



**Monuments and monument care
in Czechoslovakia and other
Central European countries
during the second half of
the 20th century**

26—29 / 4 / 2021

Book of Abstracts

26 / 4 / 2021 17.30—18.30

Plenary Lecture

**The alchemy of preservation in postwar
Czechoslovakia: Agency, structure
and the containment of things
in a time of mass expulsion
and dispossession**

Cathleen M. Giustino

Auburn University, USA

This paper offers a view into the complex, often contingent interrelations between actors and structures that resulted in the construction of a state-run movement-control system to regulate the comings, goings and containment of valuable interior furnishings, including art and antiques, taken from Germans in postwar Czechoslovakia. This securement apparatus was not the product of pre-conceived plans; nor did it simply result from one individual's or one group's material greed or lust for power. An understanding of the causal forces behind the construction of the movement-control system is gained by examining the views of Czech agents active in the securement of German cultural property, and the structures in which they competed, strategized, and negotiated for sway over moveable objects confiscated from Germans. Taken together, the agents and structures were ingredients in what I am calling here the alchemy of preservation in postwar Czechoslovakia.

27 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 1

The miracles of Frankfurt/Oder — Trends of preservation of monuments 1945—2020

Thomas Drachenberg

Brandenburg State Office for Monument Preservation and State Archaeological Museum

The Second World War, initiated by Germany, was an absolute disaster for Europe and Germany itself. In the Potsdam Agreement in 1945, the borders of Germany were reworded and unity was destroyed: the Soviet zone of occupation developed differently from the American, English and French zones. Until 1989 there was a little common German history — but rather a history of East and West. These two stories only became a reunited story since the brake of the Berlin-Wall in 1989. Today, in the generations who have experienced the German and European division, common values but different life experiences are existing. The same development can be observed in the preservation of monuments.

I would like to use the example of the Marienkirche in Frankfurt/Oder to explain the development of East German civil society and the different kinds of preservation of monuments shortly:

How did the political conditions from 1945 to 2020 affect the preservation of monuments in East-Germany? Which concepts were successful and which not and why? How can we learn from our monuments and our different history in Europe?

27 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 1

The Cultural Palace of Dresden

Alf Furkert

State Office for Monument Preservation in Saxony

The city center of Dresden was destroyed through the bombardment of the Allies a few months before the end of World War II. After the end of the war, almost the whole city center was cleared out to gain space for a new socialist urban development. Following Soviet specifications, straight streets and large squares were built. The first residential and business buildings conformed to the so-called “national tradition” of Stalinist influence; and, with respect to Dresden's architectural history, were constructed in a neo-baroque style.

The Northern side of the square “Altmarkt” was supposed to be rounded off with a multifunctional culture palace. The first drafts resembled the Lomonosov University in Moscow or the culture palace in Warsaw; however, it was decided against them. In 1959, an architectural competition was held - its draft's requirements contained a request for a “height-dominant feature” to represent the superiority of the socialist idea. 29 plans were handed in; one of them was very modern but did not include a tower. Therefore, no one dared to select it as the winner of the competition. A delegation to discuss the matter was sent to Moscow; and, to everyone's surprise, came back with a positive vote for the plan without a tower. The building was constructed until 1969.

After 1989, a new discussion arose as to whether to demolish the culture palace. Nowadays, Dresden's culture palace is an integral part of Dresden's city center and is highly frequented after being reconstructed following guidelines for historical monuments and supplemented with new functions in the interior.

27 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 1

The birth of preservationist architecture

Martina Mertová

Olomouc Museum of Art

The proto-preservationist debate over the appearance of historic town centers crystallized during the era of the First Czechoslovak Republic, albeit without a stronger base. During the Protectorate, in confrontation with the previous era, the prevailing view was theoretically formed on the appearance of new formations in the environment of old towns; in the decade after the war, and in direct connection with the advent of socialist realism, this brought the method of the holistic approach to the forefront. It is on this basis that the phenomenon of preservationist architecture stands, voluntarily lagging behind the creative role of architectural intervention. We take a more detailed look at what was behind the turnaround and transition to a preference for authorial, contrasting architecture in the early 1960s. What arguments outweighed the previous concept, and what role did the political background play? The contextual involvement of new buildings in the historical fabric of cities represented the first clearly declared strategy of Czech heritage management which has survived latently to this day. It periodically returns in more or less outspoken waves, but not as an officially promoted program. It was the opposite wing which codified the right to a contrasting form as a new norm and to which contemporary heritage management officially subscribes; without, however, legislative or revised methodological support.

27 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 1

The fall of the contrast method after 1968

Rostislav Švácha

Institute of Art History of the Czech Academy of Sciences

One of the important topics in the management of heritage properties was, and still is, the “behavior” of new buildings in a historic environment. The phenomenon of “preservationist architecture” was replaced in the 1960s by the belief that new buildings in historic cities could be conceived in a more contrasting and experimental way. The conditions of competitions for the completion of the Old Town Hall in Prague, for example, declared it as an explicit requirement. Theoretical arguments for such an approach were provided mainly by the prematurely deceased architectural historian Oldřich Dostál (1926—1966), whose key concept became the “symbiosis” of the old and the modern. After 1968, however, the authorities of Czechoslovak heritage management began to criticize this contrasting method and de facto pushed it off the scene. The critique of contrasting architecture as “non-contextual” appears in the debate on new buildings in historical environments even today, although the concepts of context and contextuality are ambiguous and allow for a variety of interpretations. The paper shows which buildings and projects this criticism turned against after 1968 and attempts to reveal its political background.

27 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.30

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 2

Monument preservation, cultural policy and urban development in the German Democratic Republic (GDR)

Alena Janatková

Technical University of Berlin

After the devastation of the Second World War, reconstructions in connection with nation-building became a real boom, as it was demonstrated by Arnold Bartetzky in his exemplary study on the context of nation-building, monument and reconstruction (Arnold Bartetzky: *Das Denkmal und seine politische Bedeutung*, In: *Werte. Begründungen der Denkmalpflege in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. by Hans-Rudolf Meier, Ingrid Scheuermann and Wolfgang Sonne, Berlin 2013, pp. 232—243). The examples go back to the 19th century, and they extend to the present. Included is Germany as well as Poland, Bohemia or Russia. According to Bartetzky, the selective relationship of reconstruction to the original is characteristic. This way, the historical monument is replaced by the ideal-typical model in the sense of purification. The decisive factor is not the many features of time, but an idealising imagination of the past.

In the German Democratic Republic, nation-building was also closely linked to reconstruction projects. The following aspects will be here crucial for the presentation of these reconstructions: The construction of history as legitimisation of the GDR, the preservation of historical monuments in connection with socialist urban planning, and monument reconstruction in the focus of urban heritage management in Berlin, capital of the GDR.

27 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.30

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 2

Industrial heritage and the socialist “*Heimat*”. Preserving industrial monuments in the GDR, 1950s—1960s

Nele-Hendrikje Lehmann

Freiberg University of Mining and Technology

In 1952, the category of “technical monuments” was included in the “Ordinance for the Preservation of the National Cultural Monuments of the GDR”. Technical artefacts and industrial remnants were thus considered an important part of heritage much earlier than in many other European countries. Historians have argued that this was due to the Marxist-Leninist understanding of history. Industrial monuments fit well with a history of productive forces and thus, with the state cultural policy. However, albeit the argument seems convincing, it ignores the continuities in historic preservation. This paper argues that the conservation of industrial monuments in the GDR was influenced by concepts that were established by actors like the Association of German Engineers and the Bund Heimatschutz in the first third of the twentieth century. It shows how these concepts were transformed and adapted in the 1950s, supporting the creation of a socialist culture and a socialist “*Heimat*” (homeland).

27 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.30

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 2

“Aesthetic-charitable opinion”? Traditionalist architectural and artistic tendencies in the management of heritage properties in Central Europe 1945—1990

Martin Horáček

Faculty of Arts, Palacký University in Olomouc

This article focuses on the phenomenon of using traditional (pre-modernist) architectural morphology in projects addressing the restoration and reconstruction of historic buildings, as well as completions and new buildings in settlements with heritage values. It notes the responses to the notions of “signs of our time” in the preservationist debate and in subject doctrinal documents (Venice Charter), while emphasizing the attitudes that opposed confrontational delineation towards classical and vernacular vocabulary and the urban concept. A diverse range of practical approaches will also be reflected, from the “new heritage properties” either built (Bethlehem Chapel in Prague) or proposed (eastern wing of the Old Town Hall in Prague), through reconstructions with a significant share of historicizing neo-formations (fortified and residential castles, castle gardens according to Břetislav Štorm, the Bishop's Palace in Olomouc), traditionalist urban planning interventions (the squares in Fulnek or Moravský Krumlov), up to the care of heritage properties “from below” (cottages and civic initiatives). The motivations and results of the described activities in the Czech lands will be placed in the context of the contemporary Central European situation.

27 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.30

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 2

Approaches to the restoration of heritage properties and their parallel lines of opinion in heritage management

Milena Hauserová

Faculty of Architecture, Czech Technical University in Prague

Reconstruction of an important stage of a heritage property as a socially desirable unambiguous interpretation of an incompletely preserved condition. A new realm opens up within the period of socialist realism but does not end there.

Consolidation of damaged aggregates using neutral retouching in the scale of individual properties as well as in entire complexes and urban formations. The strengths and weaknesses of this concept.

The distance between a heritage property and its contemporary complement as a response to modernity in heritage management. Concurrence with social changes, especially with the restructuring of the construction industry in socialist Czechoslovakia. The break with modernity, coinciding and mixing with criticism of access to heritage properties under the previous regime.

