticity and integrity are important reminders of the history for the citizens who live in a city, their focus most of the time is not on observing but on carrying on with their lives. Furthermore, they try to reach from one point to another. Therefore, it is possible to state that authenticity might not be the first concern for them, as long as it does not affect their daily activities.

After his visit to Gdańsk in 2005, former Czech president Vaclav Havel wrote in his note that: "*… in a hundred years it won't matter a bit whether a particular house in Gdansk was built two hundred years earlier or later. After all, even Czechs can no longer distinguish between Gothic and the pseudo-Gothic*." When his statement is analysed, it targets a crucial issue in the reconstruction process. Is the authenticity of the artefacts more significant for the citizens and the visitors, or is the integrity more essential for them since it helps them imagine better? Or does a 21st-century appearance of 17th or 18th-century architecture still constitute a historic monument? As stated by Gibson and Pendlebury (2009), authenticity, in its dynamic version, is related to present perception, the experience it creates, and social practice in the here and now.[46] Therefore, it might be possible to state that the value of an architectural object or a built environment for the citizens of the cities can be the reflection it has in contemporary conditions rather than the value of it for the experts. In that regard, integrity might be more critical for the people who are living in the cities every day.

However, it can be assumed that both authenticity and integrity might have a greater impact on the tourists who visit the historical cities. Due to the global COVID-19 pandemic, the statistics from 2020 and 2021 are found not to reflect the ordinary conditions of the situation; however, if the statistics for tourist visits for these three cities are analysed for 2019, it is possible to detect different results. For example, according to figures of an annual

report commissioned by the Coventry Destination Management Partnership and Coventry Business Improvement District, in the year 2019, over 10 million people visited Coventry.[47] However, this number involves both the visitors who stayed one night and those who stayed at least one night. On the other hand, according to the tourism website of Dresden, 4.7 million people stayed in Dresden with an average rate of 2 nights' stay,[48] and according to Tourism Statistics of Gdańsk, 2.2 million people visited this city in 2019.[49] It is acknowledged that the cities as tourism destinations might be affected due to various reasons, such as the access by transport, the geographical location of the cities, and the country's population, since the figures do not represent only foreign tourists. However, the figures suggest that all these locations are attractive tourist destinations when compared with the other cities in their countries.

The figures regarding Coventry are especially intriguing when it is considered that it chose to reconstruct the city in the conditions of modern times, rather than its state before the bombing. One recent tourism advertisement of Coventry stated that "*Coventry may not be the most attractive city, but it does offer plenty of Georgian and medieval interest for visiting tourists, including the remains of a city wall, historic gateways and three immediately noticeable spires*".[50] Furthermore, the official tourism website of the city states that "*… things for you to see and do in Coventry: From music, theatre and festivals, to museums, Cathedrals and medieval history, the city has something for everyone.*"[51] Therefore, as is evident, the emphasis is still on the medieval heritage of the city. However, one of the famous medieval streets was actually established by relocating some of the various medieval structures into a single street.[52] Spon Street, which is within the ring road of the city, gives an impression of what the city's medieval core looked like before the air raids. While twelve of the timber-framed Tudor structures in this street used to be located there, ten of the structures were relocated in 1980, and in total thirty-one listed buildings stand in this street. Coventry's Spon Street is promoted as the most important collection of medieval timber-framed buildings in England, therefore, even though the city itself has a modern character, it is still widely appreciated due to the existence of Spon Street, which has integrity but not authenticity. In that respect, it is possible to argue that integrity might have a more dominant effect on the perception of a historical city when it is compared with authenticity and historical accuracy for both tourists and visitors.

In the process of restoration, the desire is to improve the cities aesthetically; however when cities are reconstructed, this can frequently contradict and affect the development, especially in environments with a heritage value. In a paradoxical way, a reconstruction based on integrity can replace the image of the city better than the authenticity in some cases, which would support the development. However, it might damage the heritage value of the environment.

CONCLUSION

Cities require to change and develop regarding the current conditions, and these changes need to be beneficial and efficient for their residents. However, it should be noted that if the development of the place eventually has generic solutions for its problems, it can result in losing the reason to be in those places both for the inhabitants and for the visitors. Therefore, it might create an environment that is not any different from the other cities people can find in the world, and it can affect the *genius loci*. In that regard, it is crucial to preserve the identity of a built environment while restoring or reconstructing it.

When Coventry, Dresden and Gdańsk are analysed, it is possible to recognise that all these cities implemented diverse approaches in efforts when they tried to preserve their architectural heritage. The difference in the approaches related to political and social reasons, since there was an attempt to build national identities after the war. While Germany and Poland decided to remember and reconnect with their past (although Poland adopted the

approach to remember selectively), in the case of Coventry, the UK decided not to remember the past and preferred to look to the future in general (except in the case of Coventry Cathedral). In that regard, it is possible to state that for each of the cities the ability to establish a visual image was essential after the war, and it was tried to be achieved by various strategies.

Even though approximately 70 years have passed since all these different attitudes appeared in the post-war period, the differences in approaches still have an impact on the lives of the people in the present, which can affect the way they perceive their cities and heritage in their daily lives. Frequently, the perception of the place and the heritage in cities relates not only to what the authorities or the experts state, but also to how the inhabitants see their cities themselves. Therefore, the catalyser might need to begin from the citizens themselves, and should not be dictated or forced. In that regard, the most essential strategy might not be to force people but enable them to understand the value of the place, while at the same time help them to value the place by themselves. Like any form of heritage, architectural heritage is a cultural asset, but at the same time, it has a social and economic constraint. Until society develops a critical perspective for reconstruction, the process of reconstructing a historical environment would only be seen as an opportunity for tourism, and the engagement it establishes with the past will remain unnoticed. Therefore, citizens would focus more on integrity, and they would not be sensitive towards authenticity.

On the other hand, if what people appreciate is integrity, it should not be disregarded; however, experts should work on new strategy proposals which do not establish fake environments while trying to create intactness. In that regard, it is crucial that, in the reconstruction process, the newly constructed structures should complement the historical buildings and contain a degree of aesthetic consistency. In this way, heritage objects would be appreciated and understood by society, not to be seen only as an economic benefit, but also the reflection of their identity. In the end, if the citizens do not appreciate their environment, it would become more problematic to preserve historical cities.

References

Alberts, Heike, and Hazen, Helen. "Maintaining Authenticity and Integrity at Cultural World Heritage Sites." *The Journal of Geographical Review* 100 (2010): 56–73.

Bader, Aya Peri. "A Model for Everyday Experience of the Built Environment: The Embodied Perception of Architecture." *Journal of Architecture* 20 (2015): 244–267.

Beyme, Klaus von. *Reconstruction in the German Democratic Republic in Rebuilding Europe's Bombed Cities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 1990.

Bukal, Grzegorz and Samól, Piotr. "Authenticity of Architectural Heritage in a Rebuilt City. Comments to Vaclav Havel's Impression after His Visit in Gdansk in 2005." *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* 245 (2017): 1–10.

Cohen, Erik. "Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 15 (1988): 371–386.

Diefendorf, Jeffry M. *Rebuilding Europe's Bombed Cities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 1990.

Friedrich, Jacek. Odbudowa Głównego Miasta w Gdańsku w latach 1945–1960. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, 2014.

Gawlicki, Marcin. *Zabytkowa architektura Gdańska w latach 1945–1951*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, 2012.

Gibson, Lisanne, and Pendlebury, John. *Valuing Historic Environments*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

Hagen, Joshua. "Rebuilding the Middle Ages After the Second World War: The Cultural Politics of Reconstruction in Rothenburg ob der Tauber, Germany." *Journal of Historical Geography* 31 (2005): 94–112.

