

THE QUESTION OF AUTHENTICITY IN RECOVERIES IN POST-CONFLICT ZONES

La Cuestión de la Autenticidad en los Restablecimientos en Zonas Post-conflicto

Author: A. Radulovic

ABSTRACT

In most of military conflicts the cultural heritage is being deliberately destroyed. Two main aspects of its destructions are direct and indirect. In the direct destruction the tangible aspects of the monuments are being damaged or destroyed, while indirect destruction of the monument attacks its values – its general context (for instance during the significant demographic changes in the region where the monument is situated, or during the changes of the ideological climate, etc; the monument physically is not changed but its meaning does).

When it comes to the recovery of monuments in post-conflict period, most often there are multiple issues. Sometimes the monument can be perfectly restored in its physical aspect, but its intangible aspect (its significance) can remain deformed, which, consequently, affects the perception and the interpretation of the monument.

In what measure this incomplete recovery affects the entire monument? Recently in monument protection domain the question of authenticity is being raised, particularly now for the occasion of 20th anniversary of Nara Document on Authenticity, and it is the focus issue of this paper in context of military-conflict related cases.

The paper focuses on the case studies of performed recoveries of important monuments in post-conflict zones and it analyzes the success of these recoveries pointing out the authenticity. It also turns on the what way the communities should contribute to the recovery of damaged recoveries (the Nara Document emphasise the importance of social inclusion in the monument protection). The paper features the case studies trying to interpret different aspects of a monument: its material and intangible aspects and their relation.

Other documents that this paper relies on is the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter), World Heritage Convention, Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention etc.

Key words: recovery, authenticity, Nara Document, destruction, war, value

RESUMEN

En la mayoría de los conflictos militares se destruye el Patrimonio Cultural a propósito. Los aspectos principales de su destrucción son directos e indirectos. La destrucción directa implica los aspectos tangibles de los monumentos que están dañados o destruidos, mientras la destrucción indirecta ataca a sus valores - su contexto general (por ejemplo los significativos cambios demográficos en la región donde el monumento está ubicado, los cambios del clima ideal, etc.; el monumento no cambia físicamente, pero sí su significado).

En el momento del restablecimiento del monumento en el período post-conflicto, a menudo surgen múltiples problemas. A veces se puede restaurar el monumento perfectamente en su aspecto físico, pero su aspecto intangible (su significado) puede quedar deformado, lo que, como consecuencia, afecta la percepción y la interpretación del monumento.

¿En qué medida esta restauración incompleta afecta al monumento entero? Recientemente en el área de la protección de monumentos la cuestión de la autenticidad se ha planteado, sobre todo con ocasión del 20 aniversario del 'Nara Document on Authenticity', y es el enfoque de este documento en el contexto de asuntos relacionados con conflictos militares.

Este trabajo se centra en los estudios de restauraciones llevadas a cabo en monumentos importantes en zonas post-conflicto y analiza el éxito de estas restauraciones señalando la autenticidad. Analiza también la manera en la que las comunidades deberían contribuir en la restauración del Patrimonio Cultural dañado (el Documento Nara insiste en la importancia de la inclusión social en la protección del monumento). El trabajo presenta los estudios intentando interpretar los distintos aspectos de un monumento: aspectos materiales e intangibles y su relación. Otros textos en los que este trabajo se apoya son: el 'International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites' ('the Venice Charter'), 'World Heritage Convention', 'Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention', etc.

Palabras clave: *recuperación, autenticidad, Nara Document, destrucción, guerra, valor*

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades monument protection doctrine has been expanded much further beyond the limits of material dimension: the fact that monument doesn't present a purely tangible object opens many different questions that can result with different treatment of the monument than what could be expected in usual practice. The main reason for taking such direction lies in the need for broader understanding of cultural property, but also it is a consequence of encountering different ways of perception on what actually is cultural heritage: various cultures

have various types of heritage, in European tradition much emphasis has been put on the enormous tangible good, while, contrary to that in some other cultures the heritage emphasis can be put on incredibly rich intangible good (such as in Africa or Australia).

Authenticity and integrity of monument as two important criteria for the assessment of its value can be affected by the change of social climate. In times of conflict that occur in humanity cultural heritage is often targeted and affected in various ways and afterwards its recovery can present a challenge that would divide public and experts opinion. Not only affected in physical way, the monument can endure the consequences of various demographic and other changes.

