Julia Sowińska-Heim
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3810-596X
Department of History of Architecture
Institute of History of Art
University of Lodz
julia.sowinska@uni.lodz.pl

HERITOLOGY AND CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURAL THEORY. UNIVERSALISM OF PRINCIPLES OR HETEROGENEITY AND DISPERSION?

Abstract: Contemporary architectural theory and discussions on architectural heritage protection more and more often emphasise diversity, variability and interactivity as well as a shift away from the universalism of values and assessments.

Establishing the theory of architecture as well as protection of architectural heritage on heterogeneous assumptions, which take into account a diversity of phenomena and (tangible and intangible) values, brings new aspects to the discussion, making it definitely more complex and complicated. Since it is always necessary to consider not only the historical, but also social and cultural context, creating a common universal principle and mode of action is difficult, if not impossible. At the same time, shifting away from ready-made solutions proposed by a narrow circle of specialists and replacing a doctrinal approach with experimental thinking, in which recommendations are formulated and questions are posed in a dialectical and open manner, allows for more comprehensive understanding of the complexity of processes and interactions. It also plays an extremely important social role, since embracing the idea of the diversity of human activities and values associated with them paradoxically fosters the recovery of a sense of belonging and unity in modern communities.

The article analyses changes taking place in contemporary architectural theory and protection of architectural heritage, as well as their cultural and social context. It outlines the main challenges and fields of conflict, but also benefits of shifting from a belief in the universality of principles and existing rules to a multi-level and participatory transdisciplinary approach.

Keywords: heritage, adaptive reuse, sustainable development, architectural theory, heritage preservation, global cities, new heritage paradigm, city identity

Due to dynamic changes currently taking place worldwide, a discussion on the direction of modern city transformation processes is becoming particularly important. Challenges faced by architects go far beyond aesthetic, functional, or structural issues. The key challenges of cities in the second half of the 20th century included processes associated with globalisation and important questions raised by it, regarding, among others, the meaning and value of local identity in a rapidly changing globalised world, as well as possibilities and ways to preserve it.[1] At that time, deeper reflection related not only to the cultural, but also social significance of architecture and, more broadly, the urbanised environment, its impact on the lives of individuals, as well as entire societies.[2]

The question concerning urban identity returned twice as strong at the beginning of the 21st century in the face of the migration crisis in Europe.[3] The scale of the influx of people into metropolitan areas, not seen for many decades, in addition to practical questions and an urgent need to find solutions to such issues as housing, has presented modern cities with the significant and complex challenge of building a multicultural society based on multiplicity and diversity.[4] The need to preserve urban and social identity, which is so important for modern cities, was thus linked to the need to open up to other cultures. This issue clearly resounded, among others, in the *New Charter of Athens. Vision for Cities in the 21st century*.[5] Drawn up by the European Council of Town Planners, the document unequivocally stresses the need to preserve the richness and cultural diversity resulting from the centuries-old history of European cities, their cultural identity and heritage, while accepting and creating space for the preservation and cultivation of important cultural and social values of newcomers.[6]

---

[1] M. Castells, *The Power of Identity*, Blackwell Pub, Malden 2004; J. Sowińska-Heim, *Transformacje i redefinicje. Adaptacja dziedzictwa architektonicznego do nowej funkcji a zachowanie ciągłości historycznej miejsca*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź 2018.

[2] These aspects were already referred to in: *European Charter of the Architectural Heritage, Council of Europe*, October 1975; *The Declaration of Amsterdam*, Congress on the European Architectural Heritage, 21-25 October 1975. One of the very important documents from the beginning of the 21st century is: *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention)*, Faro, 27 October 2005. A more detailed analysis of the documents showing the process of changes can be found in: Julia Sowińska-Heim, *Transformacje i redefinicje...*

[3] In 2018, the European Union was inhabited by 22.3 million people from outside the EU, which means 4.4% of EU population. *Migration and asylum seekers: ESPON evidence* [report], ed. M. Cremaschi, F. Albanese, ESPON, Luxemburg 2020, p. 5.

[4] Russian aggression against Ukraine is increasing migration processes in Europe.

[5] *New Charter of Athens 2003: The European Council of Town Planners` Vision for Cities in the 21st century*, Lisbon, 20 November 2003.

[6] This document discusses aspects related to challenges resulting from the need to maintain urban cohesion and identity in connection with respect for multicultural richness, mainly in relation to the process of unification and migration of residents within Europe itself.

An additional challenge to preserving city connection[7] and urban identity is the functioning of modern European cities in a broader global network of relationships, connections and dependencies. A modern "network city" creates its identity based on the relational nature of cooperation and transnational networking with other cities.[8]

From this perspective, a city's identity is processual,[9] since a desire to preserve cultural values formed over centuries is combined with openness to new events, interactions and adaptations. Therefore, preserving a city identity does not mean stagnation, but rather interactivity, and thus is far from unambiguous hermetic definitions or xenophobic approaches.

While preserving historical continuity and local identity, the development of multicultural cities is an important part of measures taken within the broader idea of sustainable development. What is crucial here is the statement about ensuring such development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the chances of future generations to meet their own needs.[10] In this approach, the most important thing concerning architectural heritage is to introduce such changes by, for example, modernising historical objects and adapting them to new functions, which will be satisfactory to modern society

---

[7] The connected city is comprised of a variety of connective mechanisms acting on different scales. These include a tactile and visual connection to the built environment, as well as connections between a diversity of urban functions, infrastructure networks, and information and communication technologies. As for the issues under discussion, connectivity through time, understood as historical continuity that allows the preservation of urban identity, is very important. *New Charter of Athens 2003*, Part A.1.

[8] An interdisciplinary perspective on urban transformation analysis in a globalised world and network society is proposed by Manuel Castellas: M. Castells, *Local and global: Cities in the network society*, "Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie" 2002, vol. 93(5), pp. 548-558. Global economy contributed to the emergence of network cities, but nowadays cooperation, and exchange of knowledge and experience concern many areas and spheres, e.g. social affairs, culture or the environment (e.g. Eurocities), or creativity and cultural industries as the main factor of sustainable development (UNESCO Creative Cities Network), as well as many other fields of cooperation.

[9] As noted by Elżbieta Smolarkiewicz and Jacek Kubera, "the processual concept of identity is harmonised with the processual vision of society" visible primarily in the concepts of Anthony Giddens and Norbert Elias. E. Smolarkiewicz, J. Kubera, *Wprowadzenie. Tożsamość i identyfikacje. Propozycje teoretyczne - doświadczenia badawcze*, in: *Człowiek i społeczeństwo. Tożsamość i identyfikacje. Propozycje teoretyczne – doświadczenia badawcze*, ed. E. Smolarkiewicz, J. Kubera, Wyd. Naukowe UAM, Poznań 2017, p. 8.

[10] *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*, United Nations 1987. The significance of the concept of sustainable development and the need to combine conservation and protection with everyday social and economic life, as well as the quality of life of the local community was clearly stated in: *The Budapest Declaration. Building European civil society through community development*, The World Heritage Committee, Budapest 2004.

and, at the same time, will not exclude future perception and reading of the artifacts as cultural heritage and testimony to the past. This attitude differs from the previous and still dominant approach to conservation, whose primary goal is to counteract and prevent the process of change. The new approach regarding the conservation of architectural monuments means shifting away from an attitude that seeks to "prevent change" towards "managing change", which implies a significant modification of the paradigm.[11]

The significance of the concept of sustainable development and the need to combine conservation and protection with everyday social and economic life, as well as the quality of life of the local community[12] have led to a revision of methods and tools for preservation, as well as of the importance and role that heritage plays in a modern city. Significantly, in ongoing discussions, as well as in published documents, the traditionally used and understood "monument"[13] is becoming less important than a broader concept of "heritage".[14]

Both the *Statute of the Council of Europe* of 1949 and the *Treaty Establishing the European Community* signed in 1957 emphasised the importance of cultural heritage and its protection for European integration.[15] They identified the significance of activities aimed at highlighting cultural heritage shared by the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and fostering the flourishing of individual cultures.[16] In this case, heritage means what is common and universal, transcends individual national borders, and at the same time plays an extremely important role in preserving unity in diversity.[17]

---

[11] See, e.g., G. Araoz, *Protecting Heritage Places under the New Heritage Paradigm and Defining its Tolerance for Change. A Leadership Challenge for ICOMOS*, in: *Conservation Turn – Return to Conservation. Tolerance for Change. Limits of Change: Proceedings of the International Conferences of the ICOMOS, International Scientific Committee for the Theory and Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration: Prague, May 5th-9th 2009, Florence, March 3th-6th 2011*, ed. W. Lipp et al., Edizioni Polistampa, Firenze 2012, pp. 47–52.

