

Uses and Abuses of Reconstruction

Rodica Crişan

Professor Architect, Ion Mincu University of Architecture and Urbanism, Bucharest, Romania

Foreword

The following paper has as starting point an issue that has been worrying us for some time when confronting recent realities, more precisely the cases of built heritage denaturation by abusive reconstructions which are more and more frequent in our country and not only there. It seems to be a current trend and we considered that it was opportune to discuss it in relation to the meaning given to the concept of authenticity, especially considering its new and vague definition in the Nara Document. This question was introduced by the author's abstract for the 2017 ICOMOS University Forum meeting in Paris. Subsequently it was developed based on the workshop debates, in particular those in the group the author was part of, group 1: 'From Nara to Nara+20: where is authenticity now?' – as well as by further personal reflections.

From Nara to Nara+20

In 1994, the Nara Document marked a paradigm shift by promoting the relativity of the concept of authenticity, as the concept of cultural heritage itself assumes diverse forms proper to various cultural traditions. On the other hand, the recent heritage losses due to natural or man-made disasters, bring to the fore more than ever the question of post-trauma reconstructions and their relationship with the ways in which authenticity is understood. Twenty years later, the Nara+20 Document brought to the fore a very comprehensive and deliberately vague definition of authenticity which should be necessarily interpreted in a nuanced manner according to the cultural context in which it is applied (see note 1). Any inconsiderate generalisation can lead to misunderstandings and dangerous consequences for the heritage itself, especially in connection with the spread of the slogan 'tolerance for change' (Petzet, 2009: 9). In fact, generalisations are by definition inadequate in the field of heritage which is

Crişan, Rodica (2018). Uses And Abuses Of Reconstruction. In: *A contemporary provocation: reconstructions as tools of future-making. Selected papers from the ICOMOS University Forum Workshop on Authenticity and Reconstructions, Paris, 13 – 15 March 2017*, eds C. Holtorf, L. Kealy, T. Kono. Paris: ICOMOS.

essentially characterised by diversity and appreciated just for that. The same diversity should be also reflected by diverse interpretations of the concept of authenticity from case to case, from culture to culture. The Nara Document emphasises that the references for evaluating authenticity, i.e. truthfulness and credibility of the sources of information, could vary from case to case. It would therefore not be possible to have fixed criteria for truth:

‘All judgements about values attributed to cultural properties as well as the credibility of related information sources may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. It is thus not possible to base judgements of values and authenticity within fixed criteria. On the contrary, the respect due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong.’ (Nara Document, 1994, Art.11)

However, a list of possible references was given by the Nara Document, including material and immaterial aspects of heritage, as well as its relationship with the context:

‘Depending on the nature of the cultural heritage, its cultural context, and its evolution through time, authenticity judgements may be linked to the worth of a great variety of sources of information. Aspects of the sources may include form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors. The use of these sources permits elaboration of the specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of the cultural heritage being examined.’ (Nara Document, 1994, Art.13)

It has been stated that the Nara Document consecrates a shift from material originality to credibility of information (Kono 2014: 446) as the *sine qua non* condition for authenticity. But different cultures have different perspectives on the credibility of information provided by the heritage, thus the aspects considered in authenticity judgments have different weights. One could notice that between Oriental and Occidental cultures there are significant differences from this point of view. In contrast to the Japanese culture where true to original reconstructions are traditional, the Western understanding of authenticity seems to be more consistent with the concept of material originality.

From these differences, different ways of understandings the role of *materials and substance as credible sources of information* may, and indeed should result, and, furthermore, different ways of judging the relationship between authenticity and reconstruction. According to dictionaries, the adjective «authentic» can assume different meanings which are relevant in the case of heritage too (see note 2). In the first meaning, something is authentic when it is accurate in representation of the facts, trustworthy, reliable, i.e. transmits a reliable information which, in certain cultures, does not rely on

original material substance. This is so, for example, in the case of the shrine buildings periodically reconstructed as part of traditional rituals. But the same dictionaries point out a second meaning of the adjective «authentic»: that of being not counterfeit or copied, which touches more on the materiality of the artefacts, and contradicts the idea that true to original reconstructions could guarantee the credibility of information in any circumstances. Yet the consequences of misunderstandings and/or inappropriate generalisations of the shift from material originality to credibility of information can be observed in real life. In the last two decades many questionable reconstruction projects have been carried out or are planned in Europe, without being supported by any coherent conservation philosophy and completely ignoring the role of *materials and substance* as *credible sources of information* in assessing the heritage.