Attempts to find harmony with the historical environment — resonance with the revolt of postmodernism.

Aesthetic interventions declared as the restoration of valuable overlaid or extinct stages. The line of reconstructions does not fade even at the end of the century.

A wave of growing respect for the historical environment, manifestations of considerateness towards architectural heritage.

This is happening against a background of social change, in which, in addition to the erosion of shared values, the plurality of wishes and expectations associated with cultural heritage is growing.

27 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.30

Section 1 — Architecture and urbanism — Part 2

The gradual expansion of the subject of interest of heritage management in the monitored period and its hitherto unreflected consequences

Milena Hauserová

Faculty of Architecture, Czech Technical University in Prague

In addition to the traditional scope of heritage management, for which an interest in an active role in urban regulation began during the pre-war period, the field of interest in heritage management has expanded to include heritage properties of modern to contemporary architecture, technical heritage properties, heritage properties of folk architecture and, most recently, the cultural landscape.

Until recently, heritage management has traditionally focused on selected heritage properties of social significance. It applies to them a model of relatively strict regulation of treatment which, in the past, was refined especially on artistic properties. This practice of official state heritage management arose from conditions during which there was no significant concern about the fate of other inherited values. The second half of the 20th century, especially the latter part, showed that this concept is no longer sufficient. The responsible management of inherited values in their full breadth will likely presuppose not only a change in the traditional setting of heritage management and the expansion of the tools for its operation, but also an interlacing with the issue of environmental protection in particular.

28 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 1

In the period of change: Organisation and main activities in the monument protection in Slovakia (1945 — approx. 1951)

Tomáš Kowalski

Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic, Bratislava

The contribution focuses on the development and context of the protection of monuments in Slovakia at the time of the onset of the so-called people's democracy. In the main features, it follows the genesis of the organizational arrangement of the protection of monuments. Its previous anchoring in the Slovak Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment (1938—45) was transformed into the upper executive body called the Commissionership of Education and Enlightenment. The structure was supplemented by the National Cultural Commission for Slovakia (active: May 1948—December 1951) with a specific mission to manage and use movable and immovable heritage property, confiscated from the persons of foreign nationalities and the so-called enemies of state-forming nations. Finally, the necessity of a substantial expansion of the organizational base of monument protection ultimately resulted in the establishment of the Monuments Institute in Bratislava. Taking into account the sources of the governmental level (Prague), the main trends and major events in the protection of architectural and artistic heritage in Slovakia in the first decade after 1945 are further discussed.

28 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 1

Creating the conservation system in People's Republic of Croatia, 1945—1960

Marko Špikić

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

After the Second World War Croatia became one of six republics in new Yugoslav federation. It took a week for conservators to transform the war-time Croatian State Conservation Bureau into new, central institute for protection of monuments. The staff faced radical changes in political ideology, economy and culture, and in this context a new system for the protection of monuments was created. In line with constitutional sovereignty of each federal republic, Croatian conservators designed the system in three regional offices, organizing the staff, financial support, and projects in order to contribute to post-war reconstruction. They reassessed the pre-war conservation theories originating from Germany, Austria and Italy, expressing their opinions at conferences and in first specialized journals. The paper will present the political framework, main protagonists and projects, methodology and contemporary influences in the process of creation of a new conservation system in the first fifteen years of communist Croatia.

28 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 1

Old monuments in a new regime: Conceptualizing architectural heritage in 1950s Romania

Liliana Iuga

Independent researcher

This paper aims to analyze the reorganization of monument protection in Romania during the 1950s, after the activity of the Commission for Historical Monuments was initially interrupted in 1948. It shows that the 1950s were marked by two complementary processes: first, an attempt to re-conceptualize heritage in the postwar context, given both the changes in property regimes and the ideological requirements of the Communists, and second, the efforts to institutionalize monument protection as part of the state-building process. The paper will emphasize the peculiarities of the Romanian case — for example, the significant differences in monument protection policies existing between the historical provinces (Transylvania and the Old Kingdom), and the extent to which these were maintained in the new political context. Very significantly, the first inventory of historical monuments was carried out on Romania's territory in the first half of the 1950s. Until the mid-1950s, new legislation in the field was promulgated, which remained valid until the end of the Communist period. The paper will therefore focus on continuities and ruptures, demonstrating that positive developments happened in the field of monument protection in period largely known for major economic scarcity and harsh political repression.

28 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 1

State Heritage Administration (1953—1958)

Kristina Uhlíková

Institute of Art History of the Czech Academy of Sciences

The situation in Czechoslovakia changed radically several times between 1945 and 1958 in comparison to the relatively stabilized interwar period. New institutions were created only to disappear after several years or to be transformed and merged with others. The executive and professional components of heritage management were divided and subsequently reunited, with power being transferred from the central authorities to the regional authorities and back again. The situation in other spheres of state administration was similar, of course, as related to the turbulent changes in society at the beginning and gradual consolidation of the positions of the totalitarian regime. One of the institutions established and subsequently abolished during this complicated period was the State Heritage Administration (*Státní památková správa*), which centralized practically the entire agenda of state-guaranteed care for heritage properties at the beginning of 1953. It organized the administration of about 130 state-owned castles as well as a general revision and the second cycle of sorting the furnishings expropriated by the state to private owners and concentrated in these buildings. It prepared the creation of the first urban heritage reserves, but it also set up the methods of presenting cultural heritage to the public according to new ideological postulates. Despite this very wide range of agendas, there is still much that is not known about its activities.

28 / 4 / 2021 10.00—12.15

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 1

The Golden Sixties? Critical remarks on heritage practices of the Act on Cultural Heritage Properties

Marek Krejčí

Center for Slavic Art Studies

The adoption of the Heritage Properties Act (památkový zákon) at the National Assembly in 1958 seemed to signify the fulfillment of the long-standing desires of those who wished to protect heritage properties. One of the few skeptics was the preservationist Jaroslav Helfert who, after its adoption, resigned from the position of district conservator in the Rychnov region; he stated that he could hear the death knell for heritage management and did not want to play the role of undertaker. It was not until the end of the 1960s, during the Prague Spring, that a number of contemporary heritage management cases (particularly the physical destruction of cultural heritage properties) were being critically documented by the free press. The entire situation was critically mapped in summary by the Memorandum on the Current State of Heritage Management by the Institute of Art Theory and History of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in 1968. The negligence and non-fulfillment of statutory obligations were undoubtedly tolerated as part of the current political and economic system. Even the government commissioner for the renovation of the historic core of the city of Cheb shipwrecked against the cumbersome system of planning and network of local interests; he and his colleagues were later subjected to an investigation for sabotage. The lesson learned, even relevant today, could be a reflection of the differentiation of the system of state heritage care to the executive unit and the professional unit that was in fact subordinated to the first; this led (and still leads) to the marginalization of professional solutions to problems.

28 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.00

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 2

Bureaucratization, centralization, categorization. The preparation of the Act on State Heritage Management

Michal Novotný

Faculty of Arts, Palacký University in Olomouc

In 1974, the Ministry of Culture began drafting a new heritage law which was to replace the hitherto valid law of 1958 on cultural heritage properties. The preparation of the new law on state heritage management lasted throughout nearly the entire period of normalization.

Although the need to make extensive changes in state heritage management had been formulated by preservationists in the late 1960s, the first conceptual documents on the bill completely ignored them. Instead of the proposed increase in respect for the expert opinion of heritage institutions, the main theme of the new law became the effort to strengthen the Ministry's methodological control over the nation's heritage fund. The original concept of a dynamic heritage fund was replaced by a system of centralized declaration of assets as state-protected cultural heritage properties. The increasingly stronger state bureaucracy, as well as the advances of the scientific and technological revolution that were trying to apply the idea of a scientifically controlled society in the real world with the assistance of expert management, were to contribute to this.

The preparation of the heritage act also demonstrated a new emphasis on positive law that strove for the accuracy of legal provisions in the creation and interpretation of law. The promoted notion of socialist legality presumed that the importance of the rule of law, as a highly organized social order, is greater in socialism than in capitalism. Legal formalism prevailed in both legal texts and in their interpretation.

28 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.00

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 2

The performance of state heritage management in the 2nd half of the 20th century

Jiří Varhaník

Independent researcher

The paper provides a brief overview of the application of Acts No. 22/1958 Coll., On Cultural Heritage Properties, and No. 20/1987 Coll., On State Heritage Management, in practice in the context of the organization of state heritage management at the time; it also deals with the relationship of the building regulations bound to them during the period under review. This was characterized by widespread non-compliance of the valid legal enactment of state heritage management, especially by the institutions that were supposed to guarantee and enforce them. The program of registering cultural heritage properties into the state lists suffered serious shortcomings. The district national committees, being the predominantly first-instance bodies of state heritage management, in most cases simply failed to fulfill a substantial part of their authority; this was instead carried out without proper authorization by the regional centers of state heritage management and nature protection, previously established by regional national committees. The building authorities of all levels were familiar with this illegal situation; they did not issue their decisions on the basis of documents of state heritage management bodies, but usually merely on the basis of notes kept by the regional organizations of state heritage management.