Hewelt, Werner. *Danzig – Ein Europäisches Kulturdenkmal*. Lübeck: Verlag Unser Danzig, 1988.

Jamal, Tazim and Hill, Steve. "Developing a Framework for Indicators of Authenticity: The Place and Space of Cultural and Heritage Tourism." *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 9 (2004): 353–372.

Jenkins, Richard. *Social identity*. Oxford: Routledge Press, 1996.

Jones, Sian. "Negotiating Authentic Objects and Authentic Selves: Beyond the Deconstruction of Authenticity." *Journal of Material Culture* 15 (2010): 181–203.

Koshar, Rudy. *Germany's Transient Pasts: Preservation and National Memory in the Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Kristensen, Troels Myrup. "Pilgrimage, Devotional Practices and the Consumption of Sacred Places in Ancient Egypt and Contemporary Syria."

International Journal of Heritage Studies 21 (2015): 354–368.

Labadi, Sophia. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013.

Larkham, Peter J. and Lilley, Keith D. "Plans, Planners and City Images: Place Promotion and Civic Boosterism in British Reconstruction Planning." *Journal of Urban History* 30 (2003): 183–205.

Lorens, Poitr and Bugalski, Łukasz. "Reshaping the Gdańsk Shipyard-The Birthplace of the Solidarity Movement. The Complexity of Adaptive Re-use in the Heritage Context." *Sustainability* 13 (2021): 71–83.

Lorens, Piotr and Mironowicz, Izabela. "Gdańsk: a City of Solidarity and Freedom." *disP–The Planning Review* 56 (2020): 8–21.

MacCannell, Dean. "Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings." *American Journal of Sociology* 79 (1973): 589–603.

Mansell, George. *Anatomy of Architecture* .Boston: A & W Publishers, 1979.

Nassauer, Joan Iverson. "Care and Stewardship: From Home to Planet." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 100 (2011): 321–323.

Olsen, Kjell. "Authenticity as a Concept in Tourism Research." *Tourist Studies* 2 (2002): 159–182.

Paul, Wolfgang. *... zum Beispiel Dresden: Schicksal einer Stadt*. Frankfurt: Wolfgang Weidlich Publishing, 1964.

Paul, Jürgen. *Reconstruction of the City Centre of Dresden: Planning and Building during the 1950s* In *Rebuilding Europe's Bombed Cities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 1990.

Pendlebury, John. "Planning the Historic City: Reconstruction Plans in the United Kingdom in the 1940s." *The Town Planning Review* 74 (2003): 371–93.

Rampley, Matthew. *Heritage, Ideology, and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe: Contested Pasts, Contested Presents*. Suffolk: The Boydell & P Brewer Press, 2012.

Rowntree, Lester B. and Conkey, Margaret W. "Symbolism and the Cultural Landscape." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70 (1980): 459–474.

Schoch, Douglas. "Whose World Heritage? Dresden's Waldschlößchen Bridge and UNESCO's Delisting of the Dresden Elbe Valley." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 21 (2014): 199–223.

Siuchniński, Mateusz. *Polish towns in the millennium–Vol: 2*. Wrocław: Ossolineum Publishing house, 1965.

Stephens, William Brewer. "The City of Coventry: Introduction", in A History of the County of Warwick." *Journal of the City of Coventry and Borough of Warwick* 8 (1969): 1–23.

Stuhrberg, A. *Faszination Deutschland: Dresden – Schmuckband*. München: Verlag Wolfgang Kunth, 2009.

Tolle, Alexander. "City Profile: Gdansk." *Journal of Cities* 25 (2008): 107–119.

Wang, Y., Huang, S. and Kim, A. K. "Toward a Framework Integrating Authenticity and Integrity in Heritage Tourism." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 23 (2015): 1468–1481.

Webb, Mark S. "An Examination of Uses of Late Medieval Urban Social Space: Coventry and Leicester." *The Archaeological Journal* 178 (2021): 167–215.

Notes

[1] Richard Jenkins, *Social identity* (Oxford: Routledge Press, 1996), 4.

[2] Lester B. Rowntree and Margaret W. Conkey, "Symbolism and the Cultural Landscape," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70 (1980), 462.

[3] ICOMOS Guidance on Post Trauma Recovery and Reconstruction for World Heritage Cultural Properties, 2016.

[4] Heike Alberts and Helen Hazen, "Maintaining Authenticity and Integrity at Cultural World Heritage Sites," *The Journal of Geographical Review* 100 (2010), 57.

[5] Aya Peri Bader, "A Model for Everyday Experience of the Built Environment: The Embodied Perception of Architecture," *Journal of Architecture* 20 (2015), 244.

[6] Yifei Wang, Songshan (Sam) Huang and Aise Kyoungjin Kim, "Toward a Framework Integrating Authenticity and Integrity in Heritage Tourism," *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 23 (2015), 1471.

[7] Rudy Koshar, *Germany's Transient Pasts: Preservation and National Memory in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 216.

[8] UNESCO's New Life for Historic Cities: The Historic Urban Landscape Approach Explained, 2013.

[9] ICOMOS, Retrospective Statements of OUV for World Heritage Properties: Authenticity & Integrity, Workshop for the 2nd Cycle of World Heritage Periodic Reporting for Western Europe, Prague 27 May 2011.

[10] UNESCO's Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 2019.

[11] Joan Iverson Nassauer, "Care and Stewardship: From Home to Planet," *Landscape and Urban Planning* 100 (2011), 321.

[12] Sophia Labadi, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 14.

[13] Sian Jones, "Negotiating Authentic Objects and Authentic Selves: Beyond the Deconstruction of Authenticity," *Journal of Material Culture* 15 (2010), 183.

[14] Troels Myrup Kristensen, "Pilgrimage, Devotional Practices and the Consumption of Sacred Places in Ancient Egypt and Contemporary Syria," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 (2015), 355.

[15] Data gained from the website called World Population Review. Accessed: July 2021, https://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/coventry-population

[16] Data gained from the official website of the Coventry University. Accessed: July 2021, https://www.coventry.ac.uk/the-university/175-celebrations/our-timeline/city-of-culture/

[17] John Pendlebury, "Planning the Historic City: Reconstruction Plans in the United Kingdom in the 1940s," *The Town Planning Review* 74 (2003), 373.

[18] William Brewer Stephens, "The City of Coventry: Introduction," in A History of the County of Warwick, *Journal of the City of Coventry and Borough of Warwick* 8 (1969): 16.

[19] Peter Larkham and Keith Lilley, "Plans, Planners and City Images: Place Promotion and Civic Boosterism in British Reconstruction Planning," *Journal of Urban History* 30 (2003), 188.

[20] George Mansell, *Anatomy of Architecture* (Boston: A & W Publishers, 1979), 178.

[21] "Though Liverpool has lost its UNESCO status, as Mayor, I know we still have a rich heritage to be proud of": article written by the Mayor of Liverpool (Steve Rotherham) in 2021. Accessed: July, 2021, https://inews.co.uk/opinion/liverpool-lost-unesco-status-mayor-we-have-rich-heritage-1114850?ito=twitter_share_article-top

[22] Data gained from the website World Population Review. Accessed: July 2021, https://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/dresden-population

[23] Wolfgang Paul, *Zum Beispiel Dresden Schicksal einer Stadt* (Frankfurt: Wolfgang Weidlich Publishing, 1964), 15.

[24] Jeffry M. Diefendorf, *Rebuilding Europe's Bombed Cities* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 1990), 173.

[25] Klaus von Beyme, *Reconstruction in the German Democratic Republic* In *Rebuilding Europe's Bombed Cities* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 1990), 192.

[26] Jürgen Paul, Reconstruction of the City Centre of Dresden: Planning and Building during the 1950s In *Rebuilding Europe's Bombed Cities* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 1990), 177.

[27] Jürgen Paul, Reconstruction of the City Centre of Dresden: Planning and Building during the 1950s In *Rebuilding Europe's Bombed Cities* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 1990), 181.

[28] Angela Stuhrberg, *Faszination Deutschland: Dresden – Schmuckband* (München: Verlag Wolfgang Kunth, 2009), 27.

[29] Data from brochure published by the City of Dresden: "Waldschlößchenbrücke Bridge and World Heritage Status" in March 2006. Accessed: August 2021, https://www.dresden.de/media/pdf/broschueren/broschuere_welterbe_engl.pdf

[30] Douglas Schoch, "Whose World Heritage? Dresden's Waldschlößchen Bridge and UNESCO's Delisting of the Dresden Elbe Valley," *International Journal of Cultural Property* 21 (2014), 199.

[31] Data gained from the website World Population Review. Accessed: July 2021, https://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/gdansk-population

[32] Piotr Lorens and Łukasz Bugalski, "Reshaping the Gdańsk Shipyard – The Birthplace of the Solidarity Movement. The Complexity of Adaptive Reuse in the Heritage Context," *Sustainability* 13 (2021), 74.

[33] Piotr Lorens and Izabela Mironowicz, "Gdańsk: a City of Solidarity and Freedom", *disP–The Planning Review* 56 (2020): 12.

[34] Mateusz Siuchniński, *Polish towns in the millennium–Vol: 2* (Wrocław: Ossolineum Publishing house, 1965), 67.

[35] Werner Hewelt, *Danzig – Ein Europeanises Kulturdenkmal* (Lübeck: Verlag Unser Danzig, 1988), 12.

[36] Matthew Rampley, *Heritage, Ideology, and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe: Contested Pasts, Contested Presents* (Suffolk: The Boydell & P Brewer Press, 2012), 124.

[37] Marcin Gawlicki, *Zabytkowa architektura Gdańska w latach 1945–1951* (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, 2012), 27.

[38] Grzegorz Bukal and Piotr Samól, "Authenticity of Architectural Heritage in a Rebuilt City. Comments to Vaclav Havel's Impression after His Visit in Gdansk in 2005," *IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering* 245 (2017), 3.

[39] Jacek Friedrich, *Odbudowa Głównego Miasta w Gdańsku w latach 1945–1960* (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, 2014), 1.

[40] Alexander Tolle, "City profile: Gdansk," *Journal of Cities* 25 (2008), 110.

[41] Dean MacCannell, "Staged authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings," *American Journal of Sociology* 79 (1973), 591.

[42] Erik Cohen, "Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research* 15 (1988): 375.

[43] Kjell Olsen, "Authenticity as a Concept in Tourism Research," *Tourist Studies* 2 (2002), 168.

[44] Tazim Jamal and Steve Hill, "Developing a Framework for Indicators of Authenticity: The Place and Space of Cultural and Heritage Tourism," *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 9 (2004), 362.

[45] Joshua Hagen, "Rebuilding the Middle Ages After the Second World War: The Cultural Politics of Reconstruction in Rothenburg ob der Tauber, Germany," *Journal of Historical Geography* 31 (2005), 98.

[46] John Pendlebury, "Planning the Historic City: Reconstruction Plans in the United Kingdom in the 1940s," *The Town Planning Review* 74 (2003), 375.

[47] Annual report commissioned by the Coventry Destination Management Partnership and Coventry Business Improvement District, 2019. Accessed: June 2021, https://www.coventry.gov.uk/news/article/3447/coventry_visitor_figures_rise_to_over_10m_in_2019 Coventry visitor figures rise to over 10m in 2019

[48] Data from the tourism website of Dresden Municipality for 2019. Accessed: July 2021, https://www.dresden.de/media/pdf/statistik/Faktum-2018-2019-engl.pdf

[49] Data taken from the website which contains the tourism statistics of Gdansk for 2019. Accessed: July 2021,
https://www.statista.com/statistics/1117026/summer-arrivals-in-gdansk-by-tourist-type/

[50] Data from a tourism website about Coventry. Accessed: June 2021, http://www.world-guides.com/europe/england/west-midlands/coventry/

[51] Data from the official tourism website about Coventry. Accessed: February 2022, https://www.visitcoventry.co.uk/

[52] Mark Webb, "An Examination of Uses of Late Medieval Urban Social Space: Coventry and Leicester," *The Archaeological Journal* 178 (2021), 185.

Huriye Armağan DOĞAN
Architektūros ir statybos institutas, Kauno techologijos universitetas, Kaunas, Lietuva

REKONSTRUKCIJOS AUTENTIŠKUMO IR VIENTISUMO KRITIKA: EUROPOS ARCHITEKTŪRINIO PAVELDO IR POKARIO MIESTŲ SUVOKIMAS

Santrauka

Sąveika su paveldo objektais, vaizduojančiais perėjimą iš praeities į dabartį, yra istorinių miestų gyventojų kasdienio gyvenimo dalis. Tačiau nors paveldas yra kultūros vertybė, jis taip pat yra socialinių ir politinių sąlygų, susijusių su paveldo objektų atranka, apsauga ir tvarkymu, rezultatas. Po Antrojo pasaulinio karo įvairios Europos šalys sukūrė skirtingus požiūrius į savo miestų, kurie buvo smarkiai sugriauti dėl oro antskrydžių, atstatymo procesą. Kai kurie laikėsi strategijos statyti modernų miestą nuo nulio, kiti nusprendė rekonstruoti ankstesnes struktūras, gyvavusias iki miestų sugriovimo. Be to, yra pavyzdžių, kai valdžios institucijos pasirenka tai, ką norėjo prisiminti ir pastatyti. Analizuojant šias strategijas šių dienų sąlygomis, kyla klausimas, kaip šie skirtingi požiūriai paveikė šių miestų vertinimą šiuolaikiniame pasaulyje, dėl jų suvokimo autentiškumo ir vientisumo, turint omenyje tai, kad suvokimas gali skirtis atsižvelgiant į klausimus, susijusius su paveldo objektais. Daugeliu atvejų, nors ekspertai akcentuoja aplinkos apsaugą ir saugo istorinių objektų autentiškumą, plačiajai visuomenei vizualinis vientisumas ir pokyčių įtaka kasdieniam gyvenimui gali būti svarbesnė, o tai nustato autentiškumo socialinę vertę. Todėl šiuo darbu siekiama parodyti galimą etinių ir estetinių požiūrių į restauravimą ir rekonstrukciją įvairovę autentiškumo ir vientisumo požiūriu, lyginant tris skirtingų Europos vietų miestus, esančius panašioje demografijoje. Šiame tyrime atrinkti miestai – Koventris (Jungtinė Karalystė), Dresdenas (Vokietija) ir Gdanskas (Lenkija), kurie buvo nukentėję Antrojo pasaulinio karo oro antskrydžių metu ir įgyvendino skirtingus miestų atstatymo būdus po karo.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: vientisumas, autentiškumas, rekonstrukcija, pokaris, Europa.

Gauta 2021-09-24
Parengta spaudai 2022-07-04

Huriye Armağan DOĞAN

PhD Huriye Armağan Doğan is an architect with specialisation in cultural heritage protection and a researcher. Before her full-time scientific occupation, she practised as an architect in Turkey in various restoration projects which allowed her to explore the relationship between research and practice in particular. She finished her Bachelor's in 2008, her Master's in 2011, and her PhD in 2020. She is currently a researcher at Kaunas University of Technology. Her research interests are Adaptive reuse, Preservation and Perception of Cultural Heritage, Modern Movement, Early 20th Century Architecture,Conservation, Cultural Memory.

E-mail: armagan.dogan@gmail.com