Authenticity and reconstructions

The scepticism regarding any form of reconstruction expressed by Western scientists, as well as by the main conservation Charters of the 20th century, is based on the knowledge that history is not reversible and that built heritage is irreplaceable: once lost, it is lost forever, and cannot be replaced by copies. In his extended version of the Principles of Preservation published in 2009, Michael Petzet says: ‘We must always remain conscious of the uniqueness of the original because, no matter how faithful in form, material and scale, a replica is always a new object and merely a likeness of the original with its irreplaceable historical and artistic dimension.’ (Petzet, 2009: 26-27)

But the repeated destructive events of recent times which lead to dramatic and extensive losses of heritage, have renewed the interest in reconstructions, accompanied by further reflections and additional considerations especially with regard to the heritage components invested with Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). As stated in the recent ICOMOS Guidance on Post Trauma Recovery and Reconstruction (2017), ‘reconstruction can take many forms, which are not mutually exclusive and can exist in parallel. As a concept, reconstruction is complex rather than singular and can extend beyond the reconstruction of fabric. From this perspective, reconstruction can be about reinvigorating communities and fostering processes and associations, as well as restoring form, function or physical fabric, depending on the nature of the attributes and their role in conveying OUV. Reconstruction is a process that responds to particular situations and, in the case of World Heritage properties, to the specific attributes that convey OUV.’ Therefore, reconstruction may target material and immaterial values as well, but always respecting the ethics of the intervention.

The reconstruction of destroyed outstanding monuments or historic city centres, based on

accurate documentation, has been and still is understandable in immediate post-trauma contexts. In such cases, the main purpose is in fact the reconstruction of the *immaterial* values associated to the lost buildings and the interpretation of the concept of «authenticity» is mainly related to the continuity and transmission of accurate, trustworthy, reliable information, as opposed to misleading, fraudulent, hypothetical, unfaithful, spurious, fictitious. Usually the reconstruction of a damaged place involves building again something that has been destroyed or lost. But rebuilding would not necessarily mean recreating something exactly as it was before: it can result in a new building in the style relevant to the period of reconstruction even though compatible to the inherited context. Reconstruction also means re-establishing or regenerating the social-economic condition of a destroyed place. ‘This will include the mental process of recalling something in ones mind and/or re-establishing an identity. It is indeed a key question when reconstructing something that has been recognized as heritage. Here, as a matter of fact, the situation can be complex.’ (Jokilehto, 2013: 513).

Moreover, in deciding upon post-trauma reconstructions with the intention of recalling memories and preserving local identity, it is to be remembered that a ruin resulting from a disaster enhances the symbolic and commemorative value of the place. Maybe in such cases an alternative solution could be more appropriate than the identic reconstruction of the lost buildings: the preservation of the strongly significant ruins combined with *immaterial/virtual* in situ reconstructions, taking advantage of the digital technologies available in the 21st century, such as holography and augmented reality (see note 3). Such an approach could simultaneously keep alive the memory of the physically destroyed heritage, while preserving the authentic material substance and the strong symbolic value of the ruins.

It is commonly accepted that heritage values mainly derive from their perceptions and uses in society which are not necessarily inherent in its tangible fabric. Furthermore, if we accept to consider the authenticity of a reconstructed monument as being given by the continuity of its social significance, we should add that this immaterial authenticity is also conditioned by *truth* and *honesty* in assuming the *new* materiality of the reconstruction: authentic means not to be fraudulent.

On the other hand, the absolutisation of the idea that *heritage values are not inherent in the tangible fabric* and the underestimation of the material authenticity, can have dangerous consequences in practice. It can easily lead to an abuse of reconstructions and subsequent distortion of the heritage perception in society, especially when reconstructions are hypothetical, unfaithful and not honestly declared to be copies. What socially constructed value can a spurious historic building have that is presented to the community as an original? In fact, everyday life shows that reconstructions are not

always justified by post-trauma recovery of lost values; sometimes abusive reconstructions are conducted for completely other reasons.

