

REACTIONS TO THE 1975 EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE YEAR – THE CASE OF SOCIALIST CROATIA

Marko Špikić

ABSTRACT At the time of the initiative to celebrate 1975 as *European Architectural Heritage Year* (EAHY 1975), Croatia was a part of a socialist state. Not belonging to either of the political blocs separated by the Berlin Wall, and as a unit of a non-aligned Yugoslavia, Croatia's conservation system was both politically influenced by the rhetoric of leaders in a decadent state, and open to the messages of the changing Europe. This paper deals with the reception of the European Council's initiative in such a political constellation. Reactions in this country may seem belated, full of concern, even of desperation due to the actual situation on the field, but it included values and aims of the 1970s conservation community: social inclusion in professional issues, invention of new historic monuments and rediscovery of historic centers as sources of new appreciation and inspiration. To have a clearer picture of the liminal position of Croatia (bearing in mind the artificial independence of the Republic in the Yugoslav Federation, official fidelity to the communist system and intimate belief in emancipation and democratization, as well as its constant European, or Western perspectives), the paper focuses on the genesis of discussions in the mid-1970s, its central issues and results.

1. CROATIAN CONSERVATION SYSTEM AND POLICY UNTIL THE 1970s

When the conservation community began to talk about the EAHY 1975, the Croatian conservation system was at its peak. As a socialist republic within Yugoslavia, