On the 50th anniversary of the adoption of the World Heritage Convention

Věra KUČOVÁ

The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, drawn up and adopted by the first signatories 50 years ago, opened the way for the formation of the World Heritage List (WHL), a truly global phenomenon. The principles for the establishment of this List and the subsequent care of its items are determined both by the Convention and by the Operational Guidelines for its Implementation. The World Heritage List has already exceeded one thousand items. The Convention has proved its timelessness, but many of its processes and working methods have had to be refined over time. States, but not least the media world, have paid much attention to the new inscriptions on the List, but in addition to this part of the implementation of the Convention, there is a significant increase in the number of the state of conservation reports of properties previously inscribed on the World Heritage List, on which it is necessary to formulate the opinion of the Intergovernmental Committee on World Heritage. It also issues decisions on important general issues and initiates a number of analyses and thematic outputs.

The Czech Republic, with 16 entries, is already one of the countries significantly represented on the WHL. However, it has not yet acted as a member of the World Heritage Committee (WHC), so it is mainly concentrated on its own sites. The article therefore explains more about the role of expert missions and reports submitted by States Parties for the WHC sessions and generally presents the reader with a number of topics related to the holistic implementation of the obligations under the Convention. The main areas of threats facing World Heritage are commented on in more detail, as analyzed in recent documents on which the WHC has taken decisions, and which include numerous challenges for States Signatories to the Convention.

Taking into account the significant share of urban and landscape heritage in the Czech Republic's WHL entries, the topics related to urban heritage are emphasized: urban pressures, Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL). The Czech practice and experience is compared with how the Recommendation on HUL has been formulated in the international environment and how in recent years there have been increasing demands for the concretization of the theses contained in this document. Using better known cases from Europe (Vienna, Prague, Liverpool, Seville, Nimes), the approaches of the World Heritage Committee and the expert organization ICOMOS to problematic situations are explained. A way to improve practice is the early application of the Heritage Impact Assessment tool, for which, however, the Czech Republic does not yet have the appropriate processes or funding in place. Therefore, international experience in dealing with development projects is inspiring. The current obligation to define more precisely the attributes of Oustanding Universal Value (OUV) is an opportunity to increase understanding of the significance of World Heritage properties in wider society.

Finally, possible steps at the national level are outlined, where, among other things, the direct incorporation of the World Heritage phenomenon directly into relevant national legislation is still lacking.

The article is complementary to several other articles in this issue, which specify the topics of heritage in danger of war, methodological issues of reconstruction of monuments after such situations, or present the recent successful nominations of the Czech Republic. The many reference links in the notes will help readers to further their studies and in particular may encourage the use of the World Heritage Centre portal, which fulfills the role of the Secretariat of the Committee.

Illustrations. ***Fig. 1.*** *Aachen Cathedral. The Cathedral, whose core is the Chapel of Emperor Charlemagne, is one of the first 12 monuments ever inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Naumburg Cathedral. European Christian churches belong to the group of so called "over-represented" types;* ***Fig. 3.*** *World Heritage properties in the Czech Republic (status in 2021);* ***Fig. 4.*** *Historical center of Český Krumlov. The town core with the dominant castle and chateau complex in one of the iconic panoramic views;* ***Fig. 5a–b.*** *The Slavic settlement in Mikulčice, a two-apse rotunda (a), a modern form of interpretation of the former situation realized together with the modernization of the visitor center and of the hall covering the church II (b);* ***Fig. 6.*** *Increases in the number of the state of conservation reports on World Heritage properties (1982–2021);* ***Fig. 7.*** *List of World Heritage in Danger, status in spring 2022;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Map showing the locations of the greatest impacts of climate change on World Heritage cities;* ***Fig. 9.*** *Venice and its lagoon. Characteristic situation of a World Heritage property in long-term danger when the sea level in the lagoon rises;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Saint-Louis Island, Senegal. One of the World Heritage Island properties threatened by rising sea levels;* ***Fig. 11.*** *Amsterdam. Climate change and rising sea levels are a major challenge for the Netherlands, including the capital city of Amsterdam;* ***Fig. 12.*** *The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz. The designed landscape in Wörlitz is a combination of water areas, garden, and park landscaping with large water bodies;* ***Fig. 13.*** *The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz. Cut-out of a map of the World Heritage property whose natural boundary is formed by the Elbe River in the north;* ***Fig. 14a–b.*** *Alhambra, Generalife and Albayzín, Granada, Spain. The drought-tested gardens at the Generalife Palace, with the Alhambra castle complex and the tower of the Iglesia de Santa María in the background (a). The inner gardens of the Generalife Palace with its fountains are a veritable oasis during the long summer season; in their elevated position, they are completely dependent on the abundance of water (b);* ***Fig. 15a–b.*** *The royal grounds of Drottningholm. Even the extensive gardens of the Nordic countries suffer from seasonal heat waves;* ***Fig. 16.*** *The Cathedral, the Alcázar, and the Indian Archives in Seville. In the background, the forty-storey high-rise office building Torre Sevilla erected despite the WHC requests to reduce the height;* ***Fig. 17a–b.*** *The Historic center of Prague. High-rise buildings on the Pankrác Plain have been the subject of controversy for many years over the limits of new buildings in the buffer zone;* ***Fig. 18.*** *Vienna, Belvedere. In the vicinity of the Belvedere site, the buffer zone of the Historic center of Vienna is completely inadequate, so that building development near the main station could not be restricted in any significant way;* ***Fig. 19a–b.*** *Liverpool. Examples of the intrusion of large new buildings into the fabric of the World Heritage property and its immediate surroundings;* ***Fig. 20.*** *The historic quarter of Old Québec. An extremely valuable city with many iconic panoramas;* ***Fig. 21.*** *A perennial challenge for heritage authorities in Vilnius is the issue of maintaining the visual integrity of the protected area in the context of high-rise buildings in the buffer zone north of the center;* ***Fig. 22a–b.*** *Qal'at al-Bahrain. The archaeological site is an extraordinary testament to the Dilmun Empire and its successors once controlling the Persian Gulf region (a);* ***Fig. 23a–b.*** *Burial mounds at Jelling, rune stones and church. The specific protection of the rune stones resulted from an architectural competition (a). Visitor center fully dedicated to the theme (b);* ***Fig. 24a–b.*** *Alhambra, Generalife and Albayzín, Granada. Details such as the well-maintained cobbled paths through the Generalife garden in the characteristic "Granada style" complete the impressive image of the sites;* ***Fig. 25.*** *The iconic character of the English Lake District landscape is enhanced by stone walls and hundreds of thousands of sheep;* ***Fig. 26a–b.*** *Berlin's modernist housing estates. Precise repairs focused on all details increase the visual integrity of this serial property.*

UNESCO World Heritage – between uniqueness and representativeness

Martin HORÁČEK

The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage stands out among international heritage conservation documents. Firstly, it innovatively combines the agenda of nature conservation and cultural heritage protection; secondly, it has the character of a binding political treaty, but backed by independent expert opinion; thirdly, it offers specific guidance for the implementation of the declared goals of conservation and protection. The World Heritage List is the best known outcome of the Convention. The selection of properties for the List has been a matter of debate from the outset. The World Heritage Committee has adopted the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List. The "representativeness", "balance" and "credibility" of the List are to be seen as follows: representativeness as representation of heritage with OUV, not all heritage typologies or heritage from all regions equally; balance as balanced attention to all aspects of nomination and management; credibility as a rigorous and impartial approach.

