

Between Reconstruction and Modernisation: Public Debates on Historic City Centres in the 20th and 21st Centuries

Conference at the Tallinn City Archives, 15–17 September 2011

Review by Oliver Orro and Anneli Randla

This conference was the eighth in a series engaging with different aspects of the history of Eastern and Northern Europe. The series was launched in 1995, when the Tallinn City Archive, the Aue-Foundation (Helsinki), and the Academia Baltica (Lübeck) organised a conference on topics concerning the migration of the German-speaking population of the Baltic region. These institutions were also in charge of the event to be reviewed here, together with the Alfred Döblin Chair of East European History at the University of Szczecin which is held by Jörg Hackmann. The topic under discussion was the reconstruction and modernisation of historic city centres, first and foremost in spatial terms but also in other aspects associated with social and economic processes.

The issues that were focused on concerned the connections between architecture, urban construction and the creation of identity; concepts of what is “national” and “local”; and processes of “modernisation” and “reconstruction” in post-war Europe, not only with regard to physical urban space but also mental space. The conference concentrated on post-World War II Europe yet included also papers that looked further both temporally and spatially. The common assumption that cities destroyed in the Second World War were modernised in Western Europe but rebuilt in Eastern Europe was shown to be a cliché contradicting a reality that was much more diverse. At the same time, it became obvious that arguments concerning the progressive and the nostalgic in urban space did not end with post-war reconstruction but continue to this day. While there is a general familiarity with the wave of reconstructions of the physical environment accompanying the quest for identity in the wake of the collapse of Communism across Eastern Europe, similar phenomena elsewhere have attracted far less attention. A key starting point for current debates on

this theme is formed by the exhibition entitled *The History of Restoration / The Creation of History* (Geschichte der Rekonstruktion/Konstruktion der Geschichte) – held at the Museum of Architecture in Munich in 2010 – and its detailed catalogue which has, at least by some experts, been characterised as „apologetic” and triggered a wide range of contradictory opinions.

Małgorzata Omilanowska (Gdańsk) delivered the keynote lecture at Tallinn’s old city hall. She addressed the restoration of buildings destroyed in World War II or earlier and the underlying rationale of this phenomenon, its changes of meaning over time, and the political and professional discussion associated with it, with Poland as primary point of reference. She emphasised that the reconstruction of completely destroyed historic buildings is certainly not limited to Poland and the Baltic countries, or Eastern Europe in general. In view of the massive scale of destruction, she argued, the initial reconstruction of buildings in an idealized form was to some extent inevitable, given the lack of resources. Practical experience in Germany and Poland shows that – regardless of whether projects are to be defined as ‘reconstructions’ or ‘restorations’ – in many cases the same amount of original substance remained and similar methodological and technical approaches were used. Traditional construction methods were used to a considerable extent as craftsmen then active were still familiar with such practices. At the same time, the idealising reconstruction of buildings played a crucial role in Warsaw and old city centres elsewhere: the “historic appearance” was devised according to old photographs, paintings and descriptions rather than the actual form in which the building had existed immediately before the war. Views of cities by 17th- and 18th-century artists (especially by Canaletto) were frequently used as

blueprints as if they were photographs. Conscious aesthetic and ideological choices were also made: Art Nouveau, for instance, was considered degenerate and therefore eliminated from the urban fabric, as was Neo-Gothic, leading to unverified 'medieval' reconstructions of churches – such as Warsaw Cathedral – which had undergone 19th-century alterations. Nevertheless, according to Omilanowska, the application of methods incompatible with current principles of heritage conservation should not lead to a negative assessment of the entire phenomenon of reconstructing city centres. For it was also crucial as a psychological means to overcome the trauma of war and destruction; and it recreated the multi-layered space which is necessary for a functioning city – and which a city centre built in accordance with Modernism might not have been able to do so well. Warsaw's Old Town has been on UNESCO's world heritage list since 1980 precisely as a highly significant example of post-war reconstruction. Similar projects that were 'too late', as it were – complete reconstructions begun decades after the war –, present a more complicated issue. The reconstruction of the Royal castle at Warsaw, one of the most important symbolic buildings of the city, was postponed for decades, yet thanks to the effective PR work of Polish art historians and conservators but certainly also the efforts by architects/craftsmen involved in the actual building process, the prevailing attitude towards the completed building remains largely positive in professional circles. However, buildings destroyed completely in the war have been reconstructed from scratch in Poland since the 1990s, apparently as part of the process of creating a new identity by actually reconstructing and canonising national history after the collapse of the Communist regime. There are parallels across East Central and Eastern Europe, as demonstrated by the examples of the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow, several churches and monasteries in Kiev, the House of the Blackheads in Riga, and the watchtower of Paide Castle in Estonia. An extreme case is the reconstruction of the Lower Castle at Vilnius, destroyed not in World War II but two centuries ago.

In his presentation, John V. Maciuka (New York) considered the problems associated with the demolition of Berlin's so-called Palace of the Republic (Pa-

last der Republik) and the reconstruction of the former Prussian royal palace. Berlin's urban fabric has been shaped by the destruction of – or damage to – significant buildings representing power, religion (churches), and intellectual life (museums). The ruins of the royal palace (Berliner Stadtschloss) were blown up by the East German regime and the modernist Palast der Republik was built on its site in the 1970s. After the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the depreciation of the Palast went hand in hand with schemes to reconstruct the Schloss, leading to the former's eventual dismantling. Maciuka sketched the public debate on the design of this site in the heart of Germany's capital and analysed the claims and ideological constructs employed in this discussion. A key theme emerging from his paper was the intervention of the rhetoric of power into aesthetic debates on public space – sometimes covertly, sometimes quite openly.

Georg Wagner-Kyora's (Berlin) paper addressed the ruins of St. Nicholas' Church in Hamburg, a Neo-Gothic church designed by the famous British architect George Gilbert Scott. Wagner-Kyora outlined how the option of preserving parts of the ruins of the church – notably the tower – as a war memorial was arrived at. The paper then considered the relationship between the ruin and its post-war urban setting, shaped by the new artery of the Ost-West-Straße and modern office buildings. Perceptions and justifications of the new urban layout made use of the city's past while emphasising the new opportunities offered by it, both in terms of reflecting Hamburg's continuity as a capitalist commercial hub and enhancing the experience of its architectural heritage: the construction of a highway through the heart of the city, it was claimed, enabled the citizens using the road to see successively the steeples of the five principal churches within a short period of time. From the perspective of the motorised viewer, St. Nicholas' Church became an individual landmark and memorial site that could be "consumed" without having to leave one's car at all.

The main theme of Epp Lankots's (Tallinn) presentation was the perception of the Old Town of Tallinn within the modernising city of the 1950s–80s. He considered how it was shaped through films, photo albums and souvenirs; how it was presented to tourists; and which buildings or historical periods were accor-

ded pre-eminence. One strategy employed was the museification of the Old Town: during the Soviet era, its Baltic German heritage was seen as ideologically dubious, therefore the quarter had to be presented as an exciting museum exhibit dating to a distant past without any relevance to the communist present.

Gregor Thum (Seattle) considered the interpretation of Wrocław's architectural heritage through different historical narratives. By 1945 over 60% of the heart of Wrocław was in ruins, the subsequent reconstruction process progressed slowly, and the city had lost its former significance. With the loss of its German population and its resettlement with Polish citizens, a method characterised by Thum as Polonocentrism was adopted to locate it within the Polish state after 1945: the aim was to demonstrate that Wrocław had originally been a Polish city. The communist regime therefore paid particular attention to the restoration of a number of medieval monuments, particularly churches: the totally destroyed cathedral island was reconstructed first. With regard to the surviving parts of the 'German' city centre, a notable change in attitude has taken place during the post-war decades. Initially perceived as alien by the new population, since the 1990s the secular medieval and early modern buildings have come to be seen as testimonies to the city's past as a community of affluent and confident burghers, and been endorsed as such, generating revised concepts both in terms of how Wrocław's past is being written and its urban space planned in future. The formerly numerous and influential Jewish community has also become part of the city's heritage, symbolised by the restoration of the ruined synagogue as a cultural centre. Nowadays, Wrocław's 'multicultural' background has become a key feature by which the city presents itself: it emphasises the role of different confessions, linguistic and cultural groups in its history and its location as a meeting-place at the crossroads of opposing influences. The narrative of the victims of communism also emerges as an important aspect, thus leaving no single overarching 'story' to create a new identity for Wrocław.

