

Shaping of Textual and Visual Representations of the Cityscape of Klaipėda in the Period 1945 to 1990. Sightseeing Tour of Soviet Klaipėda

Dovilė Bataitytė

Klaipėda University, Herkaus Manto St. 84, Klaipėda
e-mail: dovile.bataityte@gmail.com

Abstract. Based on archival sources and historiographical materials, the article provides the analysis of visual and textual representations of Klaipėda used for the purpose of tourism in the period beginning in 1945 and ending in 1990. The research also aims to elicit why representations of the city of Klaipėda utilised one or another image and to provide an answer to the question which sites of the city were highlighted on sightseeing tours and what methodologies were used for that purpose.

Keywords: Klaipėda, Soviet times, ideologization, tourism, tours.

Anotacija. Straipsnyje, remiantis archyviniais šaltiniais bei istoriografinė medžiaga, analizuojamos Klaipėdos miesto vaizdinės ir tekstinės reprezentacijos, naudotos turizmo tikslais 1945–1990 m. Taip pat nagrinėjama, kodėl Klaipėdos miestas sovietmečiu buvo reprezentuojamas vienu ar kitais vaizdais, bei siekiama atsakyti, kokie miesto objektai buvo aktualizuojami pažintinių ekskursijų po miestą metu ir kokia metodika remiantis tai buvo daroma.

Esminiai žodžiai: Klaipėda, sovietmetis, ideologizavimas, turizmas, ekskursijos.

Introduction

The research on visual and verbal representations of a city embraces the analysis of the utilisation of elements of urban spaces for cultural, political, economic and sociocultural purposes. Hence, their public manifestations – the form and the target audience they were intended for – are also of great relevance for the research on their use. Public visual and textual representations of urban spaces existing as part of the tourism industry are transmitted to the information recipient and circulate in the public domain through a number of channels of information dissemination. A city may be publicly represented through postcards, booklets, leaflets, stamps, travel guides, memoirs or by means of special publications produced for that purpose as well as sightseeing tours of a city. Sightseeing oriented cityscape representations are created in such a way that the residents and visitors of a city sense the importance of the place and its attractiveness. The construction and maintenance of the meaning associated with the place may be determined by several factors, the intention of a certain community to give prominence to the meaning of the place by the symbols acceptable to it or the attempt of individual groups to dominate in the city's public domain. In fact, the same place may be important for its different promoters and thus several meanings associated with the place can be generated or the existing images of the place can be combined to serve different interests.

Public representations of Klaipėda in the Lithuanian SSR were constructed with the aim to provide the information recipient with the image of a modern city “resurrected for a new life after World War II”. After World War II was over, Klaipėda, like other cities of the Lithuanian SSR, was presented in the information publications for sightseeing and tourism purposes, which meant that the city's public representations had to comply with ideology-based socialism ideals. The analysis of public representations of the cityscape of Klaipėda during the period 1945 to 1990 makes it possible to ascertain the forms of the ways to utilise the visual representations of the city and their evolution. In the aftermath of the Great Patriotic War, tourism in the Soviet Union was made part of the massive propaganda effort, though during the first post-war decades tourism did not actually constitute a priority activity. However, in the early 1950s it recovered its functions as a promoter of socialism ideals¹. It should be noted that the understanding of tourism as the activity which could actually promote and establish the ideals of socialism had existed since the establishment of the Soviet Union². In the Soviet Union, the concept of tourism had acquired the meanings of leisure and vacations, which, in turn, were associated with health promotion and acquaintance with the Soviet Union (representation of the industrialisation and planned economy achievements during

¹ NOACK, Christian. “You have probably heard about all this...” Baltic Seaside Resorts as Soviet Tourist Destination. In: *Tourismus im Ostseeraum / Tourism in the Baltic Region* (Nordost-Archiv, N. F. Bd. XX/2011). Hrsg. von K. Brüggemann. Lüneburg: Nordost-Institut, 2012, S. 205.

² KOENKER, Diane P. *Club Red: Vacation Travel and the Soviet Dream*. New York, 2013.

sightseeing tours had already constituted the basis of tourist activities in the Soviet Union)³. According to Juozas Raguckas, who graduated from Vilnius University in 1977 with the dissertation titled “Development of Tourism in Lithuania”, tourism was selected for the implementation of socialism objectives in the Lithuanian SSR for several factors: “... because it is becoming an active leisure form among the working people and it is gradually gaining a mass character. Nowadays, tourism should be construed as a complex social economic phenomenon. In the period of the extended construction of Communism, the meaning of the work based on tourism and sightseeing is particularly coming to the fore. First of all, tourism and sightseeing tours are becoming an integral form of cultured and active leisure time and health promotion as well as an inseparable form of communist upbringing.”⁴ Consequently, illustrated travel guides and sightseeing tours of the cities of the Lithuanian SSR had become a part of this form of communist upbringing which existed in the Lithuanian SSR.

Research object – public representations of Klaipėda in verbal (in the form of sightseeing tours of the city), textual and visual (through information publications, travel guides and photo albums) forms.

Research aim is to analyse the content of the public visual and textual representations of Klaipėda and their changes during the period 1945 to 1990. To that end, the following **objectives** were formulated:

1. To investigate what images and texts were utilised to represent the city in information publications in the period between 1945 and 1990.
2. To analyse which of the city’s sites were highlighted during sightseeing tours and what methodology was applied to their organisation.
3. To find out why and how the public representations of Klaipėda evolved during the period in question.

Relevance and available research. The research on the textual and visual representations of Klaipėda analysed in the article concerns the factor of urban space in the processes of societal development and changes, which means that it draws on the studies focusing on the construction of the cultural space of Klaipėda⁵ and the urban changes of the 20th century. Quite a number of studies dedicated to Lithuanian cities and focusing on the practices of remembrance and their ceremonialization in the First Republic of Lithua-

³ KOENKER, Diane P. *Club Red: Vacation Travel and the Soviet Dream*. New York, 2013, p. 3.

⁴ RAGUCKAS, Juozas. Turizmo vystymasis Lietuvoje. Disertacija. *VUB Rankraščių skyrius*, f. 85-972. Vilnius, 1977, p. 74.

⁵ SAFRONOVAS, Vasilijus. *Praeitis kaip konflikto šaltinis: tapatybės ideologijų konkurencija XX amžiaus Klaipėdoje*. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2011; VITKUS, Hektoras. Mažoji Lietuva kaip lietuvių atminties vieta: teorinis modelis. In: *Daugiareikšmės tapatybės tarpuerdvėse: Rytų Prūsijos atvejis XIX–XX amžiais* (Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, t. XXIII). Sud. V. Safronovas, N. Strakauskaitė, L. Motuzienė. Klaipėda, 2011, p. 203–233.

nia have been published in the past decade⁶. In fact, the above studies do not that much concentrate on the public representations of urban spaces; instead, they underline the former and current historical symbols (monuments, choice of street names) and their ideological utilisation as well as identity formation processes. The studies on heritage protection and urban development during the totalitarian regime⁷ are also relevant for the analysis provided in the present article. The studies dedicated to the expression of cultural memory in Vilnius by Živilė Mikailienė⁸ require a special notice. They address the shaping of the city's ideological landscape during the Soviet period with reference to the publications dedicated to the representation of Soviet Vilnius. Thus, the research on the images and texts employed to represent the cities of the Lithuanian SSR for sightseeing purposes has so far been only fragmentary. Tourism practices in Soviet Lithuania have so far been little explored as well. Juozas Raguckas investigated tourism activities and their regulation in the Lithuanian SSR⁹. The ideological utilisation of tourism was explored

⁶ MAČIULIS, Dangiras. Kolektyvinė atmintis ir miesto įvaizdis: Šiaulių atvejais. *Acta Humanitarica Universitatis Saulensis: mokslo darbai*, 2009, t. 9, p. 218–234; MAČIULIS, Dangiras. Laikinosios sostinės kolektyvinės atminties kraštovaizdis. In: *Nuo Basanavičiaus, Vytauto Didžiojo iki Molotovo ir Ribbentropo. Atminties ir atminimo kultūrų transformacijos XX–XXI amžiuje*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2011, p. 133–156; MAČIULIS, Dangiras. Pasisavinant Mažąją Lietuvą. Vienijančios kolektyvinės atminties konstravimas Lietuvoje tarpukariu. In: *Erdvių pasisavinimas Rytų Prūsijoje XX amžiuje* (Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, t. XXIV). Sud. V. Safronovas. Klaipėda, 2012, p. 212–228; NIKŽENTAITIS, Alyvydas. Laikinosios ir Lietuvos Respublikos sostinių kultūrinės atmintys: lyginamosios analizės bandymas. *Acta Humanitarica Universitatis Saulensis: mokslo darbai*, 2009, t. 9, p. 235–246.