However, this clarification does not explain the fundamental contradiction regarding the selectivity of the List. How can something that is "exceptional" also be sufficiently "representative"? A selected property was usually exceptional at the time of its creation; it is therefore not representative of the contemporary standard in its category, nor is it representative of current standards of "ordinary life", since it exists under a special regime of "protection". UNESCO has responded to the problem of the arbitrary exclusion of "heritage" from the rest of the world by emphasizing the participation of local communities. It issued the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, according to which "historic" cannot be separated from the contemporary by a clear boundary. The UN has signed up to seventeen Sustainable Development Goals. ICOMOS (as an advisory body to the Committee) has created a Sustainable Development Goals Working Group to bring heritage conservation closer to projects for the sustainability of life on Earth. "Heritage properties" in this conception are not documents of the past, but sources of energy for the future. This holistic view also permeates the World Heritage debate. Yet the exclusivity of the List remains, based on the OUV declaration.

In terms of the different types of heritage under-represented on the List, the disproportion of natural sites to cultural sites persists. More than a third of all properties are located in Europe. Reserves were noted for sites of geology and prehistoric archaeology. Twentieth century architecture is more often considered to bear OUV than 19th century architecture. Archaeological and artistic themes are among the examples where the concept of serial nomination of a World Heritage property is suggested as a suitable solution. An international series promotes the desired cooperation between the Parties as well as the representativeness and balance of the List.

At the same time, an alternative approach to heritage is available in Europe: the European Heritage Label (EHL). Unlike World Heritage, it does not test the OUV, authenticity and integrity of the physical property, but the relationship of the nominated entity to European history and the willingness and ability of the community to share it with other Europeans.

Compared to European Heritage, the representativeness of the World Heritage List is more detached. This is due, among other things, to the inclusion of natural heritage in the agenda. Conservationists are less shy than heritage conservationists in saying: we protect heritage for people, but we also protect it from people and in spite of people. In the history of conservation, this approach is manifested in the view that we are protecting monuments for future generations from contemporaries. However, in order to secure heritage for the future, it is necessary to negotiate with the present. The properties on the List remain in the care of contemporaries, but at the same time they fall outside their everyday lives.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Historic Centre of Kraków, one of the first twelve properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Pilgrimage Church of St. John of Nepomuk at Zelená Hora near Žďár nad Sázavou. World Heritage Site since 1994. It represents – a stylistic aberration?;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Crespi d'Adda, an industrial town from the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. World Heritage Site since 1995. It represents – premium services?;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Taj Mahal. World Heritage Site since 1983. A masterpiece;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Medina Azahara, the residential city of the Cordoba Caliphate. World Heritage Site since 2018. Destroyed and forgotten;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Jasmund National Park, island of Rügen. Part of the international World Heritage serial property since 2011;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Holašovice Historic Village . World Heritage Site since 1998. Housing inside the boundaries of the World Heritage property;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Holašovice, housing outside the boundaries of the World Heritage property;* ***Fig. 9.*** *Suzhou, Humble Administrator's Garden. Part of a serial World Heritage property since 1997. Listed under Criteria i, ii, iii, iv and v. Authenticity of matter, life… or what?;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Medina of Fez, Tanners' Quarter. World Heritage Site since 1981. Tangible and intangible in symbiosis;* ***Fig. 11.*** *Zuojiang Huashan Rock Art Cultural Landscape (South China). World Heritage Site since 2016. Does everybody recognize its OUV?;* ***Fig. 12.*** *Amphitheatre of El Jem. World Heritage Site since 1979. A monument;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Zeiselmauer, Lower Austria. Remains of a Roman fortress (Kleinkastell – burgus) on the Danube border of the empire. Part of the international World Heritage serial property since 2021. Monumentality is not a precondition for the OUV;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Stari Grad Plain, island of Hvar. World Heritage Site since 2008. Sustainability of agriculture as a part of the OUV;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Bohemian Paradise UNESCO Global Geopark, view from Prachovské skály to Trosky;* ***Fig. 16.*** *Göbekli Tepe. World Heritage Site since 2018. Archaeologists enrich the List with unexpected discoveries;* ***Fig. 17.*** *Prague, Požáry National Nature Monument with a Global Boundary Stratotype Section of the Silurian subdivisioncalled Přídolí. Part of the Barrandien National Geopark, with a strong potential of OUV;* ***Fig. 18.*** *Landscape of Gravettien hunters between Dolní Věstonice and Pavlov (pictured right). Witness to several firsts in the history of the culture (figurative pottery, textiles and perhaps also flour and wolf domestication)?;* ***Fig. 19.*** *Álvaro Siza Vieira (b. 1933), Portugal Pavilion at Expo 1998 in Lisbon. Part of the series of architect's buildings, on the Tentative List since 2017;* ***Fig. 20.*** *TheHušnjak hill in Krapina, Croatia, the richest site of skeletal remains of Neanderthal man in the world. Important part of an intended serial nomination of Neanderthal man sites;* ***Fig. 21.*** *Le Corbusier, Villa Savoye, Poissy. Contributes to the OUV of an international serial property, representing the genesis of a new architectural language and the internationalization of architecture in the 20th century. World Heritage since 2016;* ***Fig. 22.*** *Jože Plečnik, promenade around the waterfront and bridges over the Ljubljanica River. Contributes to the OUV of a national serial property, representing the functional and aesthetic rehabilitation of the existing urban fabric with an emphasis on the quality of public spaces and public buildings. World Heritage Site since 2021;* ***Fig. 23.*** *Velké Losiny, handmade paper mill. On the Tentative List since 2001;* ***Fig. 24.*** *Duszniki-Zdrój, handmade paper mill. On the Tentative List since 2019, with the declared intention to form a series of historic European paper mills;* ***Fig. 25.*** *Nikiszowiec, part of the Katowice agglomeration. Industrial district with uniform architecture and a large proportion of green space. A possible component of an international serial nomination of reform settlements in Central Europe from the turn of the 19th and 20th*

centuries; ***Fig. 26.*** *Olomouc Přemyslid Castle and Archdiocesan Museum, European Heritage from 2016. According to the European Heritage Label Panel Report of 2015, the buildings represent "a focal point of Moravian presence in European history";* ***Fig. 27.*** *The Union of Lublin (1569), European Heritage from 2015. The designation is linked to three buildings in the city of Lublin, associated with the adoption of the aforementioned act of statehood, perceived as a milestone in the history of European unification. Pictured in Lublin, a canvas quoting a scene from the painting Unia Lubelska by the Polish painter Jan Matejko;* ***Fig. 28.*** *European District of Strasbourg, European Heritage from 2016. Probably without OUV, however, certainly with the European significance;* ***Fig. 29.*** *Archaeological site of Carnuntum, Lower Austria. European Heritage from 2014, component of the International World Heritage serial property since 2021. Dual heritage conservation?;* ***Fig. 30.*** *Feroz Shah Kotla, remains of a medieval city predating present-day Delhi. It has been on the Tentative List as a component of "Delhi – a heritage city" since 2012. A source of recovery in an overpopulated and polluted city. The concept of heritage is changing: instead of "monuments", "sentimentality" and "history", it represents life, reason and hope for the future.*

World Heritage and its reconstruction: threatening authenticity or strengthening identity?

Věra KUČOVÁ; Petra KROUPOVÁ

Recent years of international cooperation in the field of World Heritage have opened up or strengthened issues related to reconstruction activities. At the same time, these are still very sensitive in terms of protecting authenticity, especially in European countries, since the adoption of the Venice Charter, which is referred to in many national methodologies. Even with the knowledge of the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity, until recently major reconstruction interventions were still seen as rather extreme or even problematic approaches in the conservation of built cultural heritage. In view of the general importance of the exchange of views, the lack of national references to international activities in this regard and, last but not least, the relevance for our heritage care in general, this article provides more detailed information on this topic. Using specific examples of World Heritage properties, it attempts to show that reconstruction in its true sense is, in certain cases, acceptable method of preserving an architectural work.

The article gives an overview of the most important international documents that have been formulated to explain the various situations that justify the reconstruction of important historical monuments. The introductory, more general part is followed by topics related to the application of the aspect of authenticity in the assessment of nominations for the World Heritage List. Some of the more substantial post-war reconstructions of historic cities destroyed in the Second World War are already part of the World Heritage List, albeit in different ways (Warsaw, Hildesheim, Le Havre). A certain milestone is the Dresden Declaration of 1982, which advocated major post-war reconstructions and opened a long phase of reconstruction of the Frauenkirche and its surrounding buildings in Dresden.

Unfortunately, armed conflicts did not end with the Second World War. The reconstruction of the historic bridge in Mostar, in the former Yugoslavia, is considered an example of an iconic reconstruction of cultural heritage destroyed by warfare in more recent history. For the local population, this form of reconstruction meant the reestablishment of damaged values, and the reconstruction of the bridge is thus linked to a national sense of revival not only of the bridge but of the national community.

The strong idea of helping to revive the nation and the local community resonates in other cases of reconstruction at World Heritage sites that are the subject of this paper. Sites such as Mosul, Palmyra, and the Bamyan Valley in Afghanistan are examples of global aid, solidarity and ultimately raise new methodological questions about the repair of damaged property and the extent to which the criterion of authenticity remains applicable to them.

The international community is also aware that monuments are not exclusively damaged as a result of armed conflict. The Riga Charter of 2000 is a document that also permits the reconstruction of monuments destroyed by the elements of nature or as a result of human activity, if the site as a whole is incomplete without such destroyed heritage. In particular, these ideas have underpinned many reconstructions in the Baltic countries. They are, for example, applicable to the recently damaged monument of Notre Dame in Paris, where its future fate is being addressed, and generally simplify the acceptance of reconstruction of monuments damaged or completely destroyed by fire or earthquake.

One of the most recent important documents, summarizing the developments to date on the subject of reconstruction and also providing the basic principles for possible reconstructions, is the Warsaw Recommendation, formulated in 2018 at a major international conference. The document very carefully balances the principles used so far in international practice, including in the care of World Heritage sites, where reconstructions are allowed only exceptionally. The document has also now become an important starting point for the work of experts and various UNESCO/ICOMOS missions in conflict zones. The Warsaw Recommendation could also be useful for national methodological discussion, since after every major disaster the legitimacy of reconstruction is often reopened in our country as well. A substantial part of this document has therefore been translated and is attached at the end of this article.

Illustrations. ***Fig. 1.*** *Square of the reconstructed Old Town of Warsaw. On the World Heritage List since 1980 precisely on the basis of respect for this post-war achievement;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Hildesheimer Dom (Cathedral of the Assumption) was almost completely destroyed in the air raid of 22 March 1945 and rebuilt with partial modifications between 1950 and 1960. Between 2010 and 2014, a thorough restoration of the cathedral took place, one of the largest ever in Germany, with partial revisions of the first phase of reconstruction;* ***Fig. 3.*** *The Michaeliskirche (St Michael's Church) of Hildesheim, was badly damaged in an air raid during World War II on 22 March 1945, reconstruction began in 1950 and was completed in 1957;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Knochenhaueramtshaus (Butchers' Guild Hall) in Hildesheim, originally built in 1529 and destroyed in 1945, reconstructed between 1987 and 1989 according to the original plans. The façade is extremely richly decorated with carvings, colorful paintings, and German proverbs;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Frauenkirche in Dresden, the church was destroyed as a result of an air raid on the city in February 1945. After the German reunification, preparations for reconstruction began, the actual reconstruction took place from 1994, finishing in 2005;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Frauenkirche in the context of the reconstructed urban structure, which took place in parallel with the church reconstruction;* ***Fig. 7.*** *The old bridge connecting the banks of the Neretva River has been a symbol of Mostar for centuries;* ***Fig. 8a–b.*** *House of the Blackheads (Schwarzhäupterhaus), on the main square, Riga. Destroyed during the bombing by German troops during World War II. The present appearance is from the 1995–1999 reconstruction, the whole (a) and a sample of the interior (b);* ***Fig. 9.*** *Model of the castle precinct at the height of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the City Museum, Vilnius;* ***Fig. 10.*** *The Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania at the time of reconstruction, Vilnius;* ***Fig. 11a–b.*** *Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, Vilnius, before t*

he completion of the reconstruction; ***Fig. 12.*** *Palmyra, general view of the site from the Arab castle. Now one of the symbols of world heritage, heavily damaged by the war of the early 21st century. Condition as of February 2005, before the outbreak of the civil war in Syria;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Aerial view showing the main landmarks, Palmyra;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Presentation of the issue at the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee in Krakow;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Hatra. Presentation of the issue at the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee in Krakow;* ***Fig. 16.*** *Sudden fire at the Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris, 15th April 2019;* ***Fig. 17a–b.*** *Presentation of the form and principles of the restoration of the Notre Dame Cathedral on a series of panels installed in December 2021 on the building's fencing. Photo of the fencing and detail of one of the panels.*

Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage versus the World Heritage Convention
Dita LIMOVÁ

The article compares two international legal instruments from the UNESCO cultural agenda – the 1972 Convention on the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. It aims to introduce readers to the practices that contribute to the identification, protection, documentation and presentation of two important segments of cultural heritage. It outlines the genesis of both legal instruments and introduces the reader to carefully formulated definitions and characteristics of immovable and intangible cultural heritage. It focuses on the differences in preservation methods between the two segments. It also introduces the reader to the key concepts of both conventions. It also describes the mechanisms created by each Convention to improve the visibility of the cultural heritage segment concerned – the prestigious cultural heritage lists – and discusses how they work.
The contribution of the article is primarily to analyse how the two legal instruments are similar, how they differ, where they complement each other, and how they contribute to a better understanding of the meaning of cultural heritage in today's world.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Indigo dyeing preparation;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Colonnade in Mariánské Lázně;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Marionette Kašpárek;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Mine Svornost in Jáchymov.*

The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Context
Pavel CABAN; Petra KROUPOVÁ

n July 2021, 11 spa towns in 7 European countries were inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List (WHL) together as new World Heritage Site under the title "Great Spa Towns of Europe". The property is composed of Františkovy Lázně, Karlovy Vary, and Mariánské Lázně in the Czech Republic, Baden bei Wien in Austria, Bad Ems, Bad Kissingen, and Baden-Baden in Germany, Spa in Belgium, Montecatini Terme in Italy, Vichy in France, and Bath in the UK. In the Czech Republic, plans to obtain World Heritage status for some spa town date back to around 2000 when Luhačovice were included on the national Tentative List because it is architecturally specific, distinct from other European spa towns and because spa phenomenon as such belonged to the under-represented type of heritage on the WHL that time. In 2008, the World Heritage Committee (WHC) postponed the evaluation of the proposal to inscribe Luhačovice and its collection of specific historic spa buildings and facilities on the UNESCO World Heritage List and requested to conduct a more thorough study of the site proposed for inscription as part of the thematic study of spa towns. In parallel, already in 2005, an idea to nominate the cities of the West Bohemian Spa Triangle was conceived.

At that time, also other European countries began to declare their interest to include their spa towns on the WHL (most actively Germany and Belgium). Starting with the first meeting of European experts on spa architecture in 2009 in Karlovy Vary, the idea of an international serial nomination of Europe's famous spa towns began to crystallize. After a conference held in Baden-Baden in 2010, the experts of the Czech Republic and leading representatives of Karlovy Vary and of this Region started to provide the coordination role of the whole project. The serial approach was, a bit surprisingly, difficult mainly from the methodological viewpoint: The representatives from the Czech Republic in the expert group emphasized the urban and architectural value, integrity and authenticity of the selected spa towns and sought a balanced European view, i.e. the inclusion of all the most valuable spa towns, while some representatives from other countries preferred both the limited number of spa towns in the emerging serial property and their international fame of the spa towns, references to their prominent spa clients and, in general, other cultural and social aspects. In 2013, the Czech Ministry of Culture assumed the main coordinating role in the nomination process, inviting the countries on whose territory the most important spa towns are located to participate, both by asking for their consent with the so far selected spa towns and by offering them the possibility to add to the existing list, that comprised already 16 towns. After a lengthy process of expert discussions and comparing characteristics of preliminary chosen spa towns, the International Steering Group decided in 2016 that 11 of them would be nominated. With participation of necessarily numerous group of both professionals, relevant mayors and newly appointed site-managers, the extensive nomination dossier was elaborated and in January submitted to the World Heritage Center. In autumn of the same year, an evaluation mission took place, which was very demanding in every respect. Later that year, it was necessary to prepare a material responsing a number of supplementary questions on topics that were insufficiently addressed in the nomination dossier. The possible inscription was to be decided by the WHC in 2020. The coronavirus pandemic also affected the World Heritage agenda, and the WHC session was finally held in July 2021 and the series of 11 spa towns got the World Heritage status, based on criteria (ii) and (iii) of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Great Spa Towns of Europe – the long road to the World Heritage List
Karel KUČA

In July 2021, 11 spa towns in 7 European countries were inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List (WHL) together as new World Heritage Site under the title "Great Spa Towns of Europe". The property is composed of Františkovy Lázně, Karlovy Vary, and Mariánské Lázně in the Czech Republic, Baden bei Wien in Austria, Bad Ems, Bad Kissingen, and Baden-Baden in Germany, Spa in Belgium, Montecatini Terme in Italy, Vichy in France, and Bath in the UK. In the Czech Republic, plans to obtain World Heritage status for some spa town date back to around 2000 when Luhačovice were included on the national Tentative List because it is architecturally specific, distinct from other European spa towns and because spa phenomenon as such belonged to the under-represented type of heritage on the WHL

that time. In 2008, the World Heritage Committee (WHC) postponed the evaluation of the proposal to inscribe Luhačovice and its collection of specific historic spa buildings and facilities on the UNESCO World Heritage List and requested to conduct a more thorough study of the site proposed for inscription as part of the thematic study of spa towns. In parallel, already in 2005, an idea to nominate the cities of the West Bohemian Spa Triangle was conceived.

At that time, also other European countries began to declare their interest to include their spa towns on the WHL (most actively Germany and Belgium). Starting with the first meeting of European experts on spa architecture in 2009 in Karlovy Vary, the idea of an international serial nomination of Europe's famous spa towns began to crystallize. After a conference held in Baden-Baden in 2010, the experts of the Czech Republic and leading representatives of Karlovy Vary and of this Region started to provide the coordination role of the whole project. The serial approach was, a bit surprisingly, difficult mainly from the methodological viewpoint: The representatives from the Czech Republic in the expert group emphasized the urban and architectural value, integrity and authenticity of the selected spa towns and sought a balanced European view, i.e. the inclusion of all the most valuable spa towns, while some representatives from other countries preferred both the limited number of spa towns in the emerging serial property and their international fame of the spa towns, references to their prominent spa clients and, in general, other cultural and social aspects. In 2013, the Czech Ministry of Culture assumed the main coordinating role in the nomination process, inviting the countries on whose territory the most important spa towns are located to participate, both by asking for their consent with the so far selected spa towns and by offering them the possibility to add to the existing list, that comprised already 16 towns. After a lengthy process of expert discussions and comparing characteristics of preliminary chosen spa towns, the International Steering Group decided in 2016 that 11 of them would be nominated. With participation of necessarily numerous group of both professionals, relevant mayors and newly appointed site-managers, the extensive nomination dossier was elaborated and in January submitted to the World Heritage Center. In autumn of the same year, an evaluation mission took place, which was very demanding in every respect. Later that year, it was necessary to prepare a material responsing a number of supplementary questions on topics that were insufficiently addressed in the nomination dossier. The possible inscription was to be decided by the WHC in 2020. The coronavirus pandemic also affected the World Heritage agenda, and the WHC session was finally held in July 2021 and the series of 11 spa towns got the World Heritage status, based on criteria (ii) and (iii) of Outstanding Universal Value.

Illustrations. ***Fig. 1.*** *Map of the serial World Heritage Site Great Spa Towns of Europe;* ***Fig. 2.*** *The hall of the Postal Court in Karlovy Vary prepared for the first meeting of European experts on spa issues on 9th October 2009;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Participants of the International Expert Group (IEG) shortly after its official establishment on a tour of Mariánské Lázně in 2011. On the left (in a white shirt) Secretary General of the whole project, architect Paul Simons, on the right (in a hat) then President of the Czech National Committee of ICOMOS Josef Štulc;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Members of the IEG getting acquainted with the city of Bath during their meeting in June 2012;* ***Fig.5.*** *Members of the IEG at the meeting in Montecatini Terme in November 2012;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Christopher Pound and Volkmar Eidloth at the IEG meeting in Luhačovice in May 2013;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Members of the succeeding International Working Group discussing the concept of boundaries and maps for the common nomination documentation at the meeting in Mainz in October 2016;* ***Fig. 8.*** *ICOMOS evaluation mission in September 2019 in Františkovy Lázně. Lubomír Zeman explains the history of this spa town to expert Tamás Fejérdy.*

The Great Spa Towns of Europe as an urban phenomenon

Karel KUČA

The Great Spa Towns of Europe, i.e. 11 spa towns in 7 European countries, as a whole most effectively document the heritage of the European spa phenomenon, which has many dimensions – architectural, urban, landscape, but also social and cultural – not to mention balneology as such. The most striking aspect of European spa culture of this era is the combination of multi-weekly therapeutic use of water with opportunities for distraction and social events and physical exertion. It was this that led to the development of the famous spa towns into an urban phenomenon of their own, with the most successful ones incorporating purposefully reshaped or entirely new landscapes.

Before the 18th century, spa towns were no different from other towns, and spa treatment buildings were no different from ordinary cleansing baths. There were only a few exceptions where the spa was more prominent in the urban fabric of the city. One of these is Bath, where even in the 16th century there were open thermal pools with enclosures within the walled city. The transformation of the older "spa town" into a spa town in the 18th–20th centuries was significantly influenced by the location of mineral springs, which often originated outside the urban core. As a result, new spa districts with parks were mostly built in the vicinity of the old town (Vichy, Baden, Bad Kissingen). There are only two cases where the transformation into a famous spa took place right in the old town: Karlovy Vary and Bad Ems. The cramped valley location gave them no other option. Both towns were founded at the springs as spa towns, so it was very much a continuous development.

There are very few spa towns newly founded at the height of the European spa industry that were able to compete with the previously established destinations. Mariánské Lázně, together with Františkovy Lázně, is the only case in the spa series where a new spa town was founded "on a green field" at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, without any connection to any older settlement. Both towns were built according to a clear urban concept, which from the outset envisaged a fundamental compositional and functional role for the spa park. In addition, both towns have extensive spa landscapes. The urban phenomenon of the spa towns of Europe is therefore most clearly expressed in these two cities. Montecatini Terme, which was founded in the last quarter of the 18th century as a small spa village, also belongs to this pair, and a century later experienced a turbulent urban development that threatened to overlay the spa industry with other functions. The imaginary line of development that began in Bath is coming to a close here after more than two hundred years. The famous spa towns of Europe thus represent both the full typological range of mineral spring-based spas and the whole period in which this form of treatment and social life associated with a stay in a spa environment developed. Even today, spa stays ("taking a cure") or just visits to these places retain a very specific genius loci, continuing to transport their guests back to the height of their glory and allowing them to use their beauty and carefully maintained spa infrastructure to continue their authentic function of healing the body and soul.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Baden, staircase in the Spa Park (Kurpark);* ***Fig. 2.*** *Baden, Josefsbad;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Baden, Spa building;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Baden, Municipal Theater;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Spa, view from Les Thermes de Spa of the town in the valley and the opposite slope with the springs;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Spa, square (Rue Rogier) dominated by the pavilion of the Peter the Great spring (Pouhon Pierre-le-Grand);* ***Fig. 7.*** *Spa, Waux-Hall, the oldest surviving casino building in Europe;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Spa, Old Baths (Bains);* ***Fig. 9.*** *Spa, colonnade Gallery Leopold II in the Parc de 7 Heures;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Spa, Casino de Spa;* ***Fig. 11.*** *Vichy, orthophotographic view of the city;* ***Fig. 12.*** *Vichy, Opéra de Vichy, view from the Parc des Sources;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Vichy, Grande Grille and Chomel Hall of the Springs at the northern end of the Parc des Sources;* ***Fig. 14.*** *1st class spa (now Center thermal des Dômes) with its dome;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Vichy, colonnade and La Rotonde pavilion at the eastern end of the Parc des Sources;* ***Fig. 16.*** *Vichy, Pavillon de la Source des Célestins;* ***Fig. 17.*** *Bad Ems, view from the Kurbrücke Bridge looking west towards the spa center, with the Quellenturm on the left and the spa's building on the right;* ***Fig. 18.*** *Bad Ems, waterfront with the dominant feature of the spa building with ballroom, casino and theatre as seen from the southwest;* ***Fig. 19.*** *Bad Ems, spa building;* ***Fig. 20.*** *Bad Ems, interior of the spa building;* ***Fig. 21.*** *Baden-Baden, spa building from the east;* ***Fig. 22.*** *Baden-Baden, drinking hall;* ***Fig. 23.*** *Baden-Baden, Friedrichsbad, south front; Fig.* ***24.*** *Baden-Baden, luxury palace villas in the park strip by the Oos River southwest of the Evangelical church (Evangelische Stadtkirche);* ***Fig. 25.*** *Baden-Baden, the new Augustaplatz square dominated by the Evangelical Church;* ***Fig. 26.*** *Bad Kissingen, the spa social building called Arkadenbau;* ***Fig. 27.*** *Bad Kissingen, the Wandelhalle;* ***Fig. 28.*** *Bad Kissingen, the southern part of the Luitpoldbad;* ***Fig. 29.*** *Bad Kissingen, northern part of the Luitpoldbad;* ***Fig. 30.*** *Montecatini Terme, view of the old town of Montecatini Alto;* ***Fig. 31.*** *Montecatini Terme, Grand Hotel Plazza in the main square;* ***Fig. 32.*** *Montecatini Terme, view of the southern part of Terme Tettucio from the east;* ***Fig. 33.*** *Montecatini Terme, Terme Toretta;* ***Fig. 34.*** *Montecatini Terme, main courtyard of Terme Tettucio;* ***Fig. 35.*** *Bath, orthophotographic view of the north-western part of the city;* ***Fig. 36.*** *Bath, Great Bath Pool in the grounds of King's Bath, with Bath Abbey in the background;* ***Fig. 37.*** *Bath, King's Bath and The Grand Pump Rooms drinking hall;* ***Fig. 38.*** *Bath, Bath Street colonnade, looking towards Cross Bath;* ***Fig. 39.*** *Bath, Royal Crescent;* ***Fig. 40.*** *Bath, The Circus;* ***Fig. 41.*** *Bath, Palladian Bridge in Prior Park;* ***Fig. 42.*** *Bath, Pulteney Bridge;* ***Fig. 43.*** *Karlovy Vary, spa town center dominated by the Imperial Hotel (far right, Pupp Hotel) as seen from the Peter the Great Lookout. Condition before the completion of Theatre Square;* ***Fig. 44.*** *Karlovy Vary, outlet of the hot water of the Vřídlo into the Teplá River, on the right the Vřídelní Colonnade, on the left the Church of St. Mary Magdalene;* ***Fig. 45.*** *Karlovy Vary, timber Market Colonnade and the Castle Tower;* ***Fig. 46.*** *Karlovy Vary, the gloriette of Dorothea Kuronska;* ***Fig. 47.*** *Karlovy Vary, Mill Colonnade;* ***Fig. 48.*** *Karlovy Vary, Park Colonnade;* ***Fig. 49.*** *Karlovy Vary, the Russian Orthodox Church of St Peter and Paul;* ***Fig. 50.*** *Karlovy Vary, Imperial Baths;* ***Fig. 51.*** *Karlovy Vary, the splendid villas Trocnov and Ritter in the Westend residential area;* ***Fig. 52.*** *Františkovy Lázně, the Social House;* ***Fig. 53.*** *Františkovy Lázně, an orthophotographic view of the town;* ***Fig. 54.*** *Františkovy Lázně, the colonnade of the Salt and Meadow Spring;* ***Fig. 55.*** *Františkovy Lázně, the Imperial Baths;* ***Fig. 56.*** *Františkovy Lázně, František Spring and Gas Bath with the New Colonnade;* ***Fig. 57.*** *Františkovy Lázně, Francouzská Street development on the northern perimeter of the City Park;* ***Fig. 58.*** *Františkovy Lázně, the Hall of Glauber's springs;* ***Fig. 59.*** *Mariánské Lázně, orthophotographic view of the town;* ***Fig. 60.*** *Mariánské Lázně, hall of the Cross Spring;* ***Fig. 61.*** *Mariánské Lázně, Maxim Gorky Colonnade;* ***Fig. 62.*** *Mariánské Lázně, Colonnade of the Caroline and Rudolf Spring and the Church of the Assumption;* ***Fig. 63.*** *Mariánské Lázně, Václav Skalník Gardens with the New Spa and Casino;* ***Fig. 64.*** *Mariánské Lázně, eastern part of Goethe Square;* ***Fig. 65.*** *Mariánské Lázně, Ferdinand's Spring Colonnade.*

New findings on Jáchymov mining water management

Ondřej MALINA; Michal URBAN

Jáchymov mining water management has always been rather marginal for mountain historians. Yet it is a crucial part of local mining practice, without which none of the larger mines could have operated from the 16th to the end of the 19th century. Water, as a basic and irreplaceable source of energy in the conditions of the Middle Ages and the modern era, largely determined the economic and mining-technical possibilities of entire mines. Despite the great emphasis on the construction of waterworks known from many places, the Jáchymov district is probably one of the most significant representatives of mining water management systems in the Czech Republic. A significant advantage of the Jáchymov district is its significant elevation gradient. Combined with the accumulation of technical knowledge, the conditions for the creation of extensive engineering works, often across several valleys, were created here. The combination of ditches on steep slopes and the routing of water conduits through the hilltops by means of galleries creates a unique combination and a showcase of the technical skill of several centuries. The advantage of the Jáchymov mountain landscape is also its limited accessibility and minimally invasive agricultural use. The destructive factor here is represented more or less only by intensive forestry, which is capable of significantly disturbing the terrain with the use of heavy machinery. The rugged nature of the Jáchymov surroundings has limited forestry, which is why there are unique remains of waterworks in many places, which can only now be comprehensively assessed for the first time, with the availability of very accurate terrain relief maps created from airborne laser scanning (ALS or LiDAR) data. On the basis of this data and field survey, it has now been established that the remains of at least 14 water ditches can be recognized in the terrain, mainly concentrated around the Svornost, High Fir, Eliáš, and Helena Huber/Josef mines, with hundreds of meters of additional waterways being excavated underground. The total length of the water ditches reaches almost 22 km, making the Jáchymov mine water management system one of the most extensive systems of its kind in the Ore Mountains. The construction of the Jáchymov mine water management system took place over more than three centuries, during which it was concentrated in three main periods. The first is the initial phase of rapid development in the 16th century, and the second is the period of state interest in the development of mining from the mid-18th century to the early 19th century. The last is related to the technological development and modernization of the Svornost and Werner mines. The monumental value of the reported works lies both in the individual significance of the surviving parts and in the connection of most of the ditches into significant units. From a technological point of view, it is possible to determine which works were linked to each other and thus created the preconditions for the existence of more significant systems or interconnected mining enterprises. A significant part of the described waterworks belonged to the Svornost mine and can therefore be understood as a single unit. Its value can then be inferred not only from the individual parts, but also indirectly from the proven link to the undoubted historical significance of what is probably the most important mining enterprise in Jáchymov.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Jáchymov in a photograph from 1927. The horizontal line of trees at the top of the photo-*

graph marks the course of the Türkner Graben, one of the most important water intakes in the Jáchymov district; ***Fig. 2.*** *Jáchymov, the interface of the Eliáš, Jáchymov, and Stísněný streams, sample map output from LLS data analysis, with the course of ditches 7, 14, and 10 highlighted in blue, and just below it, No. 8, Seidl Pond highlighted, and the Town Pond highlighted in light blue;* ***Fig. 3.*** *The Ehrenfriedersdorf pump, a piston-operated water-engine that also found wide use in Jáchymov;* ***Fig. 4.*** *The upper and lower extraction gates of the Svornost ("Prems") mine, powered by water from the Türkner Graben ditch, on a map from 1776;* ***Fig. 5.*** *The Eliáš Mine, pictured in 1908, when it was no longer in operation. The large brick waterwheel chamber was located behind the annex in the foreground on the left side of the building;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Heinz pond with the Eduard uranium mine tailings in the background;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Heinz pond culvert after the 2018 modification;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Grapelhauer Graben ditch (ditch No. 2);* ***Fig. 9.*** *The Fanggraben ditch (ditch No. 3);* ***Fig. 10.*** *The ditch from Heinz Pond to the Wassereinlass Stolln (ditch No. 4);* ***Fig. 11.*** *The stone lining of the ditch (No. 4) from Heinz Pond to the Wassereinlass Stolln adit;* ***Fig. 12.*** *Water ditch from Albrecht adit to Svornost mine, stone reinforcement preserved just below the surface (ditch No. 5);* ***Fig. 13.*** *The Svornost mine site with the building of the former processing plant in the foreground;* ***Fig. 14.*** *The road in the former water ditch between the Svornost and Josef mines (ditch No. 6), along the route of which the horse-drawn cart transported tailings from the Svornost mine in the second half of the 19th century;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Plattner Graben water ditch (ditch No. 7);* ***Fig. 16.*** *Seidl's pond;* ***Fig. 17.*** *Seidl's pond culvert;* ***Fig. 18.*** *Wasserlauf adit portal;* ***Fig. 19.*** *The mouth of the Wasserlauf ("alter Wasserstolln") is drawn in the top center;* ***Fig. 20.*** *Route of the water ditch to the Gegenbau adit (ditch No. 10);* ***Fig. 21a–b.*** *Upper Ditch No. 11 (a) and Lower Ditch No. 12 (b) at the Eva Apfelbaum Mine;* ***Fig. 22.*** *Ditch No. 14 in the eastern part above the Municipal Pond;* ***Fig. 23.*** *Summary map of the identified water ditches in the Jáchymov district and associated waterworks;* ***Tab. 1.*** *Overview of the preserved ditches of the Jáchymov mining district;* ***Fig. 24.*** *Ideal elevation diagram of the waterworks with reference to the Svornost Mine. Cross-section with the profiles of ditches and main streams of the Jáchymov district, lengths truncated 10 times, terrain profiles above water adits indicated in grey. See table for ditch numbers. Supplemented by the main water wheels and pumps for pumping mine water and ore processing (risers), I – Rovnost mine, II – riser at Svornost mine, III – Horní Svornost, IV – Svornost, V – Josef mine, VI – Barbora adit, VII – Daniel adit. Selected water management adits: A – Wassereinlass, B – Albrecht, C – Barbora, D – Daniel, E – New water supply, F – Dürrenschönberger / Gegenbau, G – Wasserlauf.*

The Jizera Mountains Beech Forests became the first natural UNESCO World Heritage Site in the Czech Republic

Jan PLESNÍK

Since July 2021, the Jizerskohorské bučiny/ /Jizera Mountains Beech Forest National Nature Reserve has been the UNESCO World Heritage Site (WHS) becoming a new component of the serial WHS Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe. The very first natural WHS in the Czech Republic is located in the country's northern part (Liberec Region, northern Bohemia), close to the Czech-Polish border. The Jizerskohorské bučiny/Jizera Mountains Beech Forest National Nature Reserve (NNR) harbours the largest continuous European beech (Fagus sylvatica) forest in the whole Czech Highlands. The NNR is the most strictly protected category of the Specially Protected Areas in the Czech Republic. In 1999 the Jizerskohorské hory/Jizera Mountains Beech Forest NNR (9.5 km^2) was established by merging 7 small--size Specially Protected Areas into a single one, now consisting of six segments. In addition, it is a part of the Jizerské hory/Jizera Mts. Protected Landscape Area Zone I and of the EU Natura 2000 network. By 1960, only selective logging was applied there because due to geomorphological conditions, the terrain is permeable only with huge difficulties in some parts of the NNR. Moreover, since 1960, the core area has not been managed, having been left to spontaneous development. The WHS property and its protection buffer sub-zone cover the largest NNR segment. The NNR's buffer zone (17.5 km^2) surrounding all the six core areas has been slightly managed, e.g. by selective logging since that time. It forms, together with other five core areas, the WHS landscape conservation buffer sub-zone.

The Jizerskohorské bučiny/Jizera Mountains Beech Forest displays a huge variety of old--growth characteristics which is consistent with previously reported studies on primary old--growth forests that have never been managed or have been unmanaged for even longer time periods. It has developed, contrary to other sites in the Subatlantic-Hercynic Beech Forest Region, on granites and granodiorite. This fact has significantly influenced the unique patterns in fungi, plant and animal communities (species composition, community structure, functionality, etc.) and their natural habitats. The site shows very rich geomorphology with a high concentration of rock formations, particularly within the top parts of mountain ranges. The NNR's Management Plan for 2021–2030 tries to maintain and enhance exceptionally valuable natural ecological and evolutionary processes there.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Map of the National Nature Reserve (NPR) Jizerskohorské bučiny with the UNECO Natural World Heritage Site marked;* ***Fig. 2.*** *The Jizera Mountains Beech Forests protect the unique beech forests on the northern slopes of the Jizera Mountains, left to develop spontaneously for more than 60 years;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Information panels draw visitors' attention to the truly transnational importance of the Jizera Mountains Beech Forests;* ***Fig. 4.*** *View from Paličník of the vast beech complex continuing to the northern slopes of the Jizera Mountains;* ***Fig. 5.*** *The Jizera Mountains Beech Forests are also characterized by significant geomorphological formations;* ***Fig. 6.*** *The Jizera Mountains Beech Forests show all the characteristics of an extremely valuable long--lived forest;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Acidophilous, flowery and mountain maple beeches and debris forests cover 94.5 % of the Jizera Mountains Beeches;* ***Fig. 8.*** *In the Jizera Mountains Beech Forests this smaller owl nests in natural tree cavities as well as in hanging boxes;* ***Fig. 9.*** *The most interesting bird species nesting in the Jizera Mountains Beech Forests include the legally protected black stork (Ciconia nigra);* ***Fig. 10.*** *Rock viewpoints approach the beech forests in several places and the rocks are also popular tourist destinations;* ***Fig. 11.*** *The Jizera Mountains are also characterized by boulder streams with rapids and waterfalls;* ***Fig. 12.*** *The Jizera Mountains Beech Forests represent the largest complex of beech-dominated forests in Bohemia;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Frýdlantské cimbuří and Polední zub rock formations in winter;* ***Fig. 14.*** *View of the Jizera Mountains towards the Polish border: chimneys of Polish power plants in the background;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Logo World Heritage Beech Forests;* ***Fig. 16.*** *Map of Europe showing beech forests, of which 51 sites are now inscribed on the World Heritage List Longleaf beech forests and forests of the Carpathian Mountains and other areas of Europe.*

Žatecko, the Saaz region – New landscape heritage zone "Saaz hop-growing landscape"

Lucie RADOVÁ

The Saaz (Žatec) Hop-growing Landscape, designated in 2021, is so far the only landscape conservation zone for which the predominant use is agricultural. The LCZ occupies the area between the villages of Stekník, Zálužice, and Trnovany (Louny district), which has unique natural conditions for hop growing – it lies in the rain shadow of the Ore Mountains, the regularly flooded riverbed of the Blšanka and Ohře rivers has high-quality

alluvial soils, and its ridge protects the area from the north and northeast from unwanted air currents. Thanks to these conditions, the local hop-growing areas have long been regarded as among the best in the country, and the continuity of hop-growing has been proven since the early modern period. A characteristic feature of this landscape is the existence of large areas of monoculture, the form of which was fundamentally influenced by the social developments of the second half of the 20th century. The conservation area also includes two historic villages, Stekník and Trnovany, which provide the necessary technological facilities for processing the hops grown. Their buildings therefore include relatively large farm buildings on whose soils hops were naturally dried in the earlier period. In the context of the great development of hop-growing, major technological innovations took place at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, resulting in the expansion of the so-called hop kilns; these buildings are also present (often in a very representative form) in both villages.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *View of the central part of the Saaz hop-growing landscape, on the right the village of Stekník;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Northern part of the Saaz hop-growing landscape, with the Bohemian Central Highlands in the background;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Southern part of the Saaz hop--growing landscape with the village of Trnovany;* ***Fig. 4.*** *The riverbed of the Blšanka River with hop farms;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Hop farms in the central part of the Saaz hop--growing landscape;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Bridge over the Ohře River and the Blšanka River;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Řopík in the central part of the Saaz hop-growing landscape;* ***Fig. 8.*** *View of the village of Stekník;* ***Fig. 9.*** *View of the castle in Stekník, above with the modern buildings of the village;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Stekník, development along the north side of the village square;* ***Fig. 11.*** *Stekník, development in the southwestern part of the village square;* ***Fig. 12.*** *Stekník, gate of farmstead No. 15;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Trnovany, drying room in farmstead No. 9;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Trnovany, drying room in farmstead No. 8;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Stekník on the Imperial obligatory prints of the stable cadastre, 1843;* ***Fig. 16.*** *Trnovany on the Imperial obligatory prints of the stable cadastre, 1843;* ***Fig. 17.*** *Map with marked area of Saaz hop-growing landscape.*

K

utná Hora – the golden era of the silver city
Aleš POSPÍŠIL

The article describes the developments in the World Heritage Site of Kutná Hora in the last decade (2011–2021) and follows up on a similarly focused article published by the author on the pages of this magazine in 2011. As recently as the 1960s, Kutná Hora was characterized by experts as the most structurally endangered town in Czecho--slovakia, but after 1989 political changes brought about a fundamental change in the approach to this unique complex. The imaginary "golden era" of the restoration of the historic city center began with the first decade of the 21st century, when most of the most important monuments were surrounded by scaffolding, and movement through the city was made more difficult between piles of paving stone for the new pavement. And this extraordinary period continued in the following decade (2011–2021), as this paper aims to show. In the introductory part, the author discusses the specific panorama of the city, characterized by the arrangement of the most important landmarks in a single line on the edge of the terrain break above the Vrchlice river, and describes in detail the restoration actions of each of the buildings in the last ten years. Subsequent sections in the same sense deal with the restoration of the urban space and housing development, the buildings of the former Cistercian monastery in the suburb of Sedlec, the restoration of the Dačický House, which houses the local Foundation Kutná Hora – a UNESCO World Heritage Site and operates an exhibition on World Heritage Sites, the only one of its kind in the Czech Republic, or separately the monitoring and concept of protection of the UNESCO property. The author concludes by recapitulating the reasons why he considers the defined period to be a continuation of the "golden era" of the restoration of the Kutná Hora heritage fund, which started in the first decade of the 21st century. Firstly, it was the owners or administrators of the monuments who, through their enthusiasm and diligence, started to prepare the actions and then, during the implementation, deservedly enjoyed the well-done work of the designers, construction companies and restorers. Secondly, it was their own sources of funding or the possibility of obtaining funds from a number of subsidy programs, such as the titles of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic, the Central Bohemian Region, the City of Kutná Hora and the European Union Structural Funds. Thirdly, it was the unusually strong interest of tourists, which is certainly closely related to the financing of property repairs and which culminated in 2019, with the Sedlec ossuary reaching the remarkable half a million visitors in that year. Finally, the author summarizes the financial resources spent in the period 2011–2021 on the restoration of the monuments of Kutná Hora and Sedlec and arrives at the figure of two billion Czech crowns.

The grounds of the Pilgrimage Church of St. John of Nepomuk on Zelená hora – 50 years of conservation
Zdeněk CHUDÁREK

It was only thanks to the increased interest in the work of the architect Jan Santini in the 1960s that state institutions began to prepare the restoration of the church. Since the early 1970s, the restoration of the pilgrimage site has been financed exclusively by state subsidy programs and special state contributions. In 1973, the replacement of the tin roofing began, and the subsequent restoration of the facades extended until 1981. Particular attention was paid to the conservation and addition of all the plastic elements of the facades. In 1994, the site was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List and a year later the Zelená hora complex was declared a national cultural monument. With the new status of the Zelená hora monument, the restoration works gained momentum thanks to the high financial subsidy from the state budget, which enabled the comprehensive monumental restoration of the ambit. Particular attention was paid to research and documentation activities. The survey also confirmed that the plaster facade of the ambit was never completed according to Santini's authorial plan. This finding had a major influence on the determination of the conservation concept for the repair of the facades of the ambit. In the interiors of the ambit, the author's plaster with stucco decoration was completed, unlike the facades. However, it has almost completely disappeared, especially in

the corridor sections. In view of the chosen method of restoration of the facades, a conservation method was adopted in the interiors of the ambit. The stucco star decoration was added only in the best preserved west gate and the adjacent chapel. In 2001, the restoration of the interior of the church began. In view of its importance, high demands were placed on research, project preparation and methodological decisions. In 2001 and 2003, the torso of the original pavement and its later additions were repaired in a rigorous conservation method. In 2004, a scaffold was erected to survey and repair the plasterwork of the dome of the nave of the church. Beneath the 19th century plaster, the presumed torso of the original decoration of the dome was found, namely traces of the severed ribs of the plastic star and the torso of the painting of the rays. The extent of the findings led to the reconstruction of the original stucco pattern and painting (completed 2008). In 2014, the grounds of the pilgrimage church returned to the ownership of the Roman Catholic Church after 61 years. New electrical wiring was installed, including the distribution of security systems. In late 2016, the parish received a grant to restore the fa_ade and complete the interior of the church, focusing on the furnishings and paving on the ground floor. In accordance with the new methodological approach to the restoration of the church interior, the approach to the plasterwork of the vaults of the four anterooms was further reassessed, where the original stucco pattern was reconstructed. In the interior of the church, the long-delayed restoration of the altars was carried out. The expected discovery of the original polychromes was confirmed. In 2016, work began on the reconstruction of the original pavement on the ground floor of the church. However, technological issues related to the production of copies of the tiles remained a problem. These were answered only in 2020, and a year later the completed paving was laid. In the course of the restoration of the interior of the church between 2001 and 2021, there was a substantial change in conceptual approach from strictly conservation repairs to reconstruction steps based on objective knowledge. The restoration of the facades and plastering of the interior of the ambo, which began in 2022, is largely influenced by the methodological approach of recent years.

15 years of the Support Program for World Heritage Sites

Jiří VAJČNER; Monika ERETOVÁ; Markéta MEISEROVÁ

One of the many subsidy and contribution programs at the disposal of the Ministry of Culture is the Program of Support for World Heritage Sites. The Program has been announced annually since 2008. The purpose of its establishment was to fulfil the obligations arising from the adoption of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and to ensure support for the monuments of the Czech Republic inscribed on the World Heritage List (hereinafter referred to as the List) and support for monuments for which a proposal for nomination to the List (National Indicative List) has been or will be submitted. Eligible applicants for the program are legal and natural persons, except for contributory organizations established by the Ministry of Culture. Applicants must aim their project submission at one of the three priorities of the program, which are: 1) creation and updating of management plans and nomination documents, 2) scientific research projects and 3) presentation and education projects. All priorities must develop the value of the property for which it has been inscribed or nominated to the World Heritage List. Specific outputs supported by the grant program include management plans, nomination documents and their translations, structural and historical and other surveys and documentation, specialist and popular science publications, lectures, conferences, exhibitions, web presentations, etc. A total of 621 applications were received in the history of the program, of which 394 projects were supported for a total amount of CZK 98,726,077. The program most often has a budget of CZK 6 million. This does not cover the total amount requested by project promoters. Most projects are supported with an amount between CZK 100,000 and CZK 250,000. CZK. The grant from the World Heritage Sites Support Program can cover up to 70 % of the total project costs.

Announced annually since 2008. The purpose of its establishment was to fulfil the obligations arising from the adoption of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and to ensure support for the monuments of the Czech Republic inscribed on the World Heritage List (hereinafter referred to as the List) and support for monuments for which a proposal for nomination to the List (National Indicative List) has been or will be submitted. Eligible applicants for the program are legal and natural persons, except for contributory organizations established by the Ministry of Culture. Applicants must aim their project submission at one of the three priorities of the program, which are: 1) creation and updating of management plans and nomination documents, 2) scientific research projects and 3) presentation and education projects. All priorities must develop the value of the property for which it has been inscribed or nominated to the World Heritage List. Specific outputs supported by the grant program include management plans, nomination documents and their translations, structural and historical and other surveys and documentation, specialist and popular science publications, lectures, conferences, exhibitions, web presentations, etc. A total of 621 applications were received in the history of the program, of which 394 projects were supported for a total amount of CZK 98,726,077. The program most often has a budget of CZK 6 million. This does not cover the total amount requested by project promoters. Most projects are supported with an amount between CZK 100,000 and CZK 250,000. CZK. The grant from the World Heritage Sites Support Program can cover up to 70 % of the total project costs.