

**Vito Hazler**

Filozofska fakulteta

Univerza v Ljubljani

Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo

Ljubljana

Slovenija

vito.hazler@gmail.com

UDK 7.025:069](497.4)

069.444(497.4)

Pregledni rad

Primljeno: 10. ožujka 2009.

Prihvaćeno: 27. ožujka 2009.

# Poveznice među konzervatorstvom i muzeologijom Pregled poveznica i postignuća u Republici Sloveniji

*Na području današnje Slovenije tradicija organizirane zaštite kulturne baštine traje već stoljeće i pol. Prvi su zakoni, kao i u drugim republikama tadašnje zajedničke države, doneseni krajem Drugoga svjetskog rata pa otada započinje izraziti razvoj djelatnosti. Prvi republički zakon dobili smo 1948. godine, nakon toga uslijedili su zakoni iz 1961., 1981., 1999. te posljednji iz 2008. godine. Zakon iz 1981. po prvi je puta ujedinio djelatnosti prirodne baštine, arhiva i knjižnica; u devedesetim godinama 20. stoljeća te su veze uglavnom oslabile. Zakonodavstvo je također bilo podloga za povezivanje zaštite spomeničke baštine i muzejske djelatnosti koje se realiziralo u različitim oblicima partnerske suradnje, kako na razini istraživanja tako i na cjelokupnom predstavljanju spomenika kulture. Poznat je velik broj kvalitetnih obnova arhitektonske baštine s ambijentalnim muzejskim postavom kao i niz uspješnih konzervatorskih akcija koje su buduću namjenu obnovljenog objekta povezale s muzejskim, galerijskim te, posredno, pedagoškim radom. Uz uspješne intervencije kojima je cilj zaštita kulturne baštine, institucionalni čuvari kulturne baštine susreću se i s trendom stihijskog osuvremenjivanja povijesno važnih građevina, što u pravilu vodi smanjivanju svijesti o potrebi za zaštitom kulturne baštine i promjeni pozitivnog odnosa prema njoj.*

**Ključne riječi:** zaštita spomenika, konzervatorstvo, muzeologija, Slovenija

## Uvod

Zaštita spomeničke baštine<sup>1</sup> i muzejska djelatnost su, sa svojim stručnim i istraživačkim temeljima, konzervatorstvom i muzeologijom, samostalne institucionalne djelatnosti zaštite kulturne baštine koje imaju bogatu tradiciju, kako u Sloveniji tako i u Hrvatskoj. Povezane su s očuvanjem i zaštitom nepokretne, pokretne i, u novije vrijeme, nematerijalne baštine. U obje države rad na zaštiti proizlazi iz dobro postavljenih programa očuvanja kulturne baštine u nekadašnjoj Austro-Ugarskoj Monarhiji, koja je različitim mjerama, ediktima, uputama te, prije svega, osnivanjem Centralne komisije za proučavanje i obnovu arhitektonskih spomenika<sup>2</sup> sredinom 19. stoljeća, postavila temelje suvremenog konzervatorstva, a time posredno i muzeologije. Nastankom Države SHS, Kraljevine Jugoslavije i potom socijalističke Jugoslavije, te su se djelatnosti dobro razvijale često si postavljajući zajedničke ciljeve u zaštiti kulturne baštine. Osamostaljivanje objiju nekadašnjih jugoslavenskih republika - Slovenije i Hrvatske - nije bitno utjecalo na nastojanja u očuvanju kulturne baštine. No, veće zanimanje civilnih udruga<sup>3</sup> i javnosti za zaštitu kulturne baštine pridonijelo je ulaganju većih napora. Prije svega, obje su ove djelatnosti u posljednjih nekoliko godina doživjele kadrovsko, stručno, metodološko i tehničko pojačanje, proširile područje svojeg djelovanja te potaknule zanimanje i za nematerijalnu baštinu<sup>4</sup> koja je, posebice u konzervatorstvu, iznimno važna za pripremu kvalitetnih obnoviteljskih zahvata i zaštitnih mjera.

## Srodne djelatnosti, srodne poteškoće - osvrt na razvoj zaštite spomeničke baštine i muzejske djelatnosti

U Sloveniji, pa tako i u Hrvatskoj, očuvanje kulturne baštine određuju zakoni koji su prihvaćeni tek 1945. godine. Prije toga, u staroj Jugoslaviji, konzervatori i muzeolozi nisu imali dovoljno snage i političke potpore da bi dobili odgovarajući zakon o zaštiti spomenika i starina. Takav zakon nije imala ni Austro-Ugarska Monarhija, iako je

<sup>1</sup> U Sloveniji je izraz "zaštita spomeničke baštine" stariji izraz koji najbolje objašnjava institucionalnu zaštitu nepokretne kulturne baštine što se provodi u okviru Zavoda za zaštitu kulturne baštine Republike Slovenije i njegovih sedam područnih jedinica (do 1999. godine regionalnih zavoda). Danas se službeno (također i u zakonima) koristi izraz »zaštita nepokretne kulturne baštine«, koji nasilno uvode »zaštitnički« birokrati u svojim tekstovima te u poslovnoj komunikaciji sa strankama. U svakidašnjem govoru i praksi izraz »zaštita spomeničke baštine« još je uvijek vrlo živ, lako razumljiv i laicima, te ću ga, zbog boljeg razumijevanja, koristiti u ovom članku.

<sup>2</sup> K.K. Central Commission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale.

<sup>3</sup> Npr., Evropa Nostra, Slovenia Nostra, Croatia Nostra, Ecovast; u Sloveniji sve više turističkih i drugih društava usmjerava dobar dio svojih djelatnosti na popularizaciju i očuvanje kulturne baštine.

<sup>4</sup> U Hrvatskoj organizirano registriranje nematerijalne kulturne baštine traje od 2005. godine, a u Sloveniji od 2006., osobito nakon prihvaćanja novog zakona o zaštiti kulturne baštine (Ur. l. RS, 16/2008). Projekt vodi Naško Križnar u okviru Instituta za slovensku etnografiju Znanstvenoistraživačkog centra Slovenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti (Inštitut za slovensko narodopisje ZRC SAZU).

djelovanje Centralne komisije i od 1911. godine njezinih pokrajinskih spomeničkih službi, usprkos svemu, bilo relativno uspješno: temeljilo se na uvjerenju i autoritetima uglednih konzervatora i njihovih suradnika - korespondenata.

U društvenim okvirima stare Jugoslavije konzervatori i muzeolozi poprilično su se trudili oko donošenja odgovarajućeg zakona o zaštiti kulturne baštine. Već na prvoj zajedničkoj konferenciji, u jesen 1922., razradili su prvi nacrt Zakona o muzejima i očuvanju starina i spomenika, koji je obuhvaćao 47 članaka. Taj je tekst bio podloga za sve kasnije tekstove - sve do 1933. i 1939. godine (Stele, 1939: 80). Zakon nikada nije bio usvojen, vjerojatno zbog vrlo različitih predodžbi o oblicima očuvanja starina odnosno spomenika i djelomično zbog poprilično nejednako razvijene konzervatorske djelatnosti u državi. Tadašnji vodeći slovenski konzervator i autor većine nacrtu zakona zapisao je 1929. godine: »spomenička uprava u Jugoslaviji ... obuhvaća samo ured u Ljubljani za Sloveniju i u Splitu za Dalmaciju, a koji su naslijeđeni od Austrije.« (Stele, 1929: 103).

Nedostatak samostalnog zakonodavstva u Sloveniji, a potom i u Dravskoj banovini, djelomično se nadomještao i uređivao drugim zakonima; između ostalih *Zakonom o šumama* (Zakon o gozdovih, 1929.), *Gradevinskim zakonom* (Gradbeni zakon, 1931.) i *Naredbom* (Naredba, 1930.) koja je izašla kao dopuna članka 121 *Zakona o šumama. Naredbu* je tadašnji vodeći konzervator France Stele ocijenio kao "sažeti spomenički zakon" (Stele, 1929: 71-72).

U Sloveniji smo prve temelje zakona o spomeničkoj zaštiti dobili tek potkraj Drugoga svjetskog rata. U *Slovenskem poročevalcu* 27. siječnja 1945. objavljena je *Odluka Predsjedništva Slovenskog narodnooslobodilačkog vijeća o zaštiti knjižnica, arhiva i spomenika kulture* (Odlok Predsedstva Slovenskega narodnoosvobodilnega sveta, Hazler, 1999: 49), koja se, po današnjem poimanju, odnosila na zaštitu pokretne i nepokretne kulturne i prirodne baštine. Nakon toga, uslijedila je jugoslavenska *Odluka o zaštiti i očuvanju spomenika kulture i starina*, koja je usvojena 20. veljače 1945.<sup>5</sup> Obje su odluke bile priprema za zakonsko reguliranje očuvanja baštine, koje je konačno uspostavio *Zakon o zaštiti spomenika kulture i prirodnih znamenitosti Demokratske Federativne Republike Jugoslavije*. To je prvi pravi spomenički zakon na području nekadašnje Jugoslavije (Hazler, 1999: 49). Zakon je u prvom članku određivao da se pod državnu zaštitu stavljaju svi pokretni i nepokretni kulturno-povijesni, umjetnički i etnološki spomenici te prirodne znamenitosti (Hazler, 1999: 50); podupro je djelatnost očuvanja spomenika i muzeja te otvorio mogućnost suradnje.

Na osnovi tog Zakona republička je vlast osnovala Zavod za zaštitu i znanstveno proučavanje spomenika i prirodnih znamenitosti Slovenije (Zavod za zaščito in znanstveno proučevanje spomenikov in prirodnih znamenitosti Slovenije), koji je naslijedio predratni (Banovinski) Spomenički ured (Spomeniški urad). Zavod je postao središnji nositelj razvoja očuvanja nepokretne arhitektonske baštine u Sloveniji te sve do kraja šezdesetih godina 20. stoljeća jedina ustanova za očuvanje spomeničke baštine

<sup>5</sup> Odluku je potpisao tadašnji povjerenik za prosvjetu i kulturu Edvard Kocbek. Taj se dan u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji obilježavao kao Dan očuvanja prirodne i kulturne baštine.

koja je pozvala na suradnju, u obliku tzv. *referada*,<sup>6</sup> ugledne ravnatelje muzeja. Tako je za voditelja *Referade za etnografske spomenike* imenovan ravnatelj Etnografskog muzeja u Ljubljani - Boris Orel.

U Sloveniji je 1948. godine usvojen prvi republički *Zakon o zaštiti spomenika kulture i prirodnih znamenitosti* (Zakon o varstvu kulturnih spomenikov in prirodnih znamenitosti Slovenije), koji je određivao da se spomenici i znamenitosti, po svojim osnovnim značajkama, dijele na pokretne i nepokretne, otvorivši i povezivši tako djelatnosti spomeničke zaštite s tadašnjim muzejima; konzervatori su se već tada pri pronalaženju predmeta (npr., na arheološkim nalazištima) susretali s problemima pa je stoga bilo potrebno razvijati načine zaštite i iznaći pravilan način čuvanja pronađenoga gradiva u muzejima. Zakon je odredio i koji su spomenici »od povijesnog, arheološkog, kulturno-povijesnog, umjetničkog, etnografskog ili socijalnog značaja odnosno koji su od regionalnog značaja» (Zakon, 1948: 3). Posebice je istaknuo značaj *spomenika narodnooslobodilačke borbe*, čime se bitno proširio opseg djelatnosti očuvanja i omogućio procvat nekoliko novih muzeja.<sup>7</sup> Referada za etnografske spomenike čitavo je vrijeme vrlo prisno surađivala s Etnografskim muzejom,<sup>8</sup> koji je za terenski rad organizirao tzv. terenske ekipe; u idućih dvadeset godina te su ekipe više od trideset puta, u trajanju od nekoliko dana, posjećivale pojedine dijelove Slovenije (Kuhar, 1976: 151-162) i, pored obrta, navika i običaja, istraživale i unutaranju opremu i narodno graditeljstvo (Šarf, 1967: 6-37). Time su stvorili, iako skroman, ali važan sustavni pregled tzv. etnološke graditeljske baštine opremljen opisima, fotografijama, crtežima i, ponegdje, tehničkim mjerama.

Stanje zaštite spomeničke baštine značajno se promijenilo krajem 1960-ih godina kada su se u Mariboru, pa tako i u Ljubljani, pojavili prvi zameci decentralizacije službe za očuvanje spomeničke baštine. Novi *Zakon o zaštiti spomenika kulture u SR Sloveniji* (Zakon o varstvu kulturnih spomenikov v LR Sloveniji) iz 1961. ozakonio je takav oblik podupiranja djelatnosti i uza središnji Zavod omogućio osnivanje više regionalnih zavoda za očuvanje spomenika. Posljedično, to je značilo povećanje opsega djelatnosti, više fizičkih intervencija na spomenicima, a također i proširivanje suradnje između regionalnih zavoda i muzeja.

Usporedno s tim oblicima konzervatorstva, razvijalo se specifično muzeološko zakonodavstvo koje se sadržajno nadovezivalo na prije spomenute zakone i djelatnost zaštite spomeničke baštine. No, muzeolozi su svoj prvi samostalni zakonski okvir dobili tek krajem pedesetih godina 20. stoljeća, iako su neki muzeji na današnjem sloven-

<sup>6</sup> Npr., Referada za umjetničke spomenike, Referada za arheološke spomenike, Referada za etnološke spomenike itd.

<sup>7</sup> Npr., *Muzej revolucije Celje* (1963), danas: Muzej novejše zgodovine Celje; *Muzej ljudske revolucije Slovenije*, Ljubljana (1948), danas: Muzej novejše zgodovine; *Revirski muzej ljudske revolucije Trbovlje* (1974.), danas: Revirski muzej Trbovlje; *Muzej narodne osvoboditve* (1958.), Maribor, danas: sačuvalao svoj prvotni naziv.

<sup>8</sup> Nastao je 1923. godine odvajanjem od Narodnog muzeja. Između dvaju svjetskih ratova zvao se Kraljevi etnografski muzej, od 1941. godine Etnografski muzej, a od 1963. Slovenski etnografski muzej (Baš, 2004).

skom području nastali već u 19. stoljeću (Fujs, 2007: 41).<sup>9</sup> Kada je 1959. u Jugoslaviji usvojen *Zakon o muzejima* (Fujs, 2007: 41), u Sloveniji je status muzeja dobilo 27 ustanova, za 31 uvriježio se pojam muzejska zbirka, što je uvelike otežavalo djelovanje s obzirom da su bili financirani od strane lokalne zajednice. Novi *Zakon o muzejima* iz 1965. ukinuo je svaku kvalifikaciju muzeja i, po mišljenju nekih muzeologa, omogućio politici da deprofesionalizacijom djelatnosti pokuša podruštveniti *muzejsku djelatnost* (Fujs, 2009). Zato su muzeolozi odlučili stvoriti snažnu mrežu muzeja te su već 1970. osnovali Zajednicu muzeja Slovenije (Skupnost muzejev Slovenije)<sup>10</sup> koja je, iako uključuje različite muzeje, galerije i zbirke, još uvijek relativno snažna stručna organizacija. Konzervatori su pak Zajednicu zavoda (Skupnost zavodov) osnovali 1972. s namjerom da se poboljša zaštita spomenika jer je prevladavalo mišljenje da središnji republički zavod više ne obavlja tu ulogu na zadovoljavajući način (Hazler, 1999: 95). Zajednica zavoda se, nažalost, već u prvoj polovici 1990-ih godina razila dok Zajednica muzeja još i danas djeluje, te je pred nju novi *Zakon o zaštiti kulturne baštine* objavljen 2008. postavio veliki izazov: kako urediti mrežu muzeja odnosno registar muzeja. No, to je druga priča, koju u ovom radu nije moguće odgovarajuće predstaviti (Fujs, 2007: 41-49).

Politika, odnosno politika na području kulture, imala je u Sloveniji sve do 1960-ih godina odlučujući utjecaj na razvoj, kako konzervatorske tako i muzejske djelatnosti. Obje su se širile, a političari su u *Nacrtu kulturnog razvoja Slovenije za razdoblje 1976.-1980.* (Načrt kulturnega razvoja Slovenije za obdobje 1976-1980) ponovno došli do zaključka da je muzejska djelatnost daleko razvijenija, iako još uvijek nije dovoljno organizacijski i svrhovito povezana, da muzejska mreža nije uređena i da u pojedinim muzejima nije utvrđen njihov stručni i teritorijalni djelokrug (Fujs, 2009).

Krajem 1970-ih godina umjesto izraza *spomenik kulture* uvriježio se pojam *kulturna baština*, koji se pojavio u *Nacrtu kulturnog razvoja za razdoblje 1981.-1985.* Nacr je pozivao na jedinstvenu politiku očuvanja kulturne baštine i na tješnju povezanost muzeja. Te je ambicije pokušao pravno uobličiti, za to vrijeme moderan te sadržajno i programatski posve nov, *Zakon o prirodnoj i kulturnoj baštini* (Zakon o naravni in kulturni dediščini, 1981.) koji je uređivao konzervatorsku djelatnost, zaštitu prirodne baštine, muzejsku i arhivsku djelatnost. Veći broj stručnjaka za zaštitu prirodne baštine zaposlio se posebice u regionalnim zavodima,<sup>11</sup> uvriježio se i novi postupak proglašavanja posebno vrijednih jedinica kulturne baštine spomenicima kulture, naglasila uloga interdisciplinarnog rada, osobito u pripremi akata za proglašavanje jedinica spomenikom kulture i u pripremi različitih dokumenata o namjeni prostorija. Zakon je

<sup>9</sup> Povijest slovenskih muzeja seže u 1821. godinu kada je u Ljubljani osnovan Kranjski deželni muzej, danas Narodni muzej Slovenije. Djelovanjem su povezani sa sve brojnijim amaterskim povijesnim i muzejskim društvima, npr., u Celju gdje je 1882. god. osnovan Celjski mestni muzej, od 1965. Pokrajinski muzej Celje.

<sup>10</sup> Zajednica muzeja danas ima status javnog zavoda. U sudski registar upisana je 1979. godine, službeno broji 64 člana, iako ih je na popisu navedeno 68 (Fujs, 2009).

<sup>11</sup> Nekadašnji regionalni zavodi za zaštitu spomeničke baštine preimenovani su u zavode za zaštitu prirodne i kulturne baštine, a središnji zavod u Zavod SR Slovenije za zaštitu prirodne i kulturne baštine.

na muzeje i arhive prenio odgovornost za zaštitu pokretne baštine koja se nalazi izvan muzejskih i arhivskih prostorija.<sup>12</sup>

Različite političke okolnosti čitav su niz godina utjecale na sustav financiranja djelatnosti, kako regionalnih zavoda tako i muzeja. Način financiranja mijenjao se iz godine u godinu jer su se uvijek iznova tražila rješenja za dobivanje sredstava za redovitu stručnu djelatnost zavoda i muzeja (plaće zaposlenika, materijalne troškove djelovanja ustanove) kao i za obnovu nepokretne kulturne baštine (tzv. akcije za očuvanje spomenika) i rad na očuvanju pokretne baštine (dobivanje građiva, izložbe i sl.).

Otkraja 20. stoljeća, sredstva za obnovu spomeničke baštine nisu se više neposredno vezala uz određeni regionalni zavod, nego su ih pokrovitelji (Ministarstvo kulture, nove općine) dodjeljivali vlasnicima spomenika kulture kao ugovornim partnerima, što je dovelo do većega reda i nadzora upotrebe odobrenih sredstava. S druge strane, na taj je način zavodima smanjen neposredan utjecaj i nadzor nad obnovom budući da se važan dio komunikacije prenio na Ministarstvo kulture, odnosno Upravu za kulturnu baštinu (Uprava za kulturno dediščino) i kasnije na novoosnovani Zavod za zaštitu kulturne baštine RS (Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine) i na Direktorat za kulturnu baštinu (Direktorat za kulturno dediščino). Sustav je postao vrlo zamršen, no činjenica je da su se time spriječile malverzacije sredstvima za obnovu koja su do tada prilično spretno privajali neki regionalni zavodi.<sup>13</sup>

## Veze između zaštite spomeničke baštine i muzeja

Iako se konzervatorske ustanove i muzeji nerijetko zajednički brinu o zaštiti kulturne baštine i imaju više ili manje isto zakonodavstvo, njihov se rad, odnos prema baštini i, prije svega, njena interpretacija, ipak ponešto razlikuju. Osnovna je razlika već u načelnoj podjeli predmeta i opsega<sup>14</sup> rada: zaštiti spomenika namijenjena je uglavnom skrb za nepokretna kulturna dobra, a muzejima za pokretna. U praksi, među-

<sup>12</sup> Svaka općina trebala je biti pokrivena barem jednim muzejom koji je za jednu ili više općina obavljao muzejske zadaće. Time se trebalo potaknuti kontinuirano djelovanje muzeja i arhiva i izvan ustanova, što je tada već bila uvrježena praksa konzervatora u zaštiti spomeničke baštine. Ova, i druge zakonske odredbe, otvorile su mogućnost da u ustanove za zaštitu baštine na velika vrata uđe *politika* (akti o proglašavanju!) i *pravo*, koji su različitim zakonima i propisima sve više i više nadzirali institucionalno očuvanje baštine.

<sup>13</sup> Ponegdje su materijalne troškove za rad na terenu obračunavali od sredstava za tzv. akcije. Drugdje su bili naivni i poštenu (npr., Zavod za zaštitu prirodne i kulturne baštine Celje) pa su te troškove obračunavali u okviru materijalnih troškova redovne djelatnosti. Neki su zaračunavali i rad na tzv. »lokacijama« tj. za izdavanje suglasnosti strankama koje su namjeravale obnoviti objekt s vrijednošću kulturne baštine ili su namjeravale graditi u zaštićenom području. Time su »neki« (ne želim ih imenovati) dobivali izdašna sredstva koja su potom koristili za kupovinu opreme i, češće, za skupe »strukovne« izlete po domovini i inozemstvu.

<sup>14</sup> Odnos muzejske djelatnosti i djelatnosti zaštite kulturne i prirodne baštine pokazao je vrlo zorno Ivo Maroević u knjizi *Uvod u muzeologiju* pomoću dva kruga koji se preklapaju u određenoj sferi (Maroević, 1993: 101).



tim, nije uvijek tako. I jedni, i drugi, već zbog cjelovitosti obrade gradiva, ublažuju oštrinu takve podjele, pogotovo ako se radi o postavi i upravljanju muzejima na otvorenom, eko-muzejima ili o cjelovitoj zaštiti objekata, na što osobito upozoravaju poznati hrvatski teoretičari iz područja muzeologije i konzervatorstva - Ivo Maroević (npr., Maroević, 1993: 101; Maroević, 1997: 9) i Tomislav Šola.<sup>15</sup>

Cilj je obiju djelatnosti cjelovito očuvanje i prezentacija materijalnih svjedočanstava proteklih razdoblja. U tom su pogledu u boljem položaju muzejski djelatnici – kustosi, zato što uz redovitu djelatnost obavljaju pregled, evidentiranje i dokumentiranje baštine. Većinom se radi o predmetima koje možemo pohraniti u muzejskim prostorijama i pritom, uz odgovarajuće postupke zaštite, očuvati od daljnjeg propadanja. Školovani restoratori potom, sukladno standardima, poduzimaju odgovarajuće mjere zaštite. Načelno prevladava težnja *za što više konzerviranja i što manje restauriranja* ili potpunog *rekonstruiranja*. To je načelo konzerviranja u praksi znatno lakše provesti na pokretnoj nego li na nepokretnoj baštini jer je potonja često podvrgnuta različitim preinakama i funkcionalizmu.

Temeljnost i kvalitetu zaštite i očuvanja spomenika načelno određuje već postupak prepoznavanja u fazi redovitoga terenskoga istraživačkog rada konzervatora, potom slijedi najvažniji dio konzervatorskoga rada - faza vrednovanja. Vrednovanje konzervatori izvode pomoću *temeljnih istraživačkih mjerila* i neprestane usporedbe prikupljenih činjenica s *općim konzervatorskim mjerilima* kao što su *rijetkost*, *ugroženost* i općenito *fizičko stanje* obrađene baštine. Temeljna istraživačka mjerila se, unatoč težnjama za jednoobraznim načinom rada, ipak značajno razlikuju jer su arheologija, etnologija, povijest umjetnosti, povijest, arhitektura, zemljopis, krajobrazno uređenje i neke druge znanosti razvile vlastita mjerila i metode rada.<sup>16</sup> Doduše ta su mjerila već po naravi uporabe koncipirana tako da omogućuju *interdisciplinarni strukovni i istraživački pristup*, što je jedna od bitnih značajki konzervatorske djelatnosti.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Tomislav je Šola mogućnosti cjelovite prezentacije i interpretacije problematike kulture, baštine, prirode i civilizacije izvršno primijenio na projektu eko-muzeja u Kapelama na slovensko-hrvatskoj granici (Šola, 1996). Elaborat (idejni projekt) pod naslovom *Ekomuzej Kapela* naručili su predlagatelji izgradnje eko-muzeja u Kapelama s namjerom »stvoriti muzej koji bi za potrebe stanovnika Kapela i vanjskih posjetitelja pokazao ornitološki rezervat JOVSI te kulturnu i drugu baštinu Kapela« (Šola, 1996: 1).

<sup>16</sup> Kao konzervator-etnolog za svojeg sam dugogodišnjega stručnog i istraživačkog rada u Zavod za zaštitu prirodne i kulturne baštine Celje te kasnije tijekom istraživačkog i pedagoškog rada na Odsjeku za etnologiju i kulturnu antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Ljubljani, razvio *temeljna mjerila za prepoznavanje i vrednovanje kulturne baštine*. Stoga od 1993. u svojim radovima upotrebljavam *prostorno, vremensko, socijalno, likovno, građevinsko-razvojno i funkcionalno mjerilo*. Ta su mjerila, po mojoj ocjeni, temelj etnološkog konzervatorstva te također i drugih nastojanja na području gradnje, a i šire. Povezana su s djelatnošću s područja etnologije te su u operativnom smislu drugačija od općih konzervatorskih mjerila, koja su dovoljno univerzalna za sve struke uključene u djelatnosti zaštite spomeničke baštine.

<sup>17</sup> Zajednički, interdisciplinarno postavljeni, stručni i istraživački postupci *glavne su karakteristike* djelatnosti zaštite spomeničke baštine, no *nisu njezino pravilo* s obzirom na to da pojedinačne struke (npr., arheologija) već zbog samog načina rada operiraju čitavim nizom specifičnih metoda koje druge struke ne upotrebljavaju. Slično vrijedi i za etnologiju gdje je u središtu zanimanja *način življenja* na razini svakodnevnice i obilježavanja praznika svih profesionalnih i socijalnih skupina u svim (za struku obuhvatljivim) vremenskim razdobljima i okolinama.

Konzervatori u svojem radu upotrebljavaju različite načine odnosno *oblike intervencije*. Temeljno je polazište *utvrđivanje optimalnih mjera zaštite i očuvanja spomenika*. Dosadašnja, više ili manje uspješna praksa, pokazala je da se te mjere razlikuju. Isto tako, može biti različit i interes za zaštitu pojedinog spomenika. S tog se aspekta dosadašnja slovenska iskustva mogu razvrstati u sljedeće skupine:

- Mjere - *in situ*:

- obnova/konzervacija (5)
- razvojna obnova (2)
- osuvremenjivanje s očuvanjem detalja (1)

-Mjere - nadomjesna gradnja:

- nužne replike (4)
- gradnja pod uvjetima koje postavi služba za zaštitu spomeničke baštine (2)
- nametnute replike koje se izrađuju pod uvjetima koje ne diktira služba za zaštitu spomeničke baštine (1)
- neprihvatljive nadomjesne gradnje (0)

-Mjere - muzeji na otvorenom:

- in situ (4)
- na novim lokacijama (3)

Navedene tri temeljne skupine sadrže željene optimalne mjere za očuvanje, ali i sporne zahvate, koji osuvremenjuju pa čak i namjerno uništavaju baštinu. One su dio prakse očuvanja spomenika u Sloveniji pa sam ih zato vrijednosno kvalificirao i ocijenio bodovima od 0 (najmanje poželjne) do 5 (optimalne).<sup>18</sup>

Od svih zaštitnih mjera najpoželjnija je *obnova*, koju razumijem u smislu *što većeg konzerviranja* i očuvanja potpunog svjedočanstva kulturne baštine.<sup>19</sup> S metodološkog stanovišta srodna je muzejskom načinu rada u očuvanju izvornosti i cjelovitosti pokretne baštine. *Obnova* koju neki, barem po mojem mišljenju, neoprezno izjednačuju s *revitalizacijom*, morala bi biti temeljni cilj doktrine zaštite spomeničke baštine pa bi stoga stručne službe upravo tom obliku zaštite trebale posvetiti puno veću pozornost. *Revitalizacija* (ponovna obnova)<sup>20</sup> slobodnija je intervencija u očuvanju baštine koja se često izokrene u radikalniji oblik - tzv. *razvojnu ponovnu obnovu*, koja je da-

<sup>18</sup> Po mojim podacima takvih procjena u Sloveniji još nema. Na tim bi se temeljima trebala postaviti strategija zaštite baštine. Ukoliko uzmemo u obzir podatak da je u registar baštine upisano oko 33.000 jedinica baštine, što iznosi samo 3% s obzirom na čitav fond objekata, onda je posve opravdano podići glas za podizanje standarda za zaštitu!

<sup>19</sup> O teoretskim osnovama ove problematike vidjeti više u: Maroević, 1986: 65-97.

<sup>20</sup> Izraz "ponovna obnova" uvriježilo se u Sloveniji u sedamdesetim godinama 20. stoljeća, i to ponajviše u smislu revitalizacije gradskih i seoskih središta te trgova. S vremenom se proširio i na pojedinačne objekte baštine u smislu ponovnog oživljavanja pa i osuvremenjivanja s ciljem uspostavljanja primarnih i sekundarnih funkcija.



nas u konzervatorskoj praksi u Sloveniji, i drugdje u svijetu, postala skoro konstanta. Njome se ističu stvaralačke ambicije projekatanata - arhitekata, koji često posve preuzimaju inicijativu (čitaj: doktrinu zaštite) i (po želji vlasnika) u objekt ugrađuju sporne suvremene elemente. Takvim postupanjem značenje objekta u smislu njegove vrijednosti opada, čega je svjestan sve manji broj predstavnika institucija očuvanja i zaštite baštine, pa i sama zainteresirana javnost.

Prilično su česte i intervencije u obnavljanju po načelu *osuvremenjivanja s očuvanjem detalja*, što u pravilu vodi do devastacije nepokretne kulturne baštine. Isto bi se dogodilo kada bi od radio-aparata iz tridesetih godina 20. stoljeća, koji je impozantan muzejski eksponat, sačuvali samo drveno kućište, a gumbe, prekidače i mehanizme nadomjestili suvremenom tehnikom.

Veliku prepreku uvođenju doktrine zaštite spomeničke baštine i očuvanju toliko željene prepoznatljivosti slovenskoga životnog prostora i arhitektonskih posebnosti predstavljaju zahtjevi za *nadomjesnu gradnju*, koja se u zakonskom smislu uvriježila u 1970-im i 1980-im godinama. Već je tada vladalo uvjerenje da je novogradnja jeftinija od obnove ili revitalizacije starog objekta. Takvo je razmišljanje zasigurno negativno utjecalo na napore u zaštiti baštine te se, unatoč pokušajima konzervatora da dokažu suprotno, posebice kad se radi o redovito održavanim i obnavljanim starim zgradama, uvriježilo. Ovom načelu dobrih i štedljivih gospodara vlast u razdoblju socijalističke izgradnje domovine nije bila naklonjena, već je radije podupirala masovnu individualnu gradnju stambenih zgrada i time posredno nadzirala socijalni (ne)mir.<sup>21</sup>

S nadomjesnim gradnjama djelomično su povezane i interpolacije (više o tome: Maroević, 1986: 186-221) podignute na ispražnjenim parcelama između objekata u zaštićenim gradskim i seoskim središtima te na trgovima koji su u nekim zajednicama uvijek predstavljali privlačne lokacije za gradnju.<sup>22</sup> Ta su rješenja ponekad bila dobra i bez agresivnih zahvata na postojećoj aglomeraciji (npr., Škrapčev trg u Ribnici u Dolenjskoj), drugdje su se temeljila na izrazito modernističkim načelima (npr., nekadašnja prodavaonica Slovenijalesa u Gosposki ulici odnosno, prije osamostaljenja Slovenije, u Zidaniškovoju ulici u Celju ili poslovna zgrada Banke Celje u Mozirju) ili pak bila agresivna i posve u suprotnosti s osnovnim obilježjima povijesnog organizma naselja (npr., dva Tomosova nebodera u Kopru ili neboder nekadašnje trgovine Teko u Celju).<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> U tom su razdoblju u Sloveniji, i u dobrom dijelu nekadašnje zajedničke države, gradili svi kreditno sposobni, dakle gotovo svi zaposleni državljani. Uvjeti za gradnju bili su vrlo povoljni, a ljudi nisu ni mogli, a ni znali gdje ulagati osim u nove nekretnine. Visoka inflacija u nekoliko bi godina snizila glavnica i kreditne kamate na minimum, država je uvijek iznova uzimala nove kredite u inozemstvu (poznati Tivoli posjeti), a tzv. »Topčider« tiskao je dinare punom parom.

<sup>22</sup> Izraz *interpolacija* su u slovensku konzervatorsku praksu uveli početkom 1980-ih godina oni konzervatori (prije svega arhitekti) koji su studirali na Sveučilištu u Zagrebu. Dotad je u uporabi bio slovenski izraz *zapolnitev*.

<sup>23</sup> Ekstremni primjer agresivne intervencije na gradskoj jezgri Kopra i Celja vrhunac su socijalističke ideologije iz 1960-ih i 1970-ih godina kada je vlast bila uvjerenja da je u povijesne aglomeracije potrebno unositi i nove sadržaje »avangardnog radničkog staleža«, i to kao protutežu postignućima minulog razdoblja, posebice onih koje je producirala Katolička crkva.

## Kako konzervatori i muzeolozi surađuju?

Iz navedenih zaštitnih mjera razvidan je djelokrug konzervatora. Svojim izborom neke od raspoloživih mjera konzervator može pozitivno ili negativno utjecati na integritet konzervatorskog rada, po čemu se njegov rad bitno razlikuje od rada kustosa, muzeologa. Obje struke definitivno nastoje fizički očuvati baštinu. Razlika je u tome što kustosi svoje eksponate odabiru i sakupljaju na terenu, dobivaju putem donacija, kupuju na aukcijama ili *sajmovima starina*<sup>24</sup> ili ih, za neke projekte, čak donose iz svoga životnog okruženja,<sup>25</sup> dok konzervatori svoje »zbirke« oblikuju na terenu, dakle na području djelovanja odgovorne *područne jedinice*<sup>26</sup> Zavoda za zaštitu kulturne baštine. Njihov rad, uz temeljni zakon o očuvanju spomeničke baštine, usmjerava i zakonodavstvo s područja prostornog uređenja i zaštite okoliša te zakoni o zavodima, upravnom postupku i autorskim pravima, odluke o razvojnim planovima lokalne zajednice te brojne druge pravne odredbe povezane s kulturom.

Ta vrlo raznovrsna i opsežna »armada« pravnih odredbi jako opterećuje svakidašnji tekući rad konzervatora. U tom su pogledu muzejski radnici manje opterećeni pa je zato u muzejima i galerijama više mogućnosti za stručni i istraživački rad. Ipak, izgleda da su konzervatori vrlo uporni jer je od 256 zaposlenih oko 14% (skoro šestina) onih koji su stekli znanstveno zvanje čime baš i ne zaostaju za radnicima u muzejskim i galerijskim ustanovama gdje približno petina njih ima zvanje magistra ili doktora znanosti.

<sup>24</sup> U brojnim slovenskim gradovima subotom prijedodne održavaju se ulične prodaje starina, koje su idealna prilika muzeolozima za nadzor trgovine pokretnom baštinom. Počeci tog oblika trgovine sežu u rane 1980-e godine. Prva ponuda obuhvaćala je kvalitetne predmete i pokućstvo iz 18. i 19. stoljeća, dok se u posljednjih nekoliko godina može primijetiti porast najrazličitijih predmeta iz doba socijalizma, od kojih se najviše ističe novac, slike maršala Tita, vojničke uniforme i slično. U Ljubljani se ponuda predmeta »slovenskog« podrijetla iznimno smanjila - sve je više prodavača iz nekadašnjih jugoslavenskih republika. Podrijetlo predmeta na *sajmu starina* je, naravno, upitno. U određenim slučajevima konzervator ili muzeolog može se povezati i s takvim sakupljačima i preprodavačima. U svojoj konzervatorskoj praksi jednom sam bio svjedokom da se na takav način nadopunila oprema obnovljenog Škrapčevog imanja u Hrovači, gdje smo u dijelu zgrade uredili ambijentalnu muzejsku zbirku. Tada smo pozvali na suradnju preprodavača starog pokućstva iz Ribnice u Dolenjskoj, koji je imao odličan pregled starih kuća i njihove unutrašnje opreme. Tom smo ga prigodom uputili na važnost dokumentiranja podrijetla predmeta koje sakuplja na terenu. Od tada predmeti koje prodaje imaju certifikate o podrijetlu, što mu je smanjilo i neugodnosti s policijom.

<sup>25</sup> Uzorke takvoga aktivnog stvaralaštva nekih suvremenih muzejskih zbirki slovenski su muzeolozi prenijeli iz stranih zemalja (npr., Nizozemske). Značajan je primjer izložba *Trsje je opet rodilo* (*Spet trte so rodile*) Slovenskog etnografskog muzeja u Ljubljani za čiji je shematski prikaz sadnje vinograda muzejska suradnica donijela nekoliko starih trsova iz svojega zapuštenog vinograda u Lendavi.

<sup>26</sup> *Područna jedinica* po svojoj organizaciji i programu djelovanja odgovara hrvatskom *konzervatorskom odjelu*.

## Primjeri dobre suradničke prakse i samostalne prakse konzervatora

Rad konzervatora i muzeologa često se isprepliće te su neka zajednička postignuća u Sloveniji doživjela da ih se kao primjere dobre prakse (modele) kopira, pa čak i nadograđuje. U nastavku teksta u sažetom se obliku predstavlja nekoliko takvih primjera suradnje konzervatora i muzeologa kao i primjeri dobre prakse u čijoj su provedbi sudjelovali samo konzervatori.

### *1. Obnova spomenika u primarnoj, prilagođenoj ili muzejskoj funkciji*

Usprkos nekim programskim, organizacijskim i institucionalnim razlikama djelovanja na području očuvanja, konzervatori i kustosi često zajedno obrađuju i spašavaju baštinu s obzirom da se njihova programska počela često preklapaju. U posljednjih trideset godina u slovenskoj etnološko-konzervatorsko-muzeološkoj praksi pojavilo se nekoliko primjera uspješne suradnje, većina u okviru obnove spomenika od posebnog značaja. Od najvažnijih, potrebno je posebno istaknuti obnovu Kavčnikovog domačinstva na Zavodnju (Hudales, 2008: 248-250), Liznjakove kuće u Kranjskoj Gori i Solinarskog muzeja u Sečoveljskim solanama u Seči kraj Pirana. Nakon obnove svi su dobili novu, muzejsku funkciju. Konzervatori su kvalitetno obnovili zaštićene objekte dok su muzeolozi, po načelu ambijentalnoga muzejskog postava, završili zajedničku zadaću. Radovi su se čitavo vrijeme odvijali usklađeno te bili planirani u okviru jedinstvene radne grupe koju su još sačinjavali i projektanti, nadzornici građevinskih radova, predstavnici izvođača radova, a ponegdje i predstavnici vlasnika odnosno sponzora obnove. Konzervatori i muzeolozi su u navedenim primjerima zagovarali optimalnu obnovu i prezentaciju spomenika, stoga su i Kavčnikovo domačinstvo (1993.) i Solinarski muzej (1994.) nominirani za europski muzej godine.<sup>27</sup>

U navedenim su primjerima konzervatori i muzeolozi prihvatili nekoliko važnih mjera u očuvanju, koje su s vremenom postale modelom uspješnog spašavanja baštine. Posve su poštivali suvremena načela konzervatorske i muzeološke doktrine, iako su se u prihvaćanju programa obnove i konačne prezentacije susretali s nekim problemima očuvanja baštine u suvremenom dobu. Glavni je problem cjelovite prezentacije bilo uvođenje ključnih suvremenih instalacija koje zaštićeni objekt nije imao u izvornom obliku. Na pretežito drvenom Kavčnikovom domačinstvu ozbiljna je zadaća bila uvođenje struje, telefona i vode što je zahtijevalo zajednički rad obje djelatnosti. Nakon pažljive procjene, instalacije koje jamče sigurnost (alarmne naprave) i nesmeta-

<sup>27</sup> Oba obnovljena lokaliteta mogu se svrstati u muzeje na otvorenom na prvotnoj lokaciji, dakle *in situ* (slično kao Muzej na otvorenom »Staro selo« u Kumrovcu, vidjeti: Šprem-Lovrić, 1997: 137). Nositelji obnove i prezentacije iskoristili su sve postojeće resurse (o tome vidjeti: Maroević, 1997: 9) te ih na temelju opsežnih etnoloških istraživanja uključili u programsku i sadržajnu shemu, kako jednog tako i drugog muzeja. U Sečoveljskim solanama današnji su skrbnici (Muzej Sergeja Mašere, Piran) revitalizirali fondove soli koju dobivaju na prvobitan način. U Kavčnikovom domačinstvu (Muzej Velenje) u usku su muzejsku djelatnost uključili još i dodatne djelatnosti iz svakodnevnog života tamošnjih stanovnika po modelu *museum vivum* (npr., kolinje, pečenje rakije, sakupljanje ljekovitog bilja itd.).

no primanje posjetitelja (osvjetljenje, sanitarije, ponuda hrane, osiguranje djelatnosti u programu *museum vivum*) smještene su i na domaćinstvo i na središnju stambeno-gospodarsku zgradu tako da su gotovo neprimjetne. Električni je ormarić, na primjer, ugrađen u drvenu nišu u staji, kablovi su provedeni po kutovima podova i zidova te prekriveni letvama i žbukom, rasvjeta imitira nekadašnju svjetlost petrolejki. Samo su u najvažnijoj prostoriji, u sušionici, ugrađeni halogenski reflektori koji su usmjereni prema gore u otvoreno ognjište tako da posjetitelji dobivaju dojam kako tamo uistinu gori vatra.

Isto tako pažljivo odnosili su se i pri obnovi u Solinarskom muzeju i u Liznjekovoj kući te u ostalim primjerima konzervatorsko-muzejski prezentirane baštine.<sup>28</sup> I tamo su uveli struju te ugradili svjetla i upravljače iz vremena prve elektrifikacije kad su još spomenici bili u prvobitnoj stambenoj i gospodarskoj funkciji. U oba je primjera stara nadomjesna električna instalacija, doduše bez izmjeničnog toka, postala važan muzejski eksponat koji govori o neprekinutim procesima promjene kulturne baštine po načelima potreba svakidašnjeg života. Nova instalacija uvedena je po standardima današnjeg elektro-gospodarstva po najmanje primjetnim putovima.<sup>29</sup>

Ipak, obnova objekata koji imaju svojstvo kulturne baštine nije bila uvijek učinkovita kao u prethodno opisanim primjerima. Ponekad se konzervatorski pristup nerazumno podređuje općem estetskom izgledu prezentacije i zahtjevima muzeologa koji žele unutrašnjost objekta “neutralno” modernizirati i naglasiti samo neke simbolične promjene njihove nekadašnje funkcije. U tom su smislu vrlo poučni primjeri Kosovelov dom<sup>30</sup> u Tomaju na Krasu i Gradnikova kuća<sup>31</sup> u Medani u Goričkim brdima koji su vidno modernizirani i podređeni galerijskom uređenju unutrašnjosti. Kosovelov dom su konzervatori novogoričke upravne jedinice Zavoda za zaštitu kulturne baštine nerazumno osuvremenili i u potpunosti mu smanjili veličinu prvotnih prozora<sup>32</sup> te na temelju zahtjeva muzeologa i posjetitelja dopustili uklanjanje većine dovratnika

<sup>28</sup> Na sličan brižan način uvedena je struja te ostale nužne instalacije i u Juneževom domaćinstvu u Rogasčkoj Slatini, u Muzeju na otvorenom Rogatec (Hazler, 1997: 83), u Skomarskoj kući na Skomarju, u Kroflinovom mlinu u Kozjem (Hazler, 2008: 40), u Škrapčevom domaćinstvu u Hrovači u Ribnici, u župnom dvoru na Skomarju i drugdje. Danas se tih modela prezentacije kulturne baštine sve više drže i drugi, iako se ponegdje primjenjuje i sve ozloglašeni i agresivniji način obnove koji uključuje i upadljivo ugrađivanje svjetiljki na mjesta na kojima ih nije bilo u vrijeme primarne funkcije objekta.

<sup>29</sup> Kad su se konzervatori-etnolozi pripremali na obnovu spomenutih i drugih spomenika kulture, putovali su Europom i učili vještinu provođenja instalacija, kanalizacije, izolacije tla i druge novine. Ponegdje (npr., u Muzeju na otvorenom u Zuberu u Slovačkoj) nisu se pretjerano bavili tim pitanjem, dok su se konzervatori i muzeolozi u Muzeju na otvorenom »Staro selo« u Kumrovcu morali pridržavati važećih državnih tehničkih propisa. Autor ovog članka u svojoj konzervatorskoj praksi često je namjerno kršio propise slovenskog elektro-gospodarstva jer bi se njihovim potpunim uvažavanjem devastirao obnovljeni spomenik kulture. Uvođenje instalacije po tzv. “konzervatorskom modelu” nerijetko je bio jedini mogući način da obnovljeni spomenik kulture ne dobije previše zbnjujućih novotarija.

<sup>30</sup> Srečko Kosovel (1904.-1927.) poznati je slovenski pjesnik – ekspresionist. Umro je vrlo mlad i potkraj života živio je s roditeljima u Tomaju na Krasu.

<sup>31</sup> Alojz Gradnik (1882.-1967.) poznati je slovenski pjesnik rodom iz Medane u Goričkim brdima. Stvarao je između moderne i ekspresionizma te, između ostalog, na slovenski prevodio hrvatsku liriku.

<sup>32</sup> Tadašnja skrbnica Kosovelovog domaćinstva rekla je autoru tog zapisa 2005. godine da su prozore smanjili (konzervatori!) zato što se Kosovelova kuća (izgrađena 1925.) previše isticala i nije se uklapala u tradicionalni izgled kuća obližnjeg Tomaja.

u unutrašnjosti. Potpunu transformaciju u galerijski prostor doživjela je Gradnikova kuća gdje posjetitelj uistinu više nema osjećaj da se kreće po rodnoj kući jednog od najvažnijih slovenskih pjesnika.

I što je razlog takvim više ili manje nesretnim “cjelovitim prezentacijama” spomenika? Vjerojatno je krivica na obje strane jer su evaluacije<sup>33</sup> tako prezentiranih spomenika pokazale da su konzervatori spomenik precijenili ili ga obezvrijedili ili nisu u potpunosti razumjeli sve aspekte njegova kulturnog značenja.<sup>34</sup> Na isti način, prije više od dvadeset godina, radikalno je osuvremenjen i vrednovan ljubljanski Stari grad jer je, po ocjenama nekih uglednih slovenskih konzervatora,<sup>35</sup> zbog strukovnog lapsusa odgovornih konzervatora samodopadna kreativnost narcisoidne grupice slovenskih arhitekata tako narasla da ni nakon desetljeća moderniziranja grad još nije dobio korektno obnovljenu tvrđavu, već “maketu” u prirodnoj veličini. Potrebno je reći da muzejski djelatnici nisu neposredno sudjelovali u tom moderniziranju Staroga grada, ali su nakon otvorenja često koristili njegove izložbene prostorije za povremene tematske i bialne izložbe domaćeg i umjetničkog zanata<sup>36</sup>

## 2. *Obnove spomenika – muzejskih ustanova*

Suradnja konzervatora i muzeologa u pravilu se javlja pri obnovi spomenika kulture u kojima su smještene razne muzejske ustanove, nacionalne, pokrajinske ili lokalne. Tamo se doktrina *obnove* kulturne baštine često (čini se također nesvjesno) podređuje načelu *obnove* i potpunom *osuvremenjivanju* jer je za suvremene muzejske galerije potrebno uspostaviti odgovarajuće izložbene standarde te ostaviti dojam važnosti i suvremenosti.<sup>37</sup> U takvim se primjerima, prije svega, podudaraju vanjske, arhitekton-

<sup>33</sup> Evaluacije cjelovitih prezentacija spomenika odvijaju se u okviru Vježbi iz predmeta Etnološko konzervatorstvo na Odsjeku za etnologiju i kulturnu antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Ljubljani.

<sup>34</sup> Kod vrednovanja građevinske baštine prečesto se podudaraju likovni i arhitektonski izgled, premalo se poštuju prostorne, socijalne, građevinsko-razvojne i funkcionalne osobitosti spomenika.

<sup>35</sup> Kasteolog Ivan Stopar je sredinom 1980-ih godina na nekom simpoziju o predstavljanju obnove ljubljanskog Starog grada ocijenio da konzervatorske ocjene povijesnih obilježja utvrde nisu bile optimalne. Prema ocjeni Stopara i nekih drugih povjesničara umjetnosti (Nace Šumi), odgovorni su konzervatori obezvrijedili spomeničku vrijednost i važnost ljubljanskog Starog grada.

<sup>36</sup> Za postavljanje povremenih izložbi, muzeolozi i drugi izlagači dobili su na korištenje izložbene prostorije opremljene električnom i svom drugom potrebnom instalacijom. Zato su svoje izložbene koncepte morali prilagođavati izložbenom prostoru i njegovoj tehničkoj ponudi, što je na području muzeologije poprilično česta praksa (npr., putujuće izložbe).

<sup>37</sup> Karakterističan primjer obnove i modernizacije nekadašnje su vojarnje u Metelkovoj ulici u Ljubljani gdje su se smjestili Slovenski etnografski muzej i Narodni muzej. Uglavnom su sačuvani tlocrtni i visinski gabariti zgrada te raščlanjenost pročelja, dok se unutrašnjost više ili manje podredila konceptu suvremene muzejske djelatnosti. Oba su muzeja kod središnjeg ulaza dobila impozantne željezne konstrukcije čiju namjenu ne zna objasniti većina zaposlenih stručnjaka. U izložbenim prostorijama Slovenskog etnografskog muzeja suvišnim postaju veliki betonski “radijatori” (u biti ogromne grijače ploče), koji su se pokazali prevelikim potrošačima energije i potpuno nefunkcionalnim dijelovima opreme jer zauzimaju velike zidne izložbene površine, a na njih se, zbog unikatne izvedbe, ne može objesiti ni jedan pano ni izložbeni predmet. Budući da se radi o autorskom uređenju objekta, još će neko vrijeme ti skupi i, prije svega, nefunkcionalni energetski betonski kolosi zauzimati elitne površine izložbenih prostora.

ske i likovne značajke objekta te, možda, i karakteristični unutrašnji raspored prostora, a rjeđe prvotne funkcionalne i tehničke posebnosti objekta kao što su, npr., električne instalacije, centralno grijanje s kraja 19. stoljeća, različita grijača tijela (peći) i slično. U pravilu, unutrašnjost se podređuje načelu muzejskog iskorištavanja prostora, što često dovodi do radikalnog pojednostavljenja izvornog ustroja objekta. Nažalost, programi spornih prezentacija, u čijoj provedbi nekritično sudjeluju i konzervatori, sve se češće zasnivaju na načelu: “zaštitit ćemo vanjski izgled, a unutrašnjost preurediti kako nam odgovara”.

Ponegdje su temeljito *obnovljeni* i *modernizirani* slabije očuvani ili skoro u potpunosti dotrajali spomenici, koji su u svojem postojanju više puta mijenjali brižne i manje brižne vlasnike. Poslijeratno socijalističko razdoblje nije pokazivalo pretjeranu brigu za slovenske utvrde u kojima su vodeći ideolozi tog vremena prepoznavali samo domove tzv. “klasnih neprijatelja”. Neke su utvrde iz različitih razloga (npr., kao sjedišta okupatorskih baza) spaljene već tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata (takvu su sudbinu, na primjer, doživjele tvrđava Soteska na rijeci Krki i tvrđava Brdo kod Lukovice), na drugima su se pak vojnici jugoslavenske narodne armije učili miniranju zidova (tvrđava Hmeljnik), a u nekima je vlast vidjela mogućnost rješavanja problema nedostatka stambenog prostora pa je u ispražnjene odaje brojnih slovenskih utvrda, gradina i dvoraca naselila ljude sa socijalnoga dna.

Izrazito ilustrativni primjeri nepravilne razvojne brige za baštinu jesu tvrđava u selu Grad na Goričkom i Blagajeva gradina u Polhovem Gradcu,<sup>38</sup> koje su u višegodišnjim obnovama dobile u potpunosti drukčiji izgled. Prvu je prije desetak godina slijedila vrlo radikalna *obnova*, koja još uvijek traje. Većinu programa za očuvanje tvrđave usmjerili su ideolozi obnove u doktrinu tzv. *statičkog perfekcionizma* kao da će tvrđava zauvijek biti očuvana i neće joj moći ništa ni najteže vremenske nepogode ni izopačeni pojedinci ljudskog roda. Statički perfekcionizam sam po sebi nije loš, ali u objektu, koji se obnavlja državnim i europskim sredstvima, “obnovitelji” su ugradili enormne količine betona (u temelje, vijence krovnih greda, armiranobetonske ploče na stropovima i podovima), nove prozore i vrata (Hazler, 2005: 187),<sup>39</sup> uzicali su suvremenu šuplju opeku umjesto klasične tipične za stoljetnu gradnju na panonskom prostoru i još nekoliko drugih novotarija koje potiču dvojbu hoće li pri takvom radikalnom razvojnom obnavljanju tvrđava sačuvati osobitost i prepoznatljivost spomenika kulture. U tvrđavi je već nekoliko godina sjedište Pokrajinskog parka Goričko (Krajski park Goričko), dvorana za vjenčanje, kuhinja s otvorenim ognjištem iz obližnjeg

<sup>38</sup> Primjere navodim samo kao *poučne primjere*, a nikako ne zbog *jeftinog kritizerstva*. U Sloveniji je općenito slabo razvijena kritika konzervatorskih i muzeoloških prezentacija baštine. Taj nedostatak nastojimo nadomjestiti odgojem diplomanata na Odsjeku za etnologiju i kulturnu antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Ljubljani. Diplomanti su već izradili poneku zanimljivu stručnu ocjenu o intervencijama u zaštićenim krajevima (Štanjel), aktualnim intervencijama u Ljubljani (Kolizej, Plečnikov stadion) i drugdje.

<sup>39</sup> Među ostalim, i suvremeni kovani dijelovi su bez izravne povezanosti s najvjerojatnijom izvornom izvedbom.



sela, radionice domaćih obrta iz susjednih sela<sup>40</sup> i još podosta neprihvatljivih novosti koje prelaze okvire razumnoga suvremenog konzervatorstva i muzeologije (Utvrdavna Grad na Goričkom, 2009.). Tvrđavu, koja se obnavlja sredstvima Phare, pokušava oživjeti kolektiv Pokrajinskog parka različitim djelatnostima kako bi pod svoje okrilje privukao što više posjetitelja.<sup>41</sup>

Znatno je bolje u procesu obnove prošla Blagajeva gradina u Polhovem Gradcu koja je prije nekoliko godina bila primjer kvalitetne obnove pa je skupina konzervatora za izvršeni rad dobila Steleovo priznanje, priznanje strukovnog Slovenskoga konzervatorskog društva. U obnovi gradine muzejski djelatnici nisu sudjelovali jer je nacrt obnove predviđao univerzalni model iskorištavanja prostorija za više funkcija. Niz godina obnovu objekta kočio je denacionalizacijski postupak, a nakon što je gradina prešla u ruke vlasti, probleme između višegodišnjeg upravitelja i organizatora obnove, Općine Polhov Gradec-Dobrova i države, u Ministarstvu kulture riješili su “gordijski”: 2008. godine u gradinu je postavljen dio zbirke Tehničkog muzeja Slovenije, a zadržali su i već zatečene djelatnosti (dvoranu za vjenčanja, pokrajinsku muzejsku zbirku, prostor privremenih izložbi itd.), a njih vodi i o njima brine lokalna zajednica. Djelatnici Tehničkog muzeja prilagodili su se postojećem izložbenom prostoru pa je stalna muzejska zbirka postavljena uzorno i pregledno.

### ***3. Prirodne nepogode, onečišćenje okoliša, ratovi***

Rad konzervatora i muzeologa također se dodiruje u slučajevima nepredvidivih nesreća, potresa, požara, čovjekova nemarnog odnosa prema prirodi i, nažalost, u slučajevima ratnih haranja i nerazumnog uništavanja kulturne baštine koje pokreću ideološke, vjerske ili nacionalno-rasističke pobude.

Tijekom jakih razornih potresa u Kozjanskom (1974.) i Posočju (1976. dvaput, 1998. i 2005.) oštećene su ili uništene brojne zgrade i naprave te velik broj zaštićenih objekata, npr., Breginj (Potresi v Sloveniji, 2009; Potresna aktivnost, 2009). U tim su prirodnim nepogodama veliku ulogu u procjeni štete i spašavanju objekata preuzele stručne ekipe u kojima su, u velikom broju, bili zastupljeni i konzervatori i muzeolozi. U Posočju su najteže stradale upravo zaštićene zidane građevine (kuće, žitnice, crkve) pa je zbog toga, da se spase od potpunog uništenja, trebalo skinuti freske s pročelja ili iz unutrašnjosti građevina te ih prenijeti u restauratorske radionice muzeja i regionalnih zavoda za zaštitu spomenika. Nakon restauratorskih intervencija poneke su

---

<sup>40</sup> U Sloveniji i drugim državama (npr., Stainz u austrijskom dijelu Štajerske) ponešto je muzejskih ustanova smješteno u nekadašnjim feudalnim bazama (tvrđavama, gradinama i dvorcima). Za većinu posjetitelja i sve manje kritičnih čuvara baštine takvi zahvati nisu uopće sporni, pa čak i onda kada se u dvorskim spavaonicama danas nađu kreveti i kola iz susjednih sela. Tvrđave su još ponegdje korisni okvir – kulise – za novu muzejsku, ugostiteljsku, kulturnu, protokolarnu i još poneku djelatnost. Vremenski odmak od njihove prvotne funkcije tolerira i najradikalnije intervencije.

<sup>41</sup> Već nekoliko godina u tvrđavi se na državni praznik Dan reformacije, 31. listopada, priređuje proslava američkog blagdana Noć vještica (Halloween). Na temelju usmenih iskaza iz 2008. godine, tim se povodom u okolici, gdje živi velik broj vjernika protestantske augsburške vjeroispovjesti, okupilo oko 20.000 posjetitelja.



vraćene na obnovljene zgrade, dok ih je većina nadomještena kopijama. Izvorne freske pohranjene su u područnim muzejima u Škofjoj Loki, Idriji i Tolminu.

Uspješna iskustva u zaštiti kulturne baštine stečena prigodom prirodnih nepogoda slovenski konzervatori i muzeolozi prenosili su kolegama u drugim dijelovima nekadašnje zajedničke države, a pogotovo tijekom sanacije posljedica katastrofalnog potresa u Crnoj Gori koji je tu jugoslavensku republiku opustošio 15. travnja 1979.,<sup>42</sup> te, između ostalih, snažno pogodio i Dubrovnik. Na obnovi spomenika kulture na Cetinju i drugdje,<sup>43</sup> Slovenci su sudjelovali većinom kao mentori, te vodili preseljenje samostana Piva na višu, sigurniju razinu kako bi ga zaštitili od prodora rijeke Pive. Na taj su način uspješno spasili jedan od najuglednijih aktivnih pravoslavnih samostana u Crnoj Gori.

Konzervatori i muzeolozi opet su bili na kušnji 2007. godine kada je zapadni dio Slovenije pogodio niz nepogoda. Najteže je bilo 18. rujna kad su vodene bujice uništile brojna područja i oštetile poprilično spomenika kulture, a među ostalima i poznatu partizansku bolnicu Franju. U nekoliko je sati vodena bujica uništila većinu drvenih baraka u sutjesci Pasice i zauvijek odnijela predragocjene izvorne eksponate. Uz suradnju domaćina, općine Cerkno, više nadležnih ministarstava, konzervatora i nadležnog Gradskog muzeja Idrija, u tijeku je intenzivna obnova spomenika. Uskoro će biti izvedena gotovo potpuna rekonstrukcija objekata jer je vodena bujica poštjedjela samo nekoliko baraka. Bit će potrebno iznova opremiti i unutrašnjost pojedinih baraka analognim predmetima jer je stradao veći dio izvorne opreme, operacijskih instrumenata, zidnih ukrasa, dokumentacije i drugih dragocjenosti.<sup>44</sup>

I arheološka su iskapanja<sup>45</sup> također primjeri dobre suradnje obje djelatnosti, pri čemu je spašeno nekoliko ključnih spomenika kulture koji su inače dio prirodnog okruženja. Već su 1952. konzervatori i muzeolozi sudjelovali u spašavanju svetišta boga Mitre u Rožancu u Beloj krajini (Hazler, 1999: 54) gdje je u jami, usred šume, reljef s bogom Mitrom uklesan u vapnenački kamen. Tom su prigodom restauratori izradili kopije reljefa i pohranili ih u obližnjem Belokranjskom muzeju u Metlici. Današnja usporedba stanja izvornika u prirodi i muzejske kopije ukazuje na veliku ugroženost spomenika *in situ* ponajprije zbog sve većeg onečišćenja okoliša. Kisele kiše u Rožancu desetljećima su ispirale vapnenu stijenu zbog čega je reljefni prikaz rimskog boga bio gotovo neprepoznatljiv. Tek je vrlo radikalni potez s izvedbom zaštitnog krovništva nekako zaustavio daljnje propadanje.

<sup>42</sup> U potresu jačine devet stupnjeva po Merkaliju život je izgubila 101 osoba, a bilo je oštećeno na desetine spomenika kulture i poznatih primorskih gradova (Budva, Trogir itd.).

<sup>43</sup> Na obnovi u Crnoj Gori sudjelovali su, među ostalima, statičar-konzervator Stojan Ribnikar i arhitekt-konzervator France Vardjan.

<sup>44</sup> Bolnica Franja je prije nekoliko godina kandidirana za upis na popis UNESCO-ve svjetske baštine. Kod prve je molbe odbijena, a sad se nalazi na listi čekanja. Početkom 2007. dobila je oznaku Europske kulturne baštine.

<sup>45</sup> Ta praksa u Sloveniji ima dugu tradiciju i česta je samo u nekim gradovima s dugom povješću (Ljubljana, Celje, Ptuj).

Još gore od prirode prema kulturnoj baštini odnosi se čovjek. Tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata u Sloveniji je bilo mnogo oštećenih ili uništenih spomenika kulture, kuća i gospodarskih zgrada koje su spalili okupatori te crkvi i tvrđava koje su u sukobima s okupatorom i njegovim pomagačima, uništili partizani. Slovenija je i u ratu za oslobođenje pretrpjela materijalnu štetu na spomenicima kulture (npr., Gornja Radgona), ali ipak u znatno manjoj mjeri nego li Hrvatska i Bosna i Hercegovina. Tamo su ratni sukobi uvelike prešli granice civiliziranog odnosa prema kulturnoj baštini jer se rat, izašavši iz okvira etničkog čišćenja, usmjerio na uništavanje kulturnog i nacionalnog identiteta, što je za postojanje pojedinačnih naroda u njihovu autohtonomu životnom prostoru još i veća tragedija. Ne bih želio biti grub, ali narod se kao etnos u svojem autohtonom životnom okruženju može biološki obnoviti u nekoliko desetljeća, ali njegovi ratom uništeni spomenici kulture više se nikad ne mogu vratiti! Znamo da potpuna rekonstrukcija nikad ne može nadomjestiti izvornik<sup>46</sup> pa su zbog toga poruke toga zadnjega balkanskog rata poučne za čitav civilizirani svijet.

## Obnove spomenika – suradnja s civilnim udrugama

Unatoč mogućnosti redovite suradnje konzervatora i muzeologa, u slovenskom je konzervatorstvu zabilježeno nekoliko primjera u kojima se takvi oblici nisu razvili u opsegu kakva priželjkujemo. Razloga je više pa ih u ovom tekstu, iz objektivnih, ali i subjektivnih razloga, nije moguće u potpunosti analizirati i prikladno interpretirati. Zbog toga ovaj tekst uključuje samo neke primjere realnoga stanja kojima su stručna i šira javnost ipak posvetile određenu pažnju. Radi se o manje poznatom konzervatorskom radu koji je dao nekoliko primjera relativno dobre prakse koji se temelje na korisnom modelu povezivanja doktrine zaštite baštine i civilnih udruga, a posljedično i o “spuštanju konzervatorstva kao struke s oltara” nedodirljivosti. Izrazit model povezivanja konzervatorske struke s lokalnom zajednicom, i još više s formalnim zajednicama (udrugama), razvio se u Rogatcu prilikom nastajanja i izgradnje (koja, nažalost, još uvijek traje) muzeja na otvorenom, najvećega slovenskog muzeja tog tipa koji leži samo kilometar od slovensko-hrvatske granice. Većinu poslova na izgradnji, sakupljanju, restauriranju i smještanju opreme te oblikovanju sadržajnih programa preuzeli su Društvo za uređenje muzeja na otvorenom Rogatec (Društvo za uređenje muzeja na prostem Rogatec) i konzervator-etnolog Zavoda za zaštitu prirodne i kulturne baštine Celje (Zavod za varstvo naravne in kulturne dediščine Celje). Na taj se način razvio sasvim nov oblik suradnje konzervatora i ljubitelja prirode, kakav dosad još nije zabilježen u slovenskom prostoru (Hazler, 1993: 10-11; 1997: 80).

Iz ne posve objašnjenih razloga, u izgradnju Muzeja na otvorenom Rogatec nije se aktivno uključio strukovni pokrajinski muzej iz Celja. Pokrajinski je muzej nastajanje

<sup>46</sup> Na raznim međunarodnim susretima (npr., Gozd Martuljek u Sloveniji 1993., 1994., 1995., 1996., Szantodpuszta na Balatonu u Mađarskoj 1995.) priopćavali su hrvatski kolege o uništavanju spomenika kulture. Snažno nas je potreslo uništavanje poznatih drvenih građevina (kuća, crkvi) u Pokuplju i Turopolju, koje, po mojem mišljenju, spadaju u sam vrh narodnog stvaralaštva u Hrvatskoj. Čak ni vješanje zastava sa znakom haaške konvencije nije omelo nekulturne napadače (Ukrainčik, 1992: slika br. 28).

muzeja u Rogatcu pratio većinom izdaleka i samo se na početku 1990-ih njegov kustos-etnolog značajnije uključio u rad dviju istraživačkih radionica (1993., 1994.) koje je zapravo organizirao suparnički muzej – Muzej novije povijesti (Muzej novije zgodovine). Taj je muzej programski mnogo obećavao. Osim u organizaciji radionica, sudjelovao je još i u nabavi opreme. Međutim, tada su u zborniku prve Muzejske radionice u Rogatcu objavljene neke neumjesne kritike članova društva i programa koje su jako udaljile taj celjski muzej od Rogačana. Preko toga se očito nije moglo prijeći ni poslije, kad je upravu Muzeja na otvorenom Rogatec preuzeo Zavod za kulturu, turizam i razvoj Rogatec (Zavod za kulturo, turizem in razvoj Rogatec).

U znatno manjem opsegu, ali po sličnom modelu suradnje konzervatora s vlasnicima i predstavnicima civilnih udruga, odvijala se još obnova Skomarske kuće na Skomararu (1992.-1996.), Ošlakove kovačnice na Skomararu (2000.-2002.), Kroflinovog mlina u Kozjem (1998.-2002.), Juneževog domaćinstva u Rogaškoj Slatini (1998.-2005.), Rezarove kuće u Grajski vasi (1998.-2004.) i još neke druge. Ovlašteni konzervator-etnolog Zavoda za očuvanje kulturne baštine Celje vodio je nekoliko obnova spomenički zaštićenih zgrada i tako utemeljio muzejski postav koji se, u pravilu, temeljio na ambijentalnom predstavljanju kulture življenja<sup>47</sup> i obliku gospodarskih nastojanja, temeljenih na primarnoj funkciji zaštićenih objekata. Uz različite graditeljsko-razvojne oblike: vremenske, likovne i funkcionalne komponente zgrada i opreme, u tom je kontekstu te serije prezentacije graditeljske baštine predstavljena i njihova socijalna pripadnost odnosno socijalno okruženje njihovih graditelja i korisnika. Ta je komponenta, prije svega, naglašavala etnološke aspekte interpretacije kulturne baštine koja na trgovima i u selima prikazuje život malih i srednjih seljaka te obrtnika.

## Zaključak

U radu se donosi pregled nekih značajnijih načina suradnje slovenskih konzervatora i muzeologa u zaštiti kulturne baštine. Prikazana su praktična konzervatorska i muzeološka iskustva i evaluacija prezentirane baštine posljednjih trideset godina u Sloveniji, u kojima je u nekoliko slučajeva aktivno sudjelovao i pisac ovog rada. Autorova namjera u opisivanju manje ili više intenzivnih oblika suradnje nije bila subjektivno prikazati situaciju, nego koliko-toliko objektivno analizirati stanje što bi trebalo voditi poboljšanju i, prije svega, razvijanju interdisciplinarnog i multidisciplinarnog rada, što je jako važno i potrebno za uspješno očuvanje i zaštitu kulturne baštine.

*Sa slovenskog prevela Dubravka Zupanec*

<sup>47</sup> Načelo ambijentalnog postavljanja unutrašnje opreme u spomenički zaštićene objekte sigurno je među najpoučnijim načinima cjelovite prezentacije. Zanimljivo je uvođenje etnoloških oblika zaštite baštine jer se u interijerima zgrada i gospodarskim zgradama najbolje vidi kulturni i socijalni način života (vidjeti: Mihalić, 2008: 99) te oblici gospodarskih djelatnosti na njihovoj primarnoj razini gdje je također moguće doseći i neke zanimljive oblike muzejske komunikacije (Maroević, 2003: 14).

## Literatura:

Barker, Philip. 1998. *Tehnike arheološkega izkopavanja*. Ljubljana: Slovensko arheološko društvo. Ministrstvo za kulturo. Uprava RS za kulturno dediščino.

Baš. Angelos, ur. 2004. *Slovenski etnološki leksikon*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.

Batič, Jerneja, Damjana Prešeren, ur. 2000. *Kulturne poti 2000. Vodnik po spomenikih. Dnevi evropske kulturne dediščine*. Ljubljana: Uprava Republike Slovenije za kulturno dediščino.

Batič, Jerneja, ur. 1994. *Varstvo naravne in kulturne dediščine v letu 1993*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za kulturo. Zavod za varstvo naravne in kulturne dediščine.

Bučič, Vesna, ur. 1972. *Muzeji in galerije v Sloveniji. Jugoslavija*. Ljubljana: Društvo muzealcev Slovenije in Turistična zveza Slovenije.

Fister, Peter. 1979. *Obnova in varstvo arhitekturne dediščine*. Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga.

Fortunat Černilogar, Damjana. 2008. "Obnovljena rojstna hiša pesnika Simona Gregorčiča". *Argo* 51/1: 131-133.

Fujs, Metka. 2007. "Slovenska muzejska mreža". *Informatica museologica* 38/3-4: 41-49.

Fujs, Metka. 2009. »Skupnost muzejev Slovenije«, <http://www.sms-muzeji.si/?id=52&jezik=slo&vsebina=dok> (2.2.2009).

Grad Grad na Goričkem. 2009. "Občina Grad na Goričkem", [http://www.obcina-grad.si/sl/informacija.asp?id\\_informacija=38&id\\_meta\\_type=4](http://www.obcina-grad.si/sl/informacija.asp?id_informacija=38&id_meta_type=4) (23.2.2009).

Hazler, Vito. 1997. "Muzej na otvorenom Rogatec". *Muzeologija* 34: 80-88.

Hazler, Vito. 1999. *Podreti ali obnoviti? Zgodovinski razvoj, analiza in model etnološkega konservatorstva na Slovenskem*. Ljubljana: Založba Rokus.

Hazler, Vito. 2005. »Znanja in izkušnje – izziv za sodobno konservatorstvo«. U *Nesnovna kulturna dediščina Slovenije*. D. Prešeren, N. Gorenc, ur. Ljubljana: Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine Slovenije, str. 185-188.

Hazler, Vito. 2008. "Mlin brez mlina. Obnova domačije Pri šprenglerju, kulturnega spomenika Kroflnov mlin". *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 48/1-2: 35-43.

Hudales, Jože. 2008. *Slovenski muzeji in etnologija. Od kabinetov čudes do muzejev 21. stoletja*. Ljubljana: Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani.

Kuhar, Boris. 1976. "Slovenski etnografski muzej v Ljubljani". V *Etnološka topografija slovenskega etničnega ozemlja. Uvod. Poročila*. S. Kremenšek, ur. Ljubljana: Raziskovalna skupnost slovenskih etnologov, 1976, str. 151-162.

Maroević, Ivo. 1986. *Sadašnjost baštine*. Zagreb: Društvo povjestičara umjetnosti SR Hrvatske.

Maroević, Ivo. 1993. *Uvod u muzeologiju*. Zagreb: Zavod za informacijske studije.

Maroević, Ivo. 1997. "Muzeji na otvorenom – hrvatska šansa". *Muzeologija* 34: 7-13.

Maroević, Ivo. 2002. "Kulturna baština u ruralnom prostoru između kustosa i konservatora". U *III. Simpozij etnologov konservatorjev Slovenije in Hrvaške. Varstvo nepremične kulturne dediščine. Zbornik povzetkov*. Novo mesto: Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine Slovenije, Območna enota Novo mesto, str. 4-5.

Maroević, Ivo. 2003. "Muzejska izložba – muzejski izazov". *Informatica museologica* 34/3-4: 13-18.

Mihalič, Veljko. 2008. "Privatne zbirke darovane gradu Zagrebu i njihova uloga u kulturnom razvoju grada". *Muzeologija* 45: 99-105.

Moder, Gregor, ur. 1992. *Vodnik po slovenskim muzejih*. Ljubljana: Zveza muzejev Slovenije.

Novak, Slobodan Prosperov, ur. 1991. *The Destruction of Museums and Galleries in Croatia during the 1991 War*. Zagreb: Museum Documentacion Centre.

Novak, Slobodan Prosperov, Šulc, Branka, ur. 1992. *Muzeji i galerije Hrvatske*. Zagreb: Muzejski dokumentacijski centar.

Perko, Verena. 2008. "Znanje je moć, modrost je življenje. Ali o društveni vlogi zbirki in muzejev (I. del)". *Argo* 51/2: 56-79.

Potres v Črni gori. 1979. "Potres v Črni gori", [http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/15.\\_april](http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/15._april) (28.2.2009).

Potresi v Sloveniji. 2009. "Seznam potresov v Sloveniji", [http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seznam\\_potresov\\_v\\_Sloveniji](http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seznam_potresov_v_Sloveniji) (28.2.2009).

Potresna aktivnost. 2009. »Potresna aktivnost«, [http://www.arso.gov.si/potresi/potresna%20aktivnost/mocnejsi\\_potresi.html](http://www.arso.gov.si/potresi/potresna%20aktivnost/mocnejsi_potresi.html) (28.2.2009).

Rihter, Andreja, Ciglencečki, Marjeta, ur. 2001. *Vodnik po slovenskim muzejih*. Ljubljana: Skupnost muzejev Slovenije.

Salopek, Davor. 1974. *Arhitektura bez arhitekta. Vitalne poruke narodnog graditeljstva*. Zagreb: Izdavačka djelatnost saveza arhitekata Hrvatske.

Stele, France. 1928. "Varstvo spomenikov. Referat na proslavi 25-letnice Zgodovinskega društva v Mariboru". *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 24: 103.

Stele, France. 1939. "Spomeniško varstvo v Jugoslaviji". *Jugoslovenski istorijski časopis* 2/1-4: 49-100.

Šarf, Fanči. 1967. "Domovi v Drašičih s posebnim pogledom na stanovanjsko reven", *Slovenski etnograf* 20: 6-37.

Šola, Tomislav. 1994. "Sedanjest in bodočnost muzeja". U *Muzeoform. Zbornik muzeoloških predavanj 1992/93*. B. Rovšnik ur. Ljubljana: Zveza muzejev Slovenije: str. 19-24.

Šola, Tomislav. 1996. *Ekomuzej Kapele. Idejni projekt* (tipkopis, bez kraja i navoda naručitelja te izdavača).

Šperm Lovrić, Branka. 1997. "Poštivanje izvornosti u rekonstrukciji i restauraciji Muzeja na otvorenom »Staro selo« u Kumrovcu". *Muzeologija* 34: 136-143.

Turk, Mojca. 1996. "Oblikovalkin pogled na nastajanje razstave". *Argo* 39/1-2: 122-124.

Ukrainčik, Vlado, ur. 1992. *War damages & Destructions inflicted od the cultural monuments, Sites & Historical centers in Croatia*. Zagreb: Institute for protection cultural monuments.

Zakon 1948: "Zakon o varstvu kulturnih spomenikov in prirodnih znamenitosti v Ljudski Republici Sloveniji z dne 19. maja 1948". *Varstvo spomenikov* 1: 3-6.

Zakon 1961: "Zakon o varstvu kulturnih spomenikov v LR Sloveniji". *Uradni list Ljudske republike Slovenije* 26/1961.

Zakon 1981: "Zakon o naravni in kulturni dediščini". *Uradni list Republike Slovenije* 1/1981.

Zakon 2008: "Zakon o varstvu kulturne dediščine". *Uradni list Republike Slovenije* 16/2008.





**Vito Hazler**

Faculty of Philosophy  
University of Ljubljana  
Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology  
Ljubljana  
Slovenia  
vito.hazler@gmail.com

UDK 7.025:069](497.4)

069.444(497.4)

Review paper

Received: March 10, 2009

Accepted: March 27, 2009

# Links Between Conservation and Museology - Overview of the Linkages and Achievements in the Republic of Slovenia

*The tradition of organized protection of cultural heritage has lasted for a century and a half in the territory of today's Slovenia. The first laws, as well as in other republics of the former common state, were issued at the end of World War II and since then significant activity in this field began to develop. The first bill on the level of the Republic was passed in 1948, followed by the laws in 1961, 1981, 1999 and the last, which was passed in 2008. The law of 1981 linked the activities in the fields of natural heritage, archives and libraries for the first time, but in the nineties of the previous century these links were mostly weakened. Legislation was also the basis for connecting the protection of cultural heritage with museological activities that have been realized in different forms of cooperative partnership, both on the research level and with the overall presentation of cultural heritage. We have witnessed a large number of restorations of architectural heritage with ambient museum exhibitions and a series of successful conservations action that linked the future purpose of the renewed building with the museum, gallery and, indirectly, teaching activities. While performing successful interventions aimed at protecting cultural heritage, institutional guardians of cultural heritage encounter a spontaneous trend of haphazard modernization of important historical buildings, which typically leads to a reduced awareness of the need for protection of cultural heritage and changes the positive attitude towards it.*

**Key words:** monument protection, conservation, museology, Slovenia

## Introduction

Protecting cultural heritage<sup>1</sup> and museological activities are - with their professional and research foundations, conservation and museology - independent institutional activities pursuing protection of cultural heritage which have a rich tradition, both in Slovenia and in Croatia. They are associated with the preservation and protection of the fixed, mobile and, more recently, the intangible heritage. In both countries the origins of the work on protection came from well set up programs to preserve cultural heritage in the former Austro-Hungary, which has, with various measures, edicts, instructions, and, above all, with the establishment of the Central Commission for the study and reconstruction of architectural monuments<sup>2</sup> in mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, laid the foundations of modern conservation, and thus indirectly of museology too. With the creation of the State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and then the socialist Yugoslavia, these activities developed well, often setting common goals in protecting cultural heritage. Independence of the two former Yugoslav republics - Slovenia and Croatia - did not significantly affect the efforts to preserve cultural heritage, although higher interest of the civil society<sup>3</sup> and the public in the protection of cultural heritage contributed to a greater investment of effort. First of all, both these activities have in recent years experienced personnel, professional, methodological and technical reinforcements, have extended their area of operation and, encouraged interest in intangible heritage<sup>4</sup>, which is, particularly in conservation, extremely important for preparing high-quality reconstruction efforts and protective measures.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Slovenia, the term "protection of cultural heritage" is an older term that best covers the institutional protection of immovable cultural heritage, which is conducted within the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia (Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine Republike Slovenije) and its seven regional units (until 1999 the Regional Institutes). Today the expression "protection of immovable cultural heritage" is used officially (legally also), and is violently imposed by "protective" bureaucrats in their texts and in official communication with interested parties. In everyday speech, and practice the phrase "protection of cultural heritage" is still very much alive, easy to understand for the layman, and, to achieve better understanding, it will be used in this article.

<sup>2</sup> K.K. Central Commission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Evropa Nostra, Slovenia Nostra, Croatia Nostra, Ecovast; more and more tourist societies in Slovenia direct their attention to the promotion of cultural heritage.

<sup>4</sup> In Croatia, the organized registration of the intangible cultural heritage has been in place since 2005 and in Slovenia since 2006 particularly after the acceptance of the new law on protection of cultural heritage (Ur l. RS, 16/2008). Nasko Križnar leads the project in the Institut za Slovensko narodopisje ZRC SAZU (Institute of Slovenian Ethnography of the Scientific research center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, translator's note).

## Related activities, related problems - an overview of the development of protection of cultural heritage and museological activities

In Slovenia, and Croatia as well, the preservation of cultural heritage is regulated by laws passed as late as 1945. Previously, in the old Yugoslavia, conservators and museologists did not have enough strength and political support to pass the appropriate laws on the preservation of monuments and antiquities. There was no such law in Austria-Hungary either, although the action of the Central Commission and, since 1911, its provincial offices, despite everything, proved relatively successful: based on the conviction and the authority of respected conservationists and their associates - correspondents.

Within the social framework of the old Yugoslavia museologists and conservators tried hard to achieve the passage of an appropriate law on protection of cultural heritage. Already at the first joint conference in the autumn of 1922, they developed the first draft of the Law on museums and the preservation of antiquities and monuments, which had 47 articles. The text was the basis for all subsequent texts - up until 1933 and 1939 (Stele 1939: 80). The law was never adopted, probably due to the very different perceptions about the forms of conservation of antiquities and monuments and partly because of quite unevenly developed conservation activities in the country. The then leading Slovenian curator and author of most of the draft bills wrote in 1929 that the “administration for monuments in Yugoslavia ... is made up only of an office in Ljubljana for Slovenia and in Split for Dalmatia, which were both inherited from Austria.” (Stele, 1929: 103).

The lack of independent legislation in Slovenia and then in the Drava Banovina was in part supplemented and regulated by other laws, among other *Law on Forests* (Forests Act, 1929) *Construction Law* (Construction Act, 1931) and *Order* (Order, 1930) which emerged as a supplement to the Article 121 of the *Law on Forests*. *The Order* was described by France Stele, then a leading conservator, as a “summarized law on monuments.” (Stele, 1929: 71-72).

In Slovenia, we saw the first basic laws on the protection of monuments only at the end of World War II. The Slovenian *Poročevalec* published on the 27th January 1945 a *Decision of the Slovenian Presidency of the National Liberation Council on the protection of libraries, archives and cultural monuments* (Odlok Predsedstva Slovenskega narodno-osvobodilnega sveta Hazler, 1999: 49), which was, according to contemporary understanding, related to the protection of movable and immovable cultural and natural heritage. After that came the Yugoslav *Decision on the protection and preservation of cultural monuments and antiquities*, adopted on February 20<sup>th</sup> 1945.<sup>5</sup> Both decisions were preparative measures for the legal regulation of heritage conservation, which

---

<sup>5</sup> The decision was signed by the Commissioner of Education and Culture at that time, Edward Kocbek. This day was marked in socialist Yugoslavia as the Day of preserving natural and cultural heritage.

was finally established by the *Law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage of the Democratic Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*. This is the first real law regulating monuments in the former Yugoslavia (Hazler, 1999: 49). The law determined in the first article to put all movable and immovable cultural, historical, ethnological and artistic monuments and natural wonders under the protection of the state (Hazler, 1999: 50); it supported activities to preserve monuments and museums, and opened up the possibilities for cooperation.

On the basis of this law the government established the *Institute for protection and scientific study of monuments and natural heritage of Slovenia (Zavod za zaščito in znanstveno proučevanje spomenikov in prirodnih znamenitosti Slovenije)* which succeeded the pre-war (established by the Banovina) Monuments Office (Spomeniški urad). The Institute became a central coordinator of the development and architectural conservation of immovable heritage in Slovenia and until the end of the 1960's, the only institution for the preservation of cultural heritage, which called for cooperation, in the form of the so-called *Referada*,<sup>6</sup> between the prominent directors of the museums. As the person to head the *Registry for the ethnographic monuments* the government appointed the director of the Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana, Slovenia - Boris Orel.

In 1948 the Slovenian government adopted the *Law on Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Zakon o varstvu kulturnih spomenikov in prirodnih znamenitosti Slovenije)*, which determined that the cultural monuments and attractions, judging by their basic characteristics, are to be divided into movable and immovable, and thereby opened and connected activities concerning monument protection of the contemporary museums; conservators were already encountering problems when they found items of interest (e.g. on the archaeological sites) and it was therefore necessary to develop ways to protect and find a proper way of safekeeping the findings in museums. The law also laid down which monuments were "of historical, archaeological, cultural, historical, artistic, ethnographic or social significance or that are of regional importance. (*Law of 1948: 3*). In particular, it stressed the importance of the *monuments of the national liberation struggle*, which significantly expanded the scope of conservation activities and provided a new flowering of several new museums.<sup>7</sup> The registry of ethnographic monuments for the entire time was very closely cooperating with the Ethnographic Museum<sup>8</sup>, which organized the so-called field teams for working in the field; in the next twenty years the team would visit parts of Slovenia more than thirty times in tours taking several days, (Cook, 1976: 151-162) and, in addition to crafts, habits and customs, researched traditional internal decoration and building designs (Šarf

<sup>6</sup> Such as: Referada for artistic monuments, Referada for archeological monuments, Referada for ethnological monuments.

<sup>7</sup> For example Museum of the Revolution in Celje (1963), today: Museum of modern history Celje, Museum of Slovenia, Ljubljana (1948), today Museum of modern history; Revirski Museum of the people's revolution Trbovlje (1974). Today: Revirski Museum Trbovlje, National Liberation Museum (1958), Maribor, today: retained its original name.

<sup>8</sup> Established in 1923 with the separation from the National Museum. Between the two world wars, it was called the King's ethnographic museum, since 1941 the Ethnographic Museum, and since 1963 Slovenian Ethnographic Museum (Baš 2004)

1967: 6-37). Thus they created, though it was modest, a significant systematic review of the so-called ethnological architectural heritage enriched with descriptions, photographs, drawings, and, sometimes, technical measures.

Conditions for the protection of the cultural heritage changed significantly in late 1960s when in Maribor, and in Ljubljana too, the first initiatives for the decentralization of services for the preservation of cultural heritage appeared. The new *Law on Protection of Cultural Monuments in the SR of Slovenia*, in 1961 (*Zakon o varstvu kulturnih spomenikov v LR Sloveniji*) legalized this form of supporting activities and in addition to the central department it enabled the establishment of several regional institutes for the preservation of monuments. Consequently, this meant an increase in the scope of activities, more physical intervention on the monuments, and also the expansion of cooperation between the regional institutes and museums.

Concurrently with these forms of conservation, specific legislation on museology was being developed, which was substantially building on the aforementioned laws and the work on the protection of cultural heritage activities. However, museologists didn't get their first independent legal framework until the end of the 1950's, although some museums in today's Slovenia were already established in the 19th century (Fujs, 2007: 41)<sup>9</sup>. When in 1959 Yugoslavia adopted the *Law on Museums* (Fujs, 2007: 41), in Slovenia the status of the museum was awarded to 27 institutions, 31 were the provisionally named museum collections, which has greatly hampered the work since they were financed by local community. The new *Law on Museums* of the 1965th abolished the qualifications of each museum, and, according to some museologists, allowed politics to socialize museological activities with this amateurization of museological activities (Fujs, 2009). Museologists responded and decided to form a strong network of museums and in 1970 founded the *Association of Museums of Slovenia (Skupnost muzejev Slovenije)*<sup>10</sup> which, although it included a variety of museums, galleries and collections, was still a relatively strong professional organization. Conservators however formed the *Association of Institutes (Skupnost zavodov)* in 1972 in order to improve the protection of monuments because the opinion prevailed that the central Republic Institute no longer performed this role in a satisfactory manner (Hazler, 1999: 95). The *Association of Institutes*, unfortunately, dissolved in the first half of the 1990s while the *Association of Museums* still functions, and in was faced with a great challenge by the new *Law on the preservation of cultural heritage* enacted in 2008 - how to create a *network of museums* or a *museum register* in other words. But that's another story, which cannot be appropriately presented in this paper (Fujs, 2007: 41-49)

Politics, namely politics in the field of culture had a decisive influence in Slovenia until the 1960s, on the development of both the conservation and museum activity. Both

---

<sup>9</sup> History of Slovenian Museum goes back to the 1821 when Kranjski deželni Museum was founded in Ljubljana, now the National Museum of Slovenia. Their activities are associated with the increasing number of amateur historical societies and museum, for example, in Celje, where in 1882 the Local Celje Museum was established, since 1965 the Celje Regional Museum.

<sup>10</sup> The Association of Museums now has the status of a public institution. It was legally registered in 1979. The official count numbers 64 members, although 68 are mentioned in the list (Fujs, 2009).

were expanding, and politicians again came to the conclusion in the *Outline for the cultural development of Slovenia for the period 1976-1980 (Načrt kulturnega razvoja Slovenije za obdobje 1976-1980)* that the museum activity was far more developed, although still not enough organizationally and purposefully interconnected, that the museum network has not been fully formed and that some museums did not yet have their professional and territorial scope set (Fujs, 2009).

At the end of the 1970s, instead of the term *cultural monument*, the concept of *cultural heritage* took root, which appeared in the *Outline for the cultural development for the period 1981-1985*. The outline called for a unified policy of preserving the cultural heritage and for closer relationships between museums. These ambitions got their legal form in the entirely new *Law on the natural and cultural heritage (Zakon o naravni in kulturni dediščini, 1981)* which was for that time a very modern and conceptually and programmatically innovative law, which regulated the conservationist activity, preservation of natural heritage, museum and archival branches. A large number of experts for the protection of natural heritage found employment especially in the regional bureaus,<sup>11</sup> a new procedure for the declaration of especially valuable objects of cultural heritage as cultural monuments became a norm, the role of interdisciplinary work was emphasized, particularly in the preparation of documents for the proclamation of a unit for a cultural monument and preparing various documents to determine the purpose of various premises. The law transferred the responsibility for protecting the movable heritage located outside the museums and archival facilities to the museums and archives.<sup>12</sup>

Different political circumstances affected the system of financing activities for quite a few years – affecting regional institutes as well as museums. Methods of funding changed from year to year because solutions were continually sought to obtain funds for the regular professional activities of the Institutes and Museums (salaries, fixed expenses) and for the restoration of immovable cultural heritage (the so-called actions for the preservation of monuments) and work on the preservation of movable heritage (getting materials, exhibitions, etc.).

At the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the funds for the reconstruction of cultural heritage weren't directly linked with the regional bureaus any more, instead they were allocated by sponsors (the Ministry of Culture, the new municipalities) to the owners of cultural monuments as contractual partners, which led to greater order and control of the use of approved resources. On the other hand, this method reduced the direct influence and supervision of the conservatory institutions on reconstruction as an im-

<sup>11</sup> The former regional institutes for the protection of cultural heritage were renamed Institutes for the Protection of natural and cultural heritage, and the Central Bureau into the Institute of SR of Slovenia for the protection of natural and cultural heritage.

<sup>12</sup> Every municipality in the republic was to be covered by at least one museum that performed the tasks of a museum for one or several municipalities. This should have encouraged the continued operation of museums and archives outside the institutions, as was already common practice in the conservation of cultural heritage. This, and other legal provisions, opened the possibility for politics to enter institutions for the protection of heritage in a big way (acts of constitution!) and for the law, which with different laws and regulations, increasingly monitored institutional heritage preservation.



portant part of communication was conveyed to the Ministry of Culture and the Department of Cultural Heritage (Uprava za kulturno dediščino) and later to the newly established Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage RS (Zavod za varstvo kulturne dediščine) and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (Direktorat za kulturno dediščino). The system became very complicated, but the fact is that it prevented embezzlement of the funds allocated for reconstruction, which would until then be quite aptly appropriated by some regional institutes.<sup>13</sup>

## Connections between the protection of cultural heritage and museums

Although the conservation institutions and museums often shared responsibility for the preserving of cultural heritage and were regulated by more or less the same legislation, their work, their attitude towards heritage and, above all, its interpretation, were a bit different. The main difference was in the original division of subjects and range<sup>14</sup> of work: protection of the monuments is intended mainly as the care for immovable cultural heritage, and museums for mobile. In practice, however, this is not always the case. Both are trying to overcome these divisions because of the need for comprehensiveness of the processing of material, especially if it is about the setup and management of open air museums, eco-museums, or the complete coverage of protected objects, which is particularly pointed at by famous Croatian theorists in the field of museology and conservation - Ivo Maroević (eg, Maroević, 1993: 101; Maroević, 1997: 9) and Tomislav Šola.<sup>15</sup>

The aim of both activities is most clearly the preservation and presentation of the material testimonies of previous periods. In this respect the professional museum employees - curators are in a better position, because besides the regular activity they perform reviews, recording and documenting the heritage. In most cases they are

---

<sup>13</sup> Sometimes the material costs for work in the field were taken from the funds intended for so-called actions. Elsewhere they were naive and honest (e.g. Institute for the protection of natural and cultural heritage in Celje) and the costs for the same work were billed as the material costs from the funds for their regular activities. Some charged their work on "locations", i.e. issuing the consent for the parties who intended to restore the object with the value of cultural heritage, or intended to build in a protected area. With this "some" (I will not name them) received generous funds that were then used to purchase equipment and, often, to fund the expensive "professional" trips around the country and abroad.

<sup>14</sup> The relationship of the museum activities and activities for the protection of cultural and natural heritage have been shown very clearly by Ivo Maroević in the book *Introduction to Museology* with two circles that overlap in a particular field (Maroević, 1993: 101)

<sup>15</sup> Tomislav Šola applied the possibilities of a complete presentation and interpretation of issues of culture, heritage, nature and civilization perfectly to the project of the eco-museum in Kapela on the Slovene-Croatian border (Šola, 1996). The study (preliminary design) titled *Ekomuzej Kapela* was ordered by the proponents of the construction of the eco-museum in Kapela with the intention "to create a museum that would show the ornithological reserve JOVSI and other heritage and cultural heritage of Kapela to the population of Kapela and to foreign visitors" (Šola, 1996: 1)



dealing with items that can be stored in the museum premises and thereby, with the appropriate procedures of protection, kept from further deterioration. Trained restorers then take the appropriate measures of protection in line with the standards. The tendency for *more conservation and less restoration* or complete *reconstruction* prevails in principle. This principle of conservation in practice much easier to perform on mobile than on fixed heritage, because the latter is often subjected to various modifications and functionalism.

Thoroughness and quality of care and preservation of monuments, is in principle determined by the process of recognition in the regular phase of the conservationists' field research, followed by the most important part of conservation work – the stage of evaluation. Evaluation is performed by conservators by following *basic research standards* and constant comparison of the acquired facts with the *general conservation measures* such as *rarity, vulnerability* and general *physical condition* of processed heritage. Basic research standards, despite the aspirations for a uniform method, differ significantly because archeology, ethnology, art history, history, architecture, geography, landscape planning and other sciences have all developed their own standards and methods.<sup>16</sup> However, these measures are already in the nature of their use designed to provide *interdisciplinary professional and research approach*, which is one of the essential features of conservation activities.<sup>17</sup>

Conservators use different ways and *forms of intervention* in their work. The fundamental starting point is *determining the optimal measures of protection and preservation of monuments*. So far, more or less successful practice has shown that these measures differ. The interest for the protection of individual monuments can also be different. From this point the previous Slovenian experiences can be sorted into following groups:

- *Measures - in situ:*

- restoration / conservation (5)
- developmental renovation (2)
- modernization with the preservation of detail (1)

<sup>16</sup> As a conservator-ethnologist, during my long professional and research work at the Institute for the protection of natural and cultural heritage in Celje, and later in the research and pedagogical work at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, I have developed basic criteria for the identification and evaluation of cultural heritage. Therefore, since 1993 in my work I use spatial, temporal, social, artistic, building-developmental and functional parameters. These measures, in my opinion, constitute the basis of ethnological conservation and also of other efforts in the field of construction and beyond. They are associated with activity in the field of ethnology, and are in operational terms different from the general conservation measures that are sufficiently universal for all professions involved in the activities concerning the protection of cultural heritage.

<sup>17</sup> A shared set of interdisciplinary professional and research methods are the main characteristics of activities concerning protection of cultural heritage, but are not their rules because the individual professions (e.g., archeology) in their essence operate with a whole range of specific methods that other professions do not use. The same goes for ethnology, where the center of interest is the way of life at the level of everyday life and celebration of the special dates of all professional and social groups in all (reachable for the profession) time periods and environments.

- *Measures - equivalent construction:*

- necessary replicas (4)
- construction under the terms set by the service for the protection of cultural heritage (2)
- imposed replicas that are made under conditions that are not dictated by the service for the protection of cultural heritage (1)
- unacceptable replacement construction (0)

- *Measures - Open-Air Museum:*

- in situ (4)
- in new locations (3)

These three basic groups contain the desired optimal measures for conservation, but also controversial procedures, which modernize or even deliberately destroy heritage. They are part of the practice of conservation of monuments in Slovenia and I have therefore qualified and assessed them with value points ranging from 0 (least desirable) to 5 (optimal).<sup>18</sup>

Of all the protective measures the most desirable is **reconstruction**, which I understand in the sense of **of the maximum measure of conservation** and preservation of the complete testimony of the cultural heritage.<sup>19</sup> From a methodological point of view it is related to the museological method of preserving authenticity and integrity of the movable heritage.

**Renovation**, which is by some people, at least in my opinion, imprecisely equated with **revitalization**, must be the fundamental objective of the doctrine of protecting cultural heritage and therefore professional services should be giving much greater attention precisely to this form of protection. **Revitalization** (renewed restoration)<sup>20</sup> is, in my view, freer intervention in preserving the heritage that often turns into a radical form - the so-called **developmental renewed restoration**, which has now become almost a rule in the conservation practice in Slovenia, as well as elsewhere in the world. It is used to emphasize the creative ambitions of designers - architects, who often completely take the initiative (read: the doctrine of protection), and (if desired by the owner) incorporate problematic modern elements into the building. Such treatment of the object decreases its value, which is a fact of which fewer and fewer numbers of repre-

---

<sup>18</sup> According to my data there are no such estimates in Slovenia. On these grounds the heritage protection strategy should be set up. If we take into account the fact that the Register of Heritage enrolled approximately 33,000 units of heritage, which is only 3% of units compared to the entire number of buildings, it is entirely justified to raise the voice to raise the standards for protection!

<sup>19</sup> For more information about the basics of these issues see Maroević 1986 65-97

<sup>20</sup> The term "renewed restoration" has become a common term in Slovenia in the 1970s mostly in terms of revitalization of urban and rural centers and squares. Over time it expanded to cover individual facilities in terms of the resurgence and even modernization of heritage with the aim of establishing primary and secondary functions.

sentative institutions of preservation and protection of heritage are aware of, including also the public interested in the subject.

Interventions in the renewal following the principle of *modernization with the preservation of detail* are also fairly frequent, which usually leads to the devastation of immovable cultural heritage. The same would happen if the radio from the 1930's, which is an imposing museum item, preserved only the wooden frame, with buttons, switches and mechanisms getting replaced by modern technique.

A major obstacle to the introduction of the doctrine of protection of cultural heritage and preserving the so desired recognition of Slovenia as a specific living environment with specific architectural requirements is presented by the calls for *replacement construction*, which has taken root in the legal sense in the 1970s and 1980s. Even then the conviction prevailed that new construction is cheaper than the reconstruction or revitalization of the old building. Such thinking has certainly had a negative impact on the efforts to protect the heritage and conservation, and it has become usual despite attempts by conservationist to prove the opposite, especially when it concerned regularly maintained and renewed old buildings. This principle of good and economical management was not well received by the government during the period of socialist construction of homeland, which rather supported the massive construction of individual housing and thus indirectly tried to maintain the social (in)tranquility.<sup>21</sup>

The alternate construction shares a partial connection with interpolations (more on that: Maroevič, 1986: 186-221) built on the vacated plots between objects in the protected urban and rural centers and on streets which in some communities still represent attractive building sites.<sup>22</sup> The solutions were sometimes well done and without aggressive intervention on an existing agglomeration (e.g. Škrapčev square in Ribnica, Dolenjska), elsewhere they became based on the highly modernist principles (e.g. the former Slovenijales shop in Gosposka street and, before the independence of Slovenia, in Zidaniška street in Celje or the Bank of Celje office building in Mozirje) or were aggressive and totally contrary to the basic features of the historical organism of the settlement (e.g. the two Tomos skyscrapers in Koper or the former Teko store skyscraper in Celje).<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> In that period in Slovenia, and in a good part of the former common state, all creditworthy individuals built something, meaning all employed citizens did. Conditions for construction were very favorable, considering that people were not able to, and didn't even know where else to invest, except in new property. High inflation in a few years lowered the principal and credit interest rates to a minimum, the state again and again taking new loans abroad (the famous Tito's visit), and so on. "Topčider" printed dinars at full speed.

<sup>22</sup> The term interpolation was introduced to the conservation practice in Slovenia at the beginning of the 1980s by conservators (especially architects), who studied at the University of Zagreb, previously the Slovenian term *zapolnitev* was in use.

<sup>23</sup> An extreme example are aggressive interventions in the city cores of Koper and Celje are the culmination of socialist ideology from the 1960s and 1970s when the government was convinced that the historical agglomeration needed an introduction of new facilities of the "avant-garde workers' class", in order to diminish the achievements of the past period, especially those produced by the Catholic Church.

## How do conservators and museologists cooperate?

The scope of conservators' work can be deduced from these protective measures. With his choice between the available measures a conservator may affect positively or adversely the integrity of the conservation work, making the work of conservators significantly different from the work of curators and museologists. Both professions definitely try to physically preserve the heritage. The difference is that in fact the curators select and collect objects in the field, receive donations, buying them at auctions and *antiques fairs*<sup>24</sup>, or, for some projects, even bring them from their living environment<sup>25</sup> while conservators shape their "collection" in the field, in the area of responsibility of one of the *regional units (območne enote)*<sup>26</sup> of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage. Their work, along with the fundamental law of conservation of cultural heritage is directed by legislation covering the field of physical planning and environmental protection and the laws about the institutions, administrative procedures and copyright information, decisions about the development plans of the local communities as well as numerous other legal provisions related to culture.

This very diverse and extensive "armada" of legal provisions burdens the ongoing daily work of conservators very heavily. In this regard museum workers are less burdened and therefore there are more opportunities for professional and research work in museums and galleries. However, it seems that conservators are very persistent because among the 256 employed conservators, about 14% (almost one sixth) have acquired a scientific title, which is not exactly far behind the workers in the museums, galleries, where approximately one fifth of employees have a position of Master or a Doctor of Science .

---

<sup>24</sup> In a number of Slovenian cities there is a street sale of antiques held on Saturday morning, which are ideal conditions museologists to control the trade in movable heritage. The beginnings of this form of trade go back to the early 1980s. The first offers included high-quality items and furniture from the 18th and 19th century, while in recent years one may notice an increase of various items from the era of socialism, of which the most notable are money, pictures of Marshal Tito, military uniforms and the like. In Ljubljana, the offer of items of "Slovenian" origin is highly reduced – there are more dealers from the former Yugoslav republics. The originality of items on the antiques fair is, of course, questionable. In certain cases, a conservator or museologist can be linked with these collectors and resellers. In my conservator experience I was once a witness to this method of acquiring supplemental equipment for the renewed Škrapčevo property in Hrovača, where we were arranging an ambient museum collection in the building. Then we called for the cooperation of one of the old furniture dealers from Ribnica Dolenjska, who had a great range of old houses and their internal equipment. On this occasion we pointed out to him the importance of documenting the origin of items collected in the field. Since then, the items he sells have certificates of origin, which has greatly reduced his inconveniences with the police.

<sup>25</sup> Samples of such active creativity in some modern museum collections were transferred from foreign countries (e.g., the Netherlands) by Slovene museologists. A significant example is the exhibition The grapevines have grown grapes again (Spet trte so rodile) of the Slovenian Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana, for whose schematic representation of planting vineyards a museum associate brought several old grapevines from her neglected vineyards in Lendava.

<sup>26</sup> A regional unit in its organization and program of action corresponds to the Croatian Conservation Department.

## Examples of good collaborative practice and independent conservation practice

The work of conservators and museologists is often intertwined and some of their cooperative achievements in Slovenia have become examples of good practice which are getting copied, and even improved. In the following text several such examples of cooperation between museologists and conservators will be presented in a summarized form, as well as some examples of good practice in whose implementation only conservators took part.

### *1. Restoration of monuments in the primary, modified or a museological function*

Despite some programmatic, organizational and institutional differences in the procedures of preservation, conservators and curators are often working together processing and rescuing the inheritance considering that their agendas often overlap and intertwine. In the last thirty years a few examples of successful cooperation appeared in Slovenian ethnological-conservatory and museological practice, the majority being within the process of restoration of monuments of special importance. Among the most important, it is especially important to point out the reconstruction of the Kavčnik household in Zavodnje (Hudales, 2008: 248-250), of Liznjak home in Kranjska Gora and Solinar Museum in Sečoveljske solane near Piran. After the restoration all were given a new, museum function. Conservators competently restored the protected buildings while museologists, according to the principle of ambient museum setup, completed the common mission. The works were coordinated at all times and took place and were planned within a single working group which was already constituted by designers, construction supervisors, representatives of the contractors, and sometimes representatives of the owner and sponsors. Conservators and museologists in these cases advocated the optimal reconstruction and presentation of monuments, so both the Kavčnik household (in 1993) and Solinar Museum (1994) were nominated for the European Museum of the year.<sup>27</sup>

The above are examples of conservators and museologists mutually accepting several important measures of preservation, which eventually became the model of a successful heritage rescue. They were respecting the modern principles of conservation and museum doctrine in full, although while formulating the renovation program and the final presentation they encountered some of the problems of preserving heritage

<sup>27</sup> Both the restored sites can be classified into open-air museums at the original location, meaning in situ (like the "Old Village" in Kumrovec, see Sprem - Lovric, 1997: 137). Those who carry out reconstruction and presentation used all existing resources (on this see Maroevič, 1997: 9) and on the basis of extensive ethnological studies included them in the program and the content scheme, in one and in the other museum. In Sečovlje salt fields the today's custodians (Museum of Sergej Mašer masseurs, Piran) revitalized the salt funds produced by the original method. In the Kavčnik household they (Velenje Museum) included into the narrow museum activities even more activities representing the daily life of inhabitants on the model of the museum vivum (e.g., harvesting meat, brandy, baking, collecting medicinal herbs, etc.).

in the modern age. The main problem for a comprehensive presentation was the introduction of some key modern facilities that protected object didn't have in its original form. On the mostly wooden Kavčnik household the introduction of electricity, telephone and water was a serious task that required both professions to work together. After a careful evaluation, installation of devices guaranteeing security (alarm devices) and the ability to receive visitors (lighting, sanitary facilities, food, insuring the services for the *museum vivum* program) was achieved on the household and on the central housing and economic building so that they were almost imperceptible. The electric boxes, for example, were embedded in the wooden opening in the stable, cables were conducted along the corners of floors and walls and covered with plaster and planks, and electric lighting fashioned to imitate the petroleum lamps. Only in the most important room, the drying room, halogen reflectors were installed and directed upwards in an open hearth so that visitors get the impression that there is really a fire burning there.

There was also great care taken in the cases of the Solinar Museum and the Liznjek home and in other examples of conservation and museological presentation of heritage.<sup>28</sup> There they introduced electricity too and installed electric lighting and controls from the time of the first electrification when the monuments were still utilized in their original housing and economic function. In both instances the old electrical installations, albeit without the AC current, became an important museum exhibit which conveys the continuous process of change in the cultural heritage directed by the principle of the needs of everyday life. The new installation has been introduced by the standards of today's electro-economy in the least noticeable ways.<sup>29</sup>

However, reconstruction of facilities that have the property of cultural heritage was not always effective as in the examples described previously. Sometimes the conservation approach was unreasonably subordinated to the general aesthetic appearance and presentation requirements of the museologists who wanted to "neutrally" modernize the interior of the object and to emphasize only a few symbolic changes to

---

<sup>28</sup> The electricity and other essential facilities were installed in the same careful way in the case of the Junež household in Rogaška Slatina, the Rogatec open air museum (Hazler, 1997: 83), the Skomar house in Skomar, the Kroflin mill in Kozje, the Škrapčevo household in Hrovača in Ribnica, the parish house in Skomar and elsewhere. Today these models of presentation of cultural heritage are upheld by others too, although the notorious and aggressive way of renovation which introduces lighting where it didn't exist at the time of the primary usage of the object is still being introduced in some places.

<sup>29</sup> When the conservators-ethnologists prepared to renew these and other monuments of culture, they traveled through Europe and learned the art of conducting installations, sewage, soil insulation and other innovations. In some places (e.g. the open-air museum in Zuberec in Slovakia) there wasn't too much concern over that issue, while the conservators and museologists in the open-air museum Staro Selo in Kumrovec had to respect the applicable national technical regulations. The author of this article often intentionally broke the rules and guidelines of the Slovenian electric company in his conservation practice since fully respecting them would result in a devastated restored monument. The introduction of the so-called "conservation mode" of installation is often the only way that presented a cultural monument does not get too many confusing novelties.

their former functions. In this respect the Kosovel home<sup>30</sup> in Tomaj on the Kras and the Gradnik house<sup>31</sup> and in Medana in Gorica hills present very instructive examples that were clearly modernized and subordinated to the internal decoration of a gallery. The Kosovel home was unreasonably and completely modernized by conservators belonging to the Nova Gorica administrative unit of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage - they reduced the size of the original windows<sup>32</sup> and by request of the museologists and visitors allowed the removal of most of the interior doorposts. Gradnik house has experienced a complete transformation into a gallery space where visitors can no longer truly feel that they are moving inside the native home of one of the most important Slovenian poets.

And what is the reason behind such more or less unfortunate, “full presentations” of monuments? Probably the fault is on both sides because the evaluation<sup>33</sup> of such presented monuments showed that the monument was overestimated or invalidated by conservators or they failed to fully understand all aspects of its cultural significance.<sup>34</sup> More than twenty years ago, the Ljubljana Old Town was radically modernized and evaluated in the same way because according to the evaluations of some prominent Slovenian conservators<sup>35</sup> due to a professional error of responsible conservators a narcissistic self-pretend creativity of a small group of Slovenian architects grew so strong that after a decade of modernization the city hasn't got a correctly restored fort, but a “model” in actual size. It is necessary to say that museum employees were not directly involved in the modernizing of the Old Town, but after the opening of the renovated Old Town they often used its facilities for temporary exhibitions and thematic and biannual exhibitions of domestic and artistic crafts.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Srečko Kosovel (1904-1927) is a famous Slovenian expressionist poet. He died very young and at the end of his life he lived with his parents in Tomaj on the Kras.

<sup>31</sup> Alojz Gradnik (1882-1967) a famous Slovenian poet born in Medan in Gorica hills that created the modern expressionism, and, among other things, translated Croatian poetry into Slovenian.

<sup>32</sup> The caretaker of the Kosovel households then told the author of that record that windows were reduced (by conservators!) because Kosovel house (built in 1925) stood out too much and did not fit into the traditional appearance of nearby houses in Tomaj.

<sup>33</sup> The evaluations of presented monuments take place during the exercises within the Course on the conservation of ethnological objects at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural anthropology of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Ljubljana.

<sup>34</sup> During the evaluation of the architectural heritage artistic and architectural features coincide often, and too little respect is given to spatial, social, constructional, developmental and functional characteristics of the monument.

<sup>35</sup> Castle expert Ivan Stopar said at a symposium on the presentation of the reconstruction of the Ljubljana Old Town in the mid-1980s that the conservation assessment of historical features of the fort was not optimal. According to the evaluation by Stopar and other art historians (Nace Šumi) the conservators that were responsible for it invalidated the monumental value and importance of Ljubljana's Old Town.

<sup>36</sup> To set up temporary exhibitions, museologists and other exhibitors were given the use of the exhibition rooms equipped with all necessary electrical and other installations. Therefore their exhibition concepts had to adapt to the exhibition space and its technical characteristics which is quite common in the area of museology practice (e.g. traveling exhibitions).



## 2. *Restoration of monuments – museum institutions*

Collaboration between the conservators and museologists usually occurs in the context of reconstruction of cultural monuments which shelter various museum institutions, national, provincial or local. There the doctrine of *restoration* of cultural heritage is often (it appears, almost unintentionally) subordinated to the principle of complete *renovation* and *modernization* as the contemporary galleries of the museum exhibition endeavor to establish appropriate standards and achieve the impression of importance and modernity.<sup>37</sup> In such instances, the outer, artistic and architectural features of the facility and, perhaps, the typical interior layout stay preserved, while the original functional and technical specific object experience modification, such as, for example, electrical wiring, central heating of the 19th century, different heating objects and so on. Generally, the interior is subordinated to the principle of its usage as a museum space, which often leads to a radical simplification of the original structure of the object. Unfortunately, the programs of controversial presentations, in whose implementation conservators uncritically participate, are more often based on the principle: “We will protect the exterior, and rearrange the interior to suit us.”

In places the less preserved or almost entirely decrepit monuments are radically *renovated* and *modernized*, those which have seen more and less caring owners several times during their existence. The socialist post-war period did not show excessive concern for the Slovenian forts in which the leading ideologues of the time recognized only the homes of so-called “class enemies.” Some forts were burned for various reasons (such as taking hold of the invaders’ base) during the Second World War (Soteska fortress on the river Krka experienced such as destiny, for example, or the Brdo Castle near Lukovica), in case of others the Yugoslav People’s Army soldiers learned how to blow up walls on them (fortress Hmeljnik), or the government used the possibility of solving the lack of living space and moved people from the social bottom into the empty rooms of many Slovene forts, fortifications and castles.

---

<sup>37</sup> A typical example of the reconstruction and modernization are the former barracks in Metelkova Street in Ljubljana where the Slovenian Ethnographic Museum and National Museum were placed. The blueprint and the altitudinal dimensions of the building and the diversity of its front are mostly preserved, while the interior is more or less adapted to the modern concept of the museum activities. Both museums received the imposing iron structure at the central entrance to the museum the purpose of which is unfathomable for most of the employed experts. In the exhibition hall of the Slovene Ethnographic Museum concrete “radiators” (in fact huge heating plates) soon became superfluous and proved to be too large consumers of energy and totally dysfunctional parts of the equipment because they cover large exhibition surfaces on the walls, and due to their unique characteristics, no any board or exhibit can be suspended on them. Since it is an original authorized project of the building’s interior, these expensive and, above all, energy inefficient concrete colossuses will occupy the best areas of exhibition space.

Some highly illustrative examples of improper developmental care for the heritage are the fortress in the village Grad in Goričko and Blagaj fort in Polhov Gradac<sup>38</sup>, which got a completely different look during their prolonged renovations. The first was destined for a radical *renovation* ten years ago, which is still ongoing. Most programs for the preservation of the fort have been conceived by the ideologues of the doctrine of *static perfection*, which would purportedly renovate fortress so that it would be forever preserved, and not even the harshest weather or malicious individuals would be in a position to damage it. Static perfectionism in itself is not bad, but in the house, which was renovated using state and European funds, the “renovators” built in enormous amounts of concrete (the foundations, wreaths roof beams, reinforced-concrete slabs on the ceilings and floors), new windows and doors (Hazler, 2005: 187)<sup>39</sup>, building the walls with modern hollow bricks instead of the typical classical brick used for the centuries-old classical buildings in the Pannonia region and several other novelties that invite doubt whether such a radical development of the fortress can keep the uniqueness and identification of a cultural monument. The fortress has been the seat of the Gorički Provincial Park (Krajinski park Goričko) for several years, and served also as a wedding hall, kitchen with an open fireplace from the nearby village, hosting workshops of local crafts from the neighboring villages<sup>40</sup> and still more unacceptable novelties that exceed a reasonable framework of modern conservation and museology (Fort Grad on Gorički, 2009). The fort, which is being renovated using Phare funds, is being revived by the collective of the Provincial Park with various activities in order to attract more visitors.<sup>41</sup>

The Blagaj fortification in Polhov Gradac fared significantly better in the process of reconstruction and a few years ago it was an example of quality renovation and a group of conservators received the Stele award for the completed work, the award of the Slovenian professional conservation society. The museum employees did not participate in the reconstruction of the fortification because the project of reconstruction provided a universal model of using the premises for more than one function.

---

<sup>38</sup> I cite these eExamples only as educational examples, and in no way because of cheap criticism. In Slovenia, the critical view on conservation and the museological presentations of heritage is generally poorly developed. We are trying to compensate for that lack by educating graduates in the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Ljubljana. These graduates have already written some interesting professional assessments of interventions in protected areas (Štanjel), and current interventions in Ljubljana (Kolizej, Plečnik stadium) and elsewhere.

<sup>39</sup> Among other things, the modern metal parts have no direct connection with the most probable original design.

<sup>40</sup> In Slovenia and other countries (e.g. Stainz in the Austrian part of Styria) some museums are located in the former feudal bases (fortresses, castles and palaces). For most visitors, and less critical guardians of heritage such procedures are not at all controversial, and even when it is not unusual to find beds and wagons from neighboring villages in palace bedrooms today. Forts are still sometimes a useful framework - scenery - for the new museums, restaurants, cultural, protocol and some other occasional activity. The time distance from their original functions tolerates the most radical interventions.

<sup>41</sup> For several years the celebration of an American holiday, Halloween (Halloween), has been organized in the fortress on the Reformation Day public holiday, on October 31. Based on oral testimony from 2008, around 20,000 visitors gathered on that occasion in its surroundings, where a large number of Protestant believers of Augsburg denomination live.

For years the restoration was hampered by the denationalization process and after the fort passed into the hands of authorities, the problems between the manager of many years and the organizer of restoration, the Municipality of Gradec Polhov and the state, the Ministry of Culture resolved it as a “Gordian knot”: a part of the collection of the Technical Museum of Slovenia was placed inside in 2008, while the previous activities were kept in too (hall for weddings, the provincial museum collection, temporary exhibition space, etc.), and managed by the local community. Staff of the Technical Museum adapted the existing exhibition to the interior and the permanent museum collection was set clearly and ideally.

### *3. Natural disasters, environmental pollution, wars*

The work of conservators and museologists also intertwines in cases of unexpected accidents, earthquakes, fires, careless human attitude towards nature and, unfortunately, in cases of the ravages of war and unreasonable destruction of cultural heritage, triggered by the ideological, religious or national-racist motives. The strong destructive earthquakes in Kozjansko (1974) and Posočje (twice in 1976, in 1998 and 2005) damaged or destroyed numerous buildings and fixtures and a large number of protected areas, such as, for example, Breginj (Earthquakes in Slovenia 2009; Seismic Activity 2009). In these natural disasters a major role was played by expert teams which reviewed and rescued heritage, whose members were in large part the conservators and museologists. In Posočje the worst damage was inflicted to the protected masonry buildings (houses, barns, churches) and it was therefore necessary to remove the frescoes from the front or inside the building and transfer them to the museum and restoration workshops and regional institutes for the protection of monuments in order for them to be saved from total destruction. After the restoration intervention some were returned to the renovated building, while most were replaced with replicas. The original frescoes are stored in the regional museums in Škofja Loka, Idrija and Tolmin.

Their successful experiences in the preservation of cultural heritage during natural disasters were related by the Slovenian experts in the field of conservation and museology to other parts of the former common state, especially during the recovery from the consequences of a catastrophic earthquake in Montenegro, which devastated that Yugoslav republic on the 15th of April 1979,<sup>42</sup> which also strongly affected Dubrovnik among other places. During the reconstruction of the cultural monuments in Cetinje, and elsewhere,<sup>43</sup> Slovenes participated usually as mentors, and led the transposition of the Piva monastery to a higher, safer level during the outbreak of the River Piva. In this way, they successfully rescued one of the most prominent active Orthodox monasteries in Montenegro.

---

<sup>42</sup> An earthquake measuring nine degrees on the Mercalli scale caused the loss of life of 101 people, and damaged dozens of cultural monuments in the famous coastal cities (Budva, Trogir, etc.).

<sup>43</sup> The statistician-conservator expert Stojan Ribnikar and architect-conservator France Vardjan were involved in reconstruction in Montenegro, among others.

Conservators and museologists were again challenged in 2007 when the western part of Slovenia was hit by a number of disasters. The hardest was on September 18 when the flash floods destroyed many areas and damaged quite a few cultural monuments, among others, the well-known partisan Franja Hospital. In a couple of hours the water destroyed most of the wooden huts in the Pasic gully and took precious original exhibits with it forever. Now for a few months an intensive restoration of monuments has been under way in cooperation between the host community Cerkno, several responsible ministries, conservators and the responsible City Museum of Idrija. Soon an almost complete reconstruction of the buildings will be finished because the water torrent spared only a few huts. Again it will be necessary to refit the interior of some barracks with the replicas of equipment because the flooding destroyed much of the original equipment, operating instruments, wall decorations, documents and other valuables.<sup>44</sup>

Archaeological excavations<sup>45</sup> are also examples of good cooperation between both professions, where several key cultural monuments that are normally part of the natural environment were saved. Already in 1952 conservators and museologists participated in the rescue of sanctuary of the god Mithras in Rožanec in Bela Krajina (Hazler, 1999: 54) where the relief of god Mithras was carved in limestone rock in the pit in the middle of the forest. On that occasion, the restorers made copies of the relief and stored them in the nearby Bela krajina Museum in Metlika. Today's comparison of the original state in nature to the one in the museum copies indicates a great threat to the monument *in situ* primarily due to increasing environmental pollution. Acid rain in Rožanec has washed out the lime rock during the decades and the relief image of the Roman god became almost unrecognizable. Only a very radical measure to build a protective roof somehow halted further deterioration.

Cultural heritage is treated even worse by man than by nature. During the Second World War in Slovenia there were many damaged or destroyed cultural monuments, houses and farm buildings which were burned by the occupier, and many churches and fortress which were destroyed by the partisans in the conflict with the occupier and their helpers. Slovenia suffered damage to cultural monuments in the 1991 war of liberation (e.g. Upper Radgona), but to a considerably lesser extent than Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. There the conflicts of war crossed the limits of civilized attitude towards cultural heritage as the rat turned from a framework of ethnic cleansing into the field of destruction of cultural and national identity, which was an even greater tragedy for the existence of individual indigenous people in their living environment. I would not want to be rude, but people can recover biologically as an ethnos in its native living environment in a few decades, but their monuments destroyed during war can never come back! We know that the replica can never replace

---

<sup>44</sup> The Franja Hospital was submitted a few years ago as a candidate for entry to the list of UNESCO World Heritage sites. At first the application was rejected, and now it is on the waiting list. In early 2007 it received the designation of being European cultural heritage.

<sup>45</sup> This practice has a long tradition in Slovenia and is often found only in some cities with a long history (Ljubljana, Celje, Ptuj).

the original<sup>46</sup> and therefore the messages of that the last Balkan are a lesson for the whole civilized world.

## **Restoration of monuments - cooperation with civil organizations**

Despite the possibility of regular cooperation between conservators and museologists in Slovenia, the Slovenian conservation practice noted several examples in which such forms did not develop in the scope that was wished for. The reasons are many, and they cannot be fully analyzed and interpreted appropriately in this text for objective, and subjective reasons. Therefore, this article includes only some examples of the real situations to which the professional and the general public still devoted particular attention. It is the case of less well-known work of conservation, which gave relatively few examples of good practice which are based on a useful model of connecting the doctrine of protection of heritage with elements of the civil society, and consequently about “lowering the conservation profession from the untouchable altar”. A distinct model of linking the conservation profession with the local community, and even more so with formal communities (associations) developed in Rogatec during the formation and construction (which, unfortunately, is still ongoing) of the museum in the open, the largest Slovenian museum of the type which lies only a mile from the Slovenian-Croatian border. Most of the tasks in construction, collecting, restoring and placing equipment and shaping the program of the content were given to the Society for arranging the Rogatec open air museum (Društvo za ureditev muzeja na prostem Rogatec) and the ethnologist and curator of the Institute for the Protection of natural and cultural heritage of Celje (Zavod za varstvo naravne in kulturne dediščine Celje). In this way a completely new form of cooperation between conservation and nature lovers developed, what had not been recorded thus far in Slovenia (Hazler, 1993: 10-11, 1997: 80).

For reasons not fully explained the Celje Regional Museum did not take part in the construction of the Rogatec museum in the open. The Regional Museum watched the formation of the museum in Rogatec mostly from afar, and only at the beginning of the 1990s, did its curator take part, an ethnologist significantly involved in the work of two research workshops (1993, 1994) which were actually organized by the rival museum in the city and in the province – the Museum of modern history (Muzej novejšje zgodovine). This museum was programmatically very promising. Except in the organization of workshops, he participated in obtaining equipment. But then, in the proceedings of the first workshop in the museum in Rogatec some in-

---

<sup>46</sup> At various international meetings (e.g., Gozd Martuljek in Slovenia in 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, Szantodpuszta on Balaton in Hungary in 1995) our Croatian counterparts informed us about the destruction of cultural monuments. We were strongly shaken by the destruction of the famous wooden buildings (houses, churches) in Pokuplje and Turopolje, which, in my opinion, belong to the very pinnacle of people's traditional creativity in Croatia. Even hanging the flag with the Hague Convention sign did not deter the attackers (Ukrainčik, 1992: Image no. 28).

appropriate criticism of the members of society was published which has pushed the Rogatec people away from the Celje Museum, which couldn't be overcome even later, when the administration of the Rogatec museum in the open was assumed by the Institute for the culture, tourism and development of Rogatec (Zavod za kulturo, turizem in razvoj Rogatec).

On a much smaller scale, but still a similar model of cooperation of conservators with the owners and representatives of civil organizations, took place while renovating the Skomarska house on Skomar (1992-1996), Ošlakov blacksmith workshop in Skomar (2000-2002), Kroflin's mill in Kozje (1998-2002), Juneževa household in Rogaška Slatina (1998-2005), Rezar house in Grajska vas (1998-2004) and some others. The authorized conservator-ethnologist of the Institute for the preservation of cultural heritage Celje led a couple of restorations of monuments and protected buildings and so founded the museum exhibition that was, in general, based on an ambient presentation of the culture of living<sup>47</sup> and the forms of economic efforts, based on the primary function of the protected objects. With a variety of architectural and development forms: temporal, visual and functional components of buildings and devices, in this context of the series of presentations of architectural heritage - the social backgrounds and the social environment of their builders and users were also presented. This component primarily stressed the ethnological aspects of the interpretation of cultural heritage, showing the life of small and medium farmers and tradesmen in the markets and villages.

## Conclusion

The paper presents an overview of some significant ways of cooperation of Slovenian museologists and conservators in the effort to protect the cultural heritage. The practical conservation and museological experience and heritage evaluation in the last thirty years in Slovenia are presented, which have actively involved the author of this paper in some cases. The author's intention was to describe the more or less intense forms of cooperation not as a subjective view of the situation, but to somewhat objectively analyze the situation, which should lead to improvement and, above all, the development of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary work, which is very important and necessary for the successful conservation and protection of cultural heritage.

*Translated by Tomislav Redep*

---

<sup>47</sup> The principle of the internal ambient setup of equipment in the protected monumental buildings is certainly among the most instructive ways of achieving a full presentation. The introduction of ethnological heritage forms of protection is very interesting, because one can best see the cultural and social way of life in the interiors of buildings and farm buildings (see also: Mihalic, 2008: 99) and also the forms of economic activities in their primary level where one can reach some interesting forms of museological communication (Maroević, 2003: 14).