

## INTRODUCTION

# Heritage under Socialism

## *Trajectories of Preserving the Tangible Past in Postwar Eastern and Central Europe*



Corinne Geering and Paul Vickers

On the cover of this book, a small, seventeenth-century, Orthodox church building stands right next to a large, paneled skyscraper in the city center of Moscow. The size of the church pales in comparison with one of the twenty-four story buildings that were erected on the new Kalinin Prospekt, today known as Novyi Arbat, between 1964 and 1968 as part of Moscow's urban development plan (figure 0.1). The arrangement of the two antithetic buildings may appear like a product of chance that saved a prerevolutionary, sacral building in the largest metropole of a state striving to build communism and promoting state atheism.

The images of the destruction of historic buildings, such as the detonation of the Church Christ the Savior in 1931 not far from this location, and the radical reconstruction envisaged by the Moscow General Plan of 1935, have become a crucial element of popular memory of the Soviet period.<sup>1</sup> By contrast, the small church on Novyi Arbat appears to have defied the destructive tendencies of state socialism and is thus reminiscent of holdouts situated in the middle of large-scale construction sites or new real estate developments. However, this scenario does not apply in this case, as the historical tradition expressed by the Orthodox building and the socialist vision of modernization reflected in the grand-scale, bulky design of socialist public spaces were not mutually exclusive. Instead, the community of church building and skyscraper was actually envisioned and promoted by the same socialist reconstruction plan in the 1960s. The Church of the Venerable Simeon Stylites on the Povarskaia, as the small church is called, was carefully restored during the construction of today's Novyi Arbat and repurposed to house an exhibition of applied arts.<sup>2</sup>

Heritage under Socialism

Preservation in Eastern and Central Europe, 1945–1991

Edited by Eszter Gantner, Corinne Geering, and Paul Vickers

<https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/GantnerHeritage>

Not for resale

The apparent tension between tradition and modernization—embodied in the cover image of this book—also shaped the discourses and practices associated with heritage in the socialist states discussed in this volume. The contributions in this volume show that radical modernization indeed could be compatible with a commitment to preserving the heritage of the past. Historical sites, buildings, and objects from the era before socialism were integrated alongside modernist construction in accordance with socialist ideals within the same official discourses. Already in the immediate aftermath of the October Revolution in 1917, the waves of willful destruction motivated the new Bolshevik regime to issue a decree on the protection of monuments.<sup>3</sup> This fact was a source of Soviet patriotic pride, as publications issued in the postwar period connected the care of the Bolshevik regime for the past to the reconstruction of buildings destroyed in World War II, emphasizing that the act of preservation was a continuation of the victory in the so-called Great Patriotic War.

With the political transition to state socialism in Eastern and Central Europe following World War II, a number of new governments were confronted with the question of how to continue national historical narratives under the changed circumstances. At the same time, a general European trend was also in evidence as people were rediscovering the past during what can be described as a “historical turn” emerging from the 1960s.<sup>4</sup> This turn was marked in socialist states by the establishment of hundreds of new museums, the organization of festivals celebrating historical events, and the promotion of the study of local culture and local history through new voluntary associations.<sup>5</sup> While certain events assumed crucial importance in official public memory, such as World War II and socialist revolutions, the interpretation of the past also left room for discussion, negotiation, or even contestation, as well as personal reflection when dealing with specific historical sites, buildings, or objects.

Socialist ideas of heritage had not only local or regional resonance but were also of international significance, both within the region of Eastern and Central Europe and also transnationally, as these ideas shaped the nascent international organizations—among others, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)—dealing with heritage across the Iron Curtain. Thus, this volume points toward a broader global history of heritage, but within the more coherent spatial and temporal frames of postwar Europe. The example of the small church on Novyi Arbat reveals the relevance of the international sphere for socialist preservation practices, as heritage assumed a central position in the construction of the self-image of the Soviet Union and other socialist states after World War II. The restoration of the historical church building was not simply

a by-product of the large-scale construction project; rather, the restored building was embedded in the overall representation of state-led efforts associated with modernization and striving toward communism in the Soviet Union. A picture of the final stages of construction of Kalinin Prospekt and restoration of the church unfolding right next to each other (figure 0.2) was reproduced for the global public in an article titled “U.S.S.R. Today” in a special issue of the *UNESCO Courier*, the monthly magazine of UNESCO. This special issue was published in 1967 in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution and aimed to introduce an international readership to recent developments in the fields of education, science, and culture in the Soviet Union. Within this framework, the preservation of cultural heritage formed part of the achievements that Soviet officials sought to present to the world. Accordingly, the picture caption stated that the church was “preserved in its modern surroundings” and furthermore emphasized the increasing importance attributed to cultural heritage by socialist policies.<sup>6</sup>

This volume seeks to carefully examine the relation between nation-building and increasing internationalization in preservation in postwar Eastern and Central Europe, while also accounting for the role that local and regional actors, including voluntary societies and local residents, played in these processes. In an effort to move away from a homogenous conception of the so-called socialist bloc, this volume presents case studies from the Polish People’s Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People’s Republic, and the Soviet Union, while also focusing on the Estonian and Ukrainian Soviet republics separately. International relations between these countries were consolidated by international agreements, such as the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) and the Warsaw Pact, while new international organizations like UNESCO provided avenues for experts from socialist countries to engage with global debates. The approach taken in this edited volume is thus a transnational history as the contributions pay particular attention to the international transfers and exchanges in the preservation and to uses of the historical built environment in postwar Eastern and Central Europe. These historical accounts on cultural heritage contribute to a reassessment of the relevance of the nation in the socialist period as well as of the influence and control in this region exerted by the political center in Moscow that has been emphasized in other accounts.<sup>7</sup> The transnational history in this volume instead seeks to shed light on the multiple actors that shaped preservation in the region and at the international level, both within the socialist bloc and transcending the ideological divide.



**Figure 0.1.** Church of the Venerable Simeon Stylites on the Povarskaia next to a skyscraper on Novyi Arbat, Moscow (2014). Photograph by Corinne Geering.

## **Heritage, Monuments, and Memorialization: Socialist Relations to the Past**

The notion of heritage has emerged across the world as the primary concept driving today's management of and legislation on protection and preservation of movable, immovable, and intangible cultural property.<sup>8</sup> The differences of the concept of heritage to that of history and of memory and how they relate to place have been subject to considerable debate.<sup>9</sup> With the emergence of the field of heritage studies, scholarship appears to have settled on a consensus that understands heritage as a discourse and an interrelated set of sociocultural practices,<sup>10</sup> encompassing both tangible and intangible cultural expression as well as the natural environment, that are formed in the present and reflect concerns about the past.<sup>11</sup> The focus on present concerns also explains why scholarship on heritage has traditionally focused on contemporary societies rather than historical ones. This concern becomes ever more pressing when the present contrasts starkly from the past and thus urges societies to reorient themselves. Against this background, in the last three decades, scholarship dealing with heritage in the Eastern and Central European region has primarily engaged with ways of dealing with the socialist past during and after the political transition



### ST. SIMEON AND THE SKYSCRAPER

Photo © Paul Almasy, Paris

Mantled in scaffolding and dwarfed by its multi-story neighbour, a 17th-century Moscow church undergoes restoration. Located near the Kalinin Prospekt, a broad, modern avenue bisecting an area recently transformed by town planning, the church is preserved in its modern surroundings. It is dedicated to St. Simeon Stylites, propagator of the Greek Orthodox faith and one of Russia's most venerated saints. Two years ago a society for the preservation of historic and cultural monuments was set up in the Federal Republic of Russia, in the U.S.S.R. Some 30,000 monuments have since been catalogued and many of them are being restored.

**Figure 0.2.** Restoration work during the construction of Kalinin Prospekt. Reprinted from the *UNESCO Courier* 20 (1967). Photograph © Paul Almasy / akg-images.

of 1989–91. While earlier research has focused on the reinterpretation of socialist monuments,<sup>12</sup> postsocialist urban development,<sup>13</sup> dissonant heritage, and the question of how to come to terms with a difficult past,<sup>14</sup> more recent scholarship has reassessed the postsocialist nature of heritage and connected it to challenges of securitization in state-building processes in times of political upheaval.<sup>15</sup>

In contrast to scholarship dealing with postsocialist societies, where the focus has been on their ways of working through the socialist past, this book is concerned with how socialist societies related to the past between the end of World War II in 1945 and the dissolution of the socialist bloc in 1991. It discusses how experts of various backgrounds, government officials, and politicians, as well as tourists, visitors, and local residents, participated in the shaping of heritage in state socialist societies in Eastern and Central Europe. The contributions focus on the preservation of the tangible past, as manifested in legislation on protection, institution-building, and practices of restoration or reconstruction. The examples explored in this volume range from architecture, public infrastructure and sites, to other objects stemming from the historical periods preceding state socialism. The concept of heritage is used primarily as an analytical term, drawn from the more recent tradition of heritage studies, whereas other notions were employed more frequently by the historical actors at the time. In most languages concerned here, the concept generally used in source material would correspond to the English notion of *monument* (e.g., *pamiatnik* in Russian, *Denkmal* in German, *zabytek* in Polish, and *műemlék* in Hungarian). Valorization of heritage sites did not commence with the socialist era, of course; the new socialist governments had at their disposal national heritage registries that had been compiled over decades under different political conditions. While various actors, from ministries through academics to local administration and associations, exerted much effort in conceiving an officially sanctioned past compatible with socialism, this took into account existing historical layers, canons, and experiences of continuity and rupture.

The strong embeddedness of heritage registries in the national context, advanced by their function of representing a sanctioned account of national history, has often overshadowed the transnational links of members of governments and intellectual elites that shaped activities promoting heritage conservation in their respective countries, a process that emerged already in the nineteenth century.<sup>16</sup> During the Cold War era, too, the production of national culture through tangible remains from the past, known as monuments of history and culture, was an endeavor motivated by transnational links across ideological divides.<sup>17</sup> At the same time, the contributions here remain aware of the significance of the state as an actor in heritage policy

and practice on the local, national, and international levels.<sup>18</sup> As the studies presented in the chapters of this volume show, socialist conceptions of heritage were not only manifested in specific sites and locations, but they also developed out of those sites, ultimately informing practices and discourses that took on international significance, in the shape of professional practices and discourses as well as international standard-setting instruments that remain in place to this day. For example, this is evident in the parallel development of the notion of industrial heritage in socialist and nonsocialist countries, as well as in the inclusion of dark heritage, such as concentration camps, in the international heritage canon. By inquiring into the socialist uses of the past, and the international responses to them at the time, this volume deepens the interlinkages of the fields of history, heritage studies, and Central and Eastern European studies. It seeks to further ongoing debates about the globally resonant concept of heritage where the socialist interpretations have so far played a marginal role.<sup>19</sup>

Recent inquiries have started delineating the characteristics of socialist conceptions of heritage, with a particular focus on the efforts by socialist regimes to create historical continuity over the political rupture of revolutions by including imperial structures like palaces and monasteries in the new socialist heritage canon. The October Revolution in 1917 also initiated a new time regime that later made it possible to extend the notion of heritage to include artifacts erected and created during socialism, such as modernist buildings and memorials.<sup>20</sup> Historical continuity not only provided a source of political legitimacy to the socialist regimes by effectively referring to established cultural canons, but also supported the transformation of citizens into “new men” through a cultural revolution that reassessed basic functions and notions of heritage.<sup>21</sup> For the region of Eastern and Central Europe, World War II presented a powerful caesura in multiple respects. For one, the transition to state socialism occurred in most countries in this region during and immediately after World War II. These states included, among others, the Estonian SSR as part of the USSR, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People’s Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, and the Hungarian People’s Republic, which are all discussed in this volume. In some of these countries, the end of the war also led to a change in borders, thus subjecting new territories to socialist rule, which also applied to the Ukrainian SSR, a thitherto existing Soviet republic. Further, the massive destruction suffered across Eastern and Central Europe in World War II challenged the new and old socialist regimes to devise a reconstruction plan for historical places that accommodated both a longer national historical narrative and the political objectives of striving toward the communist future. The experiences of World War II provided the basis

for postwar institutions responsible for preservation in many states in Europe as measures of safeguarding and reconstruction were implemented by public authorities in response to wartime destruction. Historical accounts have revealed that it was indeed Soviet republics other than the Russian SFSR that were pioneering in the field of preservation and thus also shaped measures taken by the political center in Moscow.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, studies on the reconstruction of cities in the Soviet Union, Poland, and the GDR have shown the extent of public debate and strong involvement of local actors, thus contrasting with narratives declaring a clear top-down decision-making process in state socialist societies.<sup>23</sup>

By focusing on heritage and practices of preservation, this book engages with broader themes in the historiography of postwar Eastern and Central Europe, such as the role of ideology, state propaganda, and historiographic revision in socialist societies.<sup>24</sup> The victory in World War II, called the “Great Patriotic War” in Russian, and the struggle against fascism have been central elements of official socialist historiography, education, and memory culture.<sup>25</sup> The substantial revisionism in these socialist narratives has been critiqued by important work highlighting blank spots and working through difficult pasts. Scholarship has revised socialist World War II accounts that focused on victims of antifascist struggle while ignoring Jewish suffering;<sup>26</sup> it has highlighted Communist crimes, such as the history of the Katyn massacre;<sup>27</sup> and, finally, it has rendered visible the multicultural history of borderlands and explored the history of regions affected by ethnic cleansing.<sup>28</sup> At the same time, however, rejection or disavowal of socialist-era historiography has been used to lend legitimacy to post-socialist nationalization of the past,<sup>29</sup> while also obscuring the ways in which socialist-era uses of the past have shaped regimes of memory that are still at work in the postsocialist present.<sup>30</sup> There are continuities in terms of what was deemed valuable and worthy of preservation from the past,<sup>31</sup> in aesthetic terms and in terms of values, at least where heroic and patriotic narratives are concerned.<sup>32</sup> This is not to suggest that Communist parties agreed on one interpretation of national symbols nor that they were necessarily successful in imposing it on the population, as the accounts in this volume highlight.<sup>33</sup>

In several countries in Eastern and Central Europe, the postwar period promoted the creation of ethnically homogenous nation-states (for example, Poland and the Czech part of the ČSSR), laying the foundations for the emergence of independent states after 1989. The authorities in Poland, for example, developed a mythology claiming that post-1945 Poland had been restored to its original location from around the turn of the second millennium, prior to Germanic aggression and the eastward shift in Poland’s foreign policy that this necessitated, thus aggravating relations with

Eastern Slavic neighbors. Heritage played a role in legitimizing discourses, with sites relating to the medieval period—rather than later epochs—foregrounded in territories that had until the end of World War II formed part of the German Empire.<sup>34</sup> These sites provided the new regime with tangible symbols that the redrawn borders could only be protected from Western aggression by an alliance with the USSR, thus guaranteeing future prosperity in a modern socialist state.<sup>35</sup> The tangible past, then, was integral to the story not only of geopolitical security but also of future progress as projected by socialist-era accounts.

Examples such as this show that socialist modernity was manifested not only in factories, technological development, and, later, consumer products, but also in a modern form of nation-building that likewise under socialism involved “the invention of tradition.”<sup>36</sup> Existing traditions were reframed and the canon mined for aspects of the past best suited to present-day needs for the purposes of official discourse. On the ground, whether among expert communities or “ordinary people,” such as tourists or locals living near heritage sites, the official framing of the past could be subject to degrees of contestation<sup>37</sup>; while on the other hand, nonstate actors could also align with the state’s heritage policy.

The role of states’ use of heritage protection as part of cultural nationalism to aid political nationalism has been outlined in recent research linking nationalism studies and heritage studies.<sup>38</sup> Regime change in many of the states discussed here, as evident in the wake of the October Revolution and after World War II, generally entailed action to protect historical buildings.<sup>39</sup> This is borne out in many of the case studies in this volume, with wartime destruction often a key factor alongside socialist nation-building policies. However, since the chapters here go beyond the initial turbulence of the installation of Communist regimes, they delve further into continuities across regime changes, tracing not only the legacies in legislation and institutions of heritage protection, but also the influence of experts’ intellectual inheritances, such as academic networks, local associations, and even family histories.

What this volume seeks to do, then, is to explore the extent to which heritage functioned within socialist nation-building efforts, but also to go beyond the focus on the effectiveness, or otherwise, of cultural nationalism for political legitimization. This is evident in the way the contributions draw on the perspectives of informal and formal networks that turned their attentions to local sites and their meaning for their users. In particular, the growing tourism sector and increasing opportunities to travel abroad for restorers and other experts offer insights into conflicting narratives and efforts toward extending the boundaries of more narrowly defined ideological foundations. By adopting approaches that highlight the ways in which

the uses of the past under socialism were produced through individual and institutional activities, such as international travel, it becomes possible to trace not only forms of “permitted dissent”<sup>40</sup> but also the limited yet productive freedoms in the realms of conservation.<sup>41</sup> Thus, state policy in relation to heritage is revealed as a product of negotiation, disagreement, or individual initiative. It is also shown to be something guided only in part by political or cultural nationalism, with economic benefits and infrastructural development also becoming part of socialist heritage policy and practice. Against this background, the contributions here demonstrate the intersections of political order, ideology, expertise, localized practice, national canons and their reworkings, and local heritage sites as interlinked factors in the production of the diverse phenomenon of heritage under socialism.

### **Transnational Perspectives on Heritage under Socialism**

From the very outset, socialism was conceived as an internationalist ideology that necessitated shared approaches to the past by individual nation-states, thus signaling the emergence of a new socialist realm of intensifying transnational exchange. However, socialism in postwar Eastern and Central Europe did not constitute a uniform ideology or a homogeneous practice. Recent research has stressed the diversity of the socialist experience across states and regions,<sup>42</sup> thus complicating a clear-cut definition of socialism. Nonetheless, socialism under different political, social, and cultural conditions shared similar trajectories, blueprints, and institutions.<sup>43</sup> They evolved in the course of transnational exchanges, which were facilitated by the politics of socialist internationalism and alternative processes of globalization centering in Eastern Europe.<sup>44</sup> Thus, the so-called Second World exhibited distinctive characteristics, which had evolved over time and which marked socialism itself as a historical product of transnational exchange.<sup>45</sup> These characteristics included the adoption of a variation of socialism as state ideology that involved the nationalization of property and the promotion of atheism. Socialist states were ruled by Communist parties whose congresses spearheaded a highly centralized form of governance. Party authorities controlled the censorship apparatus, issued travel permits, and expected varying degrees of ideological engagement from those working in public institutions. As a result, the state authorities were at the same time enablers of the international exchanges that made socialist heritage part of the global discussion on heritage. Indeed, as this volume shows, the ruling parties’ gatekeeping practices were crucial to some of the more subtle reworkings and disagreements that come across in the historical source

material discussed by the contributions in this volume. Such nuances can be revealed by an actor-centered, transnational perspective, even on the level of the production of legislation, where typically the domination of the center in Moscow or the respective state capitals has been underlined.

Socialism as an ideology and a form of rule did not remain consistent throughout the postwar period. The prevailing form of socialism in the different states was contingent on national contexts that were shaped over time by state reforms, intellectual debates over ideological foundations, and shifts in international alliances. While the early postwar period witnessed a consolidation of Communist rule in most of the countries examined in this volume, the death of Soviet leader Stalin in 1953 presented an important turning point, leading to the reforms of de-Stalinization during the Khrushchev Thaw. Though this period was characterized by efforts to liberalize the press, rehabilitate political prisoners, and renounce isolationist foreign policy, at the same time the Thaw period also witnessed more repression toward religious groups in the Soviet Union, as well as the Soviet interventions in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. In the 1970s, the politics of détente provided the basis for socialist countries to intensify international cooperation, especially within Europe, while against this background, opposition and protest movements gained ground, such as the Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia and Solidarność in Poland. Finally, the reforms of *perestroika* from the mid-1980s aimed at economic restructuring and more transparency in government institutions, laid bare in particular by the nuclear disaster in Chernobyl in 1986. In 1989–91, the socialist bloc ceased to exist, as states and Soviet republics followed through with declarations of independence, and with both peaceful and violent revolutions emerging during the political transition. What this very brief periodization of postwar Eastern and Central Europe shows are the shifts and tensions in the national and international policies of socialist states. They point to the need to scrutinize the specific historical setting of actors who articulated socialist conceptions of heritage and the policies relating to it.

These shifts had varying influences during the postwar decades in the socialist states, leading to different historical trajectories of preserving the tangible past. The burgeoning field of historical research on preservation under socialism has shed light on how socialist regimes in specific locations, from Cuba to the Soviet Union and Romania, appropriated the past from the prerevolutionary or prewar periods for their own purposes.<sup>46</sup> As highlighted by recent research on cultural heritage in socialist Africa during the Cold War, this also held true for international cooperation and transfer of socialist ideas from Eastern Europe in support of national liberation movements.<sup>47</sup> Notwithstanding shared socialist ideas, the appropriation and use of the past was no uniform process in different societies; instead, it

involved negotiation, debate, and at times even contestation. Several case studies on particular locations in Soviet Russia have provided insight into preservation as a complex and long negotiation process between local residents, heritage experts from various fields, politicians, and members of state administration representing the interests of urban development and civil engineering.<sup>48</sup> In this respect, the preservation of sacral architecture under the conditions of state atheism, antireligious propaganda, and persecution, for example, have been of particular interest to scholarship.<sup>49</sup> Churches, monasteries, and other buildings associated with religion were included by Soviet authorities in state heritage registries and promoted as part of the state's cultural heritage. In many places, these buildings no longer served their previous religious function and were restored to house museums or tourist facilities, as it was the case in the aforementioned Church of the Venerable Simeon Stylites on the Povarskaia on today's Novyi Arbat in Moscow.

During the period between 1945 and 1991, heritage under socialism was also shaped by the increasing relevance of international cooperation. For one, there were regular meetings among socialist countries, in line with the ideology of socialist internationalism, to ensure coordination of their policies vis-à-vis the capitalist world. This also included meetings of the ministries of culture that oversaw the field of cultural heritage. At the same time, the global community saw the emergence of several new international organizations that were devoted to cultural policies and the preservation of cultural heritage as distinct fields of governance. The new legislation and standard-setting instruments adopted by international bodies both contributed to and drew inspiration from the policies of socialist states. These documents, such as the Venice Charter adopted by the Second International Congress of Architects and Specialists of Historic Buildings in 1964, built upon hitherto existing networks of the interwar period, while at the same time expanding the possibilities of international cooperation considerably. UNESCO, the International Council of Museums (ICOM), both established in 1946, and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)—its establishment in 1965 was prompted by the Venice Charter—provided new platforms to engage in transnational discussion for experts from socialist countries, thus bringing practices developed in their home countries into the international community.

Actors from socialist states formed central constituents of the history of these international organizations. For instance, ICOMOS was founded in Warsaw in 1965 with the support of the Polish government; and from the moment of its inception, this organization was committed to promoting international cooperation and exchange across ideological divides during the Cold War. Subsequent to its meeting in Poland, ICOMOS alternated

between locations in Eastern and Western Europe for the triennial general assemblies: the Third General Assembly was held in 1972 in Budapest, Hungary; the Fifth General Assembly in 1978 in Moscow and Suzdal', Russian SFSR; and the Seventh General Assembly in 1984 in Rostock, GDR. The support extended to this international organization and its work by socialist governments reflected the fact that transnational exchange through the channels of ICOMOS, as well as other international bodies, was fundamental for the development of preservation policies and practices in socialist countries in the postwar period.<sup>50</sup>

Against this background, processes unfolding under socialism cannot be confined easily within the framework of the nation-state and instead require both the transnational and subnational perspectives of the kind that this volume develops for the field of heritage. The volume thus contributes to a broader postwar history of transnational transfers and exchanges by discussing expert networks as well as less formal cross-border mobility (for example in tourism) outside the centers dominating transnational heritage discourse.<sup>51</sup> Heritage and more specifically the practice of preservation lend themselves particularly well to research examining processes across ideological and state borders during the Cold War, since it combines the two fields of culture and expertise. In the last fifteen years, several publications have revealed the active transnational networks of technology and cultural exchanges that transcended the Iron Curtain.<sup>52</sup> György Péteri was among the first scholars to reassess the separation and isolation associated with the systemic divide in the Cold War period. He suggested that it was necessary to reconsider the prominent metaphor of the Iron Curtain and instead reestablish it as a Nylon Curtain, one that "was not only transparent but . . . also yielded to strong osmotic tendencies that were globalizing knowledge across the systemic divide about culture, goods, and services."<sup>53</sup>

In the field of heritage, transsystemic transfers and exchanges promoted the use of culture as soft power and the development of mass tourism together with socialist consumer society. For example, the panel buildings framing the Kalinin Prospekt, mentioned above, included several shops and other services that catered to the needs of a new, socialist consumer society in the post-Stalin Soviet Union.<sup>54</sup> The fact that these processes unfolded in several countries, sometimes simultaneously, provided fertile ground for transnational discussions on the role cultural heritage was to assume in socialist societies. As the contributions to this volume demonstrate, transfers were often not unidirectional, solely a result of diktats and norms issued from the center in Moscow, but multidirectional, as ideas and practices from the Soviet republics and the Warsaw Pact states also exerted an influence on the development of shared preservation principles and of international heritage infrastructures.

## Transfers and Exchanges across Socialist Eastern and Central Europe

Whereas the focus of existing studies has largely been on one socialist state, this volume inquires into preservation in Eastern and Central Europe on the regional scale by paying particular attention to transfers and exchanges. Thus, it seeks to complement earlier histories on international heritage cooperation in Eastern Europe that have emphasized contacts beyond the region, with Western Europe or the Global South, but in turn neglected internationalization within Eastern and Central Europe.<sup>55</sup> As several contributions in this volume highlight, the development of international contacts within the so-called socialist bloc preceded the involvement of socialist states in the relevant international heritage bodies and indeed even contributed toward the foundations for internationalization at the European and global levels. Moreover, this new realm of socialist internationalism in Eastern and Central Europe was established by professional communities in states that had, in most cases, inherited transnational expert networks as well as national legislation and policies from the interwar and imperial periods.

This book takes into account the diverse trajectories in heritage conservation under socialism when discussing the multilayered movement of heritage concepts and practices across borders and ideological divides. By pointing to central actors and sites involved, the contributions analyze the articulation of conceptions of heritage in and from socialist states, while also paying particular attention to the role of international organizations and various expert associations. The case studies reveal the dynamic nature of socialist interpretations of the tangible past and the negotiation of its meaning at the level of local, national, and international actors. Their focus on transnational transfers and exchanges also highlights the internationalization of preservation in the postwar period and the continuity of interwar international contacts under new political conditions. Exploring the internationalization of heritage policies and practices in postwar Eastern and Central Europe makes clear the place of socialist countries and actors in the broader European and global historical accounts dealing with heritage and uses of the past. In this volume, the region of Eastern and Central Europe is framed neither as peripheral to global processes nor as an isolated, self-enclosed region. Instead, it emerges as a region where ideas and practices related to heritage shaped the globalization of this field in the second half of the twentieth century, while also producing a particular mode of internationalizing preservation within the region. As this volume shows, heritage under socialism was a coconstitutive of the international heritage order that emerged after World War II.

The contributions offer insights relevant for intraregional comparisons on Eastern and Central Europe, thus diversifying the notion of the “socialist bloc,” as well as cross-regional comparisons, demonstrating that heritage grew in significance on both sides of the Iron Curtain as part of a process shaped by transnational interactions. The focus on the broad scale and scope of the actors involved in negotiating and contesting the meaning of both heritage sites and the practice of preservation challenges ideas of heritage under socialism as a top-down, centrally dictated process. Instead, the volume is guided by an emphasis on the socialist construction of heritage sites and practices as a multidirectional and multisited process, taking place in intersecting local, national, regional, and international contexts.

The volume is divided into two parts that explore concepts of heritage and practices of preservation from a transnational perspective, first by tracing transfers and exchanges across state borders and the Iron Curtain, and second by looking into concrete manifestations of these processes at specific sites on the local and regional levels. The first part of this book, “Transfers and Exchanges in Heritage Policies and Practices,” demonstrates how socialist conceptions of heritage were dynamic constructs that were also influential on the international level. The four chapters here concentrate on the versatile and multilayered relations between socialist heritage actors, practices, and policies across state borders and in particular in international organizations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS. The cases explored show how internationalization often went hand in hand with processes of nation-building under socialism. Recognizing how the state had a central role in heritage policies and practices also contributes to diversifying the socialist bloc in Eastern and Central Europe by moving the perspective away from Soviet authorities in Moscow toward actors in other places such as Poland, Estonia, and Ukraine that were participating in international debates. Transcending the ideological divide during the Cold War, period, ideas, and actors from the so-called Second World shaped heritage discourses and practices on the international level through formal and informal networks, including both scholarly exchange and tourism, as international travel increased rapidly in the postwar period. Like the volume generally, the chapters here highlight the contributions from this part of the world that have often been disregarded or ignored as a result of the rupture of 1989–91, thus continuing a general trend of epistemic asymmetry and moving Eastern European thought to the margins of analysis.<sup>56</sup>

The way heritage was incorporated in international exchanges while at the same time promoting ideas emerging from socialist conceptions of culture is demonstrated in Corinne Geering’s opening chapter: “The Past Belongs to the Future: Heritage in Soviet Policymaking on Cultural Development.” Her study of cultural policies in the Soviet Union highlights that

heritage-making was not simply a case of transmitting state-sanctioned versions of the past and showcasing a vision of progress to the international community. Soviet policymakers and heritage experts harnessed tourism and official itineraries to conceive of heritage as a resource for economic development and public education in socialist countries. Geering shows how cultural heritage had been linked to the future already in the early Soviet policies, from 1917 and then throughout the 1920s, and highlights how this discourse took new shape in an era of intensifying international exchange from the 1960s onward. At the same time, international organizations began employing heritage for cultural development, with socialist practices and ideas contributing to what became the United Nations World Decade for Cultural Development, which, running from 1988–97, spanned the collapse of the USSR. The history presented in this chapter traces the build-up to this initiative, thus demonstrating beyond geopolitical rupture the continuities of ideas that ultimately outlasted state socialism.

The significant contributions of the Eastern and Central European region to global conceptions of heritage are particularly evident in the case of Poland. The second chapter in this section focuses on the activities of some of the same international bodies, in particular UNESCO, in the context of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and Museum, a globally recognized site bearing testimony to the Holocaust and Nazi persecution. Julia Röttjer's chapter, "International Experts—National Martyrdom—Socialist Heritage: The Contribution of the Polish People's Republic to the Early UNESCO World Heritage Program," shows how nascent international definitions of heritage were transformed by encounters with socialist conceptions of heritage, which drew on established cultural memory tropes. In the Polish People's Republic, Auschwitz was initially framed first and foremost as a site of national suffering and martyrdom, as well as an emblem of anti-fascist struggle, thus embodying socialist internationalist narratives of the past. An international group of experts' encounter with this site, which Poland proposed as one of the first UNESCO World Heritage sites in the late 1970s, contributed to a transformation of UNESCO's conception of sites of "outstanding universal value," thus broadening the initial focus on aesthetically and culturally valuable sites. Alongside the Old Towns of Warsaw and Kraków or the Wieliczka Salt Mine, Auschwitz was included in the UNESCO World Heritage List as a site embodying "negative historical values," thereby setting a precedent for inscription of sites dealing with the history of slavery and imprisonment. Röttjer notes that international visitors to the site during the socialist period were already struck by the care taken by the authorities for a site of dark heritage, which despite being framed with national inter-

est in mind, ultimately transformed international parameters of UNESCO World Heritage.

In addition to demonstrating the contributions of the socialist bloc to the globalization of heritage institutions and discourses, this section highlights two particularly innovative aspects of this volume: firstly, the intraregional internationalization of heritage within the socialist bloc, and, secondly, individual Soviet republics' efforts to develop heritage practices and policies relatively independently of the Moscow center. Both of these aspects in turn fed back into socialist-era and postsocialist nation-building agendas that were particularly evident in the tourism sector. Iryna Sklokina's chapter, "International Tourism and the Making of the National Heritage Canon in Late Soviet Ukraine, 1964–1991," explores the growth of international visitors to Soviet Ukraine. From an initial focus on tourists associated with Soviet-approved émigré organizations in the mid-1960s, the scope of tourism expanded to include visitors not necessarily seeking affirmation of official narratives in itineraries that mixed traditions of historical state-building with industrial modernity. The entanglement of continuities with the past with projections of present successes and future transformations was most evident around Zaporizhia, where Cossack heritage, vast dams, and factories were woven into tour guides' narratives. As most tourists came from the North American diaspora or neighboring socialist states, particularly Poland, Hungary, and Romania, and had family connections to Ukraine, they demanded opportunities to visit relatives and former homelands. Especially in Western Ukraine, visitors increasingly sought recognition of their national group's contribution to what had been multiethnic spaces, and Jewish visitors to Kyiv challenged the absence of recognition of the Babyn Yar massacre. While officials sought to ensure tours reflected efforts to present heritage that was "national in form" and "socialist in content," this principle proved difficult to maintain, both at the scale of relations between tourists and guides, and at the level of tourist infrastructure. As Corinne Geering's chapter also shows, the commercialization of culture long before *perestroika* combined attempts to present socialist values to international audiences with infrastructural development. In tourism, it becomes clear that the financial benefits often could trump ideological demands and nationalist-oriented objectives.

A similar decentralizing perspective on heritage practices and policies in the Soviet Union is projected in Karin Hallas-Murula's and Kaarel Truu's contribution on Estonia, which in 1961 became the first Soviet republic to adopt a law on preservation. Their chapter, "International Contacts and Cooperation in Heritage Preservation in Soviet Estonia, 1960–1990," continues the themes of nation-building and international travel with a

particular focus on contacts within socialist Eastern and Central Europe, especially those with Polish restorers. Hallas-Murula and Truu highlight the frictions, both productive and disruptive, of national and socialist aspects of heritage, as well as continuities with interwar networks of heritage experts. Estonian scholars maintained contacts with colleagues in other Baltic Soviet republics, as well as in Finland and Sweden, with these networks translating over time into nonstate organizations such as the Estonian Heritage Society, which laid foundations for an independent Estonia in 1991. Its emergence demonstrates the complex relations of conformity and disobedience that characterized officials' relations with the Soviet authorities whose permission was needed for the international networking trips that shaped the Estonian school of heritage, which alongside Lithuanian practices and policy was particularly pioneering in the USSR in protecting the urban built environment. This status enabled experts in the individual Soviet republics to maintain their own limited international relations and become visible on the international stage of professional and scholarly exchanges. The case study of Tallinn's Old Town highlights how the ready availability of local expertise produced tensions over both the construction of meaning of a site and the methods used to preserve it. The Polish Conservation Workshops (PKZ), seen as an international gold standard for restoration at the time, were brought to Tallinn for their first project in the USSR in preparation for the 1980 Moscow Olympics. The Polish restorers' methods were critiqued by Estonian colleagues who were confident in their own approaches that had been shaped by interwar and recent contacts with Scandinavia. Encounters like this highlight that intra-bloc cooperation in the field of heritage could entail disagreement, or even rivalry, among members of the socialist bloc.

What emerges in this section from the study of cultural development, international standard-setting instruments like UNESCO World Heritage, the construction of national canons through tourism, and finally international contacts between restorers are processes of intraregional internationalization in Eastern and Central Europe. These international contacts at least partially continued along the trajectories of interwar expert networks, while at the same time carving out new realms for experts, state authorities, and other stakeholders to engage with the conscious shaping of socialist conceptions of heritage between 1945 and 1991. The canonization of sites that today continue to attract millions of visitors annually also involved discussion and, at times, contestation over the way the past should be interpreted and presented to this audience. The case studies explored in this section thus extend the analysis of issues into the socialist period that have otherwise been primarily the topic of research dealing with postsocialist heritage.

## Heritage, Place, and Belonging under Socialism

Debate, negotiation, and contestation become evident when shifting the analysis onto specific heritage sites and discourses on the ground. How nationally and transnationally inflected heritage discourses and practices were both transformed and implemented at the local level is the central focus of the second part of this volume: “Canonizing and Contesting the Past: Heritage, Place, and Belonging under Socialism.” The four contributions to this section explore the ways in which heritage contributed to place-making and creating a sense of belonging in local communities, demonstrating how approaches devised by heritage experts and state authorities were still in the making, thus also leaving some room for diverging ideas. The local processes intersected in various ways with top-down projections of ideology and nation-building projects in socialist states. The case studies from Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) demonstrate that the state apparatus in socialist countries enabled a degree of autonomy on community levels—whether in specific localities or institutions—and was influenced by both the expertise and demands of citizens. This section emphasizes the multiple actors involved in heritage-making and interpretation on the ground: administrators and politicians, heritage experts, institutions, and the visitors of heritage sites, including local residents and international tourists. The chapters here also suggest that it was not simply the case that the authorities could draw on national frameworks of identification to generate authority and legitimacy. Rather they had to engage with local, regional, or institutional specificities, including finding ways of incorporating legacies of troubling or officially delegitimized historical periods into popular narratives or expert knowledge.

Despite ideologies of progress toward a modernized socialist nation, prerevolutionary practices in preserving castles or visiting bourgeois stately homes, for example, remained part of official socialist cultural life. Neither the institutional and intellectual legacies of the interwar canons of heritage sites, including lists of protected sites and the value attached to them, nor the past generally could simply be remade according to a state-sanctioned grand narrative. Equally, shared visions of an internationalist utopian future were also shaped from the bottom-up through placemaking that could be related to a diverse array of sites. Royal palaces and parliament buildings, historical city centers, manor houses, and industrial heritage are offered as case studies in the chapters here. Under socialism, they could be reframed as part of efforts to align the past with present demands and future visions of nation-building, or they could offer an ideologically sound focus on proletarian labor and skilled craftsmanship. The outcome of such canonization

processes, however, was often contested in the context of changing political, historical, and aesthetic circumstances, and always with reference to particular sites and their role in efforts to generate a sense of belonging to communities on various scales.

Eszter Gantner's contribution, "Socialist Royalty? The Ambiguities of the Reconstruction of the Royal Residence in Budapest in the 1950s," further develops the theme of international contacts within socialist Eastern and Central Europe from the first section of this volume. Her chapter embeds contacts between restorers from Hungary with those from neighboring countries in the story of how socialist regimes consciously emphasized particular historical layers when creating a sense of continuity with the socialist present through the reconstruction of heritage sites destroyed in World War II. Gantner shows how debates over the restoration of Buda Castle, the historical seat of royal power and a canonical site of Hungarian national history, involved a range of actors with competing interests, from Party leaders through journalists and academics to the general public, as well as international heritage experts. As in Tallinn, the Polish company PKZ was consulted on plans for reconstruction projects in Budapest. The site of Buda Castle was reconfigured both in terms of aesthetics and intended use several times in the postwar period, being shaped by shifting policies of socialist Hungary. While aesthetic values remained contested, often because of their bourgeois connotations, the Royal Palace's significance was framed each time in a manner that sought to maintain a sense of continuity with the past and build legitimacy for the policies of the ruling Communist authorities. A focus on opening up this site to the public, rather than reaffirming its exclusivity as the seat of power, came after the Hungarian uprising and Soviet intervention in 1956. Efforts to reverse this trend are becoming evident in today's Hungary, as Gantner shows. The history of the reconstruction of the Castle Hill complex illustrates the entanglements of socialist nation-building within Hungary, internationalization of heritage within the region, and the ongoing significance of a broader European history of art that, despite ideological wariness, remained central to socialist conceptions of heritage.

Urban heritage, the relation of expertise and ideology, and the relevance of interwar networks are further explored in Liliana Iuga's chapter dealing with socialist Romania. Her contribution, titled "Justifying Demolition, Questioning Value: Urban Typologies and the Concept of the 'Historic Town' in 1960s Romania," reveals how heritage experts negotiated recognition for Romania's diverse urban planning traditions stemming from the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires while also reflecting the arguments for radical reconstruction promoted by modernist architects in interwar Romania. Iuga sets ideas and practices of urban conservation in Romania in

the context of international debates on the subject, with the architectural historian Gheorghe Curinschi proving a key actor in maintaining and developing knowledge in socialist Romania of discussions across Europe. His broad interests intersected with the country's regional diversity, which was shaped by the imperial past and challenged arguments for the existence of a single national architectural style. Instead, the debates in state institutions and professional organizations often drew on the interwar discourse of international modernist ideas for ideal cities and radical remodeling, thus demonstrating the extent of continuities in socialist conceptions of heritage that were ultimately realized in the construction of Bucharest's new city center under Ceaușescu. However, this canonical site of Romania's "socialist transformation of cities" was actually an outlier and exception. As Iuga shows, a singular Romanian model of urban heritage protection under socialism cannot be posited; instead, a patchwork emerges shaped by limited resources, competing discourses, and regional specificities, with value ascribed to urban heritage according to established European aesthetic values.

Regional difference and the intersection of the broader vision of modernist socialist transformation with efforts to rework official heritage canons are also elaborated in Čeněk Pýcha's chapter: "Making Sense of Socialism through Heritage Preservation: Stories from Northwest Bohemia." Largely inhabited by German populations before their expulsion in the wake of World War II, this area was doubly remade by ethnic cleansing and becoming part of a socialist state. As a single case study, the Duchcov viaduct and monument might illustrate ideologically motivated canonization of heritage sites in a socialist state, as a railway viaduct unremarkable in aesthetic and engineering terms was afforded the status of national cultural monument, making it an equal of Prague Castle. The viaduct was protected because an interwar workers' protest was violently crushed there. This event was subsequently incorporated into the Czechoslovak historical account of socialist revolution, leading to the erection of a memorial at the site. The Duchcov viaduct therefore combined two new forms of heritage-making, by, firstly, commemorating the workers' movement and, secondly, adding industrial heritage to the canon of sites deemed worthy of inclusion in the state's heritage registries. As a result, a local workers' protest was inscribed as a nationally significant event. Set in the comparative context, however, Pýcha demonstrates that the significance attached to heritage sites by their users was not easily determined from above by official canonization efforts. Visits to manor houses and gentry estates retained their long-established popularity despite the efforts to push through a new "authorized heritage discourse."<sup>57</sup> The limits of state power as an arbiter of what was deemed of national historical importance were laid bare by the failure to ensure the

local grounding of the value of the site. Indeed, socialist modernization based on an extraction economy, with opencast mining tearing through the landscape, ultimately led to the disavowal of the significance of this site, a situation that was compounded by the collapse of socialism.

Industrial heritage remains one of the categories that is most readily associated with socialist aesthetics. That this type of heritage actually has a history reaching back into the pre-World War II period is one of the topics discussed in Nele-Hendrikje Lehmann's concluding chapter: "Socialism and the Rise of Industrial Heritage: The Preservation of Industrial Monuments in the German Democratic Republic." She shows how the prewar recognition of "technical cultural monuments" in Germany informed heritage policy and practices in the GDR and later the broader international discourse that developed out of diverse national traditions of preserving the industrial past. In the GDR, "industrial monuments" were already protected from the 1950s as a result of interactions between local authorities, *Heimat* (homeland) societies, a legacy of the prewar period, and centralized ideas of socialist nation-building that promoted different ideas and loci of belonging. Lehmann finds that over time, particularly in the 1970s, industrial heritage was no longer the focal point of the GDR nation-building project but one part of a broader canon that sought to reincorporate the key sites of German history, including Prussian history and the Lutheran Reformation. At the same time, the GDR was among the pioneers of the internationalization of industrial heritage; as one of a few states, alongside Poland and the United Kingdom, to systematically preserve the industrial past in the 1950s already, the GDR could take a leading role at the First International Congress on the Conservation of Industrial Monuments held in Ironbridge, United Kingdom, in 1973. The international committee organizing this event provided a forum where socialist heritage ideas could contribute to the development of international standards, while also being transformed by these international-level expert discussions, just as they had been by reinterpretations of established traditions on the level of local *Heimat* societies in previous decades. In the case of industrial heritage in the GDR, as well as for the issues discussed in preceding chapters, it becomes clear that socialist interpretations of the tangible past emerged from interactions between actors on the local, national, and international levels.

The discussions on industrial heritage in both Czechoslovakia and the GDR also point to the historical layers underlying efforts to create a new national canon under socialism that experts, authorities, and other actors were confronted with. Indeed, all the examples explored in this section also prompt a reassessment of what aesthetics and practices may be associated with the ideology of socialism, as traditions stemming from the interwar and imperial periods, as well as those connected to broader European or

global processes, continued to shape heritage sites, expertise, and official discourses under socialism. As the contributions to this section make clear, specific sites and national canons, as well as heritage policy, were shaped not only by local particularities and national trajectories in the development of socialist ideology and rule in the respective locations. Processes of placemaking and canonization were also inflected by the kinds of transnational transfers and exchanges outlined in the first part of this book. And, of course, the reverse was also true—with expertise developed at sites such as Auschwitz, Warsaw and Tallinn Old Towns, Suzdal', or Zaporizhia shaping international ideas and organizations.

### **Converging the Multiple Sites of Heritage under Socialism**

One critique of the transnational turn has been that it can reinscribe the significance of the nation-state rather than overcome it. The contributions to this volume, in particular in the second part, show that turning to the local scale and particular places can be one way of challenging this shortcoming. In terms of the internationalization of heritage and formation of transnational heritage networks under socialism, however, the role of the state as a key actor cannot be ignored. Indeed, it was responsible for granting travel permits and organizing tours, for issuing contracts for restoration projects, and was the partner for participation in international organizations. It could be then that this volume also demonstrates the need to reconceptualize the transnational turn to account for the role of the state in the so-called Second World, alongside the persistence of expert networks and informal contacts in the form of diasporic tourism. These themes are elaborated further by Corinne Geering in the conclusion: "Transnational Heritage Networks in Socialist Eastern and Central Europe." She discusses the central themes emerging from the transnational exchanges and interactions among heritage experts within Eastern and Central Europe, thus highlighting the overlapping and divergent spaces of internationalization in this region. While the logics of cultural diplomacy framed socialist states' activities on the international stage, it was ultimately specific actors, drawing on particular experiences and bodies of knowledge, who produced the transnational networks shaping the heritage discourses and practices in the respective countries. Moreover, by drawing on the significance of ideas and practices developed in the region for the formation of international heritage institutions, the conclusion also presents perspectives for future research on heritage under socialism.

While positing "socialist heritage" as a factor in international heritage discourse, the contributions here also highlight the local origins and in-

traregional dimensions of internationalization based on exchanges of ideas, practices, and expertise, as well as tourist contacts. The volume thus queries the notion of a singular socialist heritage. Instead, we find that it differed not only by national variations, but also within states, owing to subnational regional differences and also, temporally, as interpretations of socialism shifted. It is for this reason that this volume has as its central concept heritage under socialism, rather than socialist heritage. The historical contextualization guiding the volume points to both collaboration and contestation within and between socialist countries that accompanied the construction of the socialist heritage canon in the aftermath of war, genocide, and displacement in the region. What is clear from this volume is that nationalization and internationalization of heritage, likewise under socialism, are not mutually exclusive, but rather coconstitutive.

Indeed, the socialist period has left an institutional legacy in most countries, with the local, national, and international infrastructure of heritage policies shaped by events since 1945, and in particular since the 1960s. There is thus a significant portion of heritage sites that remain, at least partly, “socialist in form” from an institutional perspective, and indeed national in content as far as the narratives are concerned, just as was the case under socialism. The chapters illustrate that one way socialist rule sought legitimacy was by stressing continuities with national traditions and heritage canons. Today, though, there is a tendency toward framing heritage under socialism as a history of popular rejection of the socialist narratives rather than as a more complex interaction of contestation, reinterpretation, and acceptance. Indeed, rising nationalism and exclusionist memory politics in part of Eastern and Central Europe indicate the need to remain wary of historical accounts framing the socialist era as a time when expressions of national identity were repressed, censored, and opposed. Turning to the history of heritage shows that it was, in many cases, a time when the infrastructure, institutions, and contents forming national canons were developed further, particularly when it comes to their international recognition.

**Corinne Geering** leads a junior research group at the Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO) in Leipzig. She received her PhD from the University in Giessen in 2018, where she was a doctoral fellow at the International Graduate Centre for the Study of Culture (GCSC). She has published on material culture, cultural politics, international cooperation during the Cold War, and the use of the past for regional development. She is the author of *Building a Common Past: World Heritage in Russia under Transformation, 1965–2000*.

**Paul Vickers** is manager of the Department for Interdisciplinary and Multiscalar Area Studies (DIMAS) and the Leibniz ScienceCampus Europe and America at the University of Regensburg, Germany. His book, *Making Popular Memory in Communist Poland*, is forthcoming.

### Notes

1. See Sidorov, "National Monumentalization"; Zubovich, "The Fall of the Zariad'e".
2. Makarevich, *Prospekt Kalinina*, 48.
3. Stites, "Iconoclastic Currents in the Russian Revolution."
4. Historical research has revealed that socialist societies expressed profound interest in the past, especially from 1960s onward. See Clark, "Changing Historical Paradigms"; Haney, "The Revival of Interest in the Russian Past"; Kozlov, "The Historical Turn in Late Soviet Culture"; Colla, "The Politics of Time."
5. Campbell, "Preservation for the Masses."
6. "U.S.S.R. Today," n.pag.
7. For a more recent example of historiography that suggests that in the cultural sphere, too, Moscow could dictate policy in satellite states outside the USSR, see Babiracki, *Soviet Soft Power in Poland*.
8. See UNESCO, "What Is Meant by 'Cultural Heritage'?"
9. Ashworth, "From History to Heritage"; Nora, "Entre mémoire et histoire"; Lowenthal, "History and 'heritage'."
10. L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*.
11. Harvey, "Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents"; Harrison, Fairclough, Jameson, and Schofield, "Introduction: Heritage, Memory and Modernity."
12. Forest and Johnson, "Unraveling the Threads of History."
13. Dmitrieva and Kliems, *The Post-Socialist City*; Kinossian, "Post-Socialist Transition."
14. Bartetzky, Dietz, and Haspel, *Von der Ablehnung zur Aneignung?*; Ingerpuu, "Socialist Architecture."
15. Plets, "Post-Soviet Heritages in the Making"; Demeter, "Regime Change and Cultural Protection."
16. See Swenson, "'Heritage,' 'Patrimoine' und 'Kulturerbe,'" 54.
17. Geering, *Building a Common Past*.
18. See Bendix, Eggert, and Peselman, *Heritage Regimes*.
19. See, for example, Harrison, *Heritage*; Falser and Juneja, *Kulturerbe und Denkmalpflege transkulturell*; Glendinning, *The Conservation Movement*.
20. Deschepper, "Between Future and Eternity."
21. Alonso González, "Communism and Cultural Heritage."
22. See Shchenkov, *Pamiatniki arkhitektury*.

23. Qualls, *From Ruins to Reconstruction*; Stangl, *Risen from Ruins*; Fuchs, *Städtebau und Legitimation*.
24. For an overview of how socialist regimes created historical memory and used the past as a source of legitimacy, see Mrozik and Holubec, *Historical Memory*.
25. See Plum, *Antifascism after Hitler*; Marples, *Historical Memory and World War II*; Qualls, "Where Each Stone Is History."
26. On Holocaust memory in socialist Czechoslovakia and Hungary, see Hallama, *Nationale Helden und jüdische Opfer*; Fritz, *Nach Krieg und Judenmord*.
27. See Etkind et al, *Remembering Katyń*.
28. For case studies of particular borderland cities and regions, see Amar, *The Paradox of Ukrainian Lviv*; Brodersen, *Die Stadt im Westen*; Glassheim, *Cleansing the Czechoslovak Borderlands*; Thum, *Uprooted*.
29. See Bernhard and Kubik, *Twenty Years after Communism*; Mink and Neumayer, *History, Memory and Politics*.
30. Mark, *The Unfinished Revolution*.
31. Rampley, *Heritage, Ideology, and Identity*.
32. On Poland, see Wawrzyniak, *Veterans, Victims, and Memory*. On Russia and the Soviet Union, see Wertsch, *Voices of Collective Remembering*.
33. For an argument making such claims, see, for example, Zaremba, *Communism, Legitimacy, Nationalism*.
34. This is outlined in Rączkowski, "'Drang nach Westen.'" The discourses were particularly prevalent in the initial postwar years and revived around the time of the Polish millennium in 1966.
35. Kamusella, *The Un-Polish Poland*, 103–4. The online exhibition of the Polish History Museum also offers a particularly clear, English-language outline of this narrative in Muzeum Historii Polski/ Polish History Museum, "Shifting Poland."
36. See Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*.
37. Watson, "Memory, History and Opposition," 2. This contrasts with, for example, implication that contestation and public debates emerged only with communism's collapse and following "enforced official mnemonical stasis," as Maria Mälksoo's article on postsocialist East European memory politics suggests. Mälksoo, "The Memory Politics," 672, 659.
38. See the contributions in Thatcher, *The State and Historic Buildings: Preserving "The National Past."*
39. Thatcher, "Introduction: The State and Historical Buildings," 38.
40. Spechler, *Permitted Dissent*.
41. See Weiner, *A Little Corner of Freedom*.
42. Long, "Modernity, Socialism and Heritage in Asia."
43. Todorova, "Introduction: From Utopia to Propaganda and Back."
44. Mark, Kalinovsky, and Marung, *Alternative Globalizations*.
45. Babiracki and Jersild, *Socialist Internationalism in the Cold War*.
46. Alonso González, *Cuban Cultural Heritage*; Odom and Salmond, *Treasures into Tractors*; Grama, *Socialist Heritage*.
47. Telepneva, "A Cultural Heritage for National Liberation?"; Cowcher, "The Museum as Prison."
48. Donovan, *Chronicles in Stone*; Kelly, "'Ispravliat' li istoriiu?"; Maddox, *Saving Stalin's Imperial City*.

49. Takahashi, "Church or Museum?"; S. A. Smith, "Contentious Heritage"; Kelly, *Socialist Churches*.
50. For the Soviet Union, see Bekus, "Transnational Circulation of Cultural Form."
51. See also Jalava, Nygård, and Strang, *Decentering European Intellectual Space*.
52. See, among others, Mikkonen and Koivunen, *Beyond the Divide*; Autio-Sarasmo and Miklóssy, *Reassessing Cold War Europe*; Mikkonen and Suutari, *Music, Art and Diplomacy*; Kohlrausch and Trischler, *Building Europe on Expertise*.
53. Péteri, "Nylon Curtain," 115.
54. The image of Kalinin Prospekt as a place of consumption and leisure is clear in contemporary presentation of the project. Cf. Makarevich, *Prospekt Kalinina*.
55. For example, Gfeller, "Preserving Cultural Heritage across the Iron Curtain"; Falser and Lipp, *Eine Zukunft für unsere Vergangenheit*. In his seminal study on the conservation movement, Miles Glendinning even differentiates between "a Western-bloc narrative, a socialist-bloc narrative and finally a growing internationalist narrative that mediated between the others," thus limiting the internationalist narrative to a space transcending the realm of one side of the Cold War divide. Glendinning, *The Conservation Movement*, 259.
56. See Trencsényi et al., *A History of Modern Political Thought*; Buden, "Translation and the East." This process has also been repeated elsewhere in the history of ideas. Offering an illustration from the field of economics, Johanna Bockman's transnational history draws attention to how Eastern and Central Europe served both as an empirical testbed and as a space from which ideas that have come to shape twenty-first century global norms have emerged. Bockman, *Markets in the Name of Socialism*.
57. L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*.

## Bibliography

- Alonso González, Pablo. "Communism and Cultural Heritage: The Quest for Continuity." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 22, no. 9 (2016): 653–63.
- . *Cuban Cultural Heritage: A Rebel Past for a Revolutionary Nation*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2018.
- Ashworth, G. J. "From History to Heritage: From Heritage to Identity: In Search of Concepts and Models." In *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*, edited by G. J. Ashworth and P. J. Larkham, 13–30. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Amar, Tarik Cyril. *The Paradox of Ukrainian Lviv: A Borderland City between Stalinists, Nazis, and Nationalists*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- Autio-Sarasmi, Sari, and Katalin Miklóssy, eds. *Reassessing Cold War Europe*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Babiracki, Patryk. *Soviet Soft Power in Poland: Culture and the Making of Stalin's New Empire, 1943–1957*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.
- Babiracki, Patryk, and Austin Jersild, eds. *Socialist Internationalism in the Cold War: Exploring the Second World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Bartetzky, Arnold, Christian Dietz, and Jörg Hapsel, eds. *Von der Ablehnung zur Aneignung? Das architektonische Erbe des Sozialismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Köln: Böhlau, 2014.

- Bekus, Nelly. "Transnational Circulation of Cultural Form: Multiple Agencies of Heritage Making." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26, no. 12 (2020): 1,148–65.
- Bendix, Regina F., Aditya Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann, eds. *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2012.
- Bernhard, Michael, and Jan Kubik, eds. *Twenty Years after Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Bockman, Johanna. *Markets in the Name of Socialism: The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Brodersen, Per. *Die Stadt im Westen: Wie Königsberg Kaliningrad wurde*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Buden, Boris. "Translation and the East: There Is No Such Thing as an 'Eastern European Study of Culture.'" In *The Trans/National Study of Culture: A Translational Perspective*, edited by Doris Bachmann-Medick, 171–80. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Campbell, Brian. "Preservation for the Masses: The Idea of Heimat and the Gesellschaft für Denkmalpflege in the GDR." *kunsttexte.de* 3 (2004). Retrieved 13 April 2020. <https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/18452/7671/campbell.pdf>.
- Clark, Katerina. "Changing Historical Paradigms in Soviet Culture." In *Late Soviet Culture: From Perestroika to Novostroika*, edited by Thomas Lahusen and Gene Kuperman, 289–306. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Colla, Marcus. "The Politics of Time and State Identity in the German Democratic Republic." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 29 (2019): 223–51.
- Cowcher, Kate. "The Museum as Prison and Other Protective Measures in Socialist Ethiopia." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26, no. 12 (2020): 1,166–84.
- Demeter, Laura. "Regime Change and Cultural Protection, a Matter of State Security." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 25, no. 5 (2019): 522–35.
- Deschepper, Julie. "Between Future and Eternity: A Soviet Conception of Heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 25, no. 5 (2019): 491–506.
- Dmitrieva, Marina, and Alfrun Kliems, eds. *The Post-Socialist City: Continuity and Change in Urban Space and Imagery*. Berlin: Jovis, 2009.
- Donovan, Victoria. *Chronicles in Stone: Preservation, Patriotism, and Identity in North-west Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019.
- Etkind, Alexander, Rory Finnin, Uilleam Blacker, Julie Fedor, Simon Lewis, Maria Mälksoo, and Matilda Mroz. *Remembering Katyń*. Cambridge, MA: Polity, 2012.
- Falser, Michael, and Monica Juneja, eds. *Kulturerbe und Denkmalpflege transkulturell: Grenzgänge zwischen Theorie und Praxis*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2013.
- Falser, Michael, and Wilfried Lipp, eds. *Eine Zukunft für unsere Vergangenheit: Zum 40. Jubiläum des Europäischen Denkmalschutzjahres (1975–2015)*. Berlin: Bässler, 2015.
- Forest, Benjamin, and Juliet Johnson. "Unraveling the Threads of History: Soviet-Era Monuments and Post-Soviet National Identity in Moscow." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 92, no. 3 (2002): 524–47.
- Fritz, Regina. *Nach Krieg und Judenmord: Ungarns Geschichtspolitik seit 1944*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012.
- Fuchs, Jana. *Städtebau und Legitimation: Debatten um das unbebaute historische Warschauer Zentrum, 1945–1989*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020.
- Geering, Corinne. *Building a Common Past: World Heritage in Russia under Transformation, 1965–2000*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019.

- Gfeller, Aurélie Elisa. "Preserving Cultural Heritage across the Iron Curtain: The International Council on Monuments and Sites from Venice to Moscow, 1964–1978." In *Geteilt—Vereint! Denkmalpflege in Mitteleuropa zur Zeit des Eisernen Vorhangs und Heute*, edited by Ursula Schädler-Saub and Angela Weyer, 115–21. Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2015.
- Glassheim, Eagle. *Cleansing the Czechoslovak Borderlands: Migration, Environment, and Health in the Former Sudetenland*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016.
- Glendinning, Miles. *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation, Antiquity to Modernity*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Grama, Emanuela. *Socialist Heritage: The Politics of Past and Place in Romania*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2019.
- Hallama, Peter. *Nationale Helden und jüdische Opfer: Tschechische Repräsentationen des Holocaust*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Haney, Jack V. "The Revival of Interest in the Russian Past in the Soviet Union." *Slavic Review* 32, no. 1 (1973): 1–16.
- Harrison, Rodney. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.
- Harrison, Rodney, Graham Fairclough, John H. Jameson Jr., and John Schofield. "Introduction: Heritage, Memory and Modernity." In *The Heritage Reader*, edited by Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson Jr., and John Schofield, 1–12. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Harvey, D. C. "Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scope of Heritage Studies." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7, no. 4 (2001): 319–38.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Ingerpuu, Laura. "Socialist Architecture as Today's Dissonant Heritage: Administrative Buildings of Collective Farms in Estonia." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24, no. 9 (2018): 954–68.
- Jalava, Marja, Stefan Nygård, and Johan Strang, eds. *Decentering European Intellectual Space*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Kamusella, Tomasz. *The Un-Polish Poland, 1989 and the Illusion of Regained Historical Continuity*. Cham: Palgrave, 2017.
- Kelly, Catriona. "'Ispravliat' li istoriiu?' Spory ob okhrane pamiatnikov v Leningrade 1960–1970-kh godov." *Neprikosnovennyi zapas* 64, no. 2 (2009). Retrieved 1 April 2017. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2009/2/kk7.html>.
- . *Socialist Churches: Radical Secularization and the Preservation of the Past in Petrograd and Leningrad, 1918–1988*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2016.
- Kinossian, Nadir. "Post-Socialist Transition and Remaking the City: Political Construction of Heritage in Tatarstan." *Europe-Asia Studies* 64, no. 5 (2012): 879–901.
- Kohlrausch, Martin, and Helmuth Trischler, eds. *Building Europe on Expertise: Innovators, Organizers, Networkers*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Kozlov, Denis. "The Historical Turn in Late Soviet Culture: Retrospectivism, Factography, Doubt, 1953–91." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 2, no. 3 (2001): 577–600.
- Long, Colin. "Modernity, Socialism and Heritage in Asia." In *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*, edited by Patrick Daly and Tim Winter, 201–17. London: Routledge.

- Lowenthal, David. "‘History’ and ‘heritage’: Widerstreitende und konvergente Formen der Vergangenheitsbetrachtung." In *Geschichtskultur in der Zweiten Moderne*, edited by Rosmarie Beier, 78–86. Frankfurt: Campus, 2000.
- Maddox, Steven. *Saving Stalin’s Imperial City: Historic Preservation in Leningrad, 1930–1950*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015.
- Makarevich, G. V. *Prospekt Kalinina*. Moscow: Stroiizdat, 1975.
- Mällksoo, Maria. "The Memory Politics of Becoming European: The East European Subalterns and the Collective Memory of Europe." *European Journal of International Relations* 15 (2009): 653–80.
- Mark, James. *The Unfinished Revolution: Making Sense of the Communist Past in Central-Eastern Europe*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Mark, James, Artemy M. Kalinovsky, and Steffi Marung, eds. *Alternative Globalizations: Eastern Europe and the Postcolonial World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020.
- Marples, David R., ed. *Historical Memory and World War II in Russia and Ukraine*. Spec. Issue of *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 54, no. 3/4 (2012).
- Mikkonen, Simo, and Pia Koivunen, eds. *Beyond the Divide: Entangled Histories of Cold War Europe*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2015.
- Mikkonen, Simo, and Pekka Suutari, eds. *Music, Art and Diplomacy: East–West Cultural Interactions and the Cold War*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2016.
- Mink, Georges, and Laure Neumayer, eds. *History, Memory and Politics in Central and Eastern Europe: Memory Games*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Mrozik, Agnieszka, and Stanislav Holubec, eds. *Historical Memory of Central and East European Communism*. New York: Routledge, 2018.
- Muzeum Historii Polski/ Polish History Museum. "Shifting Poland." Google Arts & Culture. Retrieved 11 January 2021. <https://artsandculture.google.com/exhibit/shifting-poland/QR9Nfytl>.
- Nora, Pierre. "Entre mémoire et histoire: La problématique des lieux." In *Les lieux de mémoire*, edited by Pierre Nora, 23–43. Paris: Quarto Gallimard, 1997.
- Odom, Anne, and Wendy R. Salmond. *Treasures into Tractors: The Selling of Russia’s Cultural Heritage, 1918–1938*, edited by Anne Odom and Wendy R. Salmond. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009.
- Péteri, György. "Nylon Curtain—Transnational and Transsystemic Tendencies in the Cultural Life of State-Socialist Russia and East-Central Europe." *Slavonica* 10, no. 2 (2004): 113–23.
- Plets, Gertjan. "Post-Soviet Heritages in the Making." *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity* 7, no. 1 (2019): 1,080–88.
- Plum, Catherine. *Antifascism after Hitler: East German Youth and Socialist Memory, 1949–1989*. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Qualls, Karl D. *From Ruins to Reconstruction: Urban Identity in Soviet Sevastopol after World War II*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- . "Where Each Stone Is History: Travel Guides in Sevastopol after World War II." In *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism*, edited by Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker, 163–85. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

- Rączkowski, Włodzimierz. “‘Drang nach Westen’? Polish Archaeology and National Identity.” In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, edited by Margarita Diaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion, 189–217. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Rampley, Matthew, ed. *Heritage, Ideology, and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe: Contested Pasts, Contested Presents*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012.
- Shchenkov, A. S., ed. *Pamiatniki arkhitektury v Sovetskom Soiuze: Ocherki istorii arkhitekturnoi restavratsii*. Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2004.
- Sidorov, Dmitri. “National Monumentalization and the Politics of Scale: The Resurrections of the Cathedral of Christ the Savior in Moscow.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, no. 3 (2000): 548–72.
- Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Smith, S. A. “Contentious Heritage: The Preservation of Churches and Temples in Communist and Post-Communist Russia and China.” In *Heritage in the Modern World*, edited by Paul Betts and Corey Ross. Spec. issue of *Past & Present* 226, no. 10 (2015): 178–212.
- Spechler, Dina. *Permitted Dissent in the USSR: Novy Mir and the Soviet Regime*. New York: Praeger, 1982.
- Stangl, Paul. *Risen from Ruins. The Cultural Politics of Rebuilding East Berlin*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018.
- Stites, Richard. “Iconoclastic Currents in the Russian Revolution: Destroying and Preserving the Past.” In *Bolshevik Culture*, edited by Abbott Gleason, Peter Kenez, and Richard Stites, 1–24. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Swenson, Astrid. “‘Heritage,’ ‘Patrimoine’ und ‘Kulturerbe’: Eine vergleichende historische Semantik.” In *Prädikat ‘Heritage’: Wertschöpfung aus kulturellen Ressourcen*, edited by Dorothee Hemme, Markus Tauschek, and Regina Bendix, 53–74. Münster: LIT Verlag, 2007.
- Takahashi, Sanami. “Church or Museum? The Role of State Museums in Conserving Church Buildings, 1965–1985.” *Journal of Church and State* 51, no. 3 (2009): 502–17.
- Telepneva, Natalia. “A Cultural Heritage for National Liberation? The Soviet-Somali Historical Expedition, Soviet African Studies, and the Cold War in the Horn of Africa.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26, no. 12 (2020): 1,185–202.
- Thatcher, Mark. “Introduction: The State and Historic Buildings: Preserving ‘the National Past.’” *Nations and Nationalism* 24, no. 1 (2018): 22–42.
- . *The State and Historic Buildings: Preserving “The National Past.”* Themed Section in *Nations and Nationalism* 24, no. 1 (2018): 22–147.
- Thum, Gregor. *Uprooted: How Breslau Became Wrocław during the Century of Expulsions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Todorova, Maria. “Introduction: From Utopia to Propaganda and Back.” In *Post-Communist Nostalgia*, edited by Maria Todorova and Zsuzsa Gille, 1–14. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- Trencsényi, Balázs, Maciej Janowski, Monika Baar, Maria Falina, and Michal Kopeček. *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe*. Volume 1: *Negotiating Modernity in the “Long Nineteenth Century.”* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- UNESCO. “What Is Meant by ‘Cultural Heritage?’” UNESCO. Retrieved 27 June 2019. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/illicit-trafficking-of-cultural->

- property/unesco-database-of-national-cultural-heritage-laws/frequently-asked-questions/definition-of-the-cultural-heritage/.
- “U.S.S.R. Today.” *The UNESCO Courier* 20 (1967): n.pag.
- Watson, Rubie S. “Memory, History and Opposition under State Socialism: An Introduction.” In *Memory, History and Opposition under State Socialism*, edited by Rubie S. Watson, 1–20. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1994.
- Wawrzyniak, Joanna. *Veterans, Victims, and Memory: The Politics of the Second World War in Communist Poland*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015.
- Weiner, Douglas R. *A Little Corner of Freedom: Russian Nature Protection from Stalin to Gorbachëv*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Wertsch, James V. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Zaremba, Marcin. *Communism, Legitimacy, Nationalism: Nationalist Legitimization of the Communist Regime in Poland*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2019.
- Zubovich, Katherine. “The Fall of the Zariad’e: Monumentalism and Displacement in Late Stalinist Moscow.” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 21, no. 1 (2020): 73–95.