

# Social and Economic Integration of Cultural Heritage

Jovo Grobovšek

BA Architecture, Chairman of ICOMOS/SI, Združenje ICOMOS/SI, Cankarjeva 4, SI - 1000 Ljubljana, Phone: + 396 1 200 81 50, Fax: + 386 1 200 81 60, E-mail: icomos@gov.si; jovo.grobovsek@gov.si

## 1. Position paper

### 1.1 Basic facts about Slovenia

**Republic of Slovenia** became the independent state due to the decision of citizens after the national referendum at **25<sup>th</sup> December 1990** and according to the decision of the Parliament at **25<sup>th</sup> June 1991**. From 26<sup>th</sup> June to 7<sup>th</sup> July 1991 the "ten day war" against Yugoslav Army fulfilled the aspirations of the citizens.

<i>Name:</i>	<b>Republic of Slovenia</b>
<i>Political System:</i>	Parliamentary Democracy
<i>Area:</i>	24.000 km <sup>2</sup>
<i>Population:</i>	1.964.000
<i>Language:</i>	Slovene
<i>National minorities:</i>	Italian Hungarian
<i>Ethnic group:</i>	German speaking
<i>Other nationalities:</i>	<i>Croats, Serbs, Gypsies, Muslims</i>
<i>Capitol:</i>	Ljubljana (280.000 inhabitants)
<i>BNP:</i>	10.450 USD per capita (1999)
<i>Bordering Countries:</i>	Italy (W), Austria (N), Hungary (E), Croatia (E & S)

<i>Specifics:</i>	42 km of Adriatic Coast Julian Alps (Triglav 2864 m) River Soča (to Adriatic sea and Mediteranean) Rivers Drava, Sava, Krka, Kolpa (to Black Sea) 52% of the surface is covered by the forest 2 Universities (Ljubljana / 1919, Maribor 1980) third in preparation (Koper on the Adriatic Coast)
-------------------	--

<i>Transport corridors by road:</i>	Salzburg - <b>Ljubljana</b> - Zagreb - Belgrade - Solun Graz - <b>Maribor</b> - <b>Ptuj</b> - Zagreb - Karlovac - Rijeka - Split Trst/Trieste - <b>Postojna</b> - <b>Ljubljana</b> - <b>Celje</b> - <b>Ptuj</b> - Budapest
<i>Transport corridors by train:</i>	Salzburg - <b>Ljubljana</b> - Zagreb - Belgrade - Solun

Graz - Maribor - Celje - Zidani most - Zagreb - Split  
Trst/Trieste - Divača - Ljubljana - Celje - Ptuj - Budapest

*Maximum distances:* 200 km in direction N - S  
350 km in direction E - W

## 2. State of the art conclusions

Short history about the cultural and natural heritage protection and preservation on the territory of Slovenia.

### **Austro-Hungarian Empire (up to 1918):**

the strong tradition of Vienna School of History of Art and monument protection. Work of K. K. Zentral Kommission. First Landeskonservator appointed at the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Major damages on the battlefields of the 1<sup>st</sup> World War (from Adriatic to the Alps - Soča Front).

### **Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918 - 1941):**

No special law was adopted and the best of traditions of the past have been developed originally to the local specifics. Four years of 2<sup>nd</sup> World War and battles for independence and national liberation caused severe and somewhere total loss of cultural heritage (more than 50 % of castles, palaces and mansions were demolished).

### **Federal Peoples Republic (Socialist Federal Republic) of Yugoslavia (1945 - 1990):**

Relatively independent republics within the federation developed specific systems of protection. In Slovenia the first national institute (1945 - 1962) has developed both natural and cultural protection and preservation within the unique organisation. Unfortunately the change and division came in 1994 with special laws on the government and ministries.

In 1962 the concept of regional offices has been adopted and to the 1980 seven (7) independent regional offices covered the complete area of Slovenia (Koper, Nova Gorica, Kranj, Ljubljana, Celje, Maribor and in 1980 Novo mesto).

## 3. The most up-to-date problems

### *Legal status of cultural heritage*

The new law on Protection of Cultural Heritage passed the Parliament in February 1999. Some original solutions within the administrative procedure were established. **The Ministry for Culture** is responsible for cultural heritage. Main objective concerning the heritage was its inscription in **central register of heritage** (CRH - up to now about 18.000 entities are inscribed). **Cultural Heritage Office** as a part of ministry for culture is main administrative organisation and takes care of CRH. The Government and the local communities (municipalities) are responsible for legal protection of monuments. The first for **monuments of national importance** and the last for those of **local importance**.

One central public service for the protection and preservation of cultural heritage was established (**Institute for the protection of cultural heritage in the Republic of Slovenia**). The basic procedure for the verification of private initiative on this field were inaugurated.

### *Positive achievements:*

The administrative procedure for obtaining the permission begins in the regional unit of the state service where the developer has an obligation to obtain the advice and later consensus from the regional department of institute.

The interest of private sector rises rapidly and is becoming the generator of the development of the professional service.

*Negative experiences:*

It is far too short time to recognise the full extend of practical results in the application of the law. We already noticed that the illegal archaeological excavations by metal detecting and underwater activities can not be sufficiently controlled and there is still not sdequate legal prosecution.

We have enough difficulties to prepare complete data for legal protection. The **conservation plan** needs to be improved with the contents related to the **active proposals** for non-destructive use and with all kinds of **control mechanisms**.

*Protection of cultural heritage within the system of physical planning*

Cultural heritage as a whole can be successfully protected mostly through everyday practice. It includes the relation in planning documents. While the Ministry for Environment (*Nature Protection Office*) takes responsibility for the protection of nature it is openly accepting data related to the cultural heritage. So obligatory data bases on GIS methodology are necessary content of spatial plans on local, regional and state level.

Special environment impact assessments are prepared for national projects with the priority to the cultural heritage object and sites. Local documents include the same assessment procedure.

In the administrative process for obtaining building permission the **advice** and **consensus of the institute** (regional departments) are obligatory when operation is supposed to be realised on legally protected monuments.

Local communities have to obtain the data base related to cultural heritage, its values and development strategies in the "Space Planing Act". The general public is supposed to have possibility to develop its knowledge about heritage as a whole.

*Positive achievements:*

Projects and actions completed so far confirmed the interdisciplinary work of both fields (protection of nature and cultural heritage).

*Negative experiences:*

Strong "**ecological**" **approach within protection of nature** in some cases oppose even to activities of the cultural heritage protection. The "mixed" area - **historic garden and cultural landscape** - become the prestigious field of interest. It is at the same time an opportunity for mutual activity.

*Public service*

Due to new law the most important change was the creation of **central public service** for the protection and preservation of cultural heritage. Previously regional offices (established and financed by local communities) became the parts of **unique organisation** and independent restoration centre was integrated too. **Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Slovenia** (ZVKDS) in Ljubljana consists of **seven regional offices** (see attached form), the **Conservation Centre** and **Restoration Centre**. The **central unit** is mostly developing the **centralised financial planning** while **two centres co-ordinate** professional work.

We can say that the new responsibility of professionals towards the general public is in focus of new organisation.

*Positive achievements:*

The professional expertise is obtained by the **interdisciplinary approach** by specialists from different region and diverse disciplines. The **direct contact to the public** is organised

more frequently and with modern methods, exhibitions, lectures, presentations, even publication. From professional ebony tower experts move on the ground. Young generation expect the new possibilities in education and project oriented approach.

*Negative experiences:*

Enormous challenge in front of the management structures of the institute where no need for changes is obvious. Uncertainty at the employees results some time delay in the practice.

*Human resources*

All together **200 specialists** works for the Institute (ZVKDS) as main public service. Diverse professions are already involved among them mostly art-historians, archaeologists, architects, ethnologists, historians, landscape architects, geographers and others. On the restoration field restoration centre involves nearly **30 specialists** more.

Only a few has finished MD step of education and only two others has reached PhD.

Diverse and profound research work in everyday practice has not yet been upgraded by post-graduate study and according results.

The gap between the generations has come out and further development of broader understanding of cultural heritage is to be accepted.

*Financial sources for the professional work*

**State budget** remains the **only resource** for financial matters. Direct relation between Ministry for Culture and ZVKDS opens no space for independent planning. The scheme has proved no efficiency what so ever. Possible orientation towards public and market has not yet been examined.

*Education*

In Slovenia we **don't have special conservation studies** on graduate level. The disciplines /archaeology, architecture, history of art, ethnology, history, landscape architecture etc./ have some topics dealing with cultural heritage protection within studies of their basic disciplines. The approach on the conservation is more or less individual and no consensus has been yet obtained about the doctrine.

**Studies of restoration** within the Academy of Art, department for restoration have just been completed on both levels. The first generation of restorers finished graduate studies, while post-graduate are present in last twenty years.

*Training*

Until recent the " power" of the state service for protection of monuments over the cultural heritage due to the state ownership was successful. With changes within the transition period and approaching to the EU a new palette of disciplines are incorporated into the conservation process. The basic management knowledge is taught on short courses, the methods of project approach and evaluation methodologies are also already on the schedule.

Practical training of specialists for execution of work in connection with technical schools is on the way.

*Positive achievements:*

Internal transfer of know-how within experts has been successfully established.

*Negative experiences:*

Not so many experts want to participate in training as we accepted.

*International collaboration*

Many changes are in preparation to bring the international relations to practical result. Language barrier has been put down, the new generation is able to represent experiences to the others.

Research as a field of intellectual activity is evaluated as serious promoter of cultural heritage conservation. Within the country the network of research organisations is established and in connection with several projects on the cultural monuments adequate researches are in course.

#### *Development of private sector*

It was not always easy to admit that there are many others who can participate in the preservation of cultural heritage. The new law prescribe the frame for the individuals, SME and others to obtain the licence for the work on the field of cultural heritage. The role of public service in the process of education and even training has grown. Still not enough programs of activity are related in this direction.

#### *State (public) ownership of cultural heritage*

Though the **state avoid the direct ownership** of cultural monuments ("free market economy") some of them (43 for now) have been adopted by special legal act as state ownership. Mostly the monumental values caused the decision. The way of management is still not decided and **Cultural Heritage Office is directly responsible for them.**

We have the idea, though not accepted yet, **to create** a sort of "**Slovene Heritage**" with equilibrated management between profitable and non-profitable object or sites.

Neither the state nor local communities has funds to react on the market while the strategy on cultural heritage field has not reach long term dimension. New owners generally want to sell the heritage and gain the money on short term basis. Public funds has not been established yet.

#### *Tax relieves*

We believe the most important direct support for the protection of cultural heritage could be the direct and evident tax relieves. Unfortunately the young state has not yet decided **to stimulate the citizen** in such a way. The total centralisation of taxes in integral budget does not allow flexibility in programming and execution of plans. Long term planning still does not exist.

#### *Non-governmental organisations*

Step by step the civil initiative develops within the restrictions of financial policies. Our maximum tax relief for the year 2000 was 3% of netto income revenue. I myself spent it for 1/3 of my expenses for books and education. If the time spent on the participation to the activity of NGO is not properly evaluated and treated within tax relieves we can hardly expect significant growth of public interest.