

Robert Peskar

60 years of Varstvo Spomenikov

Key words: *Varstvo Spomenikov* review, monument legislation, Institute for the Protection of Culture Heritage of Slovenia, nature conservation, conservation work, restoration work, description of activities

Dear readers,

Slovenia's main review, *Varstvo Spomenikov*, which deals with the theory and practice of protecting monuments, celebrates its 60th anniversary in 2008. In August 1948, the first issue of the review was published as the newsletter of the then-Institute for the Protection and Study of Cultural and Natural Monuments of the People's Republic of Slovenia. This means that the 44th *Varstvo Spomenikov* is a jubilee edition. In order to mark this high jubilee in suitable fashion, we should briefly describe what the review's purpose has been so far, as well as draw attention to some historical milestones and the mission of its publisher, the Institute for the Protection of Culture Heritage of Slovenia (the Institute). This retrospective is meaningful, despite the fact that a short article has already been written to mark the 50th anniversary of the review,¹ because the present context can be roughly described as similar to that of 60 years ago. In 1948, the first Slovenian law governing the protection of cultural monuments was adopted, and we can count it as the first precursor to the new Cultural Heritage Protection Act, which has been in force since 1 March 2008.

60 years of Varstvo Spomenikov

When, on 27 August 1945, the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of Slovenia founded the Institute for the Protection and Study of Cultural and Natural Monuments of the People's Republic of Slovenia,² very soon the need emerged for a specific newsletter which would explain in layman's terms the aims, principles, concrete tasks, activities and measures of monument protection to the wider Slovenian public, and especially, as the editors wrote in the introduction to the first edition,³ to the authorities, various cultural and construction institutions, schools and other organisations. Also of prime importance should be the cultural education of representatives from different fields, who would gain from the newsletter a general picture of the functioning and needs of monument protection. The emphasis was on the general goal, which was for the newsletter to help bring about the lasting preservation of works of art created by our predecessors – master craftsmen, artists and foreigners who lived in these parts. Although 1948 was the birth year of this independent publication for the needs of the monument protection service, reporting on these activities has a long tradition in Slovenia. We do not here mean just the publication of the Viennese imperial central commission for the preservation of monuments, which was published from 1856 until 1918,⁴ but also *Kirchenschmuck* of Graz, which was issued from 1870 until 1905⁵ as the newsletter of the association *Kunstverein der Diözese Seckau*, and the reports *Izvestja Društva za krščansko umetnost v Ljubljani*, which were published in five editions for the years from 1895 until 1912,⁶ and of course the reports on monument protection activities in *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino* from 1921 until 1943. These latter reports (entitled “Varstvo spomenikov” and founded in 1919) were edited by the nestor of monument protection specialists in Slovenia, France Stelè, who was the director of the Monument Office for Slovenia. He was editor until 1938; then the conservator France Mesesnel, who tragically died in 1945, took over until 1943. The above publications and reports

Dr Robert Peskar, Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia

provided the conceptual basis for the content and mission of the independent review, which was first issued in 1948, only one year later than the related newsletter of the Austrian monument preservation service, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege*.

Before we draw attention to the review's content, it is worth emphasising that the review was first published by the old Institute for the Protection and Study of Cultural and Natural Monuments of the People's Republic of Slovenia, which was led from 1945 until 1948 by Fran Šijanec, who was also the first editor of the review.⁷ He was followed by Edo Turnher, who was director of the institute and chief editor until 1962, then Mica Černigoj until 1968, followed by Marijan Kolarič until 1969. To begin with, it was the editorial committee as a whole (Jože Kastelic, Marijan Mušič, Ciril Velepčič) which was responsible for the content; between 1955 and 1965 Marijan Zadnikar with his collaborators looked after the magazine's content. Between 1966 (X. edition) and 1974, the review was edited by Helena Menaše and her collaborators, while between 1975 and 1991, the editor-in-chief was Iva Mikl Curk. Under her leadership, the review gained the subtitle *Revija za teorijo in prakso spomeniškega varstva* (Review for the theory and practice of monument preservation), which it still has to this day. In more recent times, between 1992 and 2000, the review was edited by Jerneja Batič and published by the Department for Cultural Heritage at the Ministry of Culture as the legal successor to the former institute, which was founded in 1945. When on the basis of the new Cultural Heritage Protection Act, the present-day Institute for the Protection of Culture Heritage of Slovenia was founded in 1999, bringing together the previously independent regional institutes for the preservation of natural and cultural heritage, the Restoration Centre and some employees at the Department for Cultural Heritage, the role of editor-in-chief was taken over by Biserka Ribnikar.

In the beginning, the review was not intended only for those working in monument preservation or conservation, but also fulfilled certain needs of Slovenian museums, especially by providing general reports on field activities and the state of museums and by presenting specialised technical discussions.⁸ Due to the increasing importance of museum topics, the framework of this monument review became too small, so these topics were taken over by various museum publications and the review *Argo*, which was resuscitated for the first time since 1962. The same is true for the field of nature conservation, which the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage cared for under different names until fields were separated on the basis of a law from the end of 1994, or until the independent Institute of the Republic of Slovenia for Nature Conservation was founded in 2001. To begin with, the review also covered aspects of nature conservation, and in 1962 the newly founded Institute for the Protection and Study of Cultural and Natural Monuments of the People's Republic of Slovenia began issuing an independent publication entitled *Varstvo Narave*. In 1992, the Institute of the Republic of Slovenia for the Protection of Natural and Cultural Heritage issued the last, 18th edition of the review for the theory and practice of protecting natural heritage. Only 10 years later did the publication await its subsequent, 19th edition, under the auspices of the Institute of the Republic of Slovenia for Nature Conservation.

Due to the variety listed above, it is no coincidence that the first edition of *Varstvo Spomenikov* also includes (alongside an introduction and short historical outline of the publisher) the first Slovenian law governing the protection of cultural monuments and natural attractions in the People's Republic of Slovenia, which was adopted on 19 May 1948.⁹ Although the law consists of only 20 articles, they are written relatively clearly, and if they are consistently followed, then they are entirely sufficient for the comprehensive preservation of monuments, which is particularly surprising from the point of view of current legislation. Article 16 even foresees tax relief for owners, which means that current legislation represents a step backwards in this regard. In later issues we come across present-day monument legislation many more times,¹⁰ most recently in an article by Jelka Pirkovič, who was particularly critical of separating natural and cultural heritage and the duties and responsibilities of local communities in proclaiming cultural monuments.¹¹

Although the review has diverse content, it has been dominated since the beginning by discussions, presentations and reports connected with aspects of protecting buildings considered to be monuments of cultural heritage, especially the question of renovating and preserving specific types of heritage. Besides presenting archaeological studies carried out in Ptuj, Bled and elsewhere in the first few issues, we can find special articles on the work and problems of preserving our most important artistic monuments, such as the former Cistercian monastery in Kostanjevica na Krki,¹² Our Lady's church on Ptujška Gora,¹³

the Minorite church in Ptuj,¹⁴ Maribor Castle¹⁵ and many others. However, all the articles are also of great significance for different contemporary studies due to their descriptions of the work carried out, the concrete findings and their documentary value. The former article writers, most of them conservators working for the institution, placed particular emphasis on aspects of individual types of heritage. Perhaps we should make special mention of the protection and study of castle architecture,¹⁶ medieval wall paintings and the production of copies,¹⁷ and the protection and reconstruction of archaeological monuments in Šentpeter and elsewhere.¹⁸ Due to the former socio-political situation, special attention was also attached to the preservation of monuments honouring the so-called National Liberation Struggle (NOB).

As the review has always served the theory and practice of monument preservation, there are an increasing number of articles on doctrines of monument preservation and concrete technical methods. Of particular interest is the article by France Stelè,¹⁹ who differentiated the relations between the restoration of monuments and aesthetic perception. Later we come across more analytical articles, which deal either with theoretical principles or philosophical ideas about protecting monuments through legislation or with defining monuments and their protection regimes,²⁰ the particularities of certain kinds of heritage, for example archaeological heritage,²¹ or contradictions between theory and practical reality,²² to which we can also add short descriptions of renovations which went wrong as a result of the owner's improper attitude towards the monument.²³ It is also worth mentioning that in 1962 the old Institute for the Protection of Monuments began issuing the review *Vestnik*, which despite originally being aimed at a wide readership, brought a series of basic theoretical, methodological and practical explanations about basic work, doctrines and the duties of monument protection services in Slovenia from the second edition onwards. The articles were contributed by most of the conservators active at the time. Nineteen issues have so far been published and the twentieth is planned in 2008, devoted to the archaeological explorations of the bottom of Lake Bled.

Precious articles in *Varstvo Spomenikov*, the likes of which we would like to see more, include those which give technical details on the work of restorers. As a *pars pro toto* I will mention the article by Cene Avguštin on the work carried out on the Town Hall in Kranj,²⁴ the description of methods of restoring medieval paintings on individual monuments²⁵ and some articles by Ivan Bogovčič.²⁶ Restoration work has also been presented in greater detail in other publications, especially in the independent publication *Res*, which the independent Restoration Centre of the Republic of Slovenia began issuing in 1992, and which following a lengthy break will come alive again with issue V, which will probably announce the results of restoration work on the frescos of Giulio Quaglia in the Ljubljana cathedral. However, the restoration work carried out by the monument preservation service was also specially presented in issue XVI of *Varstvo Spomenikov* to mark the 20th anniversary of the special conservation (restoration) workshop of the Institute for Monument Preservation, which also prepared an exhibition in 1972 to mark this occasion.