[12] See, e.g., *European Charter of the Architectural Heritage; Treaty of Amsterdam,* pt. d.; *The Budapest Declaration. Building European civil society through community development*, The World Heritage Committee, Budapest 2004, art. 3c.

[13] *Ustawa z dnia 23 lipca 2003 r. o ochronie zabytków i opiece nad zabytkami*, „Dziennik Ustaw", 2022, no. 840, art. 3.

[14] History of the term "heritage" is described by, e.g. M. Jarząbek, *Dziedzictwo – zarys historii słowa i pojęcia. Studium metod historii pojęć a badanie „przeszłości w teraźniejszości"*, „Historyka. Studia Metodologiczne", 2021, vol. 51, pp. 411-432.

[15] *Statut Rady Europy, przyjęty w Londynie dnia 5 maja 1949 r.* [*Statute of the Council of Europe*], „Dziennik Ustaw", 1994, no. 118 poz. 565; *Wersja skonsolidowana Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej i Traktatu ustanawiającego Wspólnotę Europejską* [*Treaty Establishing the European Community*], „The Official Journal of the European Union", 2006, no. C 321E.

[16] *Treaty Establishing the European Community*, art. 151 (1).

[17] The importance of common European heritage was highlighted a little earlier in the *European Cultural Convention* adopted on 19 December 1954 in Paris. In Poland, the convention was ratified as late as in 1989. *Europejska Konwencja Kulturalna sporządzona w Paryżu dnia 19 grudnia 1954 r.*"Dziennik Ustaw", 1990, no. 118 item 44.

This way of understanding "cultural heritage" can be applied to multiple macro, as well as micro communities to indicate cultural assets that are important to their common identity and thus beyond any social, political, or economic divisions.[18] Therefore, we can talk both about world heritage having a value recognisable and relevant on a global scale,[19] as well as the heritage of North American Indians, or, putting the issue in a slightly different context, the heritage of post-industrial cities.[20] At the same time, cultural heritage is an open concept, the scope of which is constantly expanding. An example of this can be the already mentioned post-industrial architectural heritage (a new type of heritage) or the architecture of late modernism (a new type of heritage), which have only recently been recognised as objects worth protecting.[21]

The *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1972 in Paris,[22] was of key importance and provided stimulation for the development of heritage research. A definition of cultural heritage formulated therein, while significantly contributing to the introduction of the concept into popular discourse, still used categories characteristic of the narrower concept, i.e. a monument. First of all, it defined cultural heritage worth protecting as artifacts of special value from the point of view of archaeology, history, art or science,[23] pointing to such basic categories as monuments, groups of buildings and sites – that is, material heritage.

Later on, the definition and understanding of heritage was subject to modifications, including, above all, expansions. Recognition of the value and necessity of protecting not only tangible, but also intangible cultural heritage, the main carrier of which are oral transmissions and traditions, was of great

---

[18] Cultural heritage is even considered as a means of finding ways of communication in regions affected by ethnic conflicts: *Dziedzictwo kulturowe, Polski Komitet ds. UNESCO*, https://www.unesco.pl/kultura/dziedzictwo-kulturowe/ (accessed: 29.06.2022).

[19] The best example is the UNESCO World Heritage List.

[20] The 1997 *Constitution of the Republic of Poland* did not include the concept of "cultural heritage". It was replaced by the essentially identical term "cultural heritage". *Constitution of the Republic of Poland*, 1997, no. 78, item 483.

[21] The main ideas, principles and concepts for industrial heritage protection are contained in a document developed only in 2003. *Nizhny Tagil Charter for the Industrial Heritage*, International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), Nizhny Tagil, 17 July 2003.

[22] *Konwencja UNESCO w sprawie ochrony światowego dziedzictwa kulturalnego i naturalnego, przyjęta w Paryżu dnia 16 listopada 1972 r.*, "Dziennik Ustaw", 1976, no. 32, item 190. In Poland, the convention was ratified in 1976.

[23] In the case of historic sites, the categories were formulated from a historical, aesthetic, ethnological and anthropological point of view. *UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Article 1.

importance for the process of change.[24] Recognising the cultural, social and spiritual values of heritage[25] important to a community as worth protecting has contributed to shifting away from the axiomatic definition of artefact properties qualifying them for protection. Modern understanding of heritage as a collection of resources from the past, recognised by a given group as a reflection and expression of its essential values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions, not static and definite in nature, but constantly evolving,[26] does not allow for the preservation of the previously dominant universalising view. While immanent features associated with the material side of a monument are subject to clear and objective rules of evaluation that can be put into a coherent scheme, inclusion of society in the continuous process of defining cultural heritage eludes all schemes and conventional activities.[27] Thus, it has become necessary to always take into account not only the social, cultural, historical or political context, but also interactions, including the changing ways in which cultural heritage is perceived and interpreted by its recipients and users. Therefore, as highlighted in the 2000 *Krakow Charter*, nowadays it is not possible to create an unambiguous definition of heritage, yet it is possible to define criteria to identify heritage.[28]

As a result of shifting away from the proposed ready-made solutions and taking into account the multidimensional nature of heritage values, a narrow group of specialists making decisions about what is worth protecting and how it should be protected could not maintain its previous hermetic character. Therefore, although in the 1970s heritology, shaped as a new scientific discipline for heritage research, mainly dealt with conservation, over time the research has taken on a strongly interdisciplinary character.[29] The multifaceted nature of both theoretical research and practical design solutions is well illustrated

---

[24] *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* from 2003 underlined that: „'intangible cultural heritage' means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage." *The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris 2003, art. 2.

[25] *European Charter of the Architectural Heritage*, pt. 1-4.

[26] *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention)*, Faro, 27 October 2005, Article 2. cf.: Julia Sowińska-Heim, *Narratives about architecture*, "Art Inquiry. Recherches sur les Arts", 2020, vol. 22, pp. 193-207.

[27] *Faro Convention*, Preamble.

[28] *Karta Krakowska 2000 – Pryncypia konserwacji i restauracji dziedzictwa architektoniczno-urbanistycznego, Kraków*, 26 October 2000.

[29] In the 1990s, it gained the status of a separate academic field. Cf. L. Zan, *International Perspective on Management and Cultural Heritage*, in: *Managing Cultural Heritage. An International Research Perspective*, ed. S. Bonini Baraldi et al., Ashgate, Farnham 2015, p. 1. An important publication on issues related to changes in the perception of heritage occurring at the turn of the 20th century is: John Tunbridge, *Zmiana warty. Dziedzictwo na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*, Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, Kraków 2018.

by projects aimed at activating historical buildings that have lost their original function. After all, an attempt to reintegrate buildings from the past into modern city life is intrinsically heterogeneous in nature and requires undertaking transdisciplinary activities.[30]

Proper planning, design, coordination and implementation of a change process requires participation of various social and professional groups, including architects, conservators, art historians as well as local communities, city authorities, economists, developers, etc. Cooperation and co-creation can contribute to strengthening community ties and establishing a sense of belonging, playing a positive role in the process of inclusion and social integration. At the same time, finding *consensus* in the face of different aspirations and goals of various social and professional groups with differing priorities (such as preserving authenticity of the material substance of the heritage, creating valuable public space, economic activation, or promoting the area) is a significant challenge. «Democratization» characteristic of modern times and the significant expansion of the group of stakeholders, have brought new aspects to the theory and practice of heritage and ways of its protection, making it definitely more complex and complicated. However, despite significant challenges and potential semi-conflicts, this change should be seen as positive, as it demonstrates vital importance of heritage for contemporary society[31] and processes in modern cities.[32]

Projects, designs and concepts in which adaptive reuse of architectural heritage is combined with creation of publicly accessible common spaces is particularly interesting in this context and demonstrates the complex nature of the issue with its interconnections and interactions. The important aspects here are both community-forming values associated with functional as well as social, cultural and economic reactivation of architectural heritage important to the local community, and the social function of architecture and architectural design, and their impact on the behaviour of residents. Participation, understood as true engagement and involvement of the local community in the adaptation process, not merely reduced to meeting the requirement of public consultation, plays an important role in building ties with the place as well as strengthening communities through building a sense of being at home, interacting, or co-cre-

---

[30] About the difference between interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research, see, e.g. J. Tabaszewska, *"Wędrujące pojęcia": koncepcja Mieke Bal – przykład inter- czy transdyscyplinarności?*, „Studia Europaea Gnesnensia", 2013, no. 8, pp. 113-130.