⁷ ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. Kultūrinės atminties sovietizacija: Vilniaus ir Minsko atvejai. In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas: miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius, 2013, p. 267–314; ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. Miestas kaip ideologinis tekstas: teoriniai ir interpretaciniai aspektai. In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas. Miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 57–85; ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. „Tarybinės sostinės“ konstravimas J. Stalino epochoje: Vilniaus ir Minsko atvejai. In: *Nuo Basanavičiaus, Vytauto Didžiojo iki Molotovo ir Ribbentropo. Atminties ir atminimo kultūrų transformacijos XX–XXI amžiuje*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius, 2011, p. 171–224; ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. *Laikas ir akmenys: kultūros paveldo sampratos moderniojoje Lietuvoje*. Vilnius, 2005; ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. *Paveldosauga globaliajame pasaulyje*, Vilnius, 2010; ACKERMANN, Felix. Miestas kaip palimpsestas. Istorijos skaitymo ir rašymo vyksmas Gardine. In: *Erdvių pasisavinimas Rytų Prūsijoje XX amžiuje* (Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, t. XXIV). Sud. V. Safronovas. Klaipėda, 2012, p. 277–295; SAFRONOVAS, Vasalijus. Ar Tarybų Sąjungoje būta alternatyvos vyraujančiai atminimo kultūrai? Žvilgsnis į du periferinius miestus. In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas. Miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 349–382; SAFRONOVAS, Vasalijus. Dėl centro ir periferijos santykio atminimo reikšmių perimamumo procese. In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas. Miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 35–55.

⁸ MIKAILIENĖ, Živilė. Kultūrinės atminties raiška Vilniuje sovietmečiu: tarp lietuviškumo ir sovietiško. In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas: miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 199–216; MIKAILIENĖ, Živilė. Miestų jubiliejai kaip atminties kultūros formavimo vėlyvuoju sovietmečiu reiškinys (Vilniaus ir Kijevo jubiliejų atvejai). In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas: miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius, 2013, p. 315–344; MIKAILIENĖ, Živilė. *Vilnius sovietmečiu: ideologija ir miesto tapatumo formavimas (1940–1988): disertacija*. Vilnius, 2015.

⁹ RAGUCKAS, Juozas. Sunki pradžia. *Darbas ir poilsis*, Nr. 4, 1979, p. 14; RAGUCKAS, Juozas. 118 ekskursijų ir vienas vadovas. *Tarybinis mokytojas*, 1985, liepos 12, p. 4.

by historians Arvydas Anušauskas¹⁰ and Deividas Kertenis¹¹, but their studies cover individual activities of the Soviet security or specifically the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Lithuanian SSR which employ tourism for their purposes. Renata Pujanuskaitė's Master's thesis written in 2005 dealt with tourism organisations in Lithuania during the period 1918 to 1990¹². The Master's thesis explored the institutions involved in the organisation of culture and sports based recreational activities without focusing on how the image of one or another place or city was created for tourism purposes. Though few studies addressing tourism activities have so far been accomplished in Lithuania, tourism as a social and cultural phenomenon has already received considerable attention in English literature¹³. The research on tourism as a social phenomenon does not limit with the establishment and description of the process of formation of tourism practices alone. Tourism should be approached as a peculiar economic, cultural and social activity, the analysis of which can yield answers to a wide range of questions. For example, the studies on tourism practices in the Soviet Union reveal that it may not only be approached as a form of free time but also as a strongly ideologised phenomenon¹⁴. The ideologization and utilisation of tourism in the Soviet Union and its individual republics manifested through various forms: preparation of politically loaded sightseeing tours, organisation of specialised tours for pupils, release of publications illustrated with the images glorifying the socialist reality. Mass-scale placement of recreational spots and city images in travel guides corresponded to the idea of industrialised art. Margarita Matulytė, a researcher of the history of photography, addressed photography as the field of art which can reflect the Soviet society. She observed that after World War II, photography in Lithuania turned into the witness of the processes of modernisation, as the idea of "industrialised art" could be put into practice through photography¹⁵. Public visual representations of modernisation processes were especially popular in Soviet travel guides¹⁶. In fact, historian Christian Noack, having studied how the Baltic republics turned into Soviet tourist destinations, argued that though illustrated travel guides and travel magazines

¹⁰ ANUŠAUSKAS, Arvydas. KGB ir lietuvių visuomenė. Slaptasis karas 1954–1991 m. *Darbai ir dienos*, 2000, t. 2, p. 233–283.

¹¹ KERTENIS, Deividas. Okupantų parankinė (Lietuvos TSR Užsienio reikalų ministerija). *Darbai ir dienos*, 2002, t. 30, p. 227–247.

¹² PUJANUSKAITĖ, Renata. *Turizmo organizacijos Lietuvoje 1918–1990 m.: magistro darbas*. Vilnius, 2005.

¹³ URRY, John. *The Tourist Gaze*. London: SAGE Publications, 1990; ZUELOW, Eric. *A History of Modern Tourism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. *Tourismus im Ostseeraum / Tourism in the Baltic Region* (Nordost-Archiv, N. F. Bd. XX/2011). Hrsg. von K. Brüggemann. Lüneburg: Nordost-Institut, 2012. 403 S.

¹⁴ GORSUCH, Anne E.; KOENKER, Diane. *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist Under Capitalism and Socialism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2006; GORSUCH, Anne E. *All this is Your World – Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad After Stalin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

¹⁵ MATULYTĖ, Margarita. Totalitarinė fotografija: kova už sielas. *Menotyra*, 2005, t. 40, Nr. 3, p. 21–27.

¹⁶ NOACK, Christian. "You have probably heard about all this..." Baltic Seaside Resorts as Soviet Tourist Destination. In: *Tourismus im Ostseeraum / Tourism in the Baltic Region* (Nordost-Archiv, N.F. Bd. XX/2011). Hrsg. von K. Brüggemann. Lüneburg: Nordost-Institut, 2012, p. 217.

were an important channel for the propaganda of tourism in the Soviet Union, they were not as appealing as the publications of such type published in Western Europe; besides, their illustrations were of poor quality. According to him, the illustrations used in travel guides were rather limited and represented barely several highlights of the destination being presented: monuments for Soviet “heroes”, standardised Soviet buildings, spots of culture and entertainment. Also, according to Noack, travel guides did not always seek to spotlight the ideological landscape; it particularly applied to the publications intended for foreign tourists, as target audience oriented information was to be communicated through images¹⁷. The analysis of the multiplicity of research on tourism industry provides an opportunity to formulate a question: To what extent was the iconography used for tourism purposes and its accompanying texts employed for the sake of Soviet ideology in the Lithuanian SSR or perhaps their choice could have been decided by the practices of tourist representations of the city that existed before World War II? The aim of the present article is to analyse the case of public representation of Klaipėda with a focus on the information provided in travel guides and periodicals and the representations of the city during sightseeing tours.

The article is based on the documents from the funds of *Travel and Tour Bureau* and *Klaipėda Regional Museum* stored at the Klaipėda Regional State Archives (KLAA). The text refers to the documents elaborating on the work of organisation of sightseeing tours in Klaipėda after World War II and preparation of information publications for publishing, which are kept at the fund of *Klaipėda Regional Museum*. The documents available at the fund of *Klaipėda Travel and Tour Bureau* provide an opportunity to find out the principles (methodological requirements) followed in the organisation of sightseeing tours in the city, the topics of the tours as well as the number of the tours organised in the city during specific periods indicated in the files. Various booklets, leaflets, information publications and photo albums dedicated to Klaipėda and the whole Lithuanian SSR constitute a separate group of sources. With reference to the latter group of sources, the illustration content analysis can be performed and the images used to represent Klaipėda in the public domain and the reasons for their selection can be determined.