Petri Nouvanen (Helsinki) described similar tendencies in his paper on Vyborg (Viipuri in Finnish), once Finland's second largest city and since World War II part of the Finnish territory ceded to the Soviet

Union. The losses of population, urban fabric and historical ties left Vyborg in a completely new situation – socially, politically and spatially. To this day, the city is shaped by many abandoned historic buildings in poor condition, yet it is also undergoing significant changes in recent times, most notably the internationally acclaimed restoration of Alvar Aalto's library which has largely been funded by Finland. The Finnish perception of Vyborg has become ambiguous: the traditional view of a lost city destroyed by the Russians is challenged by the growing awareness that Vyborg's peripheral and inaccessible position within the Soviet Union saved it from the radical modernisations which many Finnish cities underwent in the 1960s/70s, leading to significant losses of historicist and Art Nouveau architecture which conversely has survived to an astonishing extent in Vyborg. The city's historic narrative has evolved in line with its political changes during the 20th century: having been integrated into the concept of Finnish history as an ancient Finnish settlement in the 1930s, the Soviets "reunited" the Vyborg of the era of Tsar Peter the Great with Russia; in 1991, the narrative of Vyborg changed radically into that of a multicultural centre, with the Swedish, Finnish and Soviet/Russian heritage receiving equal attention.

Liubov Kudryavtseva (St. Petersburg) gave an outline of the fundamental principles applied in the planning decisions affecting the centre of St. Petersburg. The reference point is the city's historic character: the needle-like church steeple of the Fortress of St. Peter and Paul determining in general the maximum height of buildings; the street pattern – formed by three roads branching out as rays and converging on the Admiralty Building – that should not be disrupted; and the horizontal lines that dominate along the banks of the River Neva and its tributaries. A cautious attitude is taken with regard to adding taller landmarks (though the 1960s television tower and the highly controversial Okhta/Gazprom Tower – a potentially symbolic building for the 21st century in several ways? – are notable exceptions). Open vistas extending into the distance are another significant feature. Even though the extant buildings originate from different phases in the 19th and 20th centuries, their proportions are generally based on the classical orders and their building materials traditional. Hence, St. Peters-

burg's heritage conservationists argue that radically modern architecture is difficult to accommodate, while there is recognition to develop the city not so much as a tourism-oriented product but rather as a city for ordinary people who rely on an infrastructure necessary for everyday life. In view of these concepts, the challenges posed by the triumphal progress of capitalism since 1991 are self-evident. On the one hand, management of the built heritage has become a responsibility that can no longer be coped with neither by the owners nor the city, and on the other hand, the pressure (as well as the need) to develop and the financial means to do so are immense. Thus, a chaotic "new Istanbul" has sprung up on Vassilyevski Island while internationally renowned architects (for example, Eric Owen Moss, Dominique Perrault, Norman Foster, Rem Koolhaas) have designed extravagant buildings and building extensions in the city centre. In the dispute between development-friendly politics and preservation-oriented public opinion, developers and conservationists, the vox populi (backed by decisions of the UNESCO world heritage committee) has proven to be an effective weapon in the prevention of aggressive new developments.

Riin Alatalu's (Tallinn) paper followed the evolution of Tallinn's Old Town heritage conservation area and the reception of new buildings erected there during the post-World War II era. A key feature of conservation practice at Tallinn emerging from her presentation are the different attitudes taken by the decision-making bodies towards the area of the Old Town on the one hand – where a comparatively strict approach is applied – and the former bastion belt on the other. Though the latter forms part of the conservation area, building projects which raise serious doubts in terms of their compatibility with historical urban space have been allowed to go ahead there.

Two papers engaged with the port city of Szczecin (Stettin) and the fate of its architectural heritage during the last years of German and the initial years of Polish rule. Katja Bernhardt (Berlin) presented her discovery of documents associated with a 1936 scheme to reorganise and reconstruct the Old Town in 1936 in response to the designation of the city as a provincial capital (Gauhauptstadt). A new National Socialist city centre with Party and government buildings was to be

built adjacent to the Old Town in Stettin. Though connected to the new centre by traffic and public transport schemes, the Old Town would have been hierarchically subordinated, relegated to an entirely residential area and subjected to substantial architectural alterations. This scheme, however, was never implemented.

Szymon Piotr Kubiak (Szczecin) engaged with the post-war development of this quarter when Stettin had become the Polish city of Szczecin. He considered urban designs and construction schemes through the person of the architect and politician Piotr Zaremba, mayor of Szczecin 1945-50 and a significant architect already in pre-War Poland, trained at Lviv and active at Poznań. Thanks to his comparatively modernist convictions, Szczecin – unlike other Polish cities – was not rebuilt according to the principles of historical reconstruction. Instead, a completely new city with isolated historic monuments such as Gothic churches and the Renaissance castle was built. The decision-makers were quite aware of what was going on in Western Europe at the time and – according to Kubiak – the example of Rotterdam is perceptible.

Eric Le Bourhis (Paris) spoke about the formation of a heritage conservation area in the Old Town of Riga and the development of conservation principles there since the 1960s. He considered the arguments used within the Soviet framework to justify the need for establishing a conservation area and sketched the step-by-step evolvement of the recognition that such areas have contextual and spatial dimensions, thus eschewing the idea of displaying single objects beyond time and space as if in the glass case of a museum. In the course of public debates on heritage conservation and urban planning, the Old Town began to be perceived as an entity with clearly defined boundaries and was designated as the heart of the city – a concept previously related to different places by different sections of society.

The paper by Andres Toodes (Narva) provided an insight into the issues shaping the controversy over the future appearance of the centre of Narva, the border town between Estonia and Russia. The largely Baroque 17th-century cityscape had largely burnt down in World War II, and following the almost complete replacement of the Estonian inhabitants by a predomi-

nantly Russian-speaking population, initial plans to rebuild some of the ruins of significant buildings – which were even listed as architectural monuments – were abandoned. Eventually, most of the ruins were demolished, with merely the town hall, a few isolated buildings and the medieval fortress undergoing restoration. Otherwise, the former Old Town area was covered with four- to five-storey apartment buildings in the 1950s/60s, built according to standard designs that completely ignored the former urban structure. Not least fuelled by nationalist-conservative Estonian politicians, the idea to reconstruct Baroque Narva has resurfaced since Estonia won its independence from the Soviet Union – a scheme obviously intended to obliterate Narva's Russian post-war history. The paradoxical treatment of the city's architectural heritage is embodied by the fate of its surviving mighty 17th-century bastions: While the hypothetical future reconstruction of the Baroque Old Town is currently obstructing building projects to be executed there in contemporary architectural style, neither the municipal nor the national authorities have been willing to fund the urgent conservation work on the fortifications which is now being carried out only due to European financial support.

To counterbalance architectural and urban developments in Communist Europe, Håkan Forsell (Stockholm) analysed the extensive post-war modernisation of Stockholm's historic city centre. Since there had not been any wartime destructions in the Swedish capital, a modern city (centre) could only be built at the expense of extant urban fabric. The Old Town (Gamla stan) was already valued as an historical environment at this time whereas the trend in the remainder of the city centre went towards mass demolition. Sharp opposition to this kind of development arose during the 1950s and 1960s from both the public and professional conservationists, in response to which the Stockholm Municipal Museum devised a classification system that measured the cultural and heritage value of buildings. The application of this model in matters of urban planning, the reorganisation and reconstruction of buildings, and investment was successful in the 1960s and 1970s and led to a demolition ban in Stockholm's city centre in 1974. Yet since the 1990s increasing pressure is exerted by an increa-

sing number of stakeholders and their conflicting interests, generating new controversies.

Jerzy Kochanowski (Warsaw) considered the post-war reconstruction of Warsaw – at the time rather referred to as “construction” or “erection” of the city which occurred within a completely different framework as the land was nationalised while buildings – of which none were left in the Old Town, however – remained in private ownership. Further demolitions of surviving buildings took place in order to improve traffic and public transport in the city, while the most crushing post-war blow to Warsaw's urban fabric was delivered by the construction of the Stalinist Palace of Culture and Sciences (completed in 1955), since – according to Kochanowski – this led to the destruction of even more buildings than were destroyed during the war.

Jacek Friedrich (Gdansk) gave an overview of the rebuilding of Gdansk, where in 1948 the decision was taken to combine the reconstruction of historic façades with modernist urban construction behind those façades. It meant, for example, that the pre-war interior structure of the districts was not reconstructed and the houses were organised around large courtyards. The combination of these two equally utopian approaches provided interesting yet ultimately conflicting solutions which pose challenges well into the present.