In his recent book ‘Architecture RePerformed: The Politics of Reconstruction’, Tino Mager draws to attention that *architectural reconstruction has increasingly become an established way of building aiming to visually revive a bygone past*. ‘In many cases even twentieth century modern buildings are replaced by identical reconstructions of their historic predecessors. Does this imply a failure of contemporary architecture? The politics of reconstruction go far beyond aesthetic considerations. Taking architecture as a major source of history and regional identity, the impact of large-scale reconstruction is deeply intertwined with political and social factors.’ (Mager, 2016: 1).

Authentic vs. counterfeit

‘Be careful when you are buying jewellery or watches. If you are going to buy a diamond ring, you want an authentic diamond and not glass. That would be authentic glass but a fake diamond!’ (see note 4).

The difference between original and copy is easily understood by anyone in the case of jewelry, paintings or other art objects. In such cases, there is a huge difference in market value between copies and originals, even if visually identical. If a copy of a famous painting is sold as original, this is fraud, even if the copy is true to original. But it is not equally easy for everybody to understand the difference between original and copy in the case of buildings, where originals and copies are often mistaken by the observer and sometimes deliberately made equal by professionals. It is also true that, even though the intrinsic value of the copy and of the original is not the same, an accurate copy can produce similar emotions ... which can be (and often are) commercially exploited! It is not post-trauma recovery, but generation of economic flows that is often the main reason for identical reconstructions. And such cases are not few. The motivation for the current inflation of extravagant reconstructions is sometimes clearly expressed within their intensive promotion. For example, the case of the reconstruction of Chateau de Saint-Cloud near Paris (1570-1701, severely damaged in 1870 during the Franco-Prussian war, and demolished in 1891) is a case in point: ‘If the realism of our German neighbors led them to set in 2013 the foundation stone of the Berlin palace, it is because they have understood longtime ago that historical monuments are much more than simple "cultural gadgets" intended to embellish the landscape. Generating tourist flows - and hence economic flows - heritage is, above all, a creator of direct, and even more indirect, jobs, thus greatly contributing to the enrichment of a country. [...] Therefore - particularly in the perspective of the Greater Paris master plan - the reconstruction of the

castle of Saint-Cloud is all the more an evidence that, as it is located on the most touristic axis of the planet, the axis Paris-Versailles, and only five kilometers from the capital of France, this castle if it still existed, given its history and magnificence, would be one of the most visited in the world.’(see note 5).

A counterfeit historic building is often deliberately made equal to the original by professionals, at least in terms of emotional impact, with no concern for misleading ignorant people, nor for the distortions induced in the social recognition of the heritage. And we should note here that, as Mager put it:

‘memories and associations correlated with lost buildings of a bygone era are heavily influenced by their re-appearance, something which often contradicts historical events. Moreover, architectural reconstruction disintegrates the historical relations of the original building. Thus, connotations related to historical buildings can be replaced or manipulated with huge influence on the society’s collective memory.’ (Mager, 2016: 2)

Abusive reconstructions and kitsch proliferation

Abuses of identical reconstructions are (too) often present in the practice of the last decades. They result in mystifying history and deluding people, demonstrating a corrupt way of dealing both with material and immaterial values of the heritage. Mimetic reconstruction has become a common practice of (re)creating fake historical buildings and ensembles, manipulating the observers and the collective memory. Such recent reconstructions are obviously driven by political and economic reasons which often become more important than any consideration of conservation theory and heritage values. This applies for example, to the widely promoted identical reconstructions (i.e. copies) of the aforementioned Castle Saint-Cloud near Paris, of the Tuileries Palace in Paris, of the Prussian royal palace in Berlin (Fig.1-2) or... the Austrian Hallstatt town replicated in China.



Figures No. 1-2. The reconstruction of the Prussian Royal Palace (15th-18th century, demolished in the 1950s) currently undergoing on the original site, after the 2007 demolition of the Palace of the Republic built there in the 1970s: North façade under reconstruction (1) and the 3D model of the final image (2).