Methodology. A wide variety of methodological approaches used for the analysis of the content of public visual and textual representations of Klaipėda, which ranges from the studies on the style of iconography by art historians to the methods applied in sociology, determines the cross-disciplinary character of the research and an opportunity to supplement the available research on urban spaces as well as to propose a new approach to the research, i.e. visual information analysis. Hence, to achieve the aim and objectives of the research, the analysis of the content of visual and textual sources will be conducted. Such an analysis provides an opportunity to assign the sources to individual categories

¹⁷ NOACK, Christian. “You have probably heard about all this...” Baltic Seaside Resorts as Soviet Tourist Destination. In: *Tourismus im Ostseeraum / Tourism in the Baltic Region* (Nordost-Archiv, N.F. Bd. XX/2011). Hrsg. von K. Brüggemann. Lüneburg: Nordost-Institut, 2012, S. 217.

and enables us to identify which images were brought into the spotlight and in what communicative channels they circulated. The methodological approach of memory studies contributes to the revelation of the given topic by the opportunity enshrined in the methods of the theoretical models of memory studies to pinpoint which symbols of the past were exploited in order to consolidate the selected narrative of the history of Klaipėda in textual and visual representations. Public visual urban representations dedicated to specific cities are often oriented towards a certain target audience for which it is intended to create a visually appealing image of the place. Sociologist Henri Lefebvre links the representation of the place with the attempt of the ruling political ideology or simply those in power to create the desired image of the city by virtue of visualization of the sites located in the urban space by attributing “convenient” meanings to them¹⁸. Therefore, the social environment orients the representations of the place towards the past, thus giving the secondary content of representation to it. The space of remembrance can be designated by such secondary content – it is a place with an architectural symbolic representation. Historical-cultural meaning of the place can also be constructed on the basis of the representations of modernity by concentrating the visual and textual narrative about a specific city (Klaipėda in this case) on what it is going to be in the future. The article will attempt to reveal how the imaginary cityscape of Klaipėda was created in the Lithuanian SSR by means of visual materials.

Formation and change of public visual representations of Klaipėda in information / tourist publications in the period 1945 to 1980.

After 1945, Klaipėda was presented in the public domain of the Lithuanian SSR as a city rapidly resurrecting from “ashes”¹⁹. The input of the hard-working “Soviet man” to the cleaning of the city’s ruins after World War II and the emphasis on the good things done to the city after the Great Patriotic War became an integral part of this image. The scale of the demolitions immediately after World War II amounted to 37 per cent of demolished housing; 44 per cent had to be rebuilt from bottom to top²⁰. The old residents were nearly all gone after the war, meaning that the explication of Klaipėda’s representational spaces was already oriented towards the newcomers, with the majority of them working in the port infrastructure and settling in the newly built dormitory suburbs. Hence, the idealisation of Klaipėda’s development and growth was essentially dictated by the attempt to demonstrate how much the Soviet administration managed to

¹⁸ LEFEBVRE, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Wiley, 1991, p. 34.

¹⁹ BERŽAS, A. Žmonės su pergalės vėliava. *Raudonasis Švyturys*, 1947, Nr. 172 (397), p. 3.

²⁰ BUTKUS, Tomas S.; SAFRONOVAS, Vasilijus; PETRULIS, Vaidas. *Klaipėdos urbanistika 1945–1990 m.: kolektyvinė monografija*. Sud. T. S. Butkus, V. Safronovas. Vilnius: VŠĮ „Vario burnos“, 2015, p. 21.

do for the sake of the city in a short period of time. Indeed, barely several decades passed after World War II and a series of information publications dedicated to the presentation of Klaipėda showed up in the Lithuanian SSR. The publications showcased Klaipėda in an idyllic way. They sought to convince the reader that there was what to be happy about and to marvel at in the city, e.g. texts saying that even the visitors of Klaipėda at night should have been surprised by the quay lighting system, new buildings and ships were used as evidence of the above fact²¹. Yet another frequently explored and mainstreamed theme was the socialist visions of the city's future: "The residents of the seaport, likewise the totalitarian people, today have a better life than they had yesterday, and they are going to live even better tomorrow."²² The construction of the future vision of the city in the texts of publications was tightly linked with the growth of the city and its industry. Thus, the purpose was to convince the reader of Klaipėda as the city with a glorious future.

Table 1. Table on the frequency and distribution of visual illustrations used in the publications dedicated to Klaipėda showing how much the visual representations of industry and constructions were mainstreamed compared to other visual narratives about the city

Publication	Circulation	Number of photographs	Images of industry and constructions	Monuments	Demolitions	Old Town	Culture/leisure	Seaside
PUKYS, P. Klaipėda. Klaipėda. 1959.	Unspecified	30	13	2	2	3	3	7
MEŠYS, J. Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1964.	10,000 copies	49	24	-	-	6	14	5
Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1965.	500 copies	20	8	1	-	5	3	
SAVICKAS, R. Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1966.	10,000 copies	8	5	1	-	1		1
KRIVICKAS, S. Klaipėdos diena [Day of Klaipėda]. Vilnius, 1969.	15,000 copies	92	31		-	15	30	16
KREFTAS, H. Klaipėda – pagaliau didelės ateities miestas. Lietuvos uostamiestis vokiečio akimis [Klaipėda, Finally a City with a Glorious Future. Lithuanian Seaport in the Eyes of a German]. Vilnius, 1969.	5,000 copies	66	31	-	-	5	11	-
BUTKUS, V. Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1972.	25,000 copies	27	12	2	-	10	1	2
BUTKUS, V. Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1975.	30,000 copies	74	35	8	-	9	20	2
ZAVADSKIS, A. Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1977.	20,000 copies	153	45	9	-	18	15	66
BUTKUS, V. Klaipėda, Vilnius, 1980.	40,000 copies	45	16	4	1	15	7	2
Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1983.	40,000 copies	128	53	5	-	22	28	20
MARTINKUS, P. Klaipėda. Mažasis vadovas [Klaipėda. Brief Guide]. Vilnius, 1988.	30,000 copies	172	41	7	-	49	32	4

²¹ MEŠYS, Judas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1964, p. 5.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 5

Though a photograph cannot demonstrate the fact which has not yet happened, as illustrated by the above table, the visions of the city's urban development were presented by the images of in-progress constructions. A similar model of information presentation was used by travel guides and information publications to illustrate the developments taking place in the port and industry. A large number of photographs and their continuous repetition had to persuade the information recipient that the city's development would go on without any interruptions in the future. Yet another equally important visual narrative on Klaipėda presented in information publications was the photographs of the port infrastructure. The way the port was presented suggests a parallel with the public textual and visual representations of Klaipėda that existed in interwar Lithuania. Though representations served different purposes in the abovementioned chronological periods, there was the same function of representations pertaining to the port – to justify the establishment of the new government and to build it on good achievements, i.e. the renovation and development of the port infrastructure²³. The Soviet seaport of Klaipėda and its “bright” future were also described in the first publication dedicated to the city – *Klaipėda* – which appeared in 1959²⁴: “Today, the word Klaipėda means the maritime trade, fishing and river port, an important railway hub and one of the major industrial centres in the republic with excellent prospects to expand and grow.”²⁵ The information publication *Klaipėda*²⁶ released in 1964 was illustrated with the photographs which had to provide the reader with an opportunity to get to know the city better. Hence, thanks to this publication, the reader could see the images of the following sites: House of Culture (p. 24); the city during wintertime (Montės street and Gorkio street corner) (p. 26); dormitory of School No. 1 (p. 29); the new panorama of Taikos avenue (p. 35); the photograph, in which, according to the text, “old houses yielded their place to splendid multi-storey housing” (p. 35); the bridge across the Dangė River (p. 60); the leisure and culture park (p. 72); new powerful cranes in Klaipėda cellulose-paper factory (p. 42); the great fishing freezer trawler *Rapolas Čarnas* (p. 44); the trawler sailing to the sea (p. 47) as well as a number of images of the port infrastructure. The above list of illustrations is not solely an attempt to say what was being demonstrated; the list is given to clearly showcase the importance of modernity representations (images of new housing developments, industry and port) in information publications.

²³ KLAIPĖDIŠKIS, Anas Bruožis. *Vadovėlis po Klaipėdos kraštą bei prūsų paribius*. Klaipėda, 1924; BABICKAS, Petras. *Gintaro krantas*. Kaunas, 1932; *Lietuvos miestais*. Šiauliai, 1935; *Vadovas po Lietuvą*. Redaktoriai Pranas Barkauskas, Aleksandras Vabalas. Kaunas, 1938; *Lietuvos pajūris*. Kaunas, 1931.

²⁴ *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1965.

²⁵ PUKYS, Povilas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1959, p. 12.

²⁶ MEŠYS, Judas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1964.



1. II. KREFTAS, H. *Klaipėda, Finally a City with a Glorious Future. Lithuanian Seaport in the Eyes of a German. Kaunas, 1969.*



2. II. MEŠYS, J. *Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1963.*



3. II. ZAVADSKIS, A. *Klaipėda. Vilnius, 1977.*

Public representations of modernity played the function of manifestation of power and rule. The above function was as if taken over from the monuments marking the past events and the squares named after socialist heroes. The presentation of monuments and squares in travel guides and information publications usually limited with texts, for example: “Lenino street leads to the verdant square of the same name. An exquisite square is surrounded by Montės street and Tarybinės Armijos street... The Victory Monument stands in the very heart of the square.”²⁷ The above text was not illustrated by the images of the monuments being described. It can thus be said that the representations of modernity and future visions of Klaipėda played the role of the mouthpiece of socialist ideals.

We can decide whether the planned changes of the city described in the publications were actually implemented in practice from the publications on the city of later periods. The booklet *Klaipėda*²⁸ published in 1966 showcased the city from the perspective of the past twenty years. Thus, it as if gives the answer whether the changes promised in the earlier publications of such type were actually taking place or they remained on paper only. The booklet *Klaipėda* (1966) reviewed the stages and aspects of the development of Klaipėda as a socialist city and the contribution of the Lithuanian SSR government to the urban and industrial development of the city. The text of the publication limited with a clichéd repetition of the statements already laid down in its predecessors²⁹ about the unparalleled growth of the city after World War II and the new factories, schools

²⁷ MEŠYS, Judas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1964, p. 26–27.

²⁸ SAVICKAS, R. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1966, p. 3.

²⁹ PUKYS, Povilas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1959; MEŠYS, J. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1964; *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1965.

and residential housing as the witnesses of this fact. In fact, the booklet singled out several changes of paramount importance – “Second Klaipėda“ built in Taikos avenue and the fishing fleet born during the period of Soviet Lithuania³⁰. Hence, Klaipėda’s territorial development (construction of the socialist city), the modernisation of the port and industrial growth marked the most remarkable changes in the city during 20 years. Except for the cases of drawing attention to the new “modern” buildings, no specific changes were introduced in other information publications as well. In fact, perhaps it should not have been expected; after all, the objective was to shape the image of Klaipėda as a growing and continuously expanding city in the public domain, and information publications accomplished this “mission” by abstaining from detailed accounts of what and how actually changed in the city.

To get to know the city, the photo album *Day of Klaipėda* appeared in 1969³¹. By means of images, the album provided an opportunity to learn about the day of Soviet Klaipėda, the city, which, as noted in the introductory remarks, keeps growing with new constructions every year. This photo album was of introductory and promotional type; in fact, there was not a single illustration dedicated to the monuments and squares in the city. Of course, the situation can be explained by the fact that Klaipėda’s presentation in the public discourse had already been dominated by the images of the port and industry playing the function of the mouthpieces of the city since the 1960s. The tourist map of the Lithuanian SSR published the same year again paid a tribute to the changes taking place in the city – descriptions of industrial growth and the port. It should be noted that the tourist map did not forget to present the new architecture and the city’s cultural life³².

In addition to the abovementioned objects of Klaipėda’s cityscape which had become an important part of its representative image, the representations of the city’s history existed as well. The narrative of the city’s history presented in information publications was ideologically loaded and nearly identical in all publications of such type. “The past was blamed” for any misfortunes which had happened in the city at any time in history³³: “The city and the people of its region lived through a lot of hardships in the past centuries; Klaipėda’s Lithuanians endured great suffering under the feet of various oppressors and colonisers”³⁴; “Klaipėda is one of the oldest cities in Lithuania”³⁵; “And Klaipėda, old and hard-tempered, welcomes them rejuvenated, more beautiful and grown”³⁶. In the tourist map of the Lithuanian SSR the narrative on Klaipėda traditionally began with a

³⁰ PUKYS, Povilas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1959; MEŠYS, J. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1964; *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1965, p. 3.

³¹ KRIVICKAS, Sigitas. *Klaipėdos diena*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1969.

³² *Lietuvos TSR turistinis žemėlapis*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1969.

³³ ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. Sovietmečio atmintis – tarp atmetimo ir nostalgijos. *Lituanistica*, 2007, t. 53, Nr. 4 (72), p. 39.

³⁴ PUKYS, Povilas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1959, p. 1.

³⁵ *Klaipėda*. Klaipėda, 1966, p. 3.

³⁶ ŽALYS, Alfonsas. *Klaipėda – Tarybinė*. *Klaipėda*, 1965, p. 88.

brief overview of the city's history. The publication stated that the city had once been a Lithuanian land that suffered the ruthless Germanisation of "German colonisers," and the struggle of Klaipėda residents (Lith. *Klaipėdiškiai*; the publication appeared at the time when the concept *Klaipėdiškiai* was linked with the ethnic Lithuanian element; an equivalent situation was in inter-war Lithuania) for their mother tongue and land was pictured in the creative legacy of Ieva Simonaitytė³⁷.

To promote the city's attractiveness in the context of the republic, Klaipėda in travel guides was also presented as the city representing the whole Lithuanian SSR, because it was also the seaport drawing, as it was publicly stated, thousands of seamen from foreign countries as well as ordinary foreign tourists interested in Klaipėda every year. In fact, it is rather troublesome to investigate the precise statistics of such "foreign tourists" arriving in the city due to the reliability of data. It is therefore difficult to ascertain how many tourists actually visited the city and to what extent the reasons of their visits in the city were influenced by the city's visual representations. Based on the reports of Klaipėda Regional Museum, it can be stated that the majority of foreign tourists visiting the city were seamen³⁸: "Five sightseeing tours of Klaipėda were organised for foreign seamen in 1964."³⁹ Nevertheless, the publications in French⁴⁰, German⁴¹, English⁴², Russian⁴³ languages were published for foreign tourists, meaning that people from Western Europe constituted the target group as well. The publications were based on the established form of booklets and travel guides: the history and situation in the city, its economic and cultural achievements were briefly presented and the places to spend free time were listed.

Sightseeing tour of Soviet Klaipėda. What and why had to be seen?

The sightseeing tours organised in the city constituted a separate group of the public representations of the cityscape. The working plans, reports, tour routes of Klaipėda Regional Museum and Klaipėda Tourist Bureau as well as methodological guidelines for sightseeing tours provide information on the organisation and planning of sightseeing tours in Klaipėda after 1945. Whereas it is rather problematic to refer to the documents of official institutions of the given period due to their reliability and accuracy, they serve as guidance in determining how many and what sightseeing tours could actually take place in the city. After Klaipėda Regional Museum was established, active participation

³⁷ *Lietuvos TSR turistinis žemėlapis*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1969.

³⁸ Report of Klaipėda Regional Museum for the 3rd Quarter of 1964. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 180.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, l. 181.

⁴⁰ MEŠYS, Judas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1963.

⁴¹ BUTKUS, Venantas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1972.

⁴² *Клайпеда – Klaipėda*. Вильнюс. 1982.

⁴³ *Клайпеда*. Вильнюс. 1966; *Клайпеда – Klaipėda*. Вильнюс. 1982.

in strengthening “the cultural job on a mass scale” – organising sightseeing tours and drawing up their plans – was one of its objectives⁴⁴. The study relies on the museum’s activity plans dating from 1954, because it was the year when, after checking Klaipėda Regional Museum, the commission concluded that the route for the sightseeing tours showing the city’s historical destinations was prepared and 6 tours were organised⁴⁵. The meeting of the museum’s council, which took place in 1955, considered the publication of *Klaipėda Travel Guide*, which had to ease the job of sightseeing tours done by the museum’s employees; it was therefore proposed to contact the Executive Committee and to select the individuals who would collect information on the history and architecture of the city. The Propaganda Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party had to play a part in the publication of the travel guide as well. It was also planned to set up a separate group of freelance tourist guides. The museum’s employees had to give lectures to them enabling them to hold sightseeing tours in Klaipėda on their own⁴⁶. Such proposals were at least partially put to life in 1959, when the travel guide *Klaipėda*⁴⁷ was released (see the first chapter for the analysis of the content of this travel guide). In 1956, the museum organised 8 sightseeing tours of the city⁴⁸. During the third quarter of 1958, 5 tours in Klaipėda and the Curonian Spit were organised⁴⁹. In 1959, the museum drew up the plans of the places of interest for regional studies and tourist groups⁵⁰. Drawbacks in the organisation of sightseeing tours were observed the same year, because only 14 tours of Klaipėda and the Curonian Spit were organised, and such a situation was viewed negatively⁵¹. In 1962, the collection of materials for the tours on the topic “Klaipėda in Seven Years” began at the museum; a travel guide for pupils *Klaipėda Travel Guide* was also prepared; it was supposed to list the sites of interest accompanied by an explanatory text⁵². In 1963, the regional museum’s employees provided information on the routes and places worth visiting in the city to tourist groups; the museum’s employees would also play the function of tourist guides, as there was no tour bureau in the city⁵³. On 29 February 1964, the tour bureau was established by the order of the Ministry of Culture of the Lithuanian SSR concerning the activities of the tour bureau in Klaipėda. The following objectives were formulated under the tour bureau regulations: “To broaden the cultural

⁴⁴ ELERTIENĖ, Bronė. *Klaipėdos kraštotyros muziejus: tarnybiniam naudojimui*. Klaipėda, 1975, p. 6.

⁴⁵ News on Klaipėda Regional Museum for 1954. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 1, l. 13.

⁴⁶ Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the Regional Museum, March 1955. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 56, l. 100–102.

⁴⁷ PUKYS, Povilas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1959, p. 1

⁴⁸ News on Klaipėda Regional Museum for 1956. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 1, l. 122.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, l. 168.

