



On the Topic of Use and Transformation of Historic Monuments

Tomáš Hájek*

Member of International Association of Contemporary Mosaicists, International Association of Landscape Archaeology and the Economic and Social Council of the Most Region

***Corresponding author:** Tomáš Hájek, Member of International Association of Contemporary Mosaicists, International Association of Landscape Archaeology and the Economic and Social Council of the Most Region

Received Date: September 19, 2024

Published Date: October 25, 2024

Introduction

The author of this study has been focusing on the topic of use and transformation of historic monuments on a long-term basis. It has become the subject of his four studies referred to below in the field of monument care, architecture and urbanism, which, however, only express certain initial approaches to the exceptionally multifaceted topic from the conceptual and factual perspective [1-4]. After some time, this study is presented, based on European, Central European, Czechoslovak and Czech contexts, yet at the same time aims to approach the topic in a manner allowing for its inclusion in the current global discourse in the fields of monument care, architecture and urbanism. As regards the literature used in the research, each of the essays includes its own list of literature. The studies are mostly available, and the current summarising study creates an updated list of literature with this in mind. As a note for readers capable of reading the essays both in Czech and in English, it should be explained that the individual essays referred to above were translated from Czech to English by various professional translators and the individual differences in the translated texts reflect the multifaceted nature of the issues examined in this study.

On the History of the Terms “Use” and “Transformation” in the History of Monument Care

Definition of key terms

Cultural heritage is a dynamic unit built around the central terms of memory, remembrance, participation in the past, embracing the past in the present. Providing cultural experience, encouraging

humanism and the awareness of context and educating in history is one of the key functions of a historic building. In addition to this cultural animation function, a historic building also fulfils utility functions. These may be consistent with the originally intended function of historic buildings or may differ from the original functions, sometimes quite significantly. These new functions require a historic building transformed in terms of materials and layout, i.e., a historic building changed and adapted to the current conditions. The first part of the study focuses on the basic aspects of the development of the terms “use” and “transformation” of historic buildings. The key terms distinguishing the meaning of individual types of historic monument use to the level of transformation should be defined first.

- a) Revitalisation of a historic building refers to measures and procedures aiming to return the dilapidated historic building to the current social context with restored original utility function. This may be for example representation function, although this function naturally cannot be identical after revitalisation due to permanently changing societal conditions.
- b) Reanimation of a historic building refers to measures and procedures aiming to give the historic building an entirely new function, which is then applied in the current societal context. Reanimation of a riding hall to a gallery may be mentioned as a typical example.
- c) Regeneration refers to a long-term process of continuous maintenance of a historic building in line with changing

technical conditions and needs of economic and social life.

- d) However, systematic, long-term regeneration for example in the conditions of the current Europe would not be possible without a special approach, which cannot be classified as revitalisation or reanimation. This is reconstruction – restoration of historic buildings damaged in war.
- e) The term transformation of a historic building will be studied in a separate chapter.

Viollet le Duc, Ruskin and the use of historic monuments

The French modern monument care was consolidated during the 19th century. While writers played a major role in its establishment, E. Viollet le Duc was the founding personage in architecture of monuments. This creative architect and art historian clarified in theory and practice what restoration of buildings or restoration in style means. According to him, restoring a building does not mean maintaining, repairing or modifying it, but renewing it into a complex form that may have never existed before at the relevant moment [5].

And what is the relationship between restoration in style and use of historic buildings, if there is such relationship? Viollet le Duc perceived French historic monuments as historic documents of the French history that must be maintained for future. He clearly never entertained the notion that historic buildings restored in style should be empty. He designed and restored for the emperor Napoleon II and his wife Eugenia almost unnaturally monumental Carcassonne as a respectable country retreat for the emperor.

Horace Walpole restored his Strawberry Hill villa in Twickenham entirely in line with the principles of romantic, historicizing architecture. Restoration of Strawberry Hill in the Gothic style shows that architecture restored in style was intended for everyday use. This perception also needs to be applied to major proponents of the Gothic renewal style or architects caring for historic buildings in the 19th century in Central Europe and elsewhere, including Josef Mocker.

John Ruskin comes in at the late stage of romanticism. He masterfully defended and interpreted the painters Turner and Tintoretto. The spirit of Gothic revival, which gradually dominated England from the 18th century all the way to Pugin, stems from conservatism, snobbery and fascination with antiques. Therefore, Gothic revival creates a motivational and ideological space for the emerging institutionalised monument care, despite the fact that the British monarchy in the 19th century applied the unique British approach to the protection of public interests and limited its efforts to minimal legislative institutionalisation of monument care in the sense of protection of prehistoric megalithic monuments.

Ruskin essentially criticised restoration in style, as according to him, the actual value of a monument is reflected in its age and the obvious signs pointing to its age. This is why Ruskin was in a dispute with the most significant architect of the Victorian era, Sir George Gilbert Scott, who was inspired by Viollet le Duc. This brought back the conflict between interventionists and noninterventionists

among English antiquarians of the 18th century in a new form; noninterventionists are against any intervention, i.e., falsification of ancient objects [6]. *To restore a building means to destroy it altogether, to destroy it without any remembrance, to destroy it in a manner resulting in a paradoxically distorted opinion of the destroyed object, and parody is the most abhorrent type of a lie.*

And what is Ruskin's attitude to the use of historic buildings? His critique of restoration in style does not mean critique of the use of historic buildings. The polemic regarding acceptability of the use of historic buildings is not part of the key polemic of the 19th century between conservation and restoration, which affects even the current discussion. This is clearly noticeable in the focus and work of Ruskin's student and colleague, William Morris. Morris, Marshall, Falkner & Co. commenced its operations in 1861, and this moment marks the beginning of the Arts and Crafts Movement. The very purpose of artistic crafts is to help craft items inspired by history to become useful in everyday life.

Alois Riegl: The Vision of Permanent Conflict Between Protection and Use of Historic Buildings

Conservationists appreciate Riegl and other members of the Vienna arts and crafts school for the change in the general orientation of monument care from the puristic vision of the coherent style of a historic building to its perception of a gradually developed organism, where all developmental stages need to be respected. Alois Riegl taught monument care to respect the material substance of a historic building as an irreplaceable source of information and vehicle for experiencing age and antiquity.

In his study entitled *The Modern Cult of Historic Monuments* (Der modern Denkmalkultur; Sein Wesen und seine Entstehung), which was drafted as a preface to the new act on monument care of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Riegl also addressed the use of cultural monuments. He is the first theorist of monument care reflecting on the use of historic monuments as a separate issue. This major methodological step is achieved in the notion of the so-called "presence value" of a historic monument.