[31] M. de la Torre, Randall Mason, *Introduction*, in: *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage. Research Report*, ed. M. de la Torre, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles 2002, p. 3.

[32] This concept is completely different from the one proposed by Le Corbusier and the modernists, who viewed monuments and historic city centres more as an obstacle to building a better society and world than a positive value. Le Corbusier, *La Charte d'Athènes*, Éditions de Minuit, Paris 1957.

ating. Also important, though still not a common practice, is the integration of bottom-up initiatives into formal adaptive reuse projects.[33]

An interesting example of functional transformations are inner-city post-factory complexes, but also, for example, courtyards of tenement houses, originally constituting closed enclaves accessible only to selected social groups. Particular potential is associated with the introduction of functions concerning widely understood creative and cultural work, which is related both to the public nature of such places (as opposed to, for example, office or residential functions), but also the potential of these functions to bring in the area of integration and social activation.[34]

Adaptive reuse and reintroduction of a building or architectural complex into urban life is an important element of sustainable development, both due to ecological reasons through decreasing the environmental impact of the construction sector and reducing waste, and to socio-cultural aspects resulting from the preservation of heritage important to the local community, creation of new and friendly places, and deepening of residents' ties to the place. Stopping the process of degradation and restoring the aesthetic, economic and socio-cultural value also allows municipal authorities to create a new attractive image of the city.[35]

Thus, developing methods and solutions allowing for more effective exploitation of important contemporary potential for community building, social inclusion and creating a sense of belonging and urban identity in architectural heritage adaptation projects, combined with the creation of new common spaces (both public and private ones, serving the community as a place to meet, relax and exchange ideas), requires transdisciplinary cooperation. After all, only the application of methodologies from different disciplines can produce research results that provide a more complete picture of the issue and better understanding of the complexity of the processes and interactions taking place. The integration of conclusions resulting from the research makes it possible to create a model for practical action. However, even here the model must be open as well as adapted to changing conditions and contexts.

---

[33] B. Plevouts, J. Sowińska-Heim, *Community initiatives as a catalyst for regeneration of heritage sites: Vernacular transformation and its influence on the formal adaptive reuse practice*, "Cities", 2018, vol. 78, pp. 128–139.

[34] Cf.: J. Sowińska-Heim, *Łódź as the Creative City: Cultural Industries and the Process of Urban Revival*, in: *Heritage and the City*, ed. R. Kusek, J. Purchla, International Cultural Centre, Kraków 2017, pp. 217-238.

[35] This aspect plays a particularly important role in post-industrial cities. Cf. J. Sowińska-Heim, *Transformacje i redefinicje...*; J. Sowińska-Heim, *Adaptive Reuse of Architectural Heritage and Its Role in the Post-Disaster Reconstruction of Urban Identity: Post-Communist Łódź*, „Sustainability", 2020, no. 12(19), 8054, https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198054. Accessed: 29.06.2022

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Araoz Gustavo (2012) *Protecting Heritage Places under the New Heritage Paradigm and Defining its Tolerance for Change. A Leadership Challenge for ICOMOS*, [in:] W. Lipp et al. eds., *Conservation Turn – Return to Conservation. Tolerance for Change. Limits of Change: Proceedings of the International Conferences of the ICOMOS, International Scientific Committee for the Theory and Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration: Prague, May 5th-9th 2009, Florence, March 3th-6th 2011*, Firenze: Edizioni Polistampa, pp. 47-52.

Budapest Declaration. *Building European civil society through community development*, The World Heritage Committee, Budapest 2004.

Castells Manuel (2002) *Local and global: Cities in the network society*, "Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie" 2002, vol. 93(5), pp. 548-558.