⁵⁰ Inspection of the Work of Klaipėda Regional Museum, 30 December 1959. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 53, l. 84.

⁵¹ Brief Review of the Work of Klaipėda Regional Museum for 1959. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 56, l. 84, 132.

⁵² News on Klaipėda Regional Museum for 1962. Report for the 1st Quarter of 1962. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 169.

⁵³ News on Klaipėda Regional Museum for 1963. Report for the 2nd Quarter of 1963. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 183.

horizons of the working people, educate them in the spirit of Marxist-Leninist ideas, be active and conscious builders of the communist society through the vivid presentation of materials on the achievements of the national economy in the republic, the victories of the construction of Communism, historical-revolutionary, architectural and art monuments during sightseeing tours... To make every effort that more and more tours are organised for the working people, pupils and arriving guests and that the tours become one of the most popular forms of leisure and education.”⁵⁴ In the first years, a part of work in relation to sightseeing tours was still done by the employees of the Regional Museum; such a situation could be due to the lack of employees at the Tour Bureau who could organise sightseeing tours of the city, whereas the museum’s employees were already experienced in this work. The first plans on the publication of Klaipėda travel guides were initiated and put to life with considerable input from the museum’s administration.

After several years of existence, Klaipėda Tour Bureau was already fully in charge of the organisation of sightseeing tours in Klaipėda. From its establishment until 1989, the bureau’s employees prepared 35 texts on the routes of sightseeing tours dedicated to Klaipėda and its environs; a part of texts dealt with the neighbouring regions and Samogitia; there were also texts on the factories and plants in Klaipėda⁵⁵. As the education of the youth in the course of sightseeing tours was established as the “primary concern” in the bureau’s statutes, the text of the sightseeing tour “Klaipėda, the Seaport of the LSSR” for pupils (grades 4–8) showed up in 1970⁵⁶. The text specified which historical-cultural sites had to be highlighted during the tour of the city and even laid down the required wording: “Klaipėda residents are committed to preserve the memory of those who perished for the freedom of their native city. People gather near the Victory Monument to commemorate the anniversaries of the liberation of the city and the Great Victory. This is where pioneers first get their ties and members of the Young Communist League are presented with their membership cards. The eternal flame never goes out and the flowers brought by visitors never die.”⁵⁷ The tour for pupils had to last two and a half hours; during the tour the economic and other achievements that occurred in Klaipėda in the Soviet period as well as the key events of the day had to be presented. As the tour began, pupils were expected to enumerate the major cities of Soviet Lithuania. The tour was divided into separate parts by theme. The first part was titled *Klaipėda’s Past* during which pupils had to visit the following sites of the city: the square near the wooden bridge (10 min), the Old Town (5 min), the drama theatre (5 min), M. Melnikaitės street (15 min),

⁵⁴ Orders of the Ministry of Culture of the Lithuanian SSR Concerning the Activities of the Tour Bureau of 29 February 1964. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 1, l. 8.

⁵⁵ Description of the Tour in Klaipėda Sock Factory, 1968. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 40, l. 1–9; Description of the Tour in Klaipėda Dairy Factory, 1968. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 41, l. 1–11; 1968. Description of the Tour in Klaipėda Cotton Spinning Factory Trinyčiai, 1968. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 42, l. 1–7.

⁵⁶ Description of the Sightseeing Tour for Pupils “Klaipėda, the Seaport of the LSSR”, 1970. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 52, l. 24.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, l. 6.

J. Janonio street (10 min). The story on the liberation of Klaipėda constituted a separate fragment of this part (10 min); in fact, the specific location of the city where the guide had to present this event was not specified. The first part of the tour had to conclude with the following sentence: “The reasons interfering with Klaipėda’s normal development were continuous demolitions of the city, trade routes, and manual labour.”⁵⁸ The second part focused on Soviet Klaipėda. Therefore, a separate route was created for this part of the city tour as well: Lenino street (10 min), S. Neries street (15 min), Boarding-school No. 1 (15 min), Kindergarten No. 9 (15 min), House of Pioneers and Pupils (20 min), Tower of the House of Culture (15 min), Conclusions (2 min)⁵⁹.

In 1972, the Tour Bureau issued the methodological guidelines for the organisation and holding of sightseeing tours in Klaipėda. The text detailed what and when the guide should tell to the participants of sightseeing tours. It was laid down in the guidelines that the first thing the guide had to do was to “understand” that the tours had to nurture “the most beautiful human feelings” such as “love for the socialist homeland, pride in its revolutionary past, love for beauty and nature”⁶⁰. With reference to the established methodology, the duty of the Soviet tour guide in the seaport was “to narrate the story that would enrich the person with spiritual values”, i.e. to broaden the horizons, to tell about the new developments in Soviet cities and villages in an appealing manner and about the republic that flourished in the family of brotherly nations⁶¹. Based on the above methodological guidelines, the tours had to give a detailed presentation of the socialist sites of remembrance in Klaipėda using the special wording prepared for that matter: “Situated in the very heart of the city, Lenin’s Square is a monument for Soviet soldiers, the liberators. It is interesting to note that the monument was designed and erected by Soviet soldiers. The soldiers were delighted about reaching the sea. After chasing the enemy away from the land of Soviet Lithuania, they placed their military cannon, a witness of their long road of fight from Oryol to Klaipėda, on a modest base in the centre of the city. Its 45 mm barrel is a symbol of 1945, the year of victory. There is a cemetery of the perished heroes next to the monument.”⁶² Lenin’s Square had to be presented to tourists as a traditional venue of celebrations; the tour guide also had to say that the place was the most popular destination among Klaipėda residents⁶³. The above statement had to be justified by the popularity of the site, because, according to the methodological guidelines, it was the place where the city residents could see a pensioner on a bench recalling the terrifying storm of the war and an old woman with her grandson or a group

⁵⁸ Description of the Sightseeing Tour for Pupils “Klaipėda, the Seaport of the LSSR”, 1970. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 52, l. 6.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, l. 6.

⁶⁰ Methodological Guidelines for the Tour “The Beacons of the Construction of Communism of the Ninth Five-Year Plan”, 1972. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 52, l. 6.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Ibid.*

of teenagers⁶⁴. The methodological aids for sightseeing tours even provided what and how had to be told about Soviet monuments. They had to be presented in the context of “liberation” of Klaipėda: “When speaking about the liberation of Klaipėda in Lenin’s Square, it should be highlighted that our city was liberated by the sons of various nations and that the victory against fascist Germany was achieved thanks to the friendship of the Great Nation. The conversation should continue near the monument in the cemetery of the brotherly soldiers where the guide has to underline that the residents of Klaipėda protect the memory of those who perished for its freedom and the peaceful way of life with dedication. It takes place through renovated squares, cemeteries, new monuments. Flowers will never fade in the cemetery of soldiers; there will always be plenty of visitors. Standard clichés from newspapers and texts are not enough. The guide has to think how to reveal the topic.”⁶⁵ Guidelines indicating what text the presentation of the city should begin with were also drawn up for tour guides: “The aim of our tour is to introduce the history of Klaipėda, one of the oldest cities in Lithuania, and the achievements of its people. History was rather heart-breaking for the Lithuanian nation. For long centuries, the sole seaport of Lithuania had been in the hands of foreign invaders.”⁶⁶ It should also be mentioned at the beginning of the tour how the city had changed during the Soviet period: “Today, during our tour around Soviet Klaipėda, the city that grew during the Soviet period, we shall bow our heads to the soldiers who perished liberating Klaipėda, get to know the seaport’s cultural life, visit new housing developments and take a look at Klaipėda’s future.”⁶⁷ It was also observed in the guidelines for tour guides that much attention had been paid to the past during the sightseeing tours of the city in earlier times, which was not a bad thing; but it was already indicated that more had to be said on Soviet achievements. Therefore, the route was prepared and clearly established: 10 minutes had to be dedicated to present the “liberation” and post-war Klaipėda; 10 minutes were also given to present Klaipėda; tourists had to be told about the city in the Station Square; it was followed by 10 minutes on health security and other 10 minutes on education in the city; 15 minutes were given to review the industry in the city and Klaipėda had to be presented as the city of fishermen by stopping by near the monument for fishermen; the presentation of “new” Klaipėda had to last 10 minutes; new housing developments had to be presented in 5 minutes; Debreceno street was also included in this point of the tour; it was planned to present it in 5 minutes; other 10 minutes were provided to present the city’s industry and 10 more minutes to introduce the cultural life in the city⁶⁸. Special attention was also paid to the panorama of the city. The following instructions

⁶⁴ Methodological Guidelines for the Tour “The Beacons of the Construction of Communism of the Ninth Five-Year Plan”, 1972. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 52, l. 6.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, l. 3.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, l. 14.