We should also draw attention to the contributions on individual tasks of conservators, which were, however, less frequently presented in conclusive reports covering longer periods. One of the first such contributions was provided by Ivan Komelj in issue X, which was dedicated to France Stelè. Komelj prepared a review of newly discovered frescos following systematic studies in Slovenia from 1945 to 1965 and gave them an approximate classification according to their style.²⁷ Later we come across a similar, although unfortunately very short, contribution by Olga Zupan, who listed some newly discovered items in the region of Gorenjska,²⁸ as well as a contribution by the author of this article, who prepared a review of locations of medieval frescos in the region of Dolenjska discovered from 1980, when the Institute for the Preservation of Natural and Cultural Heritage Novo Mesto was founded, until 1996.²⁹ His overview was again systematic and had appropriate stylistic and temporal classifications. We should, however, also mention in this context at least those contributions which provide an insight into the tasks of conservators in light of individual specialisations, for example the contribution by Nataša Štupar-Šumi. She very clearly describes different tasks carried out by architects working in conservation for the monument preservation service.³⁰ Later, we rarely come across similar contributions, if we discount the various articles by Peter Fister.³¹ One can, however, become acquainted with the rich and diverse activities of the monument preservation service in Slovenia from the reports on conservation work carried out on individual items of cultural heritage which were an integral part of the review up until issue XXXVI (1997). From

issue XXXVII onwards, however, they appear in a separate section entitled *Varstvo spomenikov – Poročila*. This separation aimed above all to further raise the professional level of the review's content, whose articles were also translated into English from issue XXXVII onwards. However, a crisis in monument preservation also affected the review, with various reorganisations and new legislation, and while it was previously issued regularly, it began coming in delayed intervals. Only with the decisive programme of work by the Institute in 2006 and 2007 did they again succeed in catching up with the regular rhythm of publication of the review in two separate parts. One of them contains in-depth specialist articles, and the other reports on work on items of cultural heritage – mainly the work of Institute conservators. Issue XLIV is also divided into these two separate sections. Issue numbers X, XX, XXX and XL also contain tables of contents for the preceding 10 issues.

Only a thorough study of the history of monument preservation in Slovenia following the Second World War would give a more comprehensive insight into the significance of this publication. However, no one has yet embarked on such a study or a study of the history of related subjects, especially archaeology, ethnology and art history. We are familiar with systematic overviews of the beginnings of monument preservation in Slovenia,³² and we can find some small contributions on this theme at occasional symposia.³³ However, due to the sensitivity of the topic and the role of certain political groups, we can for now expect above all general overviews and evaluations,³⁴ rarely in-depth analyses.³⁵ In most cases, the latter cannot in any case be directly translated into practice or incorporated into the work of the Institute. This was the case with the Cultural Heritage Protection Act from 1999 and the beginning of the reorganisation of the public service for the protection of cultural heritage on the basis of two founding resolutions from 1999 and 2003. It continues to undergo reorganisation, unfortunately without suitable analyses, in 2008 with the adoption of the new Cultural Heritage Protection Act³⁶ and the new resolution on the founding of the Institute.³⁷ It is impossible to say as yet what effects the law and the founding resolution will have on the protection and preservation of cultural heritage and the functioning of the Institute, but we do hope they will not too much affect the future of the review *Varstvo Spomenikov*, as publishing and promoting cultural heritage should remain one of the primary tasks of the Institute – except, of course, if those responsible for the content of the law and the reorganisation of the service have other plans.

Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia 1999–2008

The review *Varstvo Spomenikov* was (for all but a short period) always dependent on the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage. It could even be said that the review was like its mirror image or reflection, so this opportunity should be taken to briefly describe some of the institute's main duties and perspectives, and to stress the main characteristics of its functioning in the past years. My aim here is not to list all the different names and organisational forms which the institute has had. Above all, I wish to draw attention to the main circumstances which affected its functioning from 1999, when the independent regional institutes in Celje, Kranj, Ljubljana, Maribor, Nova Gorica, Novo Mesto and Piran, and the Restoration Centre were united in one unified public institute. It was the old Cultural Heritage Protection Act and two founding resolutions from 1999 and 2003 which formed the basis for unification.³⁸ Important events which occurred within the unified public institution are listed chronologically from 1999 onwards, beginning with the founding resolution and the naming of the acting director, architect Jovo Grobovšek,³⁹ followed by the naming of the Institute director, Janez Kromar, from December 2000 for a period of five years. In 2000, a tenancy agreement was signed for the premises on Cankarjeva 4 in Ljubljana. In 2004, there followed the transferral of all departments to Metelkova 4, but due to legal prescriptions, the official address of the Institute remained on Cankarjeva 4 and only changed optimistically to Metelkova 6 with the latest founding resolution, although the Institute still does not have its premises there. In 2005, the Institute also registered as a research organisation. At the end of 2005, the Institute gained a new director (the author of this article), but a provision by the Minister of Culture in July 2008 cut short the mandate with the naming of a new acting director of the Institute.

The merging of eight independent public institutions meant that in 1999 the Institute faced a series of problems which it had previously dealt with more or less successfully on a regional level. One of the more manifest problems is that of unifying work methodology, standards and working habits and hu-

man resources. It is clear from both founding resolutions that setting up the Institute and joining all the institutions took almost four years and was not even complete, seeing as the accounting, although under the same roof, remained separate. This is evident from the special list of contracting entities which the Ministry of Culture passed on to the Ministry of Finance, which shows that alongside the Institute, its independent contracting entities also include all the regional units and the Restoration Centre. In practice, this produced a series of unnecessary but urgent tasks in accounting, which consequently brought about the development of an extensive accounting sector, which is otherwise regulated by other Slovenian legal regulations. However, the difficulties were not so much connected with the unification as with a series of tasks which were imposed with the new legislation in 1999 and the founding resolutions.⁴⁰ Although at first glance we are dealing with very varied and complex activity, it was nonetheless possible to arrange these tasks in three basic groups, which also became the basis for the structure of the annual programme of work for the Institute between 2006 and 2008. The first group consists of the **spatial and legal protection of cultural heritage**, which also includes record-keeping, evaluating, documenting, and carrying out all the necessary procedures for the legal protection of cultural heritage, with a special emphasis on respecting international conventions, introducing methodologies for setting up different levels of protection and finally protecting cultural heritage in physical space, which became one of the priorities in the working processes. With the new law from 2008, spatial protection has even become the sole form of legal protection, and preparing the basis for it is now the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture. The second group consists of **planning and implementing measures for preserving cultural heritage**, which includes drawing up guidelines, conditions and agreements, measuring and producing architectural drafts and studies of the buildings, drawing up conservation programmes and conservation-restoration projects, and carrying out the most demanding work. The third group consists of the **transfer of knowledge**, where particular attention is paid to presenting studies and work, training and the preparation of training, promotion, publishing and international cooperation. Within this group, we have placed a particular emphasis on the role of our review, *Varstvo Spomenikov*, as well as other publications (*Vestnik, Res*, a collection guidebooks), which should make up the core of the publishing activities of the public service. Other tasks which are of secondary importance for the protection of cultural heritage but of key importance when it comes to the lawful functioning of the Institute were listed in the fourth group (other tasks).

During the first years of its existence, the Institute not only had problems with its premises (which it still has today), but also some serious financial difficulties. What was particularly worrying following the 2005 balance-sheet was the negative financial state connected with work expenses (salaries, transport to work, food), which amounted to a more than SIT 36 million deficit; the Institute had to cover this from other financial outlays, of which some were more successful than others. With the help of special measures, the Institute succeeded in reducing the 2006 deficit in staff payment by 50%, and in 2007 it almost completely disappeared. The remaining difference resulted only from the fact that in contrast to the collective treaty, the Institute did not receive sufficient funds for transportation to work for its employees from its founder. The listed work was not the only step taken in the field of organisation and business. In the years 2006 and 2007, the Institute shaped and adopted several rules (*Rules governing the use of the institute's cars, Manual for the World of Research, Rules governing the distribution of working hours, Rules on internal auditing, Rules on issuing public orders for which no public tender must be published, Rules on insuring personal details*), which are obligatory for lawful functioning. There followed a series of measures resulting from the first proper interior revision of the Institute, including: the introduction of a protocol for keeping a record of business events, a unified record of contracts and order forms, and above all the adoption of the *Strategic auditing plan, the 2008 annual auditing plan and Risk estimation 2008*, and in the final phase also the *Register of risk in Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia operations*, which the Institute as an indirect budget user must prepare by the end of 2008 at the latest. All this dictated some further measures, from legalising computer programmes to educating employees and gradually improving the technical capabilities of the Institute, which would result in a rise in the quality of the work. In modernising its technical capabilities, the Institute for the first time in 2007 included its own funds, amounting to 40%, alongside those provided by the Ministry of Culture. In 2008, this proportion amounted to 140% in relation to the authorised budget money. This proportion was undoubtedly made possible by the fact that in 2006, the annual targets within the programme

of work, especially coming from a different public service, were far surpassed, while in the regular programme of work we recorded a profit averaging 15%, and in 2007 this increased to 25%. The year 2007 was a record year in business terms, and this was helped by legal means as well as by small staff changes. Although insignificant at first glance, the two replacements of directors of regional units and the many project jobs which were not financed by the Ministry of Culture but by other public services were significant. In some places and at some times they also enabled the fulfilment of tasks of the regular programme, as only in this way could the Institute take some pressure off the individual full-time employees.⁴¹ By all means, the successful business year could not have happened without the effort invested by most employees, the leaders of regional units and the Restoration Centre; they certainly deserve a special commendation for this, which it has, however, unfortunately not yet been possible to express in financial terms. The reflection of all this will be expressed only in extensive files on monument preservation activities in 2007 and 2008.

However, in the past few years, some problematic areas in the functioning of the Institute have become clear. The most distinct is the legal protection of cultural heritage. The cultural heritage register often failed to provide sufficiently solid legal protection, and neither did the spatial and proclaiming acts, as the protective regimes were usually not well enough defined. Another weak point proved to be the monocratic functioning of the Institute, with the director being the sole person responsible for professionalism and legality. A proposal from the Institute to change this situation with new legislation and a founding act, by setting up a management board in which three people would be responsible at least for the more important decisions, making cultural heritage less vulnerable, was refused by the writers of the law and the founding act. Constant changes in legislation governing spatial management and the protection of cultural heritage did not exactly benefit the accelerated improvements in functioning, as they thwarted the introduction of routine implementation of work tasks, and as a result of the constant procedural alterations, they generally fail to produce results. For the next anniversary it will be possible to write more on the planned new Cultural Heritage Protection Act and founding act, which envisages reducing the network of regional units and institutionalised conservation work.

It was also found that the domain of documenting monuments, which is one of the main tasks of the Institute, is relatively weak, but this holds true above all for topographical descriptions and photographic documentation, for which the Institute has hitherto only been able to organise a few training courses. On the other hand, in recent years, producing graphic documentation in individual Institute units attained a level in 2000 which is entirely comparable with the rest of the world. This is also a result of the efforts invested by the first acting Institute director. With the predominance of digital technology and the problems of storing digital documentation, the Institute is faced with a great challenge which will have significant financial consequences. Certain steps towards solving these problems have already been taken: in 2007 a systematic network of connections between the computer systems of all the separate units was put in place as the basis for setting up a programme system for the unified storage of digital documentation. It is expected also to be accessible to registered users on the Internet in 2009. We could also list a series of other problems and controversial decisions, which resulted (among other things) in dissatisfied owners of cultural heritage, but on the other hand it must be stressed that for every 10,000 administrative acts (terms, agreements, opinions) which the Institute issues every year, less than 1% receive complaints. The Institute also had considerable difficulties in carrying out protective archaeological excavations, as on the basis of the law from 1999 it had a monopoly, being the only possible contractor, but it responded to this status relatively late; however, the question of financing post-excavation work on archaeological material, which the Institute has great problems storing, remained unsolved. However, the findings of the archaeological excavations were regularly published at least in the report supplement accompanying *Varstvo Spomenikov*.

In recent years, the operations of the Institute have focused also on fulfilling certain strategic targets, of which some have been long-term goals of the Institute since 2003. Most of them were presented in the draft strategic plan for the Institute until 2013.⁴² The fundamental goal of the foreseen strategic plan is certainly to provide the institute with the best possible foundation for rational and successful operations, while at the same time ensuring the best possible preservation of architectural cultural heritage in Slovenia. This is the fundamental requirement for fortifying Slovenia's cultural identity in the increasingly globalised world. The draft strategic plan therefore includes an outline of legal possibilities for the

functioning of the Institute, a description of its activities and its main programme contents, including central particularities and the points of departure for preparing a strategic plan, and of course a description of strategic goals and measures. We would like to draw particular attention to increasing the accessibility of cultural heritage and information on it, ensuring higher quality academic evaluation of cultural heritage, and further unifying and raising professionalism in individual organisational units. A special target which has been at the forefront since 1999 is the introduction of non-destructive research methods as the basic and preventative protection of heritage. Setting up a centrally managed depot of samples (in the form of academic and documentary collections) and other remains of cultural heritage with an emphasis on systematic storage and the possibility of renewed use of old construction material (bricks, paving stones) is, however, still wishful thinking.

The strategic goal of the Institute should be to fulfil its duties making up the aforementioned three fundamental programme groups for the protection of cultural heritage, and at a level which will be clearly comparable with that of European projects in the field of preserving cultural heritage. This strategic goal should be the focus of the existing Institute staff structure and the training of staff connected with it, which is already separated into two levels. The first level represents additional training in the organisation of the Institute (courses, presentations, workshops), and the second is the post-graduate study of employees (master's, PhD) with topics in the field of preservation of cultural heritage and related fields (archaeology, architecture, landscape architecture, ethnology, restoration, art history, history, technical sciences and natural sciences such as chemistry). In this context we could talk about at least 200 full-time employees, 50% of them being highly trained experts and at least 30% of them having academic qualifications. Such a structure of employees would have no trouble mastering the different research tasks and projects, which would mainly be connected with preserving actual instances of cultural heritage. An important portion would also be taken up by research in the field of natural sciences. This area would support those projects which would solve problems through multi-disciplinary work, also in cooperation with different institutions. A reflection of these tendencies is, after all, the content of the jubilee edition of *Varstvo Spomenikov*. Targets in this case would be higher quality and more successful preservation of cultural heritage and making the Institute better known and respected, which could also be achieved with the obligatory publication of all results of research and projects, either in independent Institute publications (*Vestnik, Res*) or in the form of articles in *Varstvo Spomenikov* or other respected publications, and of course with lectures and presentations. The latter would also be focused on international cooperation, within whose framework the priority would be comparing levels of protection and preservation of cultural heritage, common organisational workshops aimed at promoting public protection services in Slovenia, comparing and unifying standards of protection, obtaining funds from the EU, and promoting cultural heritage in Slovenia and making a name for it within the EU.

Legal regulations concerning the use of public finances, public orders, accounting standards and strategic directions in the Republic of Slovenia dictate that the Institute should also begin rationalising individual operations areas, from accounting to various working groups, with a precise enforcement of protocols for business events. In the past year, we have succeeded in shaping some of them; most of them will only obtain their final shape after analyses on the main segments of work are finished. These analyses are carried out above all with the help of interior revisions aimed at reducing risks, defining priorities and rationalising tasks.