Alfredas Bumblauskas and Salvijus Kulevičius (Vilnius) addressed the reconstruction of the Lower Castle at Vilnius, which is perhaps one of the most curious reconstructions of the 21st century (begun in 2001). Although a number of facts would have made the case for reconstruction impossible to sustain in rational circumstances (the building had been demolished in 1801; there are no plans or scale drawings; there was no functional need for such a building), political considerations resulted in the decision to reconstruct the castle as a symbol of Lithuanian statehood. The actual architectural solution is a compromise, as a modern structure with 17th-century features and symbols of the present-day Lithuanian state rises above 16th-century cellars. The reception of this ‘kitsch’ building raises real problems as the public appears to be under the impression that the new structure is indeed a faithful copy of the original castle.

Bert Hoppe (Berlin) described an even more extreme situation in Kaliningrad. In addition to wartime destructions, the remaining historic buildings in what was the German city of Königsberg were almost completely demolished by the 1970s at the orders of the Soviet authorities, as the traces of the “evil German settlement” had to be obliterated. The shooting of Soviet war films among the “German” ruins led to further destructions. Standard mass-produced Soviet style buildings made up the new cityscape, though all high-status projects were left unfinished due to a lack of material resources. Attempts have been made to define a new identity for the city since 1991 without clear results; the ensuing confusion is also reflected in the current architecture of Kaliningrad which looks to historic models elsewhere than in the Königsberg past: thus, side by side can be seen orthodox churches with onion-shaped cupolas, buildings in the spirit of Russian postmodernism, parodies of Western European historic architecture, and international skyscrapers. Shopping malls and cheap residential buildings make up most of the current construction volume.

Manfred Finke's (Lübeck) thought-provoking paper engaged with the postmodernist building activity in one of the older quarters of Lübeck (the Gründerviertel). Following the demolition of two post-war schools, thorough archaeological excavations were carried out. With regard to the rebuilding of the quarter, it was decided that the historic layout of building plots was to be maintained. But instead of reconstructing destroyed houses, contemporary interpretations of architectural traditions were to be attempted. The first postmodernist experiments, however, have not been accepted by the public since they lack the individuality of historic buildings.

The final presentations focused on the (re)construction of nations on a broader scale. José Faraldo and Carolina Rodríguez-López (Madrid) compared the relationship between nationalism and reconstruction in dictatorships, juxtaposing Franco's Spain and socialist Poland during the years 1939/1945–1956. The speakers claimed that the damages caused by the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) were comparable to the destruction caused by World War II in Eastern Europe (for instance in Warsaw). In both cases, they argued, the building work was not limited to the re-

construction of the physical environment alone but rather aimed at the construction of a new nation. The results were different but had been initiated by a similar underlying ideology.

The art historian Arnold Bartetzky (Leipzig) delivered the summing up with his wide-ranging survey entitled *Building History: Reconstruction and Nation-Building in the 19th – 21st Centuries*. He pointed out that there is a frequent nexus between nationalist movements and reconstructions of symbolic historic buildings, even if an immediate causality cannot always be discerned. “Young” nations regard the completion or reconstruction of unfinished or damaged monuments as highly meaningful. From the early 19th century onwards, numerous prominent examples prove the point: the restoration of the Teutonic Knights' Castle at Marienburg (Malbork) as a national monument of victorious German culture; the completion of Cologne Cathedral in the wake of the victory achieved over Napoleon, the completion of Prague Cathedral finished as late as 1929; the reconstruction of the royal palace on Wawel Hill in Cracow since 1907; or the complete reconstruction of the Bethlehem Chapel (site of Jan Hus's preaching in Czech at the beginning of the 15th century, and destroyed already in the 18th century) in Prague in 1950–1952. Since the downfall of Communism in 1989/90, a whole series of projects can be added to this list: the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow; St. Michael's Monastery in Kiev; the House of the Blackheads in Riga; and the Lower Castle at Vilnius. A common denominator of these projects is the selective approach taken towards the original, as idealised versions rather than accurate copies of the buildings in their last documented appearance were built. The most “successful” reconstructions have been those of buildings deliberately destroyed by “enemies” for political and/or symbolic reasons, or where such claims could be made. Such campaigns have usually initiated at grassroots level but quickly evolved into national undertakings. Bartetzky demonstrated that orthodox principles of heritage conservation advanced since the end of the 19th century (by John Ruskin, Alois Riegl, Georg Dehio and others) – strictly rejecting reconstructions of buildings to their supposedly “original” state – have in fact not been applied, or given way, to reconstructions which

were regarded as objects of pre-eminent symbolic and/or stylistic importance.