In historic monuments, Riegl defines the so-called memory values (Erinnerungswerte), namely the "age value" (der Alterswert), the "historical value" (der historische Wert), the "intended memory value" (der gewollte Erinnerungswert), and "presence value" (Gegenwartswerte). Riegl argues that most historic buildings are capable of satisfying sensual or spiritual needs of people that would otherwise be satisfied by contemporary structures. This includes almost all functions fulfilled by new buildings, including economic and residential functions. Riegl divides the presence value of a historic buildings into "utility value" (der Gebrauchswert) and "artistic value" (der Kunstwert), which is further divided into the "novelty value" (der Neuheitswert) and the "relative artistic value" (der relative Kunstwert).

As regards utility value, Riegl states: *"This is why for example an old building, which is in practical use to this day, must be maintained in a condition fit for the use by people without jeopardising their safety, lives and health."* While Riegl admitted the legitimacy of the

utility value of historic buildings, he also presented the vision of permanent conflict between historical and utility values. However, new uses for recently used historic buildings should be found once the original purpose is no longer required. The age value must ensure that the historic building is not isolated from the natural context of life. Therefore, Riegl showed that while the conflict between the antiquity value and the current utility values cannot be eliminated, it entails a range of options and specific situations, where consensus in terms of monument care can be sought and found [7].

Social determinism and structurally aesthetic approach as a method for harmonising the protection and use of historic monuments

According to Georg Dehio, artistic forms do not develop by themselves and within themselves, but between the artistic forms and the real life with a feedback network in its economic and social circumstances. He saw himself as a historian writing about German historic buildings, who perceives the German nation as the greatest hero. This is part of the reason why he was referred to as a socialist of monument care [8]. Riegl interprets Dehio's approach in his *New Directions in Monument Care* as follows: *"We do not conserve a historic monument because it is beautiful, but because it is part of our national existence. To protect heritage means to seek piety rather than enjoyment."*

History of monument care appreciates his attitude to establishing architectural symbols of the unified Germany. Extensive modifications mainly in the Gothic style are asserted at the time. Dehio goes against this trend, advocating for conservation and respectful approach to historic buildings. Riegl defended piety in the approach to historic buildings from the perspective of the history of art and its developmental principles and Dehio arrived at the same conclusion based on the requirement for honest interpretation and documentation of history.

The fact that Dehio sees the use of historic buildings as standard is demonstrated not only in his logic applied to the meaning of monument care, but also the structure of the summary of historic monuments in the renowned *Handbuch der Deutschen Kunstdenkmäler*, i.e. an inventory of heritage monuments in Germany, in the neighbouring Austria and in Switzerland. Dehio's edition expresses the search for scientific, yet legible form of description of the historic monument inventory. It is obviously influenced by travel guides, the so-called Baedekers. But his approach to the use of historic buildings is of almost contemporary nature. To sum up: as the use of historic buildings was not subject of discussions at the time, it is fair to say that their use within certain limits was natural. In addition, a certain character of Dehio's concept, according to which the spiritual sphere is dominated by the society's social structure, opens the space for social functions of historic buildings, in other words for their utility functions.

Riegl's perception of a historic building as a multilayered document of its long-term development is the basis for another ideological direction in monument care. The analytical method

builds on Riegl's approach, developing it further and highlighting in certain sense. Any puristic improvement of historic buildings achieving the previously non-existent pure style is not desirable. In addition, this preserved multilayered character is to be expressed on the outside without any camouflage. The analytical method allows historic monuments to make an impression as a reminder of the absolute truth of their past and historic buildings subsequently appear to be almost expressionist artworks. While this radical perception of the restoration of historic buildings does not prevent their use, it is clearly a complicating factor and specialists in monument care are aware of this.

Responding to the analytic method, which developed Riegl's concept to a rather extreme level, Václav Wagner as an expert in monument care with holistic way of thinking begins to perceive historic buildings as aesthetic units [9]. The requirement for historic buildings to function as aesthetic units opens the space for using historic buildings. It is by paradox that Wagner builds on Riegl in this notion, despite being mainly perceived as Riegl's opposite by historians of monument care. After all, both perceive historic monuments as compact structures, although Riegl is a holist focusing on completely multilayered character of historic monuments, while Wagner is a holist focusing on the aesthetic impression of a historic building as a whole.

Venice Charter or the use of historic buildings as means for protecting them

Firstly, it is necessary to point out that international documents mainly focus on preserving, i.e. conservation of historic buildings. The impact of the Venice Charter is felt even at the beginning of the 21st century; over time, the charter has become the unquestionable law defining the core relationships between the term of conservation, restoration and use: *"Conservation of historic monuments is always supported when a function useful to the society is found for them: determination of this function is always desirable but must not interfere with the structure and decoration of buildings."*

Globalising and post-Fordist society as a context for transformation of historic buildings

The term transformation of historic buildings is a direct consequence of the concept of historic building use. A different section of this study focuses on nationalisation of castles and chateaus and related structures in Czechoslovakia after the end of World War II, where usage becomes the cornerstone of the theory and practice in monument care. This study argues that this signals the term of transformation, although it only appears globally a decade later. The use of historic buildings is shifted to a new, significantly more radical level, which means new usage the society determines for buildings whose original function is no longer required, despite exceptional architectural or urban values of some of these structures. The term transformation links to the civilisation change as a whole; if the usage of historic buildings can be described up to the 1970s, the term transformation points to a widespread practice in the globalising, post-Fordist society. Extraordinarily large areas are left without functional use due to

the global economic change and this means, their dilapidation is unprecedented and mass application of new uses for entire premises is necessary.

Definition of transformation of a protected historic building

Transformation of historic buildings will now be clarified in detail against terms describing individual monument care strategies applied to historic buildings.

- a) Conservation renewal and restoration of an architectural unit means an approach retaining the material substance of a historic building, including the signs of age and fragmented individual structures, with maximum caution. This approach is highly cautious when removing elements from older developmental stages of a building and respects the historic building as a semantic structure with its own expression, meaning and historical calling.
- b) Restitution of former conditions is applied in buildings that have undergone complex development in terms of history and art. Layers that have been obscured, covered or even eliminated with construction development are being renewed. The key is to renew older layers at the cost of sacrificing the full range of developmental layers of the historic building. This strategy was applied especially in the period after World War II.
- c) Corrective renewal removes remnants or elements of unsuitable modifications, such as the stucco cement known under the name of Brizolit.
- d) Reductive modernisation represents a utilitarian approach, which is suitable in monument care perhaps only in absolutely unavoidable cases. This entails for example making openings in walls within historic layout or even removal of architectural elements.
- e) Transformation of a protected structure is undoubtedly a complex issue. As this strategy is of utmost importance, a quote directly from the relevant methodology of the Czech monument care is included: "Transformation of a protected structure means an intervention or a series of interventions that change the character of the protected structure significantly. From the morphological point of view, this includes mainly structures attached on top of or to the sides of buildings or major changes in interior layout required by functional changes.

Transformation of a protected historic building is equivalent to complete reconstructions in a different style occurring in the past. In view of the overall decline in the number of authentic buildings restored during the last century and the gradually broadening knowledge in monument care, which generally expands the range of protected phenomena – elements or layers of buildings or territories – transformation of protected historic buildings or phenomena is admissible only in absolutely exceptional cases and must be always considered with great caution[11]."

- f) Transformation of a historic monument is greatly limited by

the methodological text referred to above. In this context, this study points out that the dilapidation of former, for example industrial and other types of premises containing potentially and sometimes even actually protected elements disturbs the aesthetic and social coherence of individual large and small historical settlements as urban units. Decay of premises within settlements or demolition of dilapidated historically valuable complexes jeopardises the prestige and credibility of monument care. Transformation of historic monuments naturally needs to be restricted to some extent and these restrictions are included in the principles of urbanism focusing on monument care. Even in the case of transformation of former industrial complexes situated in urban areas, the rule that *"The ground plan layout of town or village squares, streets and other roads are the core of the ground plan structures of settlements. The historic ground plan structure of protected historic settlements must remain unchanged..."* must be applied [12,13].

On the Topic of Renewed Use and Transformation of Churches and Chapels

Introduction

The objective change in the overall religiosity and active cult practice among the population gives rise to the issue of renewed use of mainly countryside churches and chapels, which no longer fulfil their liturgical function and have already been deconsecrated in many cases. In addition, countryside churches have the function of dominating features in the European, Central European and Czech cultural landscape. Churches no longer used for liturgical purposes promptly dilapidate and may pose a threat to the health of people. This is why determining new functions is of utmost importance not only in countryside churches and chapels.

System transformation of churches and chapels in the international context

Each country has its own unique religious past and present. Religious differences between individual regions can even be found within a single country. While the numbers of active churchgoers generally decline in all European countries, the situation in the Czech Republic is different in the Czech Republic when compared to Germany or Great Britain. Tolerance of the local population in individual European countries towards the use of churches for other than liturgical purposes also differs. This topic has received ample attention at least in the European context over long-term. John Gordon Davies focused on this topic in his study *"The Secular Use of Church Building"* (SCM Press, London, 1968). Another study entitled *"New Life for Old Churches, Aspects of Conservation"* (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1977) presented a detailed description of the existing usage of former churches for cultural purposes. The report of the Council of Europe focusing on this topic authored by A. Fowler and published in 1989 points out that churches without current liturgical use must not be neglected and should be protected against destruction and inappropriate use. The topic of churches no longer used for liturgical purposes in the

former West Berlin is addressed in the compilation published in 1988 under the title "Neue Nutzungen von alten Kirchen". In 2003, the Secretariat of the German Episcopal Conference published the text "Places for quiet. Thoughts for protecting the endangered good in our churches", reflecting on the fact that the number of people attending Sunday worships has been falling since the 1950s from the original 12 million to the current 4 million.

While the increasing number of churches without liturgical use is a reality in the current Europe, no common plan of European societies for salvation of these churches and chapels has been submitted to date. However, there is general consensus that takeover of churches or chapels with no liturgical function by a public entity is preferential over takeover by a private entity and non-commercial use is preferred over commercial use. Commercial use is subject to certain limitations, for example the use of sacral motifs for commercial purposes is prohibited.

System approach to the use and transformation of churches and chapels with no liturgical use in the Czech Republic

The situation in the Czech Republic has been affected by exceptionally complex development of religiosity. The Hussite movement in the 15th century is followed by an era in the 16th century when Lutherans and Bohemian Brethren outnumber Calixtines and establish the so-called Bohemian confession supported by the Letter of Majesty issued by the emperor Rudolf II in 1609, which guarantees religious freedom also for serfs. After the battle of Bílá hora in 1620, recatholicization under the direction of the Roman Catholicism is carried out in the Austrian and later Austro-Hungarian Empire. The official atheism during the existence of the socialist republic of Czechoslovakia is also a major milestone worth mentioning in this context. These and other historical aspects combined with the overall conservative central European nature results in great inhibitions in the Czech society as regards the use of already deconsecrated churches and chapels. The conflict between the original purpose of the sacral space and its potential profane use is felt rather strongly.

The use and transformation of churches and chapels without liturgical function in the Czech Republic still is a discussed topic, which is demonstrated for example in the study by Eliška Nejezchlebová published around the turn of the millennium under the title "Alternative use as an option for saving threatened churches and chapels in the Czech Republic". The future of superfluous churches and chapels is discussed in the following alternatives:

- a) The church or chapel will continue to be used by the original Christian church for regular or occasional services and this sacral use will be supplemented from time to time by use for suitable profane cultural purposes, such as exhibitions or concerts. The supplementary profane use may include seasonal residential function, for example in the case of additional buildings, such as bell towers.
- b) The church or chapel will continue to be used for sacral

purposes by a different Christian church or other than Christian religious organisation. This option is supported by the fact that this has taken place regularly in the past. In the Balkans, Christian churches were transformed into mosques and vice versa during the course of history. In Great Britain, the superfluous Christian churches are used by the Sikh community. In the Czech Republic, catholic churches were transformed into evangelic churches and vice versa over time.

- c) The church or chapel will find its alternative profane use. This option is supported by the fact that this is not a radically new step in terms of history. In the past, naves of churches with existing liturgical function were regularly used for business or entertainment. Examples from the past show that after being deconsecrated, churches were perceived purely from a utilitarian perspective and could be transformed into anything. The piety felt with regard to sacral premises only began to appear after the protestant reformation. What's more, the profane use of superfluous churches and chapels allowed these buildings to survive over the course of time. Churches and chapels secularised during the reforms carried out by the Austrian Emperor Joseph II were used as storehouses, including military storehouses. There are cases of secularised churches used as wash houses, granaries and hostels.

Therefore, profane use of superfluous churches and chapels, including potential transformation of the historic building in the rather conservative Czech society, is therefore possible as cultural endeavour, as commercial and social endeavour (cafe, dance hall), private commercial or non-commercial endeavour (studios).

On the Presentation, Use and Transformation of the Architecture and Premises of Castles and Chateaus

When examining functional changes in the current castles and chateaus, it is necessary to point out that their function changed significantly throughout history as a result of economic, social and cultural impacts. The fate of a castle or chateau as a dominating feature of the cultural landscape is a sensitive indicator of changes in production methods and functional use of the territory. The approach to transformation of the architecture of castles and chateaus unquestionably differs from conversion of industrial architecture due to the classification of castles and chateaus under the most traditional categories of historic monuments. This architecture is subject to the traditional criteria of defining the monument's value and it can be noted that these criteria in fact developed around castles and chateaus. Transformation of the architecture of castles and chateaus may influence significantly what will be generally accepted as the core of cultural heritage.

We begin the study of transformation of the architecture of castles and chateaus and their premises as a wide category of structures ranging from torsos of architectural units to pseudohistorical structures with an analysis of their presentation. Presentation in this context is seen as the simplest form of use, which can subsequently culminate in transformation attempts.



Figure 1: Precedent of transformation of churches and chapels: Church of St. Kliment was shut down in 1782 and the masonry became part of a private residence. - photograph by Tomáš Hájek – 2009.

On the presentation of the architecture and premises of castles and chateaus

Spontaneous presentation is the first type of presentation. Castle ruins attract attention far and wide due to their picturesqueness, automatically become the subject of economic, social and cultural life and stimulate these activities. Castle ruins serve as an anchor for the regional cultural landscape and identity is clearly a category of economic development in today's world. The travel industry can be mentioned in this context as an example. On the other hand, active presentation is a controlled comprehensive process including a predefined level of educational, pedagogical and cultural effort using the knowledge of specialised fields, such as museum management [14].

Key stages in the development of active presentation of the architecture and premises of castles and chateaus in the Czech lands in the past

a) Presentation of private aristocratic residences in the 19th century

Representative rooms in chateaus were installed in a museum-like style already in the 19th century. They are described in tourist guides and tourists can routinely view these parts of chateaus under the assistance of the castle manager. The residential complex

of a chateau is the home of an aristocratic family, a member of the imperial court, the modern aristocracy or bourgeoisie. The same strict hierarchy as the hierarchy reflected in the society of the time is applied to the structure and functions of chateaus. They are characterised by a binding layout and fixed functions of individual rooms, and this distinguishes them from homesteads or villas. The dramatic social changes in the historic Czech lands at the time are reflected in the fact that many chateau premises are reconstructed in the medieval style during mid-19th century, following the example of the reconstruction of the English Windsor castle in the Gothic style, as well as presentation of medieval French motifs by Viollet le Duc.

The architect Wingelmüller, who was commissioned to reconstruct the Lednice chateau in South Moravia, departs for a study trip to England and Scotland, and Count Harrach plans reconstruction of his chateau in Hrádek u Nechanic directly with the British architect Lamb. On the other hand, the romanticising reconstruction of the Sychrov chateau draws on the French inspiration. Certain other major tourist destinations of our time, such as Bouzov and Hluboká are also reconstructed to create their illusive medieval appearance. In 1849, reconstruction of the Žleby chateau in the style of a medieval residence commences under the leadership of the architects Škvor and Schmoranz, both highly active in Gothic revival activities. This eruption of romantism preceded

by widespread construction of romantic buildings in classicist natural parks naturally comes hand in hand with frenetic collecting not only in furnishings, but also in buildings. For example, certain elements of the chateau chapel in the reconstructed Žleby chateau are collected from Italy, Bavaria and several locations in Bohemia. The eclectic, imitating, yet stylistically disjointed and vague spirit of the time is best demonstrated in the fact that collections freely mixed originals with copies, both of which were knowingly marked with old dates of origin [15].

Is this mass wave of Gothic revival frenzy in the mid-19th century also the first wave of transformation of historic buildings? The opinion presented in this study is that this wave of Gothic revival associated with escape to the fictional worlds of the past or to the constant return of the same cannot be seen as transformation, because this study understands transformation of historic buildings as a thought-out strategy, which is true and realistic in the basis, as well as implementation. Monument care, architecture and urbanism in the era of globalisation and post-Fordism faces real problems that affect everyone – city and country people alike, people from the North, as well as those from the South. The impulse driving the Gothic revival wave in the mid-19th century came from the attempt to use external symbolic means to address the unsatisfactory status of a certain social group combined with creative enthusiasm of clearly talented and honest artists of the time.

It is helpful to highlight the connection between the modern style in architecture, constructivism, functionalism and transformation practice in this context, although each of these phenomena occurred at completely different time. The modern style in architecture combines art, technology and usefulness, as do some transformation projects [16]. To quote the description of the modern style in Czech architecture, which was closely associated with the architect Jan Kotěra in its early days: *“At the same time, the modern architecture arrives at the conclusion that instead of emerging from new shapes (which was attempted in the Art Nouveau style shortly before that) a new architectural style is born from a new content and the new content arises from a new style of living [17].”* For adequate architectural performance, an architect needs to create a logical floorplan reflecting a certain social context. Otto Wagner, the teacher of Jan Kotěra comes to mind in this context, as he did not abandon the traditional morphology, but subjected it to the principle of usefulness [18].

b) Presentation of nationalised architecture and premises of castles and chateaus intended for cultural use:

As we open this extraordinarily complex issue, it is necessary to point out that it can only be addressed briefly in the key points:

The turmoil of extensive social changes that was to affect significantly the entire subsequent era began to unfold in Czechoslovakia after the end of World War II. Few were prepared for the revolutionary era and Czechoslovak monument care was entirely unprepared. While certain interesting theoretical outputs were achieved, an act on monument care was not established during the first Czechoslovak Republic. In addition, monument care was in the centre of the ideological fight at the time. However, this

is hardly surprising since modern monument care in European countries was established as the co-creator of symbols of newly profiled national states, although historic monuments were no longer presented as proud national symbols at a later stage.

Germany immersed itself in Gothic revival with gradual unification and unified Italy in the form of the Italian kingdom discovered, consolidated and interpreted its vast inventory of historic monuments [19-21]. The general nationalising or even socialising tendencies in modern monument care emerging in various parts of Europe in the 19th century need to be taken into account. These were typically present in the approach of the young Greek state, a country with vast cultural heritage, which declared in 1834 that *“all movable and immovable cultural heritage is the national property of all Hellenes, unless the lack of value of individual items is declared officially by a special decree”*.

Hundreds of castles and chateaus with their furnishings were nationalized in Czechoslovakia after World War II. Certain buildings selected as the most significant in terms of their artistic and historic value, i.e. in terms of their cultural heritage value, were intended exclusively for cultural purposes [22]. The “Plan for the use of buildings by the National Cultural Committee” was drafted in 1950 and the term “use” appeared in such a key document for the first time in the history of perhaps even global monument care. At the end of 1951, the National Cultural Committee administered 95 nationalised castle and chateau premises and buildings intended for presentation of artistic, historical and other cultural values. The Plan for the use of buildings by the National Cultural Committee defined the use of each castle and chateau building separately and in detail, based on the following concept of the use of nationalised castle and chateau premises, which is presented in this study with a certain degree of simplification.

- I. The specialists from the National Committee headed by Zdeněk Wirth defined the first group of medieval buildings that should be maintained in the currently preserved condition with all subsequent modifications since piety of the relicts of the oldest parts of the Czech history does not allow for any other use except for detailed presentation.
- II. The second group included chateaus where installation should be in the form of museums of dwelling culture from the 16th to the end of the 19th century. Therefore, the aim was to produce a somewhat artificial reconstruction of a certain environment typical for a specific time. Renaissance, baroque and rococo museums were to be established along with a museum of the Louis XVI style, a museum of the rococo revival, a museum of mid-19th century and finally a museum of “imitation of styles in the second half of the 19th century”.
- III. Special museums were to be included in the third group of buildings. This group was to include only several buildings, for example the museum of fashion and social culture in the Jemniště chateau.

As regards specific practical development in the preparation for presentation of heritage values, the so-called interim installation

is prepared in the nationalised castle and chateau premises. This means that items for regular use by their original owners were first removed and certain interventions in the style of the buildings were made to clarify the overall focus of the buildings, so that the relevant building open for cultural purposes could be clearly defined, for example as a “rococo chateau with the relevant furnishings”. The motivation for these interventions was partly ideological, as this meant eliminating any reference to the lives of the former owners and the buildings could become neutral cultural facilities. Only a minimal part of the installation plans of the National Cultural Committee was implemented. The postwar plans for cultural use of the nationalised castle and chateau premises were eventually transformed in the state-run system of the Czechoslovak monument care into series of educative installations carried out in castle and chateau premises, which were mostly associated with the work of Oldřich Jakub Blažíček [23].

c) Contemporary presentation of castle and chateau premises in the Czech Republic

Their presentation over the last couple of decades is influenced by a major change in the social situation and rehabilitation of private property, as well as aristocracy as such, which occurred after 1989. Many castle and chateau premises previously owned by the state were returned to their original owners (for example the castles Český Šternberk and Kost, the chateaus Častolovice, Dobříš and Rychnov nad Kněžnou), some became the property of local municipalities (for example the chateaus in Děčín and Brandýs n/ Labem), and others were privatised. However, many remain the

state's property. The current castle and chateau architecture owned by the state suffers from problems associated with lacking finance to a certain degree. This is quite logical, as the influence of national states weakens in the unifying Europe with the growing influence of regions. Certain attempts to reorganise state-owned castle and chateau architecture for example by transferring these historic monuments to regions are therefore understandable [24]. Many so far overlooked castles and chateaus may become dominating features and carriers of identity in individual regions, and fixed social background for their renovation and function will thus be created.

The effort to apply unified approaches no longer dominates the presentation of castle and chateau premises and gradual decentralisation and diversification can be observed. In addition, castles and chateaus are used for commercial purposes extending beyond mere presentation of the cultural values of individual buildings. Weddings or various travel industry products can be mentioned as examples in this context. Intertwining the presentation of castle and chateau premises as cultural values with the use of buildings even for non-traditional commercial activities (including congress tourism) is probably a characteristic trait of the beginning of the 21st century even in the case of state-owned buildings. An emphasis on everything naturally attached to the building, including attributes of everyday life of the original owners is another typical feature of the current presentation and installations involved in this presentation.



Figure 2: Zvíkov castle. Jewel of the Czech medieval castle architecture. In the first half of the 19th century, the Zvíkov castle was a ruin. However, in the 19th century the castle's owners – the Schwarzenberg family carried out extensive modifications to the ruins of the historic building, resulting in the castle's romanticising appearance preserved to this day. The castle is owned by the state. – photograph by Tomáš Hájek – 2024.

The development of mansion presentations (examples)

The presentation development of Chateau Milotice (state Chateau)

In the Milotice Chateau, tours were provided already in 1948 when the first floor (piano nobile) was opened to the public. In the next years, the establishment of an ethnographic museum on the second floor was seriously considered. The „opposite to feudal culture of 18th century, the proof of which is the Chateau building with all accessories of a mansion in the precinct“ should have been established. New complete installation was opened only in 1974; it was composed as a Blažíček-like „natural trail“ of the development of historic styles from baroque up to Napoleonic-empire. The relevant chambers were furnished in a simple way and were gallery-like within the boundaries of individual styles. For example, the reception room that had never been in Milotice Chateau was incorporated in the presentation rather artificially and misleadingly, regardless the historical truth.

During the years 2004-2005, new interior installation was prepared, abandoning the gallery-like exhibition of historical styles development gathered from the so-called haulage of goods (mobiliary from chateaux determined for other than cultural purposes after nationalisation). The new installation focussed on the presentation of the chateau as an authentic seat for normal family life of a not such a wealthy family of Seilerns at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. Nevertheless, the baroque installation reminding of the house of Serényi, with whom the Seilerns were associated, was preserved. The conception of the guided tour is truly based on the way of life of the Seilerns family; for instance, it is based on the fact that their day began and ended in the oratory.

Originally, the installation was intended to reflect the life of the powerful noble Serényi family in the baroque times, but the plan was abandoned because of its high financial cost.

The development of Chateau Častolovice presentation (restitution, owner Diana Phipps Sternberg)

Nationalisation after World War II resulted in the interior installation being carried out in a part of the Chateau. The Kovoslužby vocational school occupied the eastern wing, subsequently and it subsequently devastated these spaces. After the restitution in 1992, the Chateau's permanent exhibition was placed in twenty chambers equipped with historic furniture from the times of renaissance up to the Biedermeier style. Small items of daily use give visitors the impression that the inhabitants have just left. Several times in a year, the second guided tour is also available for the broad public, where Diana Phipps Sternberg presents herself as an interior architect.

Transformation of castle and chateau premises in the international context

This type of transformation is a relatively frequent practice in Europe, although certain discussion is still held regarding the extent of intervention. On the one hand, investors point out excessive financial cost associated with transformation of castle

and chateau premises, mentioning partitions in rooms, sanitary facilities and heating in the buildings. On the other hand, the general public sees certain transformation projects unacceptable in terms of maintenance of heritage and traditional values. Transformation is frequently performed with the intention to create a hotel or countryside apartments. In Spain, the business group called Paradores de Turismo has been operating several hotels in transformed castles, chateaus and monasteries for decades.

The available information shows that no significant intellectual group in Spain questions the idea of the Paradores network, which generally directs tourism to so far marginal locations and thus contributes to its sustainability. This compensates the decline of the heritage values in material and layout, which is unavoidable in transformation projects. From the methodological point of view, it can be stated that sustainability creates extensive communicating vessels between proportional approaches in various aspects of the living, social and cultural environment with their flows of revenues and costs.

Besides Spain, Great Britain, France and Germany are among the European countries that progressed significantly in transformation of castle and chateau premises.

On Transformation of Industrial Heritage

On the term industrial heritage

Industrial heritage represents a diversified structure. This is reflected in the itemisation presented by the Czech industrial heritage specialist, Benjamin Fragner: *Abandoned factories, breweries and textile manufactures, mining towers, sugar refineries, warehouses, engineering halls, railway buildings, bakeries and printworks, foundries, mills, boiler houses, power supply facilities* [25].

The postwar England was proud of its famous industrial past. A new field called industrial archaeology appeared in Great Britain in the 1950s. The almanac edited by Neil Cossons (Perspectives on Industrial Archaeology, Science Museum, London 2000) points to Michael Rix as the creator of this term. France opted for a different approach to industrial heritage, as large industrial buildings without clear future were seen in the 1970s as a symbol of collapse and general failure. French heritage experts only began to map and classify industrial heritage in line with the tradition of the French monument care in the 1980s. However, France continued in its attempts to swiftly eliminate all traces of the past industrial development in order to start the new future, and successful projects converting industrial heritage therefore only appeared in the 1990s [26].

In greater detail on the issue of conversion of industrial heritage

Conversion (the term reconversion sometimes appears in literature) of industrial heritage differs greatly from the issue of transformation of castle and chateau architecture.



Figure 3: Hotel Filipov near Čáslav; today's transformed appearance of the premises of the Filipov chateau, which was rebuilt in the English neogothic style during 1863-1865. – photograph by Tomáš Hájek – 2009.



Figure 4: Prague, Karlín: symbolic remnant of an industrial building. – photograph by Tomáš Hájek – 2009.

Conversion is transformation of a group of technical heritage structures of a highly special structural and technological nature. Even the situation when the original function is lost and the need to find a new function arises is different. The cessation of the original function of castle and chateau premises is gradual and various alternatives originate and cease to exist in the process. However, cessation of the function of a furnace is absolute. The search for a new function of a large representative chateau of a major aristocratic family does not appear to be as an intimidating and hopeless task as the search for a way of maintaining an entirely superfluous mining tower, which is still an irreplaceable material and technological unit reminding a certain stage of the technological revolution.

The key question of the theory of industrial heritage is posed as follows: is conversion of a purely instrumental nature or can it be a positive idea in itself, creating its own aesthetic code? Even authors that include conversion in acceptable practices of monument care, i.e. accept that even a significantly altered industrial structure following conversion still has the parameters of cultural heritage, admit that conversion is a rather defensive strategy and not a real chance to confirm the meaning of transformation in general

purposes of monument care.

What is the main meaning of transformation as such? It is ensuring long-term economic sustainability of the care for and maintenance of a historic building by including it in the social life of the contemporary era. Conversion of industrial heritage is a key element of the transformation theory, as it is unavoidable by principle. The reason behind this is that industrial architecture open to the general public must be altered at least partially, must be converted. For example, the function allowing people to stop, perceive time and space needs to be introduced in an industrial building artificially, while it is naturally present for example in sacral buildings.

In addition, many industrial structures serving a single function, such as lime works or furnaces are not accessible for people due to adverse physical and chemical conditions unfit for people remaining even after cessation of the original function. The industrial structure would have to be designed and built with the notion that it will be replaced with a new architectural “coat” relatively soon. The viability of conversion of industrial architecture

within the traditional perception of monument care is also based on the fact that the creators did not strive to create any permanent aesthetic value. And if the building acquired grand greatness of industrial structures (in the terminology of aesthetic theory by Immanuel Kant), it happened accidentally and unintentionally in the service to an industrial purpose.

Therefore, conversion of industrial heritage need not be a defensive strategy. Quite the opposite! However, monument care has progressed in its search for theoretical approaches applied to industrial heritage. In particular a new set of criteria for identifying industrial heritage values and the consequent limits in managing these structures and monument care strategies for opening these structures to the general public and interpreting them. The set of three criteria (typological significance – continuity of the technological flow – authenticity of the last working day) is useful. This triad discovers new horizons for technical heritage, while at the same time maintaining the traditional code of monument care.

On the specificity of preventive care for industrial heritage

Unalloyed structural steel is subject to a swift corrosion process when left without ongoing care. Steels with increased resistance to corrosion were developed in the USA as low alloy steel with increased resistance to atmospheric corrosion, i.e., weathering steel.

A protective and aesthetic layer of rust – patina is formed on these special steels used to construct for example high-voltage poles or bridge structures. These weathering steels with increased resistance to corrosion have been used in architecture since the 1960s. However, the rusty patina has its shortcomings. Firstly, it

does not protect from corrosion entirely – for example screwed joints are vulnerable. Secondly, its aesthetic appearance is often hindered by streaks of dripping water.

Would it be better after all to use non-authentic protective paints? This is one of the questions that demonstrates the complexity and economic cost of preventive care for industrial heritage. All types of historic buildings are undoubtedly subject to pollutants coming from the environment. To mention but a few, there is acid rain caused by the chemical composition of the atmosphere and highly corrosive impact of sea salt. However, the situation in industrial heritage is even more difficult due to the materials used and the grand size of the structures.

However, from another perspective: The road connecting Bavaria and Poland passed across the deep valley of the Vltava River near the Podolsko village in South Bohemia via a chain bridge, which was 157 m long and was an exceptional piece of engineering in Europe at the time of its construction during 1847-1848. The existence of this interesting piece of work was terminated by the construction of the Orlick dam as part of the Vltava cascade constructed in the 1960s for the purposes of flood protection and energy generation. The bridge was to disappear along with the flooded deep valley.

The government decided that the bridge should be dismantled and reassembled in a different location. Now, the transferred bridge is in regular use for the traffic crossing the Lužnice river in Stádlec in South Bohemia, although with limited permitted load. What is the interesting point in this generally fascinating story in terms of preventive care for industrial heritage? When the bridge was dismantled, it was found that the hundred and twenty-year-old metal was preserved in a generally good condition [27].



Figure 5: Chain bridge near Stádlec on the Lužnice river, which was originally built near Podolsko across the Vltava river. – photograph by Tomáš Hájek – 2024.

Final Summaries

Note on the creative and separatist tendencies in the global protection of cultural and natural heritage

Understanding the dynamics of the current global context of monument care is essential in particular in the case of transformation, as this concept is fully integrated in the current monument care in the emerging global society towards the end of the 1970s and at the beginning of the 1980s.

In general, the rationality of monument care rests on two pillars. The first one of them is Winckelmann's concept of style. His concept is based on the notion that a style is based on something that has ended and definitely belongs to the past. The second pillar, the evolutionary perception of the history of art was introduced by the Viennese school of art historians mainly based on positive evaluation of the baroque style by German researchers. This perception allows us to perceive any moment in the history of art as irreplaceable and thus the outcome of any given moment as worthy protection.

The Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) was a major milestone that de facto established institutionalised global protection of cultural heritage [28]. The convention can be interpreted as a document perceiving the world cultural heritage as a set of regionally and locally anchored yet unique cultural creations that gain global significance based on their regional uniqueness. This is in contrast with the principle of worldwide, but abstract cultural heritage created by the global community without inner borders. The term global cultural heritage is thus established in the 1970s.

Global cultural heritage was established as a specific, practically implemented vision and always has had the ambition to be truly specific world heritage emerging from wide democratism and without preliminary exclusion. However, separatist tendencies seem to be appearing in its concept from the perspective of the unity of the global spiritual approach rather than in terms of the formal organisation immediately at the moment of its creation. There are obvious and major differences in the understanding of the basic term of monument care – authenticity entailing authenticity of the shape, material, technique and environment. Meetings of monument care experts in Bergen and Nara did not and could not bring a breakthrough. It is becoming increasingly evident that the national state and the creation of its symbolics as the key stimulus for establishing the philosophy of modern monument care cannot be replaced easily [29].

The global multicultural approach is only capable of agreeing on a half empty perception of authenticity. This unavoidably, although slowly leads to major decline of authenticity in individual cultural, natural or mixed monuments recorded in the UNESCO's World Heritage List and consequently the world heritage suffering from extreme touristification essentially disappears before our eyes in its true substance. Yet, it seems to be becoming more and more important on the outside, representing the increasingly strong attraction for tourism. In other words, the current globalisation

in its key principles and the world heritage perceived specifically rather than in abstract sense go against each other in a very long-term perspective, almost invisibly but decisively. However, it is only fair to say that the compression of time and space in the current world as one of the aspects of globalisation is the problem rather than the attempt to create organised global cultural and natural heritage on the increasingly small planet Earth.

Note on the context of hygiene of the interior of historic buildings

I compiled three studies, which were included in the journal of the Society for Technology of Monument Care under the title "Hygiene of the interior of historic buildings" in 2013. I would like to offer some of the principles proposed in these studies, as they are associated with the discussed topic of the use and transformation of historic buildings.

Hygiene is a medical scientific discipline studying the principles in the relationships between the environment and people. The aim of hygiene as a scientific discipline is to determine a set of measures ensuring optimal conditions for healthy development of people and the humankind as a whole.

When focusing on the topic of hygiene of the interior of historic buildings, we firstly examine whether and under which conditions the requirements for monument care may collide with the hygienic requirements applicable to the interior of buildings. The requirement for protecting the human health is one of the public interests that monument care must take into account even if it were to collide with the intention of conservation. Hygiene of the internal environment of historic buildings includes the analysis of elements of internal microclimate of historic buildings as a key aspect especially in view of the new contexts entering the relevant historic building.

This study documents that the use and transformation of historic buildings is an essential path to sustainability of monument care. Besides other reasons, this is also due to the current people being different in their physical and health characteristics from the people for whom the current historic buildings were designed as modern buildings of their time. Naturally, any standardisation and scientific nature of hygiene regulations at the time was non-existent. However, it should be noted that the microclimate of historic buildings is currently studied by the competent scientific institutions in their complexity and interaction with the outside environment from the perspective of the microclimate of historic buildings as a microclimate of museums.

However, the currently published analyses in the international context show that the hygiene aspect (i.e. the aspect of human health in relation to the environment) may be one of helpful monitoring and interpreting angles of the analysis of dynamic balances and disbalances between the exterior of the historic building used as a public cultural space burdened by emissions, the traffic inside the building, which changes the building's physical, chemical and biological parameters, conserved and restored exhibits which also change the interior's physical, chemical and biological parameters

along with other environmental elements, and a specific visitor as part of the traffic inside the building in terms of the exposure to various types of threat to the human health [30].

Final summaries

- a) It is becoming evident that transformation of historic buildings is a rather frequent practice, yet it does not seem to be recognised as a fully legitimate part of the monument care practice. Save for the emerging systematic approach of architects to churches and chapels without liturgical use, a coherent methodological approach is missing. This is rather surprising especially in the phenomenon of conversion of industrial heritage, which allows creative architecture to embody the contemporary feelings in the historic time and let it mature there.
- b) Conversion of industrial heritage as a key part of transformation efforts presents the option of connecting the unconnectable, crossing extensive time periods in monumental and once purely utilitarian buildings, but perhaps this opportunity paralyses some owing to its massiveness. And perhaps the mere existence of industrial architecture is paralysing, as the great industrial era is a thing of the past. Perhaps architects perceive the architecture of conversion as a melancholic expression (rather similar to the Gothic revival wave in the mid-19th century) without any clear objectives that cannot lead to a clear form. While mere pride is insufficient for true creation, nihilist is not helpful either.
- c) Even when transformation is admitted as a legitimate practice and the relevant project is implemented, it is still perceived as the necessary evil, although certain outcomes have exceptional aesthetical value. It seems that there has not been a significant discussion of whether transformation of historic buildings as the highest level of the use of historic buildings may go beyond the horizon of mere instrumentality or the horizon of the sum of ad hoc individualised approaches and join forces with architecture at least to create a demand for a style in which the current times can be expressed the most accurately.

The widespread practice of transformation as one of the tasks of today's monument care, architecture and urbanism needs to begin to rationally define the currently desired style of living, as did the modern style, constructivism and functionalism before. Inspiration can be drawn for example from the Weimar Republic, where contemporaries saw Bauhaus as a symbol of rationalisation and modernisation of the style of living, which categorically rejects any excessive comfort already in 1923 [31]. The style of living gives rise to a functional content of a style and the journey culminates in artistic principles of the new style, possibly including the practice of transformation.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank for support in examining the topic of this study to:

Prof. Věra Majerová

Prof. Matúš Dulla

Dr. Pavel Vanoušek.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Tomáš Hájek (2009) K historii pojmů "využití" a "transformace" v dějinách památkové péče. [The Story of the Terms "Use" and "Transformation" in the History of Monument Care] in: Katarína Kosová (ed.) MONUMENTORUM TUTELA, Ochrana pamiatok 20. Bratislava: Pamiatkový úrad Slovenskej republiky, pp. 485, p. 291-297.
2. Tomáš Hájek (2007) K problematice opětného využití venkovských kostelů a kaplí. [The Re-utilisation of Churches and Chapels in the Countryside] in: Věra Majerová (ed.) Sborník prací z mezinárodní vědecké konference Agrární perspektivy XVI. Díl II, Praha, Česká zemědělská univerzita Provozně ekonomická fakulta, pp. 625-1350, p. 855-860.
3. Tomáš Hájek (2009) K tématu využití a transformace památkově hodnotné architektury. [On the Problem of Utilisation and Transformation of Monuments] in: Matúš Dulla (ed.) Architektúra a urbanismus, XLIII, Number 3-4. Bratislava: USTARCH SAV, pp. 193, p. 144-157.
4. Tomáš Hájek (2008) The presentation of Castles and Mansions in the Czech Countryside. In: Věra Majerová (ed.) Collection of Papers of International Conference Countryside-our World. Prague: Czech University of Life Sciences, Faculty of Economics and Management, Kutná Hora, pp. 607, p. 81-89.
5. Aleš Vošahlík (1999) Památková péče ve Francii in: Blanka Košťatková, Aleš Vošahlík Almanach programu městských památkových rezervací a městských památkových zón IV. Praha: Ministerstvo kultury ČR, nakladatelství Jalna, pp. 128, p. 47-88.
6. Robert Furneaux Jordan (1966) Victorian Architecture. Harmondsworth, Baltimore, Ringwood: Penguin Books, pp. 278.
7. Alois Riegl (2003) Moderní památková péče. Translated by Ivo Hlobil a Tomáš Hlobil. Praha: Národní památkový ústav, ústřední pracoviště, pp. 172.
8. Jiří Gotfried Dehio (1907) Ochrana a zachování památek. Translated by František Zuman. Praha: zvláštní otisk Časopisu přátel starožitností českých v Praze, ročník XIV, pp. 16.
9. Václav Wagner (2005) Umělecké dílo a jeho ochrana. Second edition, in Národní památkový ústav first edition. Praha: Národní památkový ústav, ústřední pracoviště, pp. 135.
10. Aleš Vošahlík, Český Národní Komitét Icomos (2001) Mezinárodní dokumenty ICOMOS o ochraně kulturního dědictví. Praha: Český národní komitét ICOMOS, pp. 48.
11. Václav Girs, Josef Holeček, Pavel Jerie, Dagmar Michoinová (2004) Předprojektová příprava a projektová dokumentace v procesu péče o stavební památky. Praha: Národní památkový ústav - ústřední pracoviště, pp. 108.
12. Karel Kuča, Věra Kučová, Karel Kibic (2004) Novostavby v památkově chráněných sídlech. Praha: Národní památkový ústav - ústřední pracoviště, pp. 151.
13. Karel Kuča, Věra Kučová (2000) Principy památkového urbanismu. Praha: Státní ústav památkové péče, vychází jako příloha časopisu Zprávy památkové péče, pp. 104.
14. Ladislav Kesner (2005) Marketing a management muzeí a památek. Praha: Grada Publishing, a.s., 2005, pp. 304.
15. Jaroslav Herout (1981) Staletí kolem nás - přehled stavebních slohů. Fourth supplemented edition. Praha: Panorama, pp. 428.

16. Oldřich Dostál, Josef Pechar, Vítězslav Procházka (1970) *Moderní architektura v Československu*. Second supplemented edition. Praha: Obelisk, nakladatelství umění a architektury, pp. 260.
17. Otakar Novotný (1958) *Jan Kotěra a jeho doba*. Praha: Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, pp. 287.
18. August Sarnitz (2006) *Otto Wagner 1841-1918 Průkopník moderní architektury*. Bratislava: Nakladatelství Slovart/TASCHEN, pp. 96.
19. Martin Zídek (1998) *Ochrana památek a památková péče ve Spolkové republice Německo – Nástin právní úpravy jednotlivých spolkových zemích*. In: Zdenka Bláhová, Michaela Glosová, Slavomíra Kašpárková, Blanka Košátková, Eva Šimáčková, Martin Zídek *Almanach programu regenerace městských památkových rezervací a městských památkových zón III*. Praha: Ministerstvo kultury ČR, Nakladatelství Jalna, pp. 184, p. 53-145.
20. Luca Ciancabilla (2014) *L'incanto dell'affresco – Capolavori strappati da Pompei a Giotto da Correggio a Tiepolo – Guida al percorso espositivo*. Ravenna: Museo d'Arte della città di Ravenna, pp. 47.
21. Andrea Emiliani, Claudio Spadoni (2008) *La cura del bello musei, storie, paesaggi per Corrado Ricci – Guida al percorso espositivo*. Ravenna: Museo d'Arte della città di Ravenna, pp. 39.
22. Kristina Uhlíková (2004) *Národní kulturní komise (1947-1951)*. Praha: ARTEFACTUM – nakladatelství Ústavu dějin umění AV ČR, pp. 254.
23. Oldřich Jakub Blažíček (1983) *Minulost a současné otázky prezentace zámeckých interiérů. Ústí n/Labem: KSSPOPP v Ústí n/Labem*, pp. 24 (for internal purposes of the organisation).
24. Tomáš Hájek (2007) *Důvody pro převod hradů a zámků z majetku státu do majetku krajů*. In: *Bulletin České komory architektů Ročník 14, 2/2007*. Praha: Česká komora architektů, pp. 62, p. 28.
25. Benjamin Fragner, Alena Hanzlová, Šimon Caban (2005) *Industriální stopy – architektura průmyslového dědictví v České republice 2000-2005-katalog v rámci 3. mezinárodního bienále Industriální stopy*. Praha: Výzkumné centrum průmyslového dědictví Českého vysokého učení technického v Praze, pp. 167.
26. Lucie Doležalová (2002) *Rekonverze průmyslových ploch a objektů ve Francii Vývoj a příklady*. Praha: Výzkumné centrum průmyslového dědictví, České vysoké učení technické, pp. 61.
27. Kolektiv (2000) *Technické památky zemí Visegrádské čtyřky I*. Praha: Informační centrum České komory autorizovaných inženýrů a techniků činných ve výstavbě, pp. 182.
28. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (2005) *Basic texts of the 1972 World Heritage Convention*. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, pp. 231.
29. Tomáš Hájek (2005) *Zánik a vznik památkových péčí – filozofie památkové péče*. Praha: Epocha ve spolupráci se Společností pro krajinu, pp. 197.
30. Tomáš Hájek (2013) *Na co se zaměřuje a potenciálně může zaměřovat hygiena vnitřního prostředí památkových staveb*. In: Tomáš Hájek, Petr Kotlík *Hygiena vnitřního prostředí památkových staveb Zpravodaj technologie ochrany památek Svazek 15, č. 3*. Praha: Společnost protechnologie ochrany památek, pp. 40 & 4-5.
31. Magdalena Drosteová (2007) *Bauhaus 1919-1933 Reforma a avantgarda*. Translated by Michaela Váňová. Bratislava: Nakladatelství Slovart/TASCHEN, pp. 96.