Castells Manuel (2004) *The Power of Identity*, Malden: Blackwell Pub.

Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention), Faro, 27 October 2005.

de la Torre Marta, Mason Randall (2002) *Introduction*, [in:] M. de la Torre ed., *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage. Research Report*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, pp. 3-4.

Dziedzictwo kulturowe, Polski Komitet ds. UNESCO, https://www.unesco.pl/kultura/dziedzictwo-kulturowe/ (accessed: 29.06.2022).

European Charter of the Architectural Heritage (1975), Council of Europe, October 1975.

Europejska Konwencja Kulturalna sporządzona w Paryżu dnia 19 grudnia 1954 r. [*European Cultural Convention*] "Dziennik Ustaw", 1990, no. 118 item 44.

Jarząbek Marcin, *Dziedzictwo – zarys historii słowa i pojęcia. Studium metod historii pojęć a badanie "przeszłości w teraźniejszości"*, "Historyka. Studia Metodologiczne", 2021, vol. 51, pp. 411-432.

Karta Krakowska 2000 – *Pryncypia konserwacji i restauracji dziedzictwa architektoniczno-urbanistycznego*, Kraków, 26 October 2000.

Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 2 kwietnia 1997 r. [*Constitution of the Republic of Poland*], "Dziennik Ustaw", 1997, no. 78, item 483.

Konwencja UNESCO w sprawie ochrony światowego dziedzictwa kulturalnego i naturalnego, przyjęta w Paryżu dnia 16 listopada 1972 r. [*Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1972 in Paris*], "Dziennik Ustaw", 1976, no. 32, item 190.

Le Corbusier (1957) *La Charte d'Athènes*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Migration and asylum seekers: ESPON evidence [report], ed. M. Cremaschi, F. Albanese, ESPON, Luxemburg 2020.

New Charter of Athens 2003: The European Council of Town Planners` Vision for Cities in the 21st century, Lisbon, 20 November 2003.

Nizhny Tagil Charter for the Industrial Heritage, International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), Nizhny Tagil, 17 July 2003.

Plevouts Bie, Sowińska-Heim Julia (2018) *Community initiatives as a catalyst for regeneration of heritage sites: Vernacular transformation and its influence on the formal adaptive reuse practice*, "Cities", vol. 78, pp. 128-139.

Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future, United Nations 1987.

Smolarkiewicz Elżbieta, Kubera Jacek (2017) *Wprowadzenie. Tożsamość i identyfikacje. Propozycje teoretyczne – doświadczenia badawcze*, in: E. Smolarkiewicz, J. Kubera eds., *Człowiek i społeczeństwo. Tożsamość i identyfikacje. Propozycje teoretyczne – doświadczenia badawcze,* Poznań: Wyd. Naukowe UAM, pp. 7-13.

Sowińska-Heim Julia (2017) *Łódź as the Creative City: Cultural Industries and the Process of Urban Revival,* in: R. Kusek, J. Purchla eds., *Heritage and the City*, Kraków: International Cultural Centre, pp. 217-238.

Sowińska-Heim Julia (2018) *Transformacje i redefinicje. Adaptacja dziedzictwa architektonicznego do nowej funkcji a zachowanie ciągłości historycznej miejsca*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Sowińska-Heim Julia (2020) *Transformacje i redefinicje...*; Julia Sowińska-Heim, *Adaptive Reuse of Architectural Heritage and Its Role in the Post-Disaster Reconstruction of Urban Identity: Post-Communist Łódź*, "Sustainability", no. 12(19), 8054, https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198054. accessed: 29.06.2022

Sowińska-Heim Julia, *Narratives about architecture*, "Art Inquiry. Recherches sur les Arts", 2020, vol. 22, pp. 193-207.

Statut Rady Europy, przyjęty w Londynie dnia 5 maja 1949 r. [*Statute of the Council of Europe*], "Dziennik Ustaw", 1994, no. 118 item 565.

Tabaszewska Justyna (2013) *"Wędrujące pojęcia": koncepcja Mieke Bal – przykład inter- czy transdyscyplinarności?*, "Studia Europaea Gnesnensia", no. 8, pp. 113-130.

The Budapest Declaration. Building European civil society through community development, The World Heritage Committee, Budapest 2004.