Figure No. 2

But the worse cases of abusive reconstructions are those that do not just reproduce a lost monument, but justify and facilitate the demolition of existing historic buildings, to be subsequently replaced by new mimetic constructions in the old style, including some adaptations to new functional and/or aesthetic demands hidden in the overall historic appearance. An example of the kind is presented in the adjoining images (Fig.3, 4). There is no doubt that behind such an attitude stands the total neglect

of the original material, techniques and craftsmanship as credible sources of historic information, as well as the complete disdain of their importance for the value of the historic building. Thereby, a new restoration method – through demolition and reconstruction – seems to emerge!



Figures No. 3-4. Historic building in Bucharest (1920s) demolished and reconstructed (2016): the new building, quasi-identical to the original (3), reconstructed on the empty space left after the demolition of the original building (4).

At a smaller scale, identical reconstruction of parts of lost historic constructions are sometimes integrated in new modern buildings, as theatrical props meant to visually revive a bygone past (Fig.5, 6). Such cases make us rhetorically ask ourselves, like Mager: does this imply a failure of contemporary architecture? (Mager, 2016: 1) Besides, such identical reconstructions deceive the innocent observer and contribute to the adulteration of the contemporary society's perception of the historic heritage.



Figures No. 5-6. The building of Novotel Hotel in Bucharest inaugurated in 2007 (5) including the copy of the entrance porch of the National Theatre once located on the same site (1846-1852), bombed in August 1944 and demolished in 1947 (6).

A counterfeit historic heritage also results when significant historic ruins – already assumed by the society as ruins and appreciated for their aesthetic and symbolic values – are embedded (hidden) in newly constructed buildings, reproducing (more or less accurately) a previous stage of the currently ruined heritage. Such reconstructions are usually justified by the intended reuse (such as the religious one) which requires the integrity of the building, but the resulting new buildings with its historic appearance is a fake which cancels any evidence of the embedded original substance of the ruin. Some other times, fanciful (and rather hypothetical) partial reconstructions/additions in a historic style transform valuable and significant ruins into commercial forgeries in the name of tourism promotion and/of for other reasons far from any philosophy of conservation. Thereby, the authenticity is corrupted, the relation of the cultural resource with the historic timeline is falsified, and the concept of heritage is distorted. The issue of this kind of abusive partial reconstructions is elaborated and illustrated in the following paragraphs.

It is generally accepted that the architectural heritage undergoes a continuous process of evolution, and its integrated conservation often make necessary certain transformations to accommodate contemporary uses. Sometimes the new uses require partial reconstructions/ additions which can be considered as expressions of the management of change within conservation, marking a new stage in the life of the heritage. But the readability of the newly constructed parts and their evident belonging to contemporary times, is an essential condition.

The international practice shows cases where the reuse of ruins is based on limited local reconstructions/ additions for accessibility reasons, conducted with modern materials and techniques, readable and reversible. Examples include the restoration of Torre Vilharigues in Portugal (2013) by Renato Rebelo, the restoration of Kalø Tower in Denmark (2016) by MAP Architects, and the restoration of Firmiano Castle in Italy (2006) by Werner Tscholl (Fig.7-11).



Figures No. 7-11. Castel Firmiano (Sigmundskron Fortified Castle) in Bolzano, Italy (1st-18th century). Since 2006 the ruins of the Castel house the Mountain Museum Firmian. To improve the accessibility, the restoration works included some discreet and reversible additions in modern materials.



Figures No. 8-9





Figure No. 10



Figure No. 11

But there are also many cases of ruins restored through massive (and fantasist?) reconstructions for the sake of tourism and profit. Very often kitsch proliferates within this kind of consumerism-lead reconstruction which in fact present heritage sites as entertainment places and thematic parks with historic ambiance for tourists' delight. In all of this, the expenditure of large amounts of money, is justified by expected returns through the touristic use. The recent hard restorations of several medieval fortified castles in Romania are in this category. An example can be observed in the adjoining images (Fig.12-16) and can be compared with the soft restoration of the Firmiano Fortified Castle in Bolzano, Italy (Fig.7-11).



Figures No. 12-16. Rupea Citadel, Romania (14th-18th century), before and after the hard restoration works completed in 2013, including extensive reconstructions: overall view before (12) and after the restoration (13); local views before (14) and after the restoration (15, 16).



Figure No. 13



Figure No. 14



Figures No. 15-16

The abuse of reconstructions is worrisome especially since it seems to be more and more accepted within current conservation practice. It seems to happily meet the mainstream of cultural capitalism and one of its major economic sectors, tourism. ‘This phenomenon is all the deeper since the tourism industry now represents the first worldwide economic sector of late capitalism, still described as cultural, ranking before oil and the automobile. This economic constraint is now responsible for unprecedented pressure on the actors within conservation, and sometimes members of commissioners of monuments and sites must make decisions with a gun at their heads in matters whose declared aim is primarily to revitalise a region. It can therefore be easily understood that such a political and economic context would go hand in hand with *weak conservation thought* and strong relativism.’ (Houbart and Dawans, 2011/1: 2).

Usually the debates on the effects of tourism on heritage consider the material damages directly caused by its massification. In their article ‘Le patrimoine a l’etat gazeux. Comment le tourisme détourne notre conception de l’authenticité’ (How tourism diverts our concept of authenticity), Stéphane Dawans and Claudine Houbart point out that there is also an indirect effect, less evident, but equally dangerous, touching on the very perception of what heritage is, and, even more, of what should be an authentic heritage. Anthropologists, sociologists and philosophers have noted that if authenticity meets the demands of cultural tourism, it will result in an adulterated version of authenticity, as tourism is an aesthetic experience (from the Greek *aesthesis*) too much oriented to hedonism, to the sole pleasure of the senses, with the complicity of the professionals that maintain and nourish it. We can thus notice the emergence of a phenomenon already denounced in the 1970s by the sociologist Daniel

Bell pointing to the fact that, under the pressure of the consumerist society and of the artistic milieu, the aesthetic and hedonistic values had spread throughout society, in order to impose themselves as a generalized ethic, favouring a complete amalgam between aesthetics and ethics, between hedonism and aesthetics (Houbart and Dawans, 2011/2: 593). A confusion that tourism, as a leading economically profitable sector, would exploit up to the point of cynicism, by selling counterfeit, misleading, fraudulent, hypothetical, unfaithful, spurious, fictitious heritage, especially created to meet the hedonism of ignorant tourists.

Conclusions

The vague definition of authenticity promoted by the Nara+20 Document should be necessarily interpreted in a nuanced manner according to the cultural context in which it is applied. Any inconsiderate generalisation of the shift from material originality to credibility of information can easily become a justification for abusive reconstructions and can lead to dangerous consequences for the heritage to be preserved.

There are significant differences between Oriental and Occidental cultures in approaching the authenticity issue. While true to original reconstructions are natural practices in the Japanese culture as part of the local traditions, they are not representative for the Western culture more attached to the material originality as the guarantee of authenticity. Nevertheless, identical reconstructions of lost heritage buildings are currently increasingly favoured by the Western world. Moreover, the latter often justifies reconstructions by arguments less consistent with the philosophy of conservation than the Japanese discourse on the ritual reconstruction of the shrine buildings, based on a still vivid thousand-year-old tradition of the periodical renewal of buildings, which by definition are not perennial in their materiality. As the 2000 Riga Charter states, the reconstruction of built heritage could be acceptable in exceptional circumstances. But beyond justified cases of post-trauma reconstructions, we currently participate in a proliferation of abusive reconstructions deeply intertwined with political, economic and social factors. Such fanciful reconstructions can hardly be justified from a sound conservation point of view and have nothing to do with authenticity: even when accurately documented and faithfully reproducing lost buildings of the past, they are simply copies. Moreover, they are fraudulent inasmuch as connotations related to historic events and historic buildings are manipulated with negative influence on the society's collective memory.

This kind of attitude promoting abusive reconstructions is especially worrisome since it seems

to be more and more assumed in current design practice. It seems to happily meet the mainstream of a major economic sector, tourism. In most cases of the kind, very pragmatic reasons are more important than any cultural consideration of authenticity, and often result in the cancellation of any distance between historic heritage and theme parks.

Therefore, if the interpretation of authenticity accepts compromise to meet the demands of tourism, it will result an adulterated version of authenticity. Moreover, as tourism is an aesthetic experience mainly oriented to hedonism, there is a hidden danger, maintained and nourished by professionals, touching on people's perception of what heritage is, and of what should be an authentic heritage. Between material fetishism and complete denial of material preservation, there is a midway point to be found from case to case, from culture to culture, in favour of a sensible and honest handling of the authenticity and reconstruction issues in a world that is changing as never before, but that always needs a certain degree of trustful historic references and continuity.

References

- Houbart, C. and Dawans, S. 2011. *Identical reconstruction and heritage authenticity*. Conference paper, S.A.V.E. Heritage, IX International Forum Le Vie dei Mercanti, Aversa, Capri, 9-11 June 2011. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259755749> [Accessed 20 July 2017]
- Houbart, C. and Dawans, S. 2011. *Le patrimoine a letat gazeux. Comment le tourisme détourne notre conception de lauthenticité*. In ICOMOS, 2011. *Le patrimoine, moteur de développement/ Heritage, driver of development*. Available at: <http://openarchive.icomos.org/1146/> [Accessed 20 July 2017]
- ICOMOS, 2017. *Guidance on Post Trauma Recovery and Reconstruction for World Heritage Cultural Properties* (working document).
- Kono, T. 2014. *Authenticity: Principles and Notions*. In *Change Over Time. An International Journal of Conservation and the Built Environment* (vol.4, n.2, fall 2014).
- Mager, T. 2016. *Architecture RePerformed: The Politics of Reconstruction*.
- Petzet, M. 2009. *International Principles of Preservation*.
- Jokilehto, J. 2013. *Reconstruction in the World Heritage Context*. In Crisan, Fiorani, Keally, Musso (eds), *Conservation/Reconstruction. Small historic centres: conservation in the midst of change*.

Notes

1. 'Authenticity: A culturally contingent quality associated with a heritage place, practice, or object that conveys cultural value; is recognized as a meaningful expression of an evolving cultural tradition; and/or evokes among individuals the social and emotional resonance of group identity.' (Nara+20, 2014)
2. The Free Dictionary by Farlex. Available at: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/authentic>
3. A number of researches have recently explored the opportunities provided by the augmented reality (AR) technologies for the cultural heritage sites. Their guiding idea is that systems for AR in outdoors can place the

3D reconstruction of the site (how it looked in the past) inside the real visual scene. “The goal of an outdoor augmented reality system is to allow the human operator to move freely without restraint in its environment, to view and interact in real time with geo-referenced data via mobile wireless devices. This requires proposing new techniques for 3D localization, visualization and 3D interaction, adapted to working conditions in outdoor environment (brightness variation, features of displays used, etc.)” (Zendjebil, I. M. et al., 2009. *Outdoor Augmented Reality: State of the Art and Issues*. Available at:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212571X16300774>. [Accessed: 25.10.2017])

An interesting paper presented at “The annual conference of Museums and the Web” (Chicago, 2015) investigates “the possibilities, pitfalls, and promises of recreating lost heritage sites and historical events using augmented reality and “Big Data” archival databases”. The authors demonstrate that architectural remains can be virtually reconstructed in situ through the use of visual augmented reality. For exemplification it is presented an augmented view of the main church of Croxden Abbey (UK), currently in ruin state. “In this case, the main church was recreated by an artist using related paintings and textual references describing the architectural features of the iconic church. When exploring the site in virtual reality, visitors can register their locations and views within the virtual space. For visitors who are physically present at the site, a geotagged photo can be used to retrieve the corresponding component of the virtual model. This was used to achieve the initial registration for the augmentation of the abbey.” (Rob Warren et al., 2015. *Data-driven enriched exhibits using augmented reality*. Paper at “The annual conference of Museums and the Web”, Chicago, 2015. Available at: <http://mw2015.museumsandtheweb.com/paper/data-driven-augmented-reality-for-museum-exhibits-and-lost-heritage-sites/> [Accessed: 25.10.2017])