28 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.00

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 2

Monument protection in Hungary in the 2nd half of the 20th century

Pál Lővei

Research Centre for the Humanities, Budapest

The paper gives a brief account of the tendencies of monument protection in Hungary from the end of the Second World War until the changes after the political transformations of 1990. The National Commission of Monuments, founded in 1872, was dissolved in 1949. The institution was reorganized several times, but the scientific programs of the young research workers from the 1930s, first of all important volumes of the monument topography, could have been realized in the 1950s. The National Inspectorate for Historic Monuments was created in 1957, which brought a two decades' flourishing period, first of all in the field of renovations and reconstructions. The 1980s brought already a decline from the point of view of the architectural progress, and political support, but with the complex protection of the historic town centres, and the perfection of Bauforschung it was still a successful period. The changes after 1990 can only be referred to: thanks to the governmental decisions and measures by now there is no institutional monument protection in Hungary.

28 / 4 / 2021 13.15—15.00

Section 2 — Legislation and institutions — Part 2

Heritage Care in the 2nd half of the 20th century in Austria

Paul Mahringer

Federal Monuments Authority Austria

The responsible institution for the care of material cultural heritage in Austria is the Federal Monuments Authority Austria (Bundesdenkmalamt). Immediately after the WW II one of the biggest challenges for the institution was to help with the rebuilding of Austria. It lasted in Austria until the 1950s. In the late 1940s the Federal Monuments Authority also started to protect Adolf Loos buildings from the beginning of the 20th century.

In the 1960s and 1970s and especially around the European Heritage Year 1975 questions of how to protect old cities and Austria's cultural landscape against modern skyscrapers, highways and other kind of environmental destruction arose.

In the 1970s and 1980s numerous important monuments like monasteries in Lower Austria were restored. Beside the restoration of highlights the question of the „masses of monuments“ like rural buildings came up and the institution also started to engage stronger with buildings of the classical modernity from pre WW II and exploration of the roots of modern heritage care around 1900.

At the end of the century there was the first engagement with post WW II buildings and a public discussion how to handle with Russian War Monuments of the late 1940s.

28 / 4 / 2021 15.45—16.45

Section 3 — Heritage management and society — Part 1

Devastation and extinction of cultural heritage properties as a result of demolition events in the Czech borderlands after 1945

David Kovařík

Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences

The paper deals with the fate of cultural heritage properties that came under threat, were damaged, or disappeared completely as part of the demolitions carried out along the Czechoslovak border after the Second World War. In addition to the mass demolition and extinction of abandoned settlements, agricultural buildings, and other structures, the post-war destruction also affected a vast number of heritage properties and religious buildings (especially churches, monasteries, and chapels). Their extinction was explained to the public as in the interest of security and military, public protection, or an attempt to settle the issue of German cultural heritage in these areas. The paper is chronologically limited to the period from 1945 (when the borderlands were reassumed by the Czechoslovak administration and the process of ethnic, social, and demographic transformation of the area began) to 1960, when the nationwide demolition of abandoned settlements in the former Sudetenland was completed. The network of settlements along the Czechoslovak borderlands was radically reduced during this transformational period. The paper also addresses the role and participation of the State Heritage Office and the State Heritage Management Authorities in deciding on the fate of local heritage properties threatened by post-war demolition.

28 / 4 / 2021 15.45—16.45

Section 3 — Heritage management and society — Part 1

Heritage properties in motion: cultural heritage through the perspective of Czechoslovak documentary film 1948—1956

Andrea Průchová Hrůzová

Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences

Michal Kurz

Masaryk Institute and Archives of the Czech Academy of Sciences

The paper offers an as yet practically unreflected view of Czechoslovak heritage management at the turn of the 1940s and 1950s through the period production of documentary films. It uses official documents to briefly outline the political context in which the films presenting domestic historical cities and their heritage properties were made, followed by insights into the functions of the film production apparatus, which was used for the purpose of long-term documentation of the local cultural heritage. The core of the paper presents a basic typology of realized films on the basis of various interpretive frameworks that the creators used in the elaboration of the themes (tourist, art, and ideological), and which in practice often intertwined and complemented each other. Viewers were provided with general characteristics of urban units in a context of historical and patriotic interpretation, detailed observations of individual buildings, and specific presentations of how nationalized heritage properties were being put to use after 1948. Samples from short documentaries *Bílá Telč/White Telč* (1948, J. Brichta), *Zámky se otvírají/Castles Are Opening* (1948, K. M. Walló), *Karlštejn/Karlštejn Castle* (1956, S. Studený) a *Moravská gotika/Moravian Gothic* (1955, J. Fuksa) will be used to illustrate this typology. The aim of the paper is to utilize a dialogical form to point out the key role that heritage management played in the presentation and legitimization of the post-1948 regime, and to reflect on the ways that preservationists and filmmakers cooperated in this complex task.

29 / 4 / 2021 9.00—10.45

Section 3 — Heritage management and society — Part 2

Heritage properties and Security — interest or disinterest?

Milan Bárta

Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes

Czechoslovak State Security formed one of the mainstays of the communist regime from 1948 to 1989 and was closely connected with communist rule. Its approach to heritage properties therefore naturally reflected the attitudes of the ruling party elite. Several topics can be addressed within this context. First is the use of listed or protected buildings, or their furnishings, by Czechoslovak State Security. In this context, the question arises as to whether attempts were made to respect this status, and to what extent modifications and repairs were made to the buildings. The issue was also reflected in the practical activities of the security forces. The heritage properties, as a primary destination for tourists from Western countries, were a focus of the security forces' attention. As such, the competence of State Security also included the search for items stolen from heritage properties and their disappearance across the borders. It is also necessary to monitor whether State Security's approach to the issue changed over time, and, if so, to what extent. Given the scope of the issue, as well as the fact that this is still a primary probe, this presentation would mainly be an outline of the topic using several specific cases as illustration.

29 / 4 / 2021 9.00—10.45

Section 3 — Heritage management and society — Part 2

The Vltava Cascade and heritage management in southern Bohemia

Martin Gaži

National Heritage Institute, Regional Office in České Budějovice

The intention to utilize the Vltava River for energy was accelerated by Stalinist plans in the early 1950s and developed over the following decades by the technocratic elites of the communist regime. To understand the possibilities and limits of the activities of heritage management under the pressure of state priorities, the paper focuses on three “paradigmatic” stories. The oldest of them concerns the dispute over the feasibility, manner, and site of the relocation of the Church of St. Bartholomew in Červená nad Vltavou in 1958—1960; the entanglement of conflicting central directives and local political efforts is particularly apparent here. The second story took place on 15 September 1959. The České Budějovice council of the Regional National Committee had convened a broad advisory board to discuss the master plan for Týn nad Vltavou, where a significant part of the city's historic core was to be demolished in connection with the Orlík Reservoir. The paper focuses on the negotiating strategy of KSSPPOP (Regional Heritage Authority) representative Marian Farka and the subsequent failure of preservationists' efforts to save at least part of this valuable heritage fund. The third story addresses the passive resistance of the preservationist community to plans for the construction of a gigantic waterworks in the second half of the (seemingly liberalizing) 1960s. During this time, there were particularly valuable monument areas in the Český Krumlov region that found themselves in acute danger.

29 / 4 / 2021 9.00—10.45

Section 3 — Heritage management and society — Part 2

Privileged monuments in the landscape of cultural heritage properties

Čeněk Pýcha

Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes

The submitted paper focuses on heritage properties of the revolutionary workers' movement; during the period of state socialism, these became the favored heritage properties, often with the highest degree of protection. The basic chronological construction of my research consists mainly of two milestones — the proclamation of the first national cultural heritage properties (NKP) in 1962, and additions to the NKP list in 1978. The concept of heritage properties and priorities of heritage protection clearly changed significantly between these two dates. While places associated with the revolutionary workers' movement listed in 1962 make up only a small minority of the NKP, the additions to the NKP list in 1978, on the contrary, may be considered a definitive assertion of a class interpretation of history with an emphasis on the workers' struggle for their rights, anti-fascist resistance, and liberation. This comparison presents such questions: What cultural practices were these “new” heritage properties associated with? Can the heritage properties of the revolutionary workers' movement be considered heritage properties in the “traditional” sense?

Answering these questions can lead us to interpretations not only related to specific political and social practices in socialist Czechoslovakia, but also to a deeper change in the relationship to the past taking place in the period under review. The approach of the paper places it within the research field of heritage studies, for example with the use of the term authorized heritage discourse.

29 / 4 / 2021 9.00—10.45

Section 3 — Heritage management and society — Part 2

The legacy of a one-armed centurion in the shadow of the red star. Managing funeral heritage properties from the Prussian-Austrian war in 1948—1989

Vojtěch Kessler

Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences

Josef Šrámek

Museum of Eastern Bohemia in Hradec Králové

The unique set of funeral and sepulchral sculptures represented by heritage properties from the war of 1866, has never, as a whole, been the subject of research and administration by an official (legal) institution of heritage management. One of the reasons for this was the existence of a traditional and influential civic initiative, specifically the Association for the Preservation of War Heritage Properties on the Hradec Králové Battlefield. From its founding, this association was professionally associated with experts in heritage management, restorers, artists, and historians, but also (and especially) with local elites; this allowed it to survive after 1918 and even after 1939. In the early 1950s, the Association was repealed and dissolved on the basis of Act No. 68/1951 on voluntary organizations and assemblies, and the property fell to the ownership of the state. Our article focuses on how the Association functioned in the (semi-)illegal regime, on the professional and personal networking of its former members within the more or less official structures of legal heritage management, and on the strategy of their operation.

29 / 4 / 2021 11.30—13.15

**Section 4 — Sacral monuments and authoritarian regimes
— Part 1**

***Longue durée* and phases of the process
of sacralization and desacralization
of the Czech landscape, devastation
of cultural heritage after 1945**

Michal Sklenář

Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes

Sacral architecture and small sacral heritage properties represent an important element of religious culture and are an integral part of the cultural landscape. The article narrows the focus to the Czech lands, to Christian and especially Roman Catholic structures, and offers a possible periodization of the sacralization and desacralization of the Czech landscape; this landscape is characterized by a large number of sacred heritage properties from early Christianization to the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries. It does not approach the devastation of cultural heritage after the end of World War II and during the communist totalitarian regime (targeted liquidation and dilapidation due to lack of interest, misuse of materials for private purposes, unprofessional interventions) as a new phenomenon, but rather integrates it into the continuing lines of Czech history while monitoring its specifics and social frameworks. It thus approaches the destruction of sacral heritage properties after 1945, likely the most extensive in history, as part of the “long-term” sacralization and desacralization of the Czech landscape, as a single wave of desacralization, and presents a basic typology of reasons for the damage or extinction of sacral buildings and other heritage properties.

29 / 4 / 2021 11.30—13.15

Section 4 — Sacral monuments and authoritarian regimes — Part 1

Religious monuments and the postwar rebuilding of Warsaw, construction of a state identity?

Marcus van der Meulen

Aachen University, Faculty of Architecture

After World War II, devastated Warsaw was rebuilt as capital of the Polish People's Republic. This rebuilding included the reconstruction of selected monuments. Apart from Old Town and New Town, specifically neoclassical buildings from the period of Constitutional Kingdom of Poland were recreated as part of the rebuilding of the capital. Historic religious buildings are significant part of the landscape of monuments. Rebuilding places of worship in a socialist state, however, was challenging. Religious symbols in the public space and continuity of purpose were problematic. The synagogue in Bank Square was not rebuilt. Many catholic churches, however, were. Most were externally replicas of the original, with the hypothetical gothic façade of the cathedral as remarkable exception.

A remarkable reconstruction is St. Alexander's Church, located in the government quarter. Architect Zachwatowicz opted for a reconstruction to the original neoclassical design and not to its pre-war state. Reconstruction of monuments such as St. Alexander's Church can be considered construction of state identity, intended to represent the People's Republic as legitimate successor of a sovereign Poland.

29 / 4 / 2021 11.30—13.15

Section 4 — Sacral monuments and authoritarian regimes — Part 1

Church and stone sculptural heritage properties of the Ore Mountains mining area in the 1950s to 1980s

Vít Honys

National Heritage Institute, Regional Office in Ústí nad Labem

Given the minimum available sources and the area's subordination to the State Office for Ecclesiastical Affairs, the issue of church heritage properties and sculptural exterior works of a sacral character in the Ore Mountains (Krušné hory) "mining area" can be more systematically monitored only from the period of validity of the Act on Cultural Heritage properties No. 22/1958. A characteristic feature of the period of existence of the professionally undersized Regional Center for Heritage Management and Nature Protection in Ústí nad Labem from the 1960s until the period of normalization, in confrontation with mining interests and ethnographic challenges, was its well-intentioned but badly coordinated activities for selective preservation of at least the most important heritage properties, resp. their removable fragments from architectural structures. This was done with a minimum of professional staffing at the executive state administration bodies and an often tense attitude among certain district church secretaries toward the activities of "preservationists". Paradoxically, the highest number of rescue activities was permitted after the conclusion of a "Trilateral agreement" on ensuring the preservation and documentation of cultural heritage in SHD (mining authority) during the period of normalization, in 1972. Political and ideological pressures, however, disrupted the possibility for larger surveys, transfers, and documentation.

29 / 4 / 2021 11.30—13.15

Section 4 — Sacral monuments and authoritarian regimes — Part 1

Hugo Doskočil and the function of the “diocesan conservator” in Hradec Králové — an example of transformations in church and state management of sacral heritage properties in the first half of the 20th century

Ladislav Holoubek

Hradec Králové Diocese

Michal Sklenář

Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes

The tasks of church institutions typically include the administration of their own heritage properties, responsibility for their maintenance, and the supervision of appropriate care. The article focuses on the first half of the 20th century and outlines the activities of the state conservator for the district of Hradec Králové; his functions also included Roman Catholic priest, canon, seminary rector, and teacher at the theological school. The conservator's extensive agenda included the protection of heritage properties of various types (buildings, statues, bells, organs), interventions in favor of specific items and persons, and expert consultations and travels, often extending beyond his own district. The biography of J. M. can. Mons. ThDr. Hugo Doskočil, Prelate of Honour of His Holiness (1875—1961), persecuted after 1948, is approached in combination with regional church history, episcopates of the bishops of Hradec Králové, and the gradual paralysis of individual parts of the Hradec Králové Bishopric after 1949/1950. The person of Hugo Doskočil represents a certain type of expert and cleric whose prestige was not limited to the church environment but also radiated clearly into the secular sphere.

29 / 4 / 2021 14.15—15.15

Section 4 — Sacral monuments and authoritarian regimes — Part 2

Church heritage management in the second half of the 20th century with a focus on the Olomouc archdiocese

Jitka Jonová

Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology, Palacký University in Olomouc

After 1949, the state took over the supervision of the administration of church property, including movable and immovable heritage properties, and the existing Archdiocesan Heritage Council ceased to function. Although the Sacrosanctum Concilium Constitution called for the establishment of a diocesan commission for sacred art, it was not established in the Olomouc archdiocese until 1989. Many sacral buildings were restored from the church's own resources; similarly, modifications to the liturgical space in connection with the introduction of the liturgical reform could not be sufficiently consulted. Ordinaries did issue their own official opinion, but consultation was still complicated. In Olomouc, the unofficial consultant was a former member of the Archdiocesan Monument Council, Leopold Chvostek, and from the 1980s the architect Tomáš Černoušek (consultations had to be kept secret due to the regime's adversity). The statement was issued by an ordinary (Bishop Josef Vrana from 1973), but the main decision was in the hands of the state. It was only after 1989 that a diocesan commission for sacred art was established (to which T. Černoušek was appointed); today it also serves as an advisory committee of the ordinary in the field of care for artistic sacral heritage properties.

29 / 4 / 2021 14.15—15.15

Section 4 — Sacral monuments and authoritarian regimes — Part 2

What does Gothic look like? The Czech school of restoration and theoretical concepts of heritage management in the 1950s and 1960s

Michaela Ottová

Faculty of Theology, Charles University in Prague
— Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague

The paper attempts to follow the thought background of the main protagonists of the “Czech school of restoration” in the application of various conservation and restoration methods in the period before and after the adoption of the Venice Charter (1964). One of the questions that should be answered is the degree of reflection on the concepts of heritage management in the 1950s and 1960s in Czechoslovakia, including their specific application.

The paper tries to analyze the approaches applied to specific sculptural and painting works of the 14th to 16th centuries to assess the extent of application of the scientific and aesthetic approach to the restoration of key works in public collections of a regional nature. The effort will be to clarify and theoretically justify the motivation of removing additions, scanning color layers, and especially determining the extent and nature of retouching. The visual appearance of these medieval restored works influenced the perception and evaluation of medieval art as a whole, and the article would like to contribute to the discussion of the role of Bohuslav Slánský and his school in codifying restoration and conservation practices, relevant even today (see the Bauerová—Skalický—Pokorný controversy). One of the essential questions in current restoration practice is how to approach these now historical interventions on re-restored works, especially whether to preserve or remove various types of retouching, or whether to supplement or even restore the form of “original” color layers and removed parts.

29 / 4 / 2021 14.15—15.15

Section 4 — Sacral monuments and authoritarian regimes — Part 2

It was here, now it's not... The specifics of caring for religious heritage properties of a movable nature during the totalitarian regime and after its fall

Šárka Radostová

National Heritage Institute, General Directorate in Prague

Church heritage properties, often paradoxically well preserved by society's lack of interest in them under totalitarianism, were hit by a strong centrifugal force brought about by the loosening of political conditions. The paper approaches the issue of cultural heritage of a movable nature after 1989, when furnishings from sacred structures, as well as works of art preserved in long-unchanging state and private collections, were set in motion. The reasons for this phenomenon can be traced to a wide range of moral, religious, economic, and social causes (secularization of society, strengthening of economic interests, trends in interior design, crime, opening borders, antique market development, property restitution, changing preferences in collections).

29 / 4 / 2021 15.20—16.00

Closing lecture

50 Years of the Prague Heritage Reserve: Balances and Questions

Richard Biegel

Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague

The Prague Heritage Reserve was declared in 1971. The idea of such a reserve, however, probably first appeared in 1917, when architect and urban planner Max Urban outlined the first “heritage reserve” in his project of an “Ideal Great Prague”. The heritage reserve, then, bears not only half a century of existence; it is also supported by the previous half-century, when this idea (and its importance) was being formulated and promoted. It is this first period, which includes the interwar “metropolitan” period, the grandiose visions of the protectorate, and the complex post-war development, later culminating in the triumphant modernist approach to the city, that may be an important key to understanding the circumstances of its origin as well as to understanding the many vicissitudes, questions, and challenges that have accompanied it during the fifty years of its existence. An insight into the formation of this heritage reserve may also serve as a springboard for analyzing its current condition and for outlining the issues related to its future.

The conference will be held in Czech and English with interpretation and will be broadcast live on the [YouTube channel of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes.](#)



[Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů](#)

Conference is held by:
Institute of Art History of the Czech Academy of Sciences
— www.udu.cas.cz

Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes
— www.ustrcr.cz

National Heritage Institute
— www.npu.cz

Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences
— www.usd.cas.cz