Everything listed above undoubtedly depends very much on the staff structure, which has a very variegated history and is worrying from certain points of view. Gojko Zupan already warned about this almost ten years ago.⁴³ I will not now repeat his findings, but I would nevertheless warn that since 1991 the number of people employed by the Institute has increased by 17. This happened between 1999 and 2000 with 11 additional employees, and between 2002 and 2004 with 6 new employees. There are a number of reasons for this. The increase was firstly caused by the new Cultural Heritage Protection Act from 1999, which brought numerous new tasks and of course the unification of the previously independent institutions for the protection of natural and cultural heritage into one public institution. A greater number of employees, especially of administrative staff, was also dictated by other legal regulations, for example from the field of public orders, accounting standards, administrative procedures, the use of public funds, etc., employing experts and a marked increase in the quantity of work, which besides the above act was also dictated by socio-economic circumstances; the most evident of these is the growth

in construction work in Slovenia between 1998 and 2006. According to information provided by the Statistical Office, it increased by a factor of 2.65. Between 2002 and 2004, the number of employees again increased because in 2002 the Ministry of Culture transferred one of its workplaces to the Institute due to the cancellation of certain tasks, and one year later another one; in 2004 the Ministry of Culture transferred another four of its employees whom it did not need to the Institute (three of them with university qualifications and one with high school education). At the end of 2007, the Institute employed 203 people who were financed by the Ministry of Culture, and alongside them a further 37 project employees, which the Institute financed from other sources from another public service (see Table 1).⁴⁴ Among those in full-time employment, most have a university education (see Table 2), and this remains a priority in the future planning of human resources. The emphasis is on dealing with replacement jobs in profiles that are lacking (civil engineers, architects, conservators-restorers, natural sciences people, lawyers), and caring for those areas of work which have hitherto not been suitably dealt with (e.g. underwater archaeology). The general aim is to produce a human resources plan which will ensure rational and effective staff to deal with the tasks in hand, which means the suitable employment of young capable staff in all domains of work of the Institute. Considering the extent of the tasks which the Institute was given with the new law from 2008, this means around 205 regularly financed staff from the primary public service and at least 20 to 30 employed (full-time and part-time) but financed by various projects (at least EUR 2 to 3 million annually). This would also create an annual profit of between EUR 100,000 and 200,000, enabling the constant modernisation of technical capabilities and therefore competitiveness and the setting of standards.

The above perspectives are by no means unrealistic, as the possibility of realising them can already be backed up with concrete business results. Their realisation in the coming years will undoubtedly depend on the institute's bodies and especially on the founder, i.e. the representatives of the Ministry of Culture, who can on the other hand completely change the plans. If the direction of development remains as planned, then we can already say there will be no lack of interesting and varied topics, contributions and articles which will be presented in our review, *Varstvo Spomenikov*. This would ensure that the main targets of the review can be fulfilled. These are not just keeping records of our work, new methods and improving on results already achieved, but also greater publicity for our work, which will enable critical comparisons, and finally also the suitable promotion of our work, the review and especially Slovenian cultural heritage, both in Slovenia and abroad.

Table I: Number of employees in the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia from 1991 until 31.10.2007.

	31. 12. 1991		31. 12. 2000		31. 12. 2002	31. 12. 2004	31. 10. 2007	
	ZVKDS	MOP	ZVKDS	MOP	ZVKDS	ZVKDS	ZVKDS	Projects
OE CE	17	4	17	4	17	19	19	3
OE KR	18		18	4	18	17	17	3
OE LJ	27	3	29	8	29	23	23	3
OE MB	31	3	33	6	32	32	32	9
OE NG	21	4	21	4	23	23	23	
OE NM	19	2	22	5	23	22	22	2
OE PI	16	1	16	5	16	16	16	1
RC	37		32		29	31	31	11
SS			9		11	20	20	5
	186	17	197	36	198	203	203	37
	203		233		198	203	240	

Key:

ZVKDS	Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia, cost of work financed by the Ministry of Culture
MOP	Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning (at the time of independent institutes for the protection of natural and cultural heritage)
OE	regional units
RC	Restoration Centre
SS	common jobs
Projects	project jobs – (mainly) temporary, cost of work is not financed from public funds earmarked for the ZVKDS

Table II: Structure of Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia employees (financed by the MK) on 31.10.2007.

TARIF GROUP

	I-IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	
OE CE	1	3	1	10	4	0	19
OE KR	1	3	1	7	5	0	17
OE LJ	1	0	2	15	5	0	23
OE MB	2	3	3	13	10	1	32
OE NG	1	6	1	12	3	0	23
OE NM	0	5	2	8	5	2	22
OE PI	1	0	2	7	5	1	16
RC	0	4	1	16	8	2	31
SS	0	2	3	11	1	3	20
TOGETHER	7	26	16	99	46	9	203