The Declaration of Amsterdam, Congress on the European Architectural Heritage, pp. 21-25 October 1975.

The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Paris 2003.

Tunbridge John (2018) *Zmiana warty. Dziedzictwo na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*, Kraków: Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury.

Ustawa z dnia 23 lipca 2003 r. o ochronie zabytków i opiece nad zabytkami, "Dziennik Ustaw", 2022, no. 840.

Wersja skonsolidowana Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej i Traktatu ustanawiającego Wspólnotę Europejską [*Treaty Establishing the European Community*], " The Official Journal of the European Union", 2006, no. C 321E.

Zan Luca (2015) *International Perspective on Management and Cultural Heritage*, in: S. Bonini Baraldi et al. eds., *Managing Cultural Heritage. An International Research Perspective*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 1-10.

HERITOLOGIA I WSPÓŁCZESNA TEORIA ARCHITEKTONICZNA. UNIWERSALIZM ZASAD CZY HETEROGENICZNOŚĆ I ROZPROSZENIE? (streszczenie)

We współczesnej teorii architektonicznej, a także dyskusjach dotyczących ochrony dziedzictwa architektonicznego, coraz silniej akcentowana jest różnorodność, zmienność i interakcyjność, a także odchodzenie od uniwersalizmu wartości i ocen.

Budowanie teorii architektury, a także ochrony dziedzictwa architektonicznego na heterogenicznych założeniach, uwzględniających różnorodność zjawisk oraz wartości (materialnych i niematerialnych), wnosi do dyskusji nowe aspekty czyniąc ją zdecydowanie bardziej złożoną i skomplikowaną. Konieczność każdorazowego uwzględniania kontekstu nie tylko historycznego, ale również społecznego i kulturowego, utrudnia, czy wręcz czyni niemożliwym tworzenie wspólnej uniwersalnej zasady i schematu postępowania. Jednocześnie odejście od gotowych rozwiązań proponowanych przez wąskie grono specjalistów i zastąpienie podejścia doktrynalnego myśleniem eksperymentalnym, w którym w sposób dialektyczny i otwarty nie tylko formułowane są zalecenia, ale również stawiane pytania, pozwala na pełniejsze zrozumienie złożoności zachodzących procesów i interakcji. Odgrywa ono również niezwykle ważną rolę społeczną, ponieważ przyjęcie idei różnorodności ludzkich działań i związanych z nimi wartości, paradoksalnie sprzyja odzyskaniu poczucia przynależności i jedności współczesnych społeczności.

W artykule analizie podane zostaną zmiany zachodzące we współczesnej teorii architektonicznej oraz ochronie dziedzictwa architektonicznego, a także ich kontekst kulturowy i społeczny. Nakreślone zostaną najważniejsze wyzwania, pola konfliktów, ale i korzyści wynikające z przechodzenia od przekonania o uniwersalizmie zasad i obowiązujących reguł w stronę wielopoziomowego i partycypacyjnego podejścia transdyscyplinarnego.

Słowa kluczowe: dziedzictwo, rewitalizacja, teoria architektoniczna, adaptacja, ochrona dziedzictwa, miasta globalne, tożsamość miasta, miasta w sieci

Julia Sowińska-Heim, PhD holding a post-doctoral degree, works as an art historian at the Department of Art History at the University of Lodz. The area of her research especially concerns the theory of adaptive reuse in the context of architectural heritage integrity and authenticity, as well as city identity. Expert of the international committee of the Belgian Research Foundation FWO (2016-2021) and vice president of the standing commission in Łódź Centre of the Revitalization Committee (2017-2021). In 2022, she joined the College of Expert Reviewers of the European Science Foundation.

Author and co-author of more than 50 publications – among others, the book Transformacje i re-definicje. Adaptacja dziedzictwa architektonicznego do nowej funkcji a zachowanie ciągłości historycznej miejsca (2018) and articles in journals included in the Journal Citation Report (JRC) database: Adaptive reuse of architectural heritage and its role in the post-disaster reconstruction of urban identity: post-communist Łódź, "Sustainability" 2020, 12(19) and Community initiatives as a catalyst for regeneration of heritage sites: vernacular transformation and its influence on the formal adaptive reuse practice, "Cities", 2018, vol. 78.