In short, a key leitmotif of the conference was the nexus between the phenomenon of reconstruction and the need for identity in response to a nation's cataclysmic crisis, a period of occupation or oppression, or the regaining of independence. With the gradual receding of such contexts, attitudes to the reconstruction or restoration of historic buildings become more dispassionate and rational.

Conference Program

Addresses of Welcome

Küllo Arjakas, Jörg Hackmann, Christian Pletzing, Robert Schweitzer

Introduction

Jörg Hackmann, Szczecin

Session 1: Historic City Centers between Reconstruction and Modernization

Castles in the Sand: The Politics of Architecture at the Heart of Berlin, John Maciuka (New York)

Mahnmal, Autotrassse und späte Nostalgie: Die Ruine der St. Nikolaikirche in Hamburg und ihre Nachbarstraßen im Wiederaufbau 1943 – 1990, Georg Wagner-Kyora (Berlin)

Historic and Modern City in Tallinn, Epp Lankots (Tallinn)

Public Keynote: Rekonstruktion und Modernisierung in Mittel- und Osteuropa, Małgorzata Omilanowska (Gdańsk)

Session 2: Legacies and Appropriations. Public Debates on Historic City Centers

Vilnius als symbolische Hauptstadt von vier Nationen: Ewige litauische Hauptstadt, Hauptstadt der Kresy, Jerusalem des Nordens und weißrussisches Mekka, Alvydas Ninkantaitis (Vilnius)

Wrocław's Multiplying Narratives. The Cultural Appropriation of Urban Spaces after the End of Polonocentrism, Gregor Thum (Seattle)

Reconstruction, Modernization or Lacuna? Conflicts of Memory, Planning and Re-Establishment in Tallinn, Riin Alatalu (Tallinn)

St. Petersburg Architectural Legacy: Challenges and Opportunities. Ljubov Kudrjavceva (St. Petersburg)

Vyborg: A Finnish Perspective, Petri Neuvonen (Helsinki)

Session 3: Modern Redesigns of Historic City Centers

Die "Gesundung der Altstadt". Ein Programm zur Restrukturierung der "Gauhauptstadt" Stettin, Katja Bernhardt (Berlin)

Piotr Zarembas Vision vom Wiederaufbau Stettins, Szymon Piotr Kubiak (Szczecin)

Die Abgrenzung des "historischen Zentrums" in Riga, Eric Le Bourhis (Paris)

Narva, Andres Toode (Narva)

The Value of Urban Heritage. Public Debate, Assessment Criteria and Redevelopment of Cultural Property in Stockholm, Håkan Forsell (Stockholm)

Session 4: Reconstructions and the Return of Historic Topographies

Warschau Jerzy Kochanowski (Warszawa)

Danzig, Jacek Friedrich (Gdańsk)

The Lower Castle in Vilnius, Alfredas Bumblauskas / Salvijus Kulevičius (Vilnius)

Kaliningrad, Bert Hoppe

Das Gründerviertel in Lübeck, Manfred Finke, Lübeck

Session 5: (Re)-Constructing Nations

Nationalism and Reconstruction in Dictatorships: Franco's Spain and Socialist Poland in Comparison (1939/1945-1956), José Faraldo / Carolina Rodríguez-Lopez (Madrid)

Geschichte bauen. Rekonstruktion und Nationsbildung im 19.-21. Jahrhundert, Arnold Bartetzky (Leipzig)

Concluding Discussion

Statements: Mart Kalm (Tallinn), Marc Schalenberg (Berlin)

Autoren

Oliver Orro (b 1981) graduated from the Estonian Academy of Arts in 2005 as an art historian. He has previously worked at the Tallinn City Heritage department, and is now working as a lecturer and researcher at the Estonian Academy of Arts, teaching architectural history and conservation. He has written on various topics of the history of Estonian architecture, mainly concentrating on the late 19th and early 20th century.

Anneli Randla (b. 1970) received her PhD in art history from the University of Cambridge. She is the dean of the Faculty of Art and Culture at the Estonian Academy of Arts, previously she has held the post of the Director General of the National Heritage Board of Estonia. She teaches art history and conservation theory and has published on medieval art and architecture as well as conservation history.

Titel

Between Reconstruction and Modernisation: Public Debates on Historic City Centres in the 20th and 21st Centuries, Conference at the Tallinn City Archives, 15–17 September 2011, reviewed by Oliver Orro and Anneli Randla, in: kunsttexte.de/ostblick, Nr. 1, 2013 (8 Seiten), www.kunsttexte.de/ostblick.