4. Available at: <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/authentic>

5. Translated from French by the author. In original: « Si le réalisme de nos voisins allemands les a conduits à reposer en 2013 la première pierre du château de Berlin, c'est parce qu'ils ont depuis longtemps compris que les monuments historiques sont bien autre chose que de simples "gadgets culturels" destinés à embellir le paysage. Générant des flux touristiques - et donc des flux économiques - le patrimoine est par excellence créateur d'emplois directs, et plus encore indirects, concourant ainsi grandement à l'enrichissement d'un pays. C'est pourquoi - surtout dans la perspective du Grand Paris - la reconstruction du château de Saint-Cloud s'impose d'autant plus comme une évidence que, situé sur l'axe le plus touristique de la planète, l'axe Paris-Versailles, et à seulement cinq kilomètres de la capitale de la France, ce château s'il existait encore, compte tenu de son histoire et sa magnificence, serait l'un des plus visités au monde ». (The website of the association Reconstruisons Saint-Cloud is now closed: <http://reconstructionssaintcloud.fr/Accueil.html> See now <http://www.academie-napoleon.com/reconstruisons-saint-cloud/> [Accessed: 5.12.2017]).

Figures and Image credits

Fig.1. Reconstruction of Berlin Palace North façade. Photo by Alois Köpple, 2017. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 licence. Available at:

https://de.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Datei:Berlin_Schloss_04_07_2017_01.JPG [accessed 31 July 2017]

Fig.2. Reconstruction of Berlin Palace: digital rendition. Photo by eldaco, 2007. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 licence. Available at:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berlin_Palace#/media/File:Berliner_Schloss_Panorama.jpg [accessed 23-07-2017]

Fig.3. Historic building reconstructed in Campineanu St., Bucharest. Photo by Rodica Crisan, 2017. Private collection.

Fig.4. The site in Campineanu St., Bucharest, after the demolition and before the reconstruction. Street view digital image. © 2017 Google, July 2014.

Fig.5. Novotel Hotel, Bucharest. Photo by Rodica Crisan, 2017. Private collection.

Fig.6. Old National Theatre in Bucharest. Photo by Alexandru Antoniu, 1901. Digital image distributed under PD. Available at:

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Bucharest_in_the_1900s#/media/File:Teatrul_National_Bucuresti_cladirea_veche.jpg [accessed 23 July 2017]

Fig.7. Castel Firmiano (Sigmundskron Fortified Castle), Bolzano. Photo by Hubert Berberich, 2007. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 licence. Available at:
<https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:FirmianHB05.jpg> [accessed 30 July 2017]

Fig.8. Castel Firmiano (Sigmundskron Fortified Castle), Bolzano. Photo by Ewald Gabardi, 2014. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 licence. Available at:
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Sigmundskron_Castle#/media/File:Burg_sigmundskron_70326_2014-08-19.JPG [accessed 30 July 2017]

Fig.9. Castel Firmiano (Sigmundskron Fortified Castle), Bolzano. Photo by Ewald Gabardi, 2014. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 licence. Available at:
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Sigmundskron_Castle#/media/File:Burg_sigmundskron_70293_2014-08-19.JPG [accessed 30 July 2017]

Fig.10. Castel Firmiano (Sigmundskron Fortified Castle), Bolzano. Photo by Hubert Berberich, 2013. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 licence. Available at:
https://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/Castel_Firmiano#/media/File:FirmianHB2013-14.jpg [accessed 30 July 2017]

Fig.11. Castel Firmiano (Sigmundskron Fortified Castle), Bolzano. Photo by ManfredK, 2008. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 licence. Available at:
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Sigmundskron_Castle#/media/File:Bozen_Sigmundskron_Kernburg_Firmian.jpg [accessed 30 July 2017]

Fig.12. Rupea Citadel. Photo by Dana T., 2011. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 RO licence. Available at: [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Cetatea_Rupea_\(Cetatea_Cohalmului\)-judetul_Brasov.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Cetatea_Rupea_(Cetatea_Cohalmului)-judetul_Brasov.jpg)

Fig.13. Rupea Citadel. Photo by Diana Popescu, 2013. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 RO licence. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rupea#/media/File:Cetatea_Rupea,_judetul_Brasov.jpg [accessed 3 August 2017]

Fig.14. Rupea Citadel. Photo by Carmen Stefan, 2010. Digital image distributed under a CC BY-SA 3.0 RO licence. Available at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Cetatea_Rupea_06.jpg [accessed 3 August 2017]

Fig.15. Rupea Citadel. Photo by Rodica Crisan, 2014. Private collection.

Fig.16. Rupea Citadel. Photo by Rodica Crisan, 2014. Private collection