⁶⁷ *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 52, l. 110.

⁶⁸ Description of the Tour “Klaipėda, the Seaport of the Lithuanian SSR”, 1972. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 2–3.

applied to the presentation of the city panorama: “Panorama. 10 minutes to admire the panorama of the city. Geographical situation of the city and the port. Planning. The city’s growth southwards by maintaining the type of the seaport. Prospects for the growth of the city.”⁶⁹ Guidelines were also provided by the Tour Bureau on how to present the Old Town: “When leading the group to the Old Town and introducing its restoration, it should be stressed that the concern with the preservation of the old architecture and the heritage of the old city layout as well as its presentation to the residents and guests of the city began in the Soviet period only. It is the youth of the old city, old Klaipėda.”⁷⁰ In the course of the tours the cityscape and its monuments were turned into the “plaque of honour” of Soviet achievements which *displayed* all the major *achievements*: rebuilding of the city, designing and construction of new housing as well as the emergence of Soviet monuments in the cityscape.

Hence, both the usual sightseeing tours of Klaipėda as well as interactive ones – by travelling through the pages of information publications – became not only the representations of the memory cityscape but also the conveyors of future visions of the fast-growing socialist city.

Changes in the representations of the cityscape of Klaipėda in the period 1980 to 1990

The changes in the representations of the cityscape of Klaipėda took place from 1980. This year is like a boundary marking the changes in the public visual and textual representations of the city, as more attention in the public representations of Klaipėda was already dedicated to the artistic-cultural panorama of the city. The monuments situated in the city were added to the publication on the promotion of culture *300 Monuments of Culture*⁷¹. This catalogue of monuments intended for the general public and tourists had to be handy for regional studies as well. The following sites presenting the artistic-cultural cityscape were included in the publication: the remains of the Klaipėda Castle, the Old Town, Lenin’s monument, the sculpture *Fisherman*, the monument to Kristijonas Donelaitis, the cemetery of Soviet soldiers.

From 1980 the cultural situation of the city was already reviewed in the context of the panorama of the cityscape, which already included the orientation towards the region of Lithuania Minor. In 1980, the publication *Klaipėda* presented the major cultural destinations in the historical context associated with, as it was said, the centuries-long

⁶⁹ Description of the Tour “Klaipėda, the Seaport of the Lithuanian SSR”, 1972. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 1.

⁷⁰ Methodological Guidelines for the Tour “Klaipėda, the Seaport of the LSSR”, 1972. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 9, l. 1.

⁷¹ *300 Kultūros paminklų*. Vilnius, 1980, p. 95–98.

struggle of Lithuanians for the national identity in the Klaipėda Region⁷². The explications of the Lithuanian culture in the publications representing the city attest to the approach formed in Lithuanian historiography that the search for “Lithuanianhood” in the past of the city increased in the 1960s and 1970s and was particularly explicated in the final decade of the 20th century⁷³.

It was already observed in 1980 that the representations of Klaipėda spotlighting the images of the port had become an axiom which everyone was expected to know already and it was no longer necessary to exploit the port’s image in the literature dedicated to the city⁷⁴. In fact, the above observations had only a trivial effect on the tendencies of representation of the city, and the port was still used as a symbol representing Klaipėda until the early 21st century. The presentation of the port did not lose its relevance in the travel guide *Klaipėda, Curonian Spit, Königsberg*⁷⁵ released in 2005, though the content of presentation itself had already been changed. The port was no longer a symbol of the city’s growth but a tourist attraction: “The port is also the gate of tourism to Lithuania... Klaipėda is learning to welcome the largest tourist groups.”⁷⁶

The information booklet on Klaipėda in Russian, English and German languages, which showed up in 1982, was oriented towards tourists as the target group, and the public spaces presented in it had to be perceived as most attractive and compelling. The booklet described the Old Town, which, as the text tells us, had become a particularly attractive destination thanks to the renovation accomplished with responsibility, flower gardens, fountains, and fachwerk architecture. The old buildings, as it was said, were renovated and adjusted for public needs – they provided spaces for museums, picture galleries, cafés. The publication also provided the photographs of the sites reflecting the exceptional character of the cityscape of Klaipėda; the first page featured the photograph of the sailing ship *Meridianas* moored near the Danė River bank, whereas the content displayed other images of the city: sculptures (near the picture gallery), the seaport, the monument for Soviet soldiers, Klaipėda’s gothic architecture. Most of the visual information sources were not dedicated to the images of the urban development and port infrastructure but to the Old Town and the objects situated in it; attention was also paid to socialist heroes / soldiers.

⁷² BUTKUS, Venantas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1980, p. 9.

⁷³ SAFRONOVAS, Vasilius. Santykio su praeitimi bruožai Klaipėdos mieste XX–XXI amžių sandūroje. *Istorija*, 2009, Nr. 4 (76), p. 40.

⁷⁴ FRANKAS, Kostas. Marinistinė kultūra senamiestyje. *Tarybinė Klaipėda*, 1988, Nr. 255, p. 2.

⁷⁵ STRAKAUSKAITĖ, Nijolė. *Klaipėda, Kuršių Nerija, Karaliaučius. Vadovas*. Vilnius: R. Paknio leidykla, 2005.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 45, 95.



4 II. Monument Sword. The monument was built in 1975. The photograph is taken from the publication *Klaipėda*. Vilnius, 1982. The illustration shows that after 1980 Soviet symbols were not refused in information publications but their use was declining

The travel guide *Klaipėda* published in 1988 featured a clear structure helping the visitor to orient him / herself in the city: “The travel guide begins with the major dates of Klaipėda’s history. The first part presents the reader with the key destinations in the Old Town, the city centre, and the new housing developments... The second part gives pieces of advice on where to get to know the seaport’s cultural life... The third part provides diverse information handy for the guest and tourist of the city.”⁷⁷ Such a model of information presentation was also applied in the publications of such type in earlier times, but the structure also testifies to the changes between the content of this publication and those which appeared before 1980. First of all, the travel guide *Klaipėda* (1988) offered to pay special attention to the city centre with Lenin’s Square as its major highlight; it was presented in the text as the venue of festive demonstrations, parades, and rallies⁷⁸. In this way, the *cultural-revolutionary* panorama of the city had become the key public representation in the publications before 1990. In the travel guide under analysis the Klaipėda Hotel situated in the vicinity of the Victory Square was called the major highlight of the whole city; it was also displayed on the cover of the publication⁷⁹. The travel guide showcased the Victory Square itself in the context of the abovementioned elimination of the ruins in the city; it was also reminded that the square had previously been known as the Soviet Square, but it was renamed after Lenin’s Monument was erected in its very heart in 1976.

The cityscape was further presented while walking along Herkaus Manto street and Maksimo Gorkio street. The Victory Square was associated with new constructions in the

⁷⁷ MARTINKUS, Pranas. *Klaipėda. Mažasis vadovas*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1988, p. 1.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 71–72.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 71–72.

city; the text held that the reader should know the fact that the square was surrounded by the buildings erected in the 20th century and reconstructed after the war. The publications released after 1988 did not forget the new dormitory suburbs as well⁸⁰. The new dormitory suburbs of Klaipėda were described as having their own peculiar face shaped by new sculptures and new modern buildings that stood out from the overall cityscape. The publications maintained that to avoid the monotonous character in constructions, new finishing materials were used, whereas the “skyscrapers,” which had previously been erected in Klaipėda, were an excellent highlight of the silhouette of the city lying on the seaside plain⁸¹. The city’s small architecture did not remain unnoticed as well: “The new buildings of the city centre and squares with the small architecture are in a perfect harmony with the local nature.”⁸²

The images illustrating the poor situation in the city started multiplying in the city’s public discourse from the mid-1980s. It was the time when the photographs of old abandoned buildings⁸³ and the views of Klaipėda of the 19th and early 20th centuries started appearing in the local press and specialised travel literature; they had to demonstrate that there were no longer any elements of the old cityscape of Klaipėda⁸⁴. The images of constructions taking place in the city remained a relevant representation in the local press until 1990, though the images of the post-war ruins were already in the public domain and still circulated in the 1980s. Therefore, throughout the given period Klaipėda was represented as a growing socialist seaport. However, 1980 already saw the formation of a series of opposing images exhibiting the Old Town.

Conclusions

In the period between 1945 and 1990 the representations of Klaipėda in information publications and travel guides as well as photo albums embraced several dominating visual themes: images of industrial facilities and constructions, cultural institutions and monuments dedicated to the socialist regime. Such a situation was due to the attempt to demonstrate how much could actually be accomplished by the Soviet administration for the sake of Klaipėda in a relatively short period of time. In the aftermath of World War II, the city also witnessed the processes of depopulation, leading to the arrival of newcomers in the seaport. Hence, from 1945 to 1980 the public representations of the cityscape of Klaipėda were produced in such a fashion that the image of new housing

⁸⁰ MARTINKUS, Pranas. *Klaipėda. Mažasis vadovas*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1988, p. 95.

⁸¹ BUTKUS, Venantas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1980, p. 24.

⁸² *Klaipėda*. Sud. R. Macienė. Vilnius: Mintis, 1986, p. 64–68.

⁸³ ZVONKUVIENĖ, Janina. Išsaugokim ir čerpių stoğą, ir seną skambantį bruką. *Tarybinė Klaipėda*, 1989, Nr. 102, p. 4–5.

⁸⁴ DEMERECKAS, Kęstutis. Klaipėdos retro. *Klaipėda*, 1991, Nr. 35, p. 2.

developments and the expanding port infrastructure demonstrating the renewal and continuous modernisation of the city would be brought forward in public mind.

The research of the texts of sightseeing tours organised in Klaipėda shows that the primary duty of a tour guide, while presenting the cityscape of Klaipėda, was to focus the attention of the information recipient on the urban changes and only then to remind to whom the citizens had to be thankful for such changes. Thus, there was a certain order of priority defining the way the city's urban development and the remembrance sites of the socialist cityscape had to be presented. Both during the tours and in various information publications dedicated to the city the overviews of the city's history were particularly concentrated and tendentious, since those moments of history were underlined which had to turn the representations of the urban panorama into the legitimization of the political situation.

When investigating why and how the public representations of Klaipėda changed during the given period, it was elicited that in the 1980 to 1990 period a more critical view of the cityscape emerged in the representations of the city. In the 1960s and 1970s the quest for Lithuanianhood in the past of the city was gaining momentum in the public discourse. In the final decade of the 20th century this quest was not only brought forward in information and periodical publications but also shaped a certain doubt whether the representations of the city directly via images of the port were viable. Consequently, more space was dedicated to the visual representations of the Old Town in various publications. The Old Town was already perceived as an attractive space, with its representations linked with renovation processes. From 1980 the representations of the urban space already involved the utilisation of national symbols with a focus on the chronological and spatial area of Lithuania Minor.

References

1. 1954. Klaipėdos m. Kraštotyros muziejaus žinios už 1954 m. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 53, l. 13.
2. 1955 03. Kraštotyros muziejaus tarybos posėdžio protokolai. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 56, l. 100–102.
3. 1956. Klaipėdos m. Kraštotyros muziejaus žinios už 1956 m. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 122.
4. 1959 12 30. Klaipėdos kraštotyros muziejaus darbo patikrinimas. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 1, l. 84.
5. 1959. Trumpa Klaipėdos m. Kraštotyros muziejaus darbo apžvalga. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 56, l. 132.
6. 1962. Klaipėdos m. Kraštotyros muziejaus žinios už 1962 I ketvirtį. Darbo ataskaita. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 169.
7. 1963. Klaipėdos m. Kraštotyros muziejaus žinios už 1963 II ketvirtį. Darbo ataskaita. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 183.

8. 1964 02 29. Lietuvos TSR kultūros ministerijos įsakymai, liečiantys ekskursijų biuro veiklą. 1964 m. vasario 29 d. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 1, l. 8.
9. 1964 m. III kv. Klaipėdos m. Kraštotyros muziejaus darbo ataskaita. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 180.
10. 1968. Ekskursijos po Klaipėdos kojinių fabriką maršruto aprašymas. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 40, l. 1, 9.
11. 1968. Ekskursijos po Klaipėdos medvilnės verpimo fabriką „Trinyčiai“ maršruto aprašymas. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 42, l. 7.
12. 1970. Apžvalginės ekskursijos moksleiviams „Klaipėda – LTSR uostamiestis“ maršruto aprašymas. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 52, l. 24.
13. 1972. Ekskursijos „Klaipėda – Lietuvos TSR uostamiestis“ maršruto aprašymas. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 65, l. 29.
14. 1972. Metodiniai nurodymai ekskursijai „Devintojo penkmečio švyturiai komunizmo statybos“. *KLAA*, f. 492, ap. 1, b. 52, l. 6.
15. ACKERMANN, Felix. Miestas kaip palimpsestas. Istorijos skaitymo ir rašymo vyksmas Gardine. In: *Erdvių pasisavinimas Rytų Prūsijoje XX amžiuje* (Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, t. XXIV). Sud. V. Safronovas. Klaipėda, 2012, p. 277–295.
16. BERŽAS, A. Žmonės su pergales vėliava. Raudonasis Švyturys. *Klaipėda*, 1947, Nr. 172 (397), p. 3.
17. ANUŠAUSKAS, Arvydas. KGB ir lietuvių visuomenė. Slaptasis karas 1954–1991 m. *Darbai ir dienos*, 2000, t. 21, p. 233–283.
18. BABICKAS, Petras. *Gintaro krantas*. Kaunas: Sakalas, 1938.
19. BUTKUS, Tomas S.; SAFRONOVAS, Vasilijus; PETRULIS, Vaidas. *Klaipėdos urbanistika 1945–1990 m.: kolektyvinė monografija*. Sud. T. S. Butkus, V. Safronovas. Vilnius: VšĮ „Vario burnos“, 2015.
20. BUTKUS, Venantas. *Klaipėda*. Klaipėda: Gintaras, 1972.
21. BUTKUS, Venantas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1980.
22. ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. „Tarybinės sostinės“ konstravimas J. Stalino epochoje: Vilniaus ir Minsko atvejai. In: *Nuo Basanavičiaus, Vytauto Didžiojo iki Molotovo ir Ribbentropo. Atminties ir atminimo kultūrų transformacijos XX–XXI amžiuje*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2011, p. 171–224.
23. ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. Kultūrinės atminties sovietizacija: Vilniaus ir Minsko atvejai. In: *Atminties daugiassluoksniskumas: miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 267–314.
24. ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. *Laikas ir akmenys: kultūros paveldo sampratos moderniojoje Lietuvoje*. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005.
25. ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. Miestas kaip ideologinis tekstas: teoriniai ir interpretaciniai aspektai. In: *Atminties daugiassluoksniskumas. Miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 57–85.
26. ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. *Paveldosauga globaliajame pasaulyje*. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2010.

27. ČEPAITIENĖ, Rasa. Sovietmečio atmintis – tarp atmetimo ir nostalgijos. *Lituanistica*, 2007, t. 53, Nr. 4 (72), p. 36–50.
28. DEMERECKAS, Kęstutis. Klaipėdos retro. *Klaipėda*, 1991, Nr. 35, p. 2.
29. ELERTIENĖ, Bronė. *Klaipėdos kraštotyros muziejus: tarnybiniam naudojimui*. Klaipėda, 1975.
30. FRANKAS, Kostas. Marinistinė kultūra senamiestyje. *Tarybinė Klaipėda*, 1988, Nr. 255, p. 2.
31. GORSUCH, Anne E. *All this is Your World – Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad After Stalin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
32. GORSUCH, Anne E; KOENKER, Diane. *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist Under Capitalism and Socialism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2006.
33. KERTENIS, Deividas. Okupantų parankinė (Lietuvos TSR užsienio reikalų ministerija). *Darbai ir dienos*, 2002, t. 30, p. 2, 27–247.
34. *Klaipėda*. Sud. R. Macienė. Vilnius: Mintis, 1986.
35. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius, 1965.
36. KLAIPĖDIŠKIS, A. B. *Vadovėlis po Klaipėdos kraštą bei prūsų paribius*. Klaipėda: Rytas, 1924.
37. KRIVICKAS, Sigitas. *Klaipėdos diena*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1969.
38. KOENKER, Diane P. *Club Red: Vacation Travel and the Soviet Dream*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2013.
39. KREFTAS, Haroldas. *Klaipėda – pagaliau didelės ateities miestas. Lietuvos uostamiestis vokiečio akimis*. Vilnius: Gintaras, 1969.
40. LEFEBVRE, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Wiley, 1991.
41. *Lietuvos miestais*. Šiauliai: „Vilties“ sp., 1935.
42. *Lietuvos TSR turistinis žemėlapis*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1969.
43. *Lietuvos pajūris*. Kaunas, Šiauliai: „Vilties“ sp., 1931.
44. MAČIULIS, Dangiras. Kolektyvinė atmintis ir miesto įvaizdis: Šiaulių atvejis. *Acta Humanitarica Universitatis Saulensis: mokslo darbai*, 2009, t. 9, p. 218–234.
45. MAČIULIS, Dangiras. Laikinosios sostinės kolektyvinės atminties kraštovaizdis. In: *Nuo Basanavičiaus, Vytauto Didžiojo iki Molotovo ir Ribbentropo. Atminties ir atminimo kultūrų transformacijos XX–XXI amžiuje*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2011, p. 133–156.
46. MAČIULIS, Dangiras. Pasisavinant Mažąją Lietuvą. Vienijančios kolektyvinės atminties konstravimas Lietuvoje tarpukariu. In: *Erdvių pasisavinimas Rytų Prūsijoje XX amžiuje*. (Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, t. XXIV). Sud. V. Safronovas. Klaipėda, 2012, p. 212–228.
47. MARTINKUS, Pranas. *Klaipėda. Mažasis vadovas*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1988.
48. MATULYTĖ, Margarita. Totalitarinė fotografija: kova už sielas. *Menotyra*, 2005, t. 40, Nr. 3, p. 21–27.
49. MEŠYS, Judas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1963.
50. MEŠYS, Judas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1964.

51. MIKAILIENĖ, Živilė. Kultūrinės atminties raiška Vilniuje sovietmečiu: tarp lietuviškumo ir sovietiško. In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas: miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 199–216.
52. MIKAILIENĖ, Živilė. Miestų jubiliejai kaip atminties kultūros formavimo vėlyvuojų sovietmečiu reiškinys (Vilniaus ir Kijevo jubiliejų atvejai). In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas: miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 315–344.
53. MIKAILIENĖ, Živilė. *Vilnius sovietmečiu: ideologija ir miesto tapatumo formavimas (1940–1988): disertacija*. Vilnius, 2015.
54. NIKŽENTAITIS, Alvydas. Laikinosios ir Lietuvos Respublikos sostinių kultūrinės atmintys: lyginamosios analizės bandymas. *Acta Humanitarica Universitatis Saulensis: mokslo darbai*, 2009, t. 9, p. 235–246.
55. NOACK, Christian. “You have probably heard about all this...” Balti Seaside Resorts as Soviet Tourist Destination. In: *Tourismus im Ostseeraum / Tourism in the Baltic Region* (Nordost-Archiv, N. F. Bd. XX/2011). Hrsg. von K. Brüggemann. Lüneburg: Nordost-Institut, 2012, S. 199–222.
56. PUJANAUSKAITĖ, Renata. *Turizmo organizacijos Lietuvoje 1918–1990 m.: magistro darbas*. Vilnius, 2005.
57. PUKYS, Povilas. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1959.
58. RAGUCKAS, Juozas. Turizmo vystymasis Lietuvoje. Disertacija. *VUB Rankraščių skyrius*, f. 85-972. Vilnius, 1977.
59. RAGUCKAS, Juozas. 118 ekskursijų ir vienas vadovas. *Tarybinis mokytojas*, 1985, liepos 12, p. 4.
60. RAGUCKAS, Juozas. Sunki pradžia. *Darbas ir poilsis*, 1979, Nr. 4, p. 14.
61. SAFRONOVAS, Vasilijus. Dėl centro ir periferijos santykio atminimo reikšmių perimamumo procese. In *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas. Miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 35–55.
62. SAFRONOVAS, Vasilijus. Ar Tarybų Sąjungoje būta alternatyvos vyraujančiai atminimo kultūrai? Žvilgsnis į du periferinius miestus. In: *Atminties daugiasluoksniškumas. Miestas, valstybė, regionas*. Sud. A. Nikžentaitis. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2013, p. 349–382.
63. SAFRONOVAS, Vasilijus. *Praeitis kaip konflikto šaltinis: tapatybės ideologijų konkurencija XX amžiaus Klaipėdoje*. Klaipėda: LII leidykla, 2011.
64. SAFRONOVAS, Vasilijus. Santykio su praeitimi bruožai Klaipėdos mieste XX–XXI amžių sandūroje. *Istorija*, 2009, Nr. 4 (76), p. 39–53.
65. SAVICKAS, R. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1966.
66. STRAKAUSKAITĖ, Nijolė. *Klaipėda, Kuršių Nerija, Karaliaučius. Vadovas*. Vilnius: R. Paknio leidykla, 2005.
67. *Tourismus im Ostseeraum / Tourism in the Baltic Region* (Nordost-Archiv, N. F. Bd. XX/2011). Hrsg. von K. Brüggemann. Lüneburg: Nordost-Institut, 2012. 403 S.
68. Trumpa Klaipėdos m. Kraštotyros muziejaus darbo apžvalga. *KLAA*, f. 693, ap. 1, b. 56, l. 84, 132.

69. URRY, John. *The Tourist Gaze*. London: SAGE Publications, 1990.
70. *Vadovas po Lietuvą*. Red. P. Barkauskas, A. Vabalas. Kaunas: „Spindulio“ sp., 1938.
71. VITKUS, Hektoras. Mažoji Lietuva kaip lietuvių atminties vieta: teorinis modelis. In: *Daugiareikšmės tapatybės tarpuerdvėse: Rytų Prūsijos atvejis XIX–XX amžiais* (Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, t. XXIII). Sud. V. Safronovas, N. Strakauskaitė, L. Motuzienė. Klaipėda, 2011, p. 203–233.
72. ZAVADSKIS, Audrius. *Klaipėda*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1977.
73. ZUELOW, Eric. *A History of Modern Tourism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
74. ZVONKUVIENĖ, Janina. Išsaugokim ir čerpių stogą, ir seną skambantį bruką. *Tarybinė Klaipėda*, 1989, Nr. 102, p. 4–5.
75. ŽALYS, Alfonsas. Klaipėda – Tarybinė. *Klaipėda*, 1965, p. 88.
76. *300 Kultūros paminklų*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1980.
77. *Клайпеда – Klaipėda*. Вильнюс: Мысль, 1982.
78. *Клайпеда*. Вильнюс: Мысль, 1966.
79. *Клайпеда – Klaipėda*. Вильнюс: Мысль, 1982.
80. *Клайпеда–Klaipėda*. Kaunas, 1982.

Klaipėdos miestovaizdžio tekstinių ir vaizdinių pristatymų formavimasis 1945–1990 m. Pažintinė ekskursija po sovietmečio Klaipėdą

Dovilė Bataitytė

Klaipėdos universitetas, Herkaus Manto g. 84, Klaipėda
el. p. dovile.bataityte@gmail.com

Santrauka

Klaipėdos viešosios reprezentacijos Lietuvos TSR buvo kuriamos siekiant informacijos gavėją supažindinti su modernaus bei „naujam gyvenimui prikeltą“ miesto vaizdiniu. Klaipėda po Antrojo pasaulinio karo buvo viešai pristatoma kaip ir kiti Lietuvos TSR miestai pažintiniais, turistiniais tikslais, tad viešosios miesto reprezentacijos turėjo atitikti ideologiškai angažuotus ir socialistinius idealus. Atlikus Klaipėdos miestovaizdžio viešųjų reprezentacijų 1945–1990 m. analizę galima nustatyti miesto vaizdinių pristatymų panaudos būdų formas ir tęstinumą. Po Didžiojo Tėvynės karo Sovietų Sąjungoje turizmas buvo tapęs masinio propagandinio darbo dalimi, tiesa, pirmaisiais dešimtmečiais po karo turizmas iš tiesų nebuvo prioritetine veikla, tačiau šeštojo dešimtmečio pradžioje vėl įgijo savo, kaip socialistinių idealų teigėjo, funkcijas. Remiantis straipsnyje atlikta analize galima teigti, kad Klaipėdos miesto pristatymai kelionių

literatūroje turėjo kelis dominuojančius vaizdinius siužetus: pramonės objektai ir statybų vaizdai, kultūrinės įstaigos ir paminklai, skirti socialistinei santvarkai. Miestovaizdžio viešosios reprezentacijos buvo kuriamos taip, kad žmonių sąmonėje susikurtų vaizdinys, susietas su naujaisiais miesto rajonais bei augančia uosto infrastruktūros vizija. Mieste rengtų pažintinių ekskursijų tekstų tyrimas atskleidžia, kad pristatant Klaipėdos miestovaizdį svarbiausia ekskursijos vadovo „pareiga“ buvo informacijos gavėjo dėmesį koncentruoti į miesto pokyčius. Tai leido susiformuoti eiliškumui, kaip turėjo būti pristatoma miesto urbanistinė plėtra ir sovietinės atminties vietos. Aiškinantis, kodėl ir kaip Klaipėdos viešieji pristatymai kito tiriamuoju laikotarpiu, paaiškėjo, kad 1980–1990 m. periodu miesto pristatymuose atsirado kritiškesnis žvilgsnis į miestovaizdį, pradėta abejoti, ar verta miestą tiesiogiai reprezentuoti uosto vaizdais, kelionių vadovuose imta daugiau dėmesio skirti senamiesčio vaizdiniam.

Įteikta / Received 2016 09 30
Priimta / Accepted 2018 02 13