Theoretical framework of this paper is consisted of the Nara Document on Authenticity, the Venice Charter on Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, the Australian Burra Charter, also the decisions took during the recoveries of sites mentioned in the paper, the theoretical work of Jukka Jokilehto¹ and Andrea Bruno.

2. THE NARA DOCUMENT AND AUTHENTICITY

The Venice Charter on Restoration of Monuments and Sites² (1964) is the crucial document in monument protection: it clearly determines the principles for the preservation and restoration of monuments and sites. In further evolution of the doctrine there are many various theoretical outcomes, one of them is the Nara Document on Authenticity³ (1994)⁴ that emerged as another important guide for appropriate monument preservation – this document in fact complements much of what was needed for more complete protection of cultural heritage: it stresses the aspects of a monument that could falsely be ignored due to the specific circumstances, consequently its value is being deformed and therefore it affects *the collective memory of humanity*⁵. It is a relatively short document consisted of many important definitions on cultural property.

1 Jokilehto, J. 2006, 'Consideration on authenticity and integrity in world heritage context'. City & Time 2 (1): 1. Available from: <http://www.ceci-br.org/novo/revista/docs2006/CT-2006-44.pdf>, accessed on January 10, 2015 at 8:20 AM.

2 ICOMOS 1964, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter)*. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf, accessed on February 3, 2015, at 3 PM.

3 ICOMOS 1994, *The Nara Document on Authenticity*. Available from: <http://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf>, accessed on January 20, 2015 at 9:17 AM.

4 Years and years after presenting the Nara Document there were many meetings organized to discuss various matters tightly related with this document as well to discuss the outcomes of the document. Particularly challenging and important is to explain the term *authenticity* the way it could be applied practically in monument protection.

5 ICOMOS 1994, *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, Preamble.

Authenticity, a term that is very briefly mentioned in the Venice Charter, then more elaborated in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Nara Document, can be understood as a capacity or feature of a monument to be unique, true, accurate and original. Authenticity⁶ emerged to be one of the key criteria for the evaluation of certain monument. However the authenticity as a concept remains vague, there are no strict rules in assessment of authenticity of the monument, this criteria is to be evaluated within the cultural context of its own. Authenticity of a monument can be tightly related with its values and its cultural significance.

The Nara Document by its nature opens the door for further discussion on authenticity and values; that is needed, adjusted to different cases. What particularly is important with this document is that involves the challenges that concern heritage management and its context within the society, then entire legal aspect that concerns its protection. Additionally among other documents on monument protection in the times of conflict, the Nara Document is also engaged in this issue calling for international protection (but primarily, according to the document the responsibility to take care of the monument belongs to the culture that produced it).

Regarding the general acceptance in previous decades to the flexibility in making decisions in preservation of cultural good, the Nara Document additionally encourages this attitude, as mentioned in the Appendix 1 of the Document, the imposed *mechanic formulae or standardized procedure in attempting to define and determine authenticity*⁷ are to be avoided.

3. DESTRUCTION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE AND THE CASE STUDIES

This paper focuses on the zones of conflict where cultural property was affected: either damaged, either completely destroyed. Therefore the challenge in discussing the authenticity is particularly important. The discussion on this subject is probably endless and lots of various proposals would come across. The final goal wanted to be reached through the recovery is to try to regain the authenticity of the site. The Nara Document in preamble states that *the essential contribution made by the consideration of authenticity in conservation practice is to clarify and illuminate the collective memory of humanity*⁸.

⁶ 'Authenticity' in heritage protection literature and document is often present in the following contexts: *test of authenticity, conditions of authenticity, historical authenticity*.

⁷ ICOMOS 1994, *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, Appendix 1.

⁸ ICOMOS 1994, *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, Preamble.

There are two monuments chosen for this paper, both of exceptional values and both had tragic destiny during the armed conflict that took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina. One was destroyed and then reconstructed, the other was heavily damaged and afterwards restored. Their destruction naturally affected the identity of places where they stood: the unique integrity of Old Town of Mostar has been damaged losing its key monument; Sarajevo lost one of its most beautiful and most meaningful buildings whose presence is important for the local identity.

3.1 Old Bridge in Mostar and Town Hall in Sarajevo

A lot of world's attention concerning deliberate destruction of monument emerged once again from the bombing of the Old Bridge in Mostar that shocked the entire monument protection community. The bridge, firstly damaged then destroyed, was a part of the very specific ensemble that was one of the most beautiful and the most unique in Europe, important for Balkan-Mediterranean visual scope and history, additionally it had a functional value for local residents (as a bridge).

In Mostar, during the Ottoman era, the place developed in a very peculiar way, and the result of that development represents the connection between the landscape and man-constructed elements established on a multicultural setting, typical for this region. The entire unit had perfectly shaped and unique form, with the Old Bridge as important element, which was a masterpiece of Ottoman architecture. Other parts of Old Town have visible some other style influences: pre-Ottoman, Western European etc.

The integrity of Old Town of Mostar due to its structure is very important for understanding its value; its authenticity goes with its integrity.

The Town Hall of Sarajevo (that is home to the National and University Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina) is a masterpiece of the Austro-Hungarian architecture that was completed in 1896, constructed in a mixture of styles that combines the historicism and pseudo-Moorish. The basic constructive elements are columns, walls, arches and glassed dome roofing the hall. The building has the unusual triangular foundation with a big six-angled centre – the hall - the most important part of luxurious interior topped with the glass dome.

Following the common architectural plan of the western European architecture, the building is organized in two levels: the Ground floor (loggia for a courtroom or a marketplace) and the First floor with its main auditorium and places for important meetings and a balcony. The tower in this case was placed on the backside of the central dome erected over the six-angled hall roofed with the glass dome.

A luxurious façade has a representative front-side doorway. The façade is coloured red and yellow in turns with ornamental faïence boarding. The painted

decorations are placed in the main stairway, walls of main auditorium, doorway and the central hall, and at the same time the stained-glass showcases ornamented with floral patterns of modelling decoration, seen in the main stairway and under the dome, illustrate a flowery style of the building⁹. The Town Hall of Sarajevo became one of the most recognizable symbols of Sarajevo, much of its history is most tightly related with authentic local stories, urban legends, customs.

3.2 Recoveries and authenticity challenge

The case of recovery of Mostar's heritage was a very challenging processes that divided experts all over the world. As it was already mentioned, the integrity of the Old Town was seriously damaged and there were much doubts if the ensemble could be authentically recovered. Before the war the monument was very significant, it enjoyed a particular attention (as major tourist site) but it hasn't been inscribed on the list of World Heritage Sites, however was protected monument of SR Bosnia and Herzegovina¹⁰. The idea for its candidature came after the war, in 1999. The ICOMOS decided in 2000 to support the inscription as a special case, determining the whole project as a *positive contribution to the protection and management of this outstanding multicultural heritage site*.¹¹

There is no doubt that the historical centre of Mostar had exceptional cultural and historical values for human civilization, but the destruction of Mostar was that extreme and there its key feature has been lost – the Old Bridge, that many experts were convinced that it wouldn't be possible to successfully recover the site according to its original looks. Obviously the main possibility for recovering the site was either through reconstruction, either through construction of new structures.

Pretty sensitive decision has been made to nominate the reconstructed site, as the place whose recovery would be performed based on the maximally authentic reconstruction of the historical Old Town and Old Bridge. This case however reminds of some similar cases already performed after the Second World War in many towns and cities all over the Europe: the issue that represents one of the most challenging domains in heritage protection. (The interventions during the recoveries of, for example, historical parts of Dresden and Warsaw after the Second World War. The historic centre of Warsaw was heavily destroyed during the war: more than 85 % of the buildings was completely destroyed, but later was

9 More available from Krzović, Ibrahim 1987, *Arhitektura Bosne i Hercegovine, 1878-1918*, Umjetnička galerija Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo; and from the site www.vijecnica.ba, accessed on February 7, 2015 at 9:30 AM.

10 Then part of Yugoslavia.

11 UNESCO 2005, *Advisory Body Evaluation, Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) No 946 rev.*, p. 180. Available from: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/946rev.pdf, accessed on March 21, 2015, at 1:11 PM.

nominated for UNESCO inscription.¹²⁾

Having in mind all the efforts and engagements on the international level invested in the entire project of recovery of Mostar's Old Town there are major positive outcomes within, that were the main argument for its presence as an important case study in various heritage literature. The reconstruction of the bridge performed certainly managed to return the original look of the place (even though there are persuasive arguments on use of reconstruction method) as well as the feelings related to pre-conflict meaning of the bridge for local residents.

The acceptance of reconstruction method in the recovery had a particular role in the renewal of authentic cultural identity of the town and region. Additionally, in Bosnia and Herzegovina the return of displaced persons and restoration of pre-war setting has importance for post-conflict reconstruction of the war-ravaged country, therefore the recovery of the Old Bridge in Mostar has important function not only in a restoration of visual (tangible) aspects, it has a major role in reconciliation process and imagining of the sustainable peace.