Notes

- 1 Marijan Slabe, Ob petdeseti obletnici Varstva spomenikov, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 38, Ljubljana 1999, pp. 286–293; see also Alenka Kuševič, Razvoj spomeniškega varstva na Slovenskem, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 38, Ljubljana 1999, pp. 247–263, and Gojko Zupan, Strokovni delavci v zavodih in perspektive, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 38, Ljubljana 1999, pp. 264–285.
- 2 Fran Šijanec, Zavod za varstvo spomenikov LRS, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 1, Ljubljana 1948, p. 6.
- 3 *Varstvo spomenikov*, 1, Ljubljana 1948, pp. 1–2.
- 4 The publication was entitled *Mitteilungen der Kaiser. Königl. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und historischen Denkmale*, Vienna, and for the last 16 years it was known as *Mitteilungen der K. K. Central-Commission für Denkmalfpflege*.
- 5 Vida Urek, Slovenica v reviji Kirchenschmuck (1870–1905) – bibliografski popis, *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, n. v. IX, Ljubljana 1972, pp. 145–158.
- 6 Glej Josip Dostal, Varstvo spomenikov in naše cerkve, *Peto izvestje Društva za krščansko umetnost v Ljubljani 1907–1912*, Ljubljana 1913, p. 56 onwards.
- 7 Ivan Komelj, Vida Fatur, Delavci Zavoda SR Slovenije za spomeniško varstvo v letih 1945–1975, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XX, Ljubljana 1976, pp. 141–158.
- 8 E.g. Bogo Teplý, Delo muzejev v l. 1953–1954, *Varstvo spomenikov*, V, 1953–1954, pp. 172–178.
- 9 Spomeniška zakonodaja, *Varstvo spomenikov*, I, Ljubljana 1948, pp. 3–6.
- 10 Dinko Gregorin, Razmišljanja o spomeniškem varstvu ob novi ustavi, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XX, Ljubljana 1976, pp. 93–106.
- 11 Jelka Pirkovič, Ali so spomeniki drobiž v igri med političnimi strankami?, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 36, Ljubljana 1997, pp. 7–12.
- 12 Emilijan Cevc, Kostanjeviški samostan, *Varstvo spomenikov*, I, Ljubljana 1948, pp. 13–15.
- 13 Marijan Zadnikar, Restavracija cerkve na Ptujski gori, *Varstvo spomenikov*, III, 1–2, Ljubljana 1950, pp. 11–29.
- 14 Marijan Zadnikar, Minoritska cerkev v Ptuj, *Varstvo spomenikov*, III, 3–4, Ljubljana 1950, pp. 88–113.
- 15 Bogo Teplý, Ivan Meznarič, Odprava hišne gobe ter obnova viteške dvorane v mariborskem gradu, *Varstvo spomenikov*, III, 3–4, Ljubljana 1950, pp. 141–148.
- 16 Ivan Komelj, Ob raziskovanju dolenskih gradov, *Varstvo spomenikov*, I, Ljubljana 1948, pp. 19–21; Ivan Komelj, Dolenski gradovi in spomeniško varstvo, *Varstvo spomenikov*, III, 1–2, Ljubljana 1950, pp. 39–46.
- 17 Ciril Velepčič, Srednjeveško stensko slikarstvo v Sloveniji ob kopiranju in razstavi v tujini, *Varstvo spomenikov*, II, Ljubljana 1948, pp. 66–75.
- 18 Peter Petru, Upravičenost rekonstrukcije posameznih arheoloških spomenikov, *Varstvo spomenikov*, IX, 1962–1964, Ljubljana 1965, 3–11; see also the articles in issue XV of *Varstvo spomenikov*.
- 19 France Stelč, Estetika in dokumentarnost v restavriranju spomenikov, *Varstvo spomenikov*, V, 1953–1954, Ljubljana 1955, pp. 5–13.
- 20 Milan Zeleznik, O prvobitni podobi likovnih spomenikov in nekaterih aktualnih nalogah spomeniškega varstva, *Varstvo spomenikov*, VIII, 1960–1961, Ljubljana 1962, pp. 48–55; Ivan Sedej, Resnica in mit v teoriji spomeniškega varstva, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XV, Ljubljana 1972, pp. 7–14; Ivan Komelj, Avtentičnost »avtentičnih« spomenikov NOB (Prispevek k metodologiji varstva), *Varstvo spomenikov*, XXVII, Ljubljana 1985, pp. 49–52.
- 21 Iva Mikl Curk, Teorija varstva arheoloških spomenikov v naši praksi, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XXIII, Ljubljana 1981, pp. 81–94; Davorin Vuga, Prispevek k teoriji in praksi zaščitnega arheološkega izkopavanja, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XXIII, Ljubljana 1981, pp. 95–99.
- 22 Marijan Zadnikar, Razkorak med spomeniško teorijo in prakso, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XI, Ljubljana 1966, pp. 5–13.
- 23 Marinka Dražumerič, Historiat neke obnove. Frančiškanska cerkev sv. Lenarta v Novem mestu, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 34, Ljubljana 1992, pp. 154–160.
- 24 Cene Avguštin, Mestna hiša v Kranju, *Varstvo spomenikov*, IX, 1961/1964, Ljubljana 1965, pp. 61–72.
- 25 Miha Pirnat, Čelovnik, Fojana, Panngreč Grm, Krtina, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XVII–XIX/2, Ljubljana 1975, pp. 75–88.
- 26 E.g. Ivan Bogovčič, Tesnenje razpok v stenskih slikah s poliuretanskim kitom, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XXII, Ljubljana 1979, pp. 199–204.
- 27 Ivan Komelj, Dvajset let odkrivanja srednjeveških fresk, *Varstvo spomenikov*, X, 1965, Ljubljana 1966, pp. 39–76.
- 28 Olga Zupan, Srednjeveško stensko slikarstvo na Gorenjskem. Sondiranja in odkrivanja v letih 1965–1985, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 28, Ljubljana 1986, pp. 209–212.
- 29 Robert Peskar, Gotsko stensko slikarstvo na Dolenskem in v Beli krajini - nova odkritja, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 37, Ljubljana 1997, pp. 69–96.
- 30 Nataša Štupar - Šumi, O delu arhitekta v spomeniškovarstveni službi, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XIII–XIV, 1968–1969, Ljubljana 1970, pp. 41–92.
- 31 Na primer Peter Fister, Obnavljanje starih polihromacij na sakralni arhitekturi, *Varstvo spomenikov*, XIII–XIV, 1968–1969, Ljubljana 1970, pp. 93–106.
- 32 Franjo Baš, Organizacija spomeniškega varstva v slovenski preteklosti, *Varstvo spomenikov*, V, 1953–1954, Ljubljana 1955, pp. 13–37.
- 33 Alenka Kuševič, Razvoj spomeniškega varstva (c.f. footnote 1); see also the contributions from the eponymous symposium in the anthology *Umetnostna zgodovina in spomeniško varstvo. Posvetovanje ob 75-letnici ustanovitve Slovenskega umetnostnozgodovinskega društva (1921–1996)*, Ljubljana 1997.
- 34 Jelka Pirkovič, Vrste opravil v spomeniškem varstvu, *Varstvo spomenikov*, 32, Ljubljana 1990, pp. 11–21.
- 35 Jelka Pirkovič, Osnovni pojmi in zasnova spomeniškega varstva v Sloveniji, *Vestnik*, XI, Ljubljana 1993.
- 36 Zakon o varstvu kulturne dediščine (ZVKD-1), *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, No. 16/2008, pp. 1121–1145.
- 37 Sklep o ustanovitvi Javnega zavoda Republike Slovenije za varstvo kulturne dediščine, *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, No. 65/2008, pp. 8776–8782.
- 38 Zakon o varstvu kulturne dediščine, *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, No. 7/1999; Sklep o ustanovitvi Javnega zavoda Republike Slovenije za varstvo kulturne dediščine, *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, No. 38/1999; Sklep o ustanovitvi Javnega zavoda Republike Slovenije za varstvo kulturne dediščine, *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, No. 110/2003.
- 39 Sklep o imenovanju vršila dolžnosti direktorja javnega zavoda (*Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, No. 108/1999).
- 40 Briefly, they include: keeping a record of heritage and transferring data to the heritage register; documenting, drawing up inventories and studying heritage; evaluating heritage; preparing the technical basis for proclaiming acts and agreements for administrative procedures;

