

Heritage and Sustainability: the Matter of Temporal Shifting and Narrativity in Terms of Urban Development

Kastytis Rudokas

Kaunas University of Technology, Institute of Architecture and Construction
Tunelio st. 60, LT-44405 Kaunas, Lithuania

Corresponding author: kastytis.rudokas@ktu.lt

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sace.13.4.13555>

Due to a raise of network-based society and interaction based decision making processes in contemporary World cultural heritage field must respond by being an active actor of holistic development. Contemporary theory in heritage hardly sheds light on an adjacent processes happening in a field of economy, policy or alteration of social activity patterns. Therefore, the following issue focuses on broader perception on cultural heritage field on the basis of the theory of the narrative. As pointed out in Ricoeur's (1985) linguistic approach towards narrative theory whereas he suggested to derive the past out of the future and thus to make our present to be a *time of initiative* in purpose to transpose history into a reasonable decision making.

Therefore, the narrative based approach towards an urban heritage (urban heritage here is to be a matrix where various of static structures of past, present and future meet and bias torrents of vivid social structure) contributes to a constant procedure of alteration that is likely enabled by the global-local continuum. The issue is to claim that the latter alteration procedures (those that provide a growth of quantity in terms of Human development) are a set of tools and methods used to rethink and interpret the past; yet the model of the future has been nearly designed.

The use of narrativity in heritage is still novel trial to adjust the prevailing heritage discourse. However, the methodology of narrativity either enhances a field of cultural ecology that plays a key role to achieve a convivial place. On the basis of some urban patterns made by Alexander as well as rethinking some researches of Zaleckis, I suggest to take a look back to a politan city structure in order to preserve and transmit a relevant leftovers of a genotype of the Polis into a megapolitan paradigm.

To sum it up, the idea of ecological is to be understood as novelty or already designed future to our cities that turn *smart*. However, the shape or frame for this kind of future must be sculpted by rethinking our past and the processes of alteration inside the past. Urban heritage (stable structures and vivid torrents) dwelled in a field of narrative may suggest a unique ways to turn about the physical environment in order to ensure convivial presence of cities as well as to prevent drastic alteration processes (that is already happening) and preserve a genotypic identity of the past.

KEYWORDS: built-environment, heritage, Kaunas modernism, sustainability, reversal coil, narrative.

JSACE 4/13

Heritage and
Sustainability:
the Matter of
Temporal Shifting
and Narrativity in
Terms of Urban
Development

Received
2015/09/10

Accepted after
revision
2015/10/14



Introduction

The prevailing paradigm of science overall tends to merge different scholar subject in order to achieve higher productivity. The paradox that lays here is to be perceived is how nowadays society opposes itself in terms of mind and action. The mind and thought tends to be integral whereas simultaneously an action in everyday life, business or public administration remains niche based, solitary activity. The legacy of enclosed medieval guilds of craftsmen transforms itself during the industrial period and reaches our times almost intact in our terms of creative industries or, say, horizontal economic integration since so called specialization takes place. The new concept of smart specialization by regions seems to be nothing but extensions of former medieval street of separate sorts of craftsmen. The field of cultural heritage has been championed by many scholars to be integral part of network based society). However in many cases heritage and its urban artefacts turn to be type of commodity only in use for visual contribution to the urbanscape. Heritage is employed as a testimony of somewhat possessing an outstanding universal value. An issue here, according to Sophia Labadi (2013) lays in terms of that is the value which is, by advanced western societies, imposed on rest of World via authorities such as UNESCO, ICOMOS or others. The universality of value must be challenged in order to prevent unification via heritization.

The paper suggest that artefacts of past together with surrounding temporal and cultural context needs to be active agent of decision making at present in order to ensure holistic sustainability of place. It is also to be relied on the spirit of The Paris Declaration (Paris, 2011) as a crucial document that legislates aspiration to achieve more or less slower paced society. In the first part it challenges visual approach to heritage field by dividing 'authorized discourse of heritage' – well know concept by Laura Janesmith (2007) and phenomenon of heritage which tends to be described by natural origin. The authorized discourse is to be discussed in a light of age of enlightenment as well as rise and development of industrial society. The former aspects, as it is suggested, are featured with natural origin of past being active in temporal present. Some examples are given. Second part of an issue intends to explore heritage dynamics in broader context of sustainability of cultural ecology. Relying on Paul James idea of conservancy of positive element of past in present, the paper suggests phenomenon of reversal coil which is later expanded in merging with case study of sustainable development in Kaunas during the interwar period.

Methods

The study of sustainability and urban heritage relies on mythical model described in Friedrich Weinreb's (1986) and Reinhart Koselleck's (2005) time semantics. Authors as well as Levi- Strauss or Nescolarde-Selva (et. al. 2014) summarizes a temporal unity of past, present and future. Thus the framework of heritage perception that must enliven the matter of sustainability is drawn by the mythical implication where heritage and its urban artefacts are to be splashes of implicit knowledge that need to be hermeneutically decoded in order to put them to conservancy status in order to achieve sustainability in long term urban planning.

Results

The phenomenon of the flat Earth

Many references can be linked to the scholars championing heritage field moving from monuments to people thus maintaining 'from below' aspect. The concept suggests the possibility for the local communities to be turned into a decision making processes in a field of cultural heritage. Thus the heritage itself has been transposed from a being a testimony of some great events of the past jet towards a festival (Harrison, 2012) or a living heritage (Poulios, 2014; Wijesuriya, 2005). Both approaches champion continuity and alteration processes as inevitable components of heritage itself maintaining that there is a relation between the user and object what is the most important part of heritage.

However, for me, this implies a phenomenon where the heritage professionals and scholars try to deny the superimpositions that were made by western mindset during the raise of heritage field

in 19 cent. But at the same time they offer us new perceptions to be imposed on. The heritage as community art strategies maintained by Rodney Harrison, or past as living heritage at the many cases is just subtle phenotypes of the very previous monument-centered heritage-authorities discourse. Heritage and its accessibility to the broader communities of society strongly correlate with market economy and its consumerist nature. If there was heritage as a matter of elites of society so was a satisfactory standard of living back in the beginning of 20 cent. In other words – by comparing heritage and simple commodities containing our everyday life experience, we see that the former as well as the latter now are at the near proximity to every human being in western society. At this case, we do have heritage field to be only poor reflection of prevailing discourses of time. After the heritage was authorized by the professionals in 19th century, the past have had less and less positive (neither direct negative) impact to the development of the society. There are several intercultural points to be emphasized. First, heritage, and how it was dealt with it, has lost its primal configuration where artefact or activity used to be inherited from generation by generation and applied to a changing condition but nevertheless itself remained active agent for future's decision-making. As same as small retails were replaced by big super marked, that first occurred in France, and thus diminished both salesman and consumer interaction as well as salesman and owner interaction making the relation to be one way oriented. Face to face interaction was about to turned around and linked towards faceless engagement. Richard Florida (2004:30) arguing with a famous Robert Putnam's concept of 'bowling alone' emphasizes that what does nowadays society need is a quaziannonimity. Thus, the quaziannonimity represents heritage where the transparency of its core meaning is to be blanked by discourse of authorities only maintaining what would be attractive to the consumer. Susie West (2010:61-62) argues that the idea of heritage management in 18th century was mostly about to extend the ideals of antiquity. She stresses on an example of Danish Prince Ludwig and sculptor Bertel Thorvandsen applied the method of anistylosis to restore ancient sculptures of antiquity. It may appear as a discourse that used to prevail in 18th century, however, individual relation with the artefact matters as well. The Prince as well as Bertel Thorvandsen they both had transparent understanding and used to perceive an artefact via knowledge deriving from period of the antiquity as well as they were able to see antiquity's meaning when it's been imposed on the period of Enlightenment. Thus the individual relation with the artefact suggests that creativity of the current Zeitgeist would support 'values' of historical period. As it is argued in Hillier (1984:189-191), there are two level of urban genotypical interactions based on: 1st professional engagement and, 2nd based on bureaucracy's configuration. Professional level is enough to make one semantic step in order to solve an issue. Bureaucracy requires many steps to be made tree-alike configurational system. The problem of bureaucracy in terms of heritage is that it supposes the industrial thinking patterns where only a big system can produce the commodity. The commodity itself then turns to be unified with others of its kind and ends up as a mass consumption thing.

Susie West's example also has the other aspect that matters in our case. Individual relation between user and the object may impose professional status of dealing with the property thus enabling creative re-use and re-think of that particular property. But on the other hand there is the very beginning of 'having'¹ concept in heritage to be revealed. The prince acts according the needs and trends of particular Zeitgeist whereas antiquity and its legacy were intended to be had by contemporaries. Hence, the raise of the new bourgeois imposed having and buying aspects into the public life. Even the past could have been bought or even brought in by countries that never put a finger on a creation of properties. Thus the classical period might be understood as the first paradigm in European society jet not having the past actively involved into a future decision making. Yet the past was simulated and transmitted physically and mentally from ancient place to the place of current decision makers.

1

The definition is used according E. Fromm work To Have or to Be?

According to Gregory Ashworth (2011), there is to be three periods of heritage perception: he names it as conservation, preservation and heritage. The first dates back from 19th century up to Charter of Venice and the second from 1964 to approximately 90s and the latter are up to our days. Anyway, at the most cases we could also name, that all these three meant to be part of conservation itself taking into account that conservation links to minimal interaction into properties tangible intangible spectrum of values (Rodwell 2007: 187). At this case the conservancy agenda appears to be included into former two. For example to give here lays interesting case of renaissance emerges in late 14 century in Florence. According to historian Hans Baron (1955:21-30,163-164), the raise of renaissance and its thinking patterns appeared in conflict with Milan city and what it stood for. The ideals of Florence were brewed in a process of thinking of Greek polis but it was reused in order to apply it to the needs of present. Thus, the heritage in its essence played a crucial role by adjusting economic, cultural and political configurations for the future. The former examples examine mere pattern of purpose of the past in history of western civilization or, say, it reflects the very core ideas of Bura Charter's (Bura, 1999) terms of what conservation is. Since the Enlightenment age the presence of being was substituted by status of having and owning in terms of Erich Fromm (1990) concept. Thus the past and heritage that transmits the that past in to the present for the future is only in use as a tool for exhibition and consuming, for claiming glory of the past of nation, rather than trying to improve qualities of state and bring them to the better future.

There are important approaches towards nowadays heritage practice and theory. First is, that is heritage where intangibility matters first. Intangible aspects, to me, look the most important because only tacit knowledge or, say, one implicit message can be transferred just only by the intangible way. To see heritage property in full transparency means to discover splashes of tacit dimension suddenly appearing on precise attribute of that property. However in terms of authorized discourse of heritage, intangible heritage is still perceived more as a tradition that is no longer at works so thus one simply catalyzes repetition that is deceitfully supporting a tradition. The implicit dimension is gone, yet the exhibition of the lost but somehow alive to be born. The heritage of so called indigenous people illustrates the case in which heritage is no longer meant to be fuel for the future neither source of knowledge implicit or explicit no matter for redesigning it. The second aspect that appears it is urban and architectural heritage. The same issue of simulation and deceitfulness lay in a servancy of visuality. Even the new architecture that is permitted to be erected in the historical area preserved by the UNESCO, is required to meet criteria and standards for roof top, scale and height (Vienna memorandum, 2005). The visual authenticity and intact urban or architectural fabric do not actually suppose the quality of heritage management. As it is told in Barthiel Buchier (2013:188) research delving deeper for sustainability and heritage, city of Cairo that was once the pearl of Arab culture now is infamous with poverty, premature death and other unsustainable artefacts even if we do have Old Cairo area visually well preserved. The only benefit here to be tourism, however it turns about into a negative presence since tourist torrents have negative affect on local retail and service market for local people if the place is incapable for diverse economy yet (Plaza 2008).

Hence here we do approach the issue that I call it a phenomenon of the flat Earth. During the medieval period there was obvious that the planet Earth was flat. In many cases this is true since we barely see and nether we do use round Earth in our everyday life. Heritage, when perceived in the light of authenticity of visuality and materials, therefore is poked to lose much of meaning which is hidden in cognitive aspects of heritage perception. Since there is the past as well as many other processes of humanity consumed according to the rules of post/industrial market economy, this makes difficult to speak off heritage and sustainability relation. The complexity of the issue stands for heritage which is no longer tradition; as well a tradition is no longer heritage just because it is excluded off today's zeitgeist context. However, relying on Reinhart Kosseleck's (2003, 2004) periodization challenging 'layers of time' (Zeitschichten) that insists that is every, even, most indi-

vidual act, still connects to other, that will be happening some when at the far future. The aim is neither to find junction nor to explain its configurations. The aim is to re-explore the methodologic framework in order to ensure sustainable approach stemming off the past agency.

Narrative approach of heritage and Paul James ideas on sustainability

Denis Rodwell (ibid:188) claims that conservation and sustainability both approaches correlate in order not to prevent any possible intervention or change but rather: 'it implies a reorientation of it focused on new development that is additive and complementary, and significantly increased emphasis on maintaining, reusing, adapting, and enhancing the existing built stock and infrastructure – all within an overall framework that embraces the principles of the sustainable city and coordinated urban management.' Indeed, conservation as it is, means taking something of the past or present and used to project the future. The conservation approach neither does contribute in heritage field, nor meets requirements of alteration in a field of sustainability. Opposing and more frequent definition used in heritage studies sure is preservation that is intended to prevent or/and avoid drastic shifts between past and present. In terms of the birth of renaissance there is seen a little of both approaches. In many cases the present had changed a lot in order to get rid of medieval structure of life. However, the gothic layout of the city as well as a configuration of merchandise or secularity and religion relation remained almost untouched. There were only new conditions of agency imposed on ongoing scotch of history. However, the past was active agent for present to be reassembled and for future to be redesigned. In this sense we can smell a conservancy playing major role for making the World of these days more sustainable.

Paul James (2015:23) stresses that sustainable conservation could be positive act by contrast – sustainable preservation supposes to be negative. Author also points out the idea of mostly negative aspect of sustainability by arguing that most approaches don't really target an issue. These are tackling side effects of activities, not trying to replace them with ones which would have been positive from the beginning. James (ibid:22) champion that: 'Sustainability is defined in terms of being able to carry on, endure or have a future. This is what, in our terms, can be called 'negative sustainability' – not negative in a sense of being bad but negative in a sense of just keeping a system or process going through acts of negation: reducing pollution, mitigating excesses, keeping law and order.' Cultural heritage as it is perceived today possesses a lot of negation too. Heritage planning in terms of urban development has many aspects of forbidding alteration by implying sets of methodology how one is supposed to act in historical area. However, documents as Vienna Memorandum (op.cit) do not say about conservation of meaning and essence of idea in particular area. For instance it is to follow a historical layout, height and rooftop parameters only approach the visual environment. Thus we here get back to phenomenon of a flat earth again. Heritage neither is able nor it seeks conserve positive aspects of the past and integrates them into the future. However, the act of development and pursuit of progress is inevitable phenomenon of mankind therefore the active agency of the past and heritage is one of foremost aims to achieve in order to become sustainable race.

At this point we can stem a parallel between concept of architectural heritage and Ricoeur's notion on history throughout understanding of the narrative concept in philosophy. As Ricoeur (1984:99) stresses: 'the initiative in history does not belong to the document but to the question posed by the historian. This question takes logical priority in historical inquiry.' In many aspects, architectural heritage is treated as facts exhibiting the various periods of the past. Telling a story is a crucial moment for attracting torrents of tourists which, in its origins, has nothing to do with intended function of heritage property neither it has to do with sustainability.

The consumerist origin of 'authorized heritage discourse' stems of history as it is narrated, according to Ricoeur, in advance, or just before the inquire took place. The author stresses that: 'The past, in a natural process, is a past superseded and dead. In nature, each moment dies and

is replaced by another one. On the other hand, the same event, known historically, survives in the present. Someone may say that the past survives by leaving a trace, and we become its heirs so that we can reenact past thoughts. But survival and a heritage are natural processes; historical knowledge begins with the way we come into possession of them.' (1985: 146).

James idea of conservation of positive qualitative processes artefacts or activities seems to be relevant to the idea of heritage narrativity where the past is enacted into present and future not just for observation but rather for active presence. As renaissance analogy suggest, there has been so much of antiquity left in renaissance. However conservation is hardly imaginable. It is probably impossible to keep even single thing the same even if these are working precisely well. For instance the big religion has really strong identity have changed a lot just in order to adapt to context of surroundings. Thus the crucial moment for conservation is to recognize the genotypic meaning of idea or property and to maintain the quality by intensifying its core meaning whatever the discourse claim at the particular moment.

This is off course correlate with idea of progress. In terms of sustainable development the progress is needed just in order to achieve sustainability Worldwide. Therefore to explain the idea of heritage based progress we can rely on Kantian notion on tradition. Kant (Kant in Jonutyte 2010: 40), as it is common to the particular *Zeitgeist*, did not treat a tradition as value to be followed by individual or community. In reverse, the civic freedom to him meant more than national freedom which according to him was an imposition of tradition. However, Kant also believes that the progress or say learning and improvement is intended for nothing but achieve divine status of mankind presence that once existed in Eden and was lost because of the sought of knowledge. Thus knowledge makes humanity to fade way from god, but at the same time it also makes it closer to it. Thus one, in order to come back where he was one step ago, now needs to travel across the globe. The particular notion relies on moral dogmas of enlightenment which was off course a starting point of heritage consumption. However it is still explains heritage based progression that is designed to achieve a sustainability of mankind. Therefore, taking into account James notion of conservation and Ricouer's concept of illusory history and heritage as a natural process, we can draw a theoretical method of bringing past to a role of active agent.

One of approaches may rely on the method I call the reversal coil. The reversal coil explains how once unprogressive past can turn into a solution of the future. In order to set a course for coils direction there is hermeneutic inquire needed. In terms of sustainability and urban development the beginning of 20th century could be once again announced as time of internal combustion engine. There was Detroit that was no. 1 city in production of cars and therefore it featured and compiled par excellence industrial architecture designed by the *architect of Detroit* Albert Kahn. Even though Detroit is barely the case since we focus on the massive automobilization, we can see that, for instance, Chicago which sprawl was based on more administrative function of business rather than on pure industry maintain its position as financial center of USA. However, even the most distant towns and cities of World remained less automobilized. And after more or less half century the most progressive cities now try to get rid of cars at least in the central areas. However, example of automobiles is only one case of the reversal coil. Recognizing at which point the coil needs to be brought back to the previous or even earlier paradigm and then, after it is recognized and approved by interdisciplinary council of professionals – then that quality or even physical artefact needs to be conserved and coherently integrated into a new context in order to achieve both sustainability and active agency to the past.

It has been mentioned the urban Sprawl of Chicago which might be seen off topic. However Chicago was not only the accidental place where sudden business processes just happened. The big impact was made by Chicago school of sociology and its thoughts on socio-economic aspects of living. One of the pioneers of cultural ecology Jacob Riis (Riis in Parker 2004:43) believes in a potential that is hidden in lower social classes. Unlike Karl Marx who championed an existence of

slavery, Riis saw that constant upgrades of lower to higher class might be the answer for common good. Nevertheless, James (ibid:4-5) argues that Melbourne was awarded as a one of the most livable city of the World, but according to him: 'If all city residents across the globe consumed at the rate of the world's most livable cities the planet would be in catastrophic trouble.' Thus the reversal coil might be the key method for developing areas which usually tries to mimic the leading ones. Instead of that these may rely on its past by trying to find there splashes of tacit knowledge appearance that can make impact towards better future. It off course implies elements of autarchy in cultural background in terms of management of places.

Case study: Heritage of Kaunas interwar architecture and its splash of sustainability that was not really meant by the contemporaries.

Giambattista Vico, an Italian thinker was able and tended to perceive different processes ongoing on different context as one entity (in Jonutyte ibid: 37). For instance, Vico stresses that there is no statehood possible to happen without a church as well as philosophy can't exist without statehood. Implicit perception offers that there is temporal and linear approach towards philosophy stemming out of religion. However according to a logical perception of time all these three processes coexist in on temporal point. As it is said in Jonutyte (ibid.) all three of qualities are consisting into each other. The 17th century ideas moved towards 19th and 20th centuries at some points. For instance, insight of Nicola Tesla or Albert Einstein often suggested pre-networkist idea if not mentioning Karl Marx and his ambitious perception how slavery as socioeconomic class was a main cause for industrial society to rise. Logical vista of different things and processes causing other processes or things that, at the first glance, can't have anything in common, was championed by Kosseleck and others. As it is offered by Kerstin Barndt (2010:6) regarding to 'dead' landscapes of industrial period: 'The exhibitions of postindustrial transformation offer glimpses into layers of time and history that undermine the idea of progress—a master trope of nineteenth century museum narratives—and replace it with a new sense of being in time as an affective relation to the multiplicity of history and memory'. The idea of art exploring transparent junction of past into the future might be crucial; however the industrial ruins converted into exhibition properties might seem consumerist. Nevertheless challenging the idea of progression might appear as an issue of reversal coil where lack or absence of industry during the industrial age might seem as a contemporary progress.

Delving deeper into Kaunas interwar (1919-1940) cultural, economic and urban period we are able to see a splash that carries a tacit experience of sustainability. After Vilnius the historical capital of Lithuania was lost to Poland during the 1918-1919 Lithuanian-Polish war, the capital moved to Kaunas pro tem. There was complex of architectural-urban ideas raised on national style of Lithuanian architecture as well as many thoughts of modern movement in press. However Kaunas would never meet requirements of pure modern movement because its low scaled, slightly decorated buildings that are flowing somewhere between art deco and German functionalism. Urban dimension here is slow-paced either. There were almost no build up by integrally planned quarters and areas. It raised one by one thus revealing and continuing a traditional building pattern of pre-industrial paradigm.

However the alteration of genius loci during the interwar in Kaunas was major. From the militarist province of Russian Tsardom, Kaunas turned into a peculiar European polis. Industry was, off course, important for city to sustain, but in a light of other European capitals or major cities of that time, we could not claim that Kaunas development was industrial based.

Hence, importance of Kaunas modernism lies in two-fold dimension of heritage sustainability. First off, Kaunas modernism reveals continuity and slow-paced alteration of genius loci of interwar. By claiming slow-paced I stress that Kaunas interwar period was a peculiar urban-architectural

phenomenon whereas a culture that changed, at the first glance, very little essentially changed everything. Whereas other towns and cities (Zlin or Brno in Czech Republic, or Gdynia in Poland) who were built almost from a scratch kept using variation of German functionalism and thus became signs of modernism pervading Worldwide which lead to the definition of international style that is common to many. At this point, Kaunas modernism was also influenced by functionalism aesthetics, however at the most cases final result of design remains very local or even baroque. So Kaunas modernism is kind of contradiction to the rest streams of MoMo. Even many of regionalist schools across the globe used tools of modern architecture to battle against, say, bones and skeleton architecture of Mies. Kaunas, here, uses traditional architecture to express modernity and modernism. The contradiction leads towards second aspect of heritage sustainability. Hence Kaunas is barely is a testimony of great processes of MoMo and thus cannot claim for being one of the best MoMo, as it is, examples of the World, it (Kaunas modernism) applies for being one of a starting point of our reversal coil. Hence, slow-paced change, which is unique in terms of particular *Zeitgeist* cannot be announced as progressive neither in terms of architecture, not in terms of lifestyle, now could be example of what needs to be preserved (in the broader terms steaming up from low-scale urbanism in city centers up to the lifestyles, cultural locality and *sofort*) in order to achieve sustainability for present and future generations of Kaunas and Lithuania.

Hence, the continuity that was featured by Kaunas modernism instead of rapid revolutionary change has to be following in terms to complete the loop of reversal coil. Nowadays cities tend to mimic and copy each other in many ways. Starting up with museums that are working as contemporary cathedrals thus catalyzing cultural processes and therefore enhance economical livability of mostly inner city areas. As well as they are preaching for international enterprises to invest and thus creating infrastructure of high-risers. Traditional or say authorized discourse of heritage rather enforces these processes of unification as we have discusses the issue via approach of consumerist nature of history and heritage since the enlightenment. This off course refers to perverseness of what Auge (2009) calls a 'non-place'. Pervasiveness here is to be found in terms of both functional aspect of architecture where we can draw attention towards unification of new business center areas Worldwide as well as geographical expansion of no -places. Both variations of expansion of a no place is caused by globalization which is no longer connects to aspects of locality.

At the Kaunas modernism case, many processes that made up phenomenon of heritage sustainability in particular place have happened by accident. Even nowadays, prevention of high-risers in Kaunas is more conditioned by economical impossibilities rather being rational choice to preserve modernistic urban fabric. Anyway, the idea is to exploit things which were once lagging behind but after one or more temporal periods have passed it (lagging) turns to be a splash of progressiveness of thought transposed to future by explicit manner.

In order to preserve Kaunas modernism as traditional heritage concept expressed by Riceour, one needs conserve the message that property transmits rather than making conservation just only of visual aspects. Thus the physical alteration is possible but only in order when heritage presents leads to alteration and impacts it in order to expand and help tacit message to be translated into implicit knowledge. Increasing energetic effectiveness and reducing CO2 emission is not the aim itself, but it is rather a consequence of continuity of active heritage presence in particular place.

Conclusions

Heritage narrative in terms of holistic sustainability is difficult to achieve in both drawing scholar methodology and applying it on practice of place management. However, the past here is to be great agent but only when the future is jet decided. This means that reversal coil first dives to the past before it leaps for the future. The possession of history therefore is a negative aspect of placing heritage to work for active agency as it still consumed for simulating things and processes that are actually dead. Phenomenon of the flat Earth extends the issue towards heritage inability to affect surroundings and also maintains blanked transparency of heritage.

Sustainability as well as heritage experiences lots of negation position, when negative impacts are not resolved but only trials of quantitative reduction is to be noticed. Heritage livability and holistic sustainability occurs when positive aspects of the past are put on conservancy and then put on work to affect environment in positive manner. The idea relies on interpretative description that is only possible when heritage property is fully transparent that means cognitive dimension is to be as important as visual. Only cognition is able to root up splashes of tacit message that is crucial for finding out what must be put on conservancy.

Kaunas modernism architecture is a decent example explaining how once off-streamed, lower class urban development can transmit a message of sustainability. Slow-paced everyday revolution draws a pattern for future development. Not to forget, the continuity, at the case of Kaunas, is important in both pure aspect of heritage when continuity makes it to be value as contradiction for MoMo context as well as sustainability requires that continuity, once performed during the interwar, yet to be respected by its extension.

Finally, the autarchy in terms of cultural interpretation and valuation of the past is crucial to achieve sustainability. In the broader context cultural and natural ecology suffers waste, pollution and various kinds of conflicts across the globe mostly because of economy races. Big metropolitan areas and greatest financial centers exploit other areas in many ways in order these 'other' developing and so called 3rd World countries seek for exactly the same result that is now performed in the big centers. Ignorance for local tradition, heritage and implicit knowledge contained in locality must be the reason of sustainability struggle.

I would like to Acknowledge my friends from AUTC.lt as well as professors Kestutis Zaleckis and Juratė Kamičaitytė – Virbašienė from

Kaunas University of tech for their educational contribution not only to this particular paper but for overall impact to my perception of environment.

Acknowledgment

Ashworth G. 2011. Preservation, conservation and heritage: approaches to the past in the present through the built environment. In: *Asian Anthropology*. Chinese University Press, pp. 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1683478x.2011.10552601>

Auge M. 2009. *Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity*. Verso.

Barndt K. 2010. Layers of Time: Industrial Ruins and Exhibitionary Temporalities. In *PMLA*, Vol. 125, iss. 1. pp. 1-15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2010.125.1.134>

Baron H. 1955. *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*. Princeton University Press.

Barthel-Buchier D. 2013. *Cultural Heritage and the Challenge of Sustainability*. Left Coast Press.

Florida R. 2004. *Cities and the Creative Class*. Routledge.

Fromm E. 1990. *Turėti ar būti?* Vilnius Mintis.

Hansen J., Hillier B. 1984. *The social Logic of space*. Cambridge University Press.

Harrison R. 2012. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Routledge.

James P. 2015. *Urban Sustainability in Theory and Practise*. Circles of Sustainability. Routledge.

Smith L. 2006. *The Uses of Heritage*. Routledge.

Jonutyte J. 2010. Kartotė: tradicijos sąvokos matas ir pamatas. In: *Tautosakos darbai XXXIX*, pp. 36-49.

Koselleck R. 2004. *Futures Past: on the Semantics of Historical Time*. NY. Columbia University Press.

Labadi S. 2013. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage and Outstanding Universal Value*. NY. Alta Mira Press.

Nescolarde-Selva J et al. 2015. Mythical systems: mathematic and logical theory. In: *International Journal of General Systems*, vol. 44 iss. 1, pp. 76-97, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03081079.2014.947977>

Parker S. 2004. *Urban theory and the Urban Experience*. Encountering the City. London Routledge.

Plaza. B. 2008. On Some Challenges and Condition for the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao to be an Effective Economic Re-activator. In *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Vol.32. Iss.2. pp. 506-517. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00796.x>

Poulios I. 2014. Discussing strategy in heritage conservation. In: *Journal of Cultural Heritage*

References

- Management and Sustainable Development, Vol. 4 Iss. 1 pp. 16 – 34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-10-2012-0048>
- Ricoeur P. 1984. Time and Narrative. Vol.2. The University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur P. 1985. Time and Narrative. Vol.3. The University of Chicago Press.
- Rodwell D. 2007. Conservation and Sustainability of Historic Cities. Blackwell Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470759547>
- UNESCO World Heritage Committee. 2005. Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape.
- Otero-Pailos, Jorge; West, Susie. 2010. Heritage Values. eds Susie West. Manchester University Press. Manchester.
- The Bura Charter. 1999. The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places and Cultural Significance. Bura.
- The Paris Declaration on Heritage as a driver of development. 2011. Paris.
- Weireb F. 1986. Roots of the Bible. Merlin Books.
- Vienna Memorandum. 2005. World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape. Vienna.
- Wijesuriya G. 2005. The past is in the present: perspectives in caring for Buddhist heritage sites in Sri Lanka. In Stovel, H., Stanley-Price, N. and Killick, R. (Eds), Conservation of Living Religious Heritage: Papers from the ICCROM 2003 Forum on Living Religious Heritage: Conserving the Sacred, ICCROM, Rome, pp. 31-43.

About the author

KASTYTIS RUDOKAS

PhD student

Kaunas University of Technology, Institute of Construction and Architecture

Main research area

Narrativity of urban heritage

Address

Tunelio st. 60, LT-44405 Kaunas, Lithuania

Phone: +37066362841

E-mail: kastytis.rudokas@ktu.lt