The reconstruction has been perceived as a highly sensitive issue consisted of many challenges. The bridge (and surroundings) had to be authentically reconstruct according to the documentation and other studies on the original destroyed structures. Highly neutral attitude in interpretation of such documentation is a must, reconstructed parts had to be authentically performed only according to the original model, any kind of adjusting of visual features of the monument or inappropriate interpretation of documentation would be absolutely not acceptable, therefore the restoration of authenticity of the entire visual context is highly emphasized.

However, the challenge in the assessment of authenticity in this complicated recoveries is related with material aspects: such interventions are generally consisted of very high percentage of reconstructed (i.e. newly built) parts and a very high percentage of the new material that is used. For this case it was important that the reconstruction was performed using the original building techniques and methods of the construction avoiding any modernizations or alterations that would differ the structures from the original and damage the authenticity and integrity of the site. Additionally this kind of recovery may face important financial issues.

The recovery of the historical heart of the city included the complete reconstruction of the Old Bridge. Even though the material used was completely new there was some integration of the original historic material. Positioning of the ensemble in the natural and urban landscape is one of the most positive achievements of this project. For some experts the idea of the reconstruction of

12 More information available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/30/>, accessed on January 12, 2015, at 12:05 PM.

the site and its listing afterwards as the Protected site was a difficult issue, stating the main argument: the recovered bridge is nothing but a completely new bridge that is not the old one. As it was mentioned this is often observed as the most vulnerable issue in the recovery of heritage in war-ravaged areas bringing the question: to recover the old or to build the new! There are many other questions tightly related in making such decision: financial and other practical issues, amount of knowledge and expertise sufficient to follow the interventions, then issues respecting the memory and emotional values, etc.

In the heritage protection the history is being regarded as the irreversible process consisted of original elements, even they represents something that was destroyed. The reconstruction can be perceived as the faking of history and conscious loss of these original elements: the reconstruction cannot replace the original building.

In the Venice Charter (1964) in the article 15 (related to archaeological excavations) states that *all reconstruction work should however be ruled out 'a priori'. Only anastylosis, that is to say, the reassembling of existing but dismembered parts can be permitted. The material used for integration should always be recognizable and its use should be the least that will ensure the conservation of a monument and the reinstatement of its form.*¹³ This actually presents the general position towards reconstruction. In that, so to say more 'ancient' doctrine of heritage protection (before the Nara Document) there are ambiguities when it comes to this issue. The Florence Charter (1981) that is dedicated to the historic gardens, in the article 9. states that *the preservation of historic gardens depends on their identification and listing. They require several kinds of action, namely maintenance, conservation and restoration. In certain cases, reconstruction may be recommended.*¹⁴ With remarks that *in any work of maintenance, conservation, restoration or reconstruction of a historic garden, or of any part of it, all its constituent features must be dealt with simultaneously. To isolate the various operations would damage the unity of the whole.*¹⁵ *...no reconstruction work on a historic garden shall be undertaken without thorough prior research to ensure that such work is scientifically executed...*¹⁶ *Where a garden has completely disappeared or there exists no more than conjectural evidence of its successive stages a reconstruction could not be considered a historic garden.*¹⁷

13 ICOMOS 1964, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter)*.

14 ICOMOS 1981, *Historic Gardens (The Florence Charter)*. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/charters/gardens_e.pdf. Accessed on February 19, 2015, at 8 PM.

15 ICOMOS 1981, *Historic Gardens (The Florence Charter)*. Article 10.

16 ICOMOS 1981, *Historic Gardens (The Florence Charter)*. Article 15.

17 ICOMOS 1981, *Historic Gardens (The Florence Charter)*. Article 17.

In 2005 rather positive estimations has been made in a favour of the authenticity of recovered ensemble in Mostar underlining the success of the attempt to recover the constructive unit that was significantly destroyed during the conflict.¹⁸ The conclusion was that *the authenticity of form, use of authentic materials and techniques are fully recognizable*.¹⁹ The case also presents the stimulus for other similar cases in the world, and like that is one of the greatest achievements of this project because it leaves an open door of possibility for reconstructions giving a home that structures that have been destroyed could be recovered. It is also a valuable practical case study-experience that could present the guide for recoveries for other similar interventions. The result is not a kind of invented or manipulated presentation of an architectural feature which never before existed in that form, rather the reconstructed bridge has a kind of truthfulness, even though in strictly material terms a considerable portion is not of identical or original pieces.²⁰

The surrounding areas of Old Bridge present an important archaeological site that, after the destruction of the bridge, has opened up the possibility for in-depth research of the ancient construction methods. The archaeological research has been completed in March 2003, and findings on the both sides were quite interesting. There were masonry structures (attributed to the previous bridges that existed prior to building of the glorious Old Bridge), about 200 pieces of the pottery, metal and stone cannon balls, about 250 metal wedges, some medieval tools etc.²¹ This way the entire process increased the parameter of integrity for the value of the monument.

From the technical point of view the entire project was very demanding.²² The first task, after preparations of complex documentation and planning, was to take-down the existing remains of the bridge in order to restore the abutment walls on both sides that later would provide the solid bases for the arch. The scaffolding have been erected in July 2002. Many composing pieces of the bridge had to be dismantled during the conservation of the support structures, to ensure the solidity of the further work. Particularly difficult was the building of the arch: composing the voussoirs and other parts of it. The maximum of the original pavement was used. The pavement on the right side of the bridge has been decomposed, every piece properly marked, measured and documented. Afterwards, the goal was to return as much as possible of pieces to their original place. At several points it was the additional issue to arrange the solid places for putting the crane for

18 UNESCO 2005, *Advisory Body Evaluation, Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) No 946 rev.*, p. 181.

19 *Op.cit.*, p. 181.

20 *Op.cit.*, p. 181.

21 Popovac, Maja 2006, 'Reconstruction of the Old Bridge in Mostar', *Acta Polytechnica*, vol. 46, no. 2/2006. Czech Technical University in Prague.

22 More information from: Popovac. *Op.cit.*

the reconstruction of the bridge, steel grids during the centering and complex network of scaffolding that served during most of the time of reconstruction.²³

Material used for the reconstruction corresponds with material of the bridge before destruction (the remains have been used as much as circumstances permitted aiming to preserve the maximum of the authenticity of the bridge). There is the stone of local origin (for the large number of bridges' elements), the limestone (for the pavement and stone slabs), the iron (for the connectors, cramps and dowels as well as for the fence), the lead (particularly important for the bridge, it ensured the high resistance of the bridge to very strong wind, flood, earthquakes...) and mortar. Pouring the lead in the voussoir stones was particularly demanding.²⁴ There are various evaluations presented that follow the assessment of success of the recovery - detailed scientific analysis and reports. Very demanding process of the reconstruction is proof of the supreme skills of the ancient constructors, which is one of the main values of the bridge and the argument for its listening.

Already mentioned similar case from the past, the Old Town of Warsaw in Poland has been described as *an outstanding example of a near-total reconstruction of a span of history covering the 13th to the 20th century*.²⁵ The case of Mostar has different significance²⁶ having in mind that the Mostar project was under supervision of many international (and local) organisations and experts, resulting with the huge project of capital importance (...*the town of Mostar is more than a national symbol. It functions today as an important symbol for the whole civilised world.*)²⁷ Still, it is important to mention that the case of Warsaw in consideration of cultural property that has been heavily damaged or destroyed and then reconstructed: from its nomination to its protection, through long way and years of various working teams, assessments and discussions that took places there is the obvious evolution in perception of reconstruction and authenticity.²⁸

The recovery of the Town Hall of Sarajevo included the restoration of building and the reconstruction of elements that were destroyed. The remains of heavily damaged building contained enough fabric for recovery. The reproduction of the

23 More information from: Op.cit.

24 More information from: Op.cit.

25 More information available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/30>. Accessed on February 1st, 2015, at 1 PM.

26 UNESCO 2005, *Advisory Body Evaluation: Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) No 946 rev.*, p. 182.

27 UNESCO 2008, *Mission Report: Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) C 946rev.*, p. 14.

28 More information available from: Cameron, C 2008, 'From Warsaw to Mostar: The World Heritage Committee and Authenticity', APT Bulletin, vol. 39, no. 2/3 (2008), pp. 19-24. Available from: <http://archives.cerium.ca/IMG/pdf/Cameron.pdf>. Accessed on March 14, 2015 at 4:20 PM.

details was mainly performed on the façade of the building, only on the places where there was no possibility to apply the conservation works. The primary stages of the recovery of the buildings were: first of all the stabilization of the structural assembly of masonry structures following with the recovery of the roof. There was also the restoration of the steel dome and the descending ceiling, the restoration of the glass roof covering with the development of lightning, the capturing of damaged structure of the hall. Further the restoration of the horizontal structures has been performed as well as the restoration of the hall. Following stages of the recovery were consisted of final works on the building, restoration and reconstruction of sculpture, paintings and other details.

The whole recovery project demanded very significant financial means and thorough study of documentation. Due to the complicity of the entire project it was questioned several times if there is a real need for its that detailed restoration. Again, the strongest argument for the restoration was the design of the building as important cultural and monument, especially from the point of view of the historical context, as well as the part of the urban ensemble. It took years and years for the preparation of the restoration, which included finding the original documents, photos, descriptions, careful planning of the restoration processes and reconstruction on the places where it was necessary (mainly on the façade).

The recoveries of both described structures have been performed in order to bear their full original value and significance as the part of the construction units where they belong. It can be concluded that visually this task has been accomplished. The success of the recovery of building is also related partially to their public function in local communities, as their function remains for the same purposes as it was prior to the war.

3.3 Perception of recoveries. Further assessment and analyses

Following the presentation of technical interventions on the recovery of presented monuments, there is a lot to be understood and interpreted related with the meaning of the monument and its immaterial function in the society.

As it is well known in heritage theory, the work of art is consisted of two aspects: its significance or meaning (that is the intangible aspect) and its material (tangible) aspect. There is an endless list of examples of monuments proving how these two aspects are inseparable (though in various cultures and traditions greater importance can be given to one or another). Consequently in recovery of damaged or destroyed monument the liaison between those two aspects can be disrupted. It would certainly not be difficult to imagine as an example a synagogue in continental Europe that has been destroyed prior or during the Second World War. The synagogue is tightly related with the history of local Jewish community: it contains various cultural aspects reflected in its existence and its function. Some

time after its destruction local community suggests the recovery of that synagogue even though there are no more people that would use the building for its main purpose, and one can ask a legitimate question: even if it is recovered will it be the same monument having in mind that the context has changed dramatically? The recovered building if recovered would not be used for its main purpose. This is the problem (of course depending on the nature or importance of the monument) that can be often met in monument protection field, and experience shows very different solutions. The meaning of the monument change.²⁹

Within the example with the synagogue it is obvious that the relationship between the tangible and intangible aspects is damaged - in fact history is full of such examples, the existence is consisted of the constant change. What does it mean for the authenticity of a monument? First of all it means its evolution, its development, new generations according to their criteria and circumstances are making new heritage or adjust the existing to their needs. Additionally we have to refer again to different cultural contexts, there are cultures that care more for the protection of intangible aspects of their culture, for some of them the material heritage can be of temporary existence, others, on the contrary attach fundamental importance to material aspects of culture.³⁰

With the Old Bridge in Mostar the intangible aspects became particularly important reasons for choosing the reconstruction option, there was a desire not to skip the visual concept that existed in history. If chosen otherwise maybe Mostar would be nothing else but a place that was permanently and irreversibly destroyed (i.e. perceived as dead): therefore recovery wasn't imagined producing non-historical solution... maybe it would be too painful for local people to make new plans of new ensembles and units unrelated to the original concept? The reconstruction performed is obviously loaded with additional meanings: aside of its revival (reanimation) the monument should also 'continue the life' of the destroyed bridge bearing its complex physical and aesthetical experience (that includes its incorporation in the urban units, interpolation with other monuments or landscape, consolidation the experiences like earthquakes that occurred in past, etc) as well as its meaning for the local community. In this recovery there were many concerns and most of people weren't indifferent towards this challenge.

29 Illustrative examples on the link <http://www.jewish-heritage-europe.eu/2014/11/09/glorious-synagogues-to-mark-anniversaries-25-years-since-the-wall-came-down-and-76-years-since-kristallnacht-glorious-synagogues-and-restored-jewish-cemeteries/%E2%80%9D>, accessed on March 1st, 2015 at 9:27 AM.

30 As a respond to this issue there are various charters originating from various region in the world, attempting to deal with the diversity in heritage in various cultures. For example the Burra Charter from Australia very practically merges local heritage needs that is very specific with some foreign practice, making a very efficient and universal document.

For understanding the vulnerability of the choice it is interesting to mention the alternative solution for Mostar's recovery proposed by Andrea Bruno. This was the different plan that would have changed the original scope, presenting the innovative challenge for the perception of authenticity and particularly respect the Venice Charter. About his proposal Andrea Bruno said: *Yes, I proposed to not rebuild the bridge as it was, but only to keep the remaining parts as an example to show that we cannot just destroy heritage. I followed the original shape with a metallic structure. I also kept the small bridge they had built immediately after the destruction to still be able to cross the river. This means that we could see at the same time the three different phases: the original bridge that was destroyed, the preliminary crossing, and finally, the proposed metallic structure of the project. It would be a testimony of the things that should not be done.*³¹

This multilayered project was rejected. The plan was particularly friendly towards the idea of change that should be accepted as perfectly normal in monument protection and shouldn't present something to be hidden in heritage.

As already pointed out in previous chapter there is a clearly negative attitude towards reconstruction as the method in recovery, but in practice the idea of the reconsideration of this method comes out from various study cases, as we saw, particularly in war-related areas. If accepted, the method of reconstruction should be performed according to the original and scientifically acceptable documentation and the monument should absolutely be prevented of making quick and ignorant solutions (a challenge that may include the additional studying). Making decision about the realization of the reconstruction differs from one case to another, and making that final decision is certainly a difficult job to do. Main reason to perform the reconstruction is nostalgia, the sentimental reason.

Significant outcome of the reconstruction of the Old Bridge in Mostar is its immeasurable positive influence on the city's economy, having in mind that it relayed on the prestigious image it had from period before the construction (the bridge was one of the most photographed monuments in former Yugoslavia). If some new plan was applied in recovery, would the site be inscribed on such a prestigious list of protected monuments?

The significance of the reconstruction of the Old Bridge is very considerable not just for Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also on the international level: the case of the bridge that was rebuilt is striking and considered as the symbol of the promising reconciliation. It is also considered as a hope for human solidarity (due

31 Rigauts, T & Rochez, M 2015, 'Interview with Andrea Bruno, November 10th, 2014', Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation Newsletter, Issue 15, Faculty of Engineering Science, Leuven. Available from: http://sprecomah.eu/rlicc/images/stories/projects/issue_15_spring_2015.pdf, accessed on March 25, 2015, at 9:17 PM.

to the cooperation of many international institutions) for the peace and resisting the catastrophes.

The recovery of the Sarajevo Town Hall represents the very important step in the recovery of the Bosnian heritage from the Austro-Hungarian period. *The renovation project is exceptional both from a historical and cultural standpoint. The restored building was reopened on 28 June 2014 amid commemorations across Europe marking the start of the First World War - for it was on 28 June 1914 that, after attending a reception at the Town Hall, the heir to the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Archduke France Ferdinand was assassinated barely 300 metres from the iconic building.*³² Additionally, the Town Hall, as one of the main symbols of Sarajevo integrated other elements that correspond with the environment: recovery from the war and ashes.

Humanity didn't manage to stop conflicts and mass destruction of happening, even though there are attempts referencing to the International law and Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict to limit the effects of war on cultural property. Wars are obviously part of the basic human reality.³³ Having in mind the measure of destruction that took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina, conditioning the recovery of cultural heritage in that country in the way that should exclude the method of reconstruction wouldn't be fair towards its cultural value and place in human civilisation significantly due to the fact that salvation of saving of cultural heritage failed. However, now, with the reconstructed Old Bridge there is the challenge of understanding its meaning in the society, since circumstances are different and the bridge is now placed in a deeply divided city.³⁴

When it comes to integrity³⁵, which is another crucial parameter in heritage theory, it should be stressed that, having in mind that integrity of one monument includes its all elements (tangible and intangible) that create its identity, in the post-conflict consolidation and recovery, the integrity is in the state of 'shock' or 'trauma' caused by the effects of war. Concerning places that had such faith the positive outcome was the possibility to perform the archaeological research on the sites before the recovery, which counts in the integrity of the place.³⁶

32 Available from: <http://www.safega.com/en/our-sectors/our-projects/supervision-of-the-restoration-of-the-sarajevo-and-novi-grad-town-halls-20122015/>, accessed on March 10, 2015 at 11:23 PM.

33 For instance even in the Bible the 'destruction of the temple' is very present.

34 Calame, Jon & Charlesworth, Esther 2009, *Divided Cities: Belfast, Beirut, Jerusalem, Mostar, and Nicosia*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

35 UNESCO 2012, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

36 The desirable continuation of this research includes performing the survey that would analyse the perception among local residents of the monuments that were recovered; that way it would be more clear how the meaning of monument treated has been perceived in the community.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The paper is questioning the authenticity-related issues in recoveries after the military conflicts and it is based on two case studies. Sadly, in times of war (or other changes in the society) the heritage belonging to the certain community is often perceived as undesirable and is targeted. Such changes affect various aspects of cultural property, most often they are being deliberately damaged or destroyed, but with the time more and more the attention is given to the intangible aspects of heritage and their perception in the context of conflict. Therefore in post-conflict recoveries it can be quite difficult to attempt to recover the monument, respecting basics of the heritage protection doctrine and willing to preserve the full authenticity of the monument but also the emotions attached to the certain sites.

Prior to recovery of Old Town in Mostar there were different proposals: pro-reconstruction and those that excluded reconstruction of the Old Bridge. Motivated by sentimental reasons it was the reconstruction method that was performed. This is the major case of recovery, thoroughly followed by the international community. Afterwards the monument was nominated and inscribed as a World Heritage Site. Its presence has particular importance for the economy of the region.

With the case of Mostar the idea of its reconstruction appeared directly after the war holding the key significance of country's recovery and, consequently, the future of Bosnia and Herzegovina, that is consisted of connecting (reconciliation) different sides previously involved in conflict³⁷. The case of Old Bridge in Mostar is very present in various studies on peace, war, conflict, reconciliation, and is perceived as a positive story. Yet, there are significant challenges in the city of Mostar, and that is the major obstacle in the recovery of authenticity: the fact that demographic and social structure in the area has changed. It is of particular importance to stress that this monument plays a major role in the recovery of the authenticity of the society. Can the reconstruction of the Old Bridge initiate the reconciliation?

Another case presented in the paper, the Town Hall of Sarajevo, the building of capital cultural importance for the city, was heavily damaged in bombing of Sarajevo at the beginning of war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The recovery was however much different compared with the Old Bridge from Mostar, since methods to apply were those that would usually be performed in such circumstances, the monument wasn't reconstructed (except mostly superficial details). However the recovery took very long time with significant financial means invested. The building, entirely and authentically restored, helps the preservation of the authentic look of the historical centre of Sarajevo. The effect of both described recoveries in preservation of original scope of two cities is considerable.

³⁷ I.e. two different sides of the river.

These cases are important, not only because of the fact that they are significantly exploited in academic discussion, but also because they reflect in the evolution of monument protection doctrine. On these cases it is obvious that the perception of the monument shifts putting more emphasis on the intangible aspects of monuments, making the interpretation of Venice Charter more flexible. The post-Nara Document discussions on monument protection that echoed in the Operational Guidelines and some other documents and decisions make place to question applying the Venice Charter. However, even though obviously the place is opened towards reconstruction in certain cases, there is no reason to believe that it would become a regular practice.

REFERENCES:

- Australia ICOMOS 1979 (and later adoptions), *The Burra Charter*. Available from: <http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf>.
- Calame, Jon & Charlesworth, Esther 2009, *Divided Cities: Belfast, Beirut, Jerusalem, Mostar, and Nicosia*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Cameron, C 2008, 'From Warsaw to Mostar: The World Heritage Committee and Authenticity', *APT Bulletin*, vol. 39, no. 2/3 (2008), pp. 19-24. Available from: <http://archives.cerium.ca/IMG/pdf/Cameron.pdf>.
- ICOMOS 1964, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter)*. Available from http://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf.
- ICOMOS 1994, *The Nara Document on Authenticity*. Available from: <http://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf>.
- Jokilehto, J. 2006, 'Consideration on authenticity and integrity in world heritage context'. *City & Time* 2 (1): 1. Available from: <http://www.ceci-br.org/novo/revista/docs2006/CT-2006-44.pdf>.
- Krzović, Ibrahim 2004, *Arhitektura Bosne i Hercegovine, 1878-1918*, Umjetnička galerija Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo.
- Ramel, Sylvie 2005, *Reconstruire pour promouvoir la paix? Le cas du «Vieux Pont» de Mostar*, Institut européen de l'Université de Genève, Genève.
- Popovac, Maja 2006, 'Reconstruction of the Old Bridge in Mostar', *Acta Polytechnica*, vol. 46, no. 2/2006. Czech Technical University in Prague.
- Rigauts, T & Rochez, M 2015, 'Interview with Andrea Bruno, November 10th, 2014', *Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation Newsletter*, Issue 15, Faculty of Engineering Science, Leuven. Available from: http://sprecomah.eu/rlicc/images/stories/projects/issue_15_spring_2015.pdf.

Stanley-Price N. (ed) & King J. (ed.) 2009, *Conserving the authentic, essays in honour of Jukka Jokilehto*, ICCROM, Rome.

UNESCO 2005, *Advisory Body Evaluation, Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) No 946 rev.* Available from: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/946rev.pdf.

UNESCO 2008, *Mission Report: Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) C 946rev.*

UNESCO 2012, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.*