carrying out studies using methods which represent an intervention in heritage; documenting maintenance, interventions, use and trade in heritage; guiding and supervising heritage management in state or local community possession; preparing guidelines from the field of heritage for the adoption of spatial and planning acts; preparing conservation and restoration programmes; cooperating with the owners of monuments and others with interests connected with individual monuments, and providing explanations, advice and instructions; preparing the technical basis for the protection of heritage; issuing preservation opinions, conditions and agreement; preparing conservation and restoration projects for protecting, renovating and reviving heritage; planning, guiding, organising and leading individual highly demanding conservation and restoration work on monuments; cooperation in evaluating and caring for the material state of heritage; providing and managing unified restoration documentation; implementing professional governance, shaping methods and standards, and guiding, aligning and accompanying their implementation; managing restoration work and caring for the development of the field of restoration and its general direction; keeping records of contractors carrying out heritage preservation work on the basis of permits and concessions, guiding and supervising their work; cooperating in administrative procedures connected with the preservation and use of heritage, and preparing the technical basis prepared by the ministry; popularising heritage and its preservation; carrying out activities in the institute's information bureaus; guiding and cooperating in educating and training staff for conservation and restoration work; incorporation in the system of heritage protection in the event of armed conflict and protection against natural disasters; cooperating with other public institutes working in the field of heritage preservation and other aspects of culture which are in the public interest in Slovenia and abroad; international cooperation with institutions in the field of heritage preservation; cooperating with related Slovenian and international cultural and scientific institutions, research foundations and other national public institutions; cooperating with the media and RTV Slovenia.

- 41 For 2007, the Institute prepared an analysis of the workload of individual work places (see Robert Peskar et al.: *Strateški načrt ZVKDS 2007–2013 [Osmutek]*, Ljubljana, March 2008, pp. 25–26 [circulated as typescript]), from which it can be gathered that restorers working on architecture are the most burdened employees within the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia; on average, they put in around 25% more hours than the average annual quota of hours, which is 1,600 hours. The next most overworked groups are the archaeologists with around 20% increased workload, the director of the Institute with around 14% increased workload, and directors of regional units with 10%. The workload of restorers and various technicians averages less than 5% excess.
- 42 Robert Peskar, *Strateški načrt ZVKDS* (c.f. footnote 41), p. 14 onwards (circulated as typescript).
- 43 Gojko Zupan, *Strokovni delavci v zavodih in perspektive* (c.f. footnote 1), p. 264 onwards.
- 44 Information on employees was gathered by Maja Horvat, head of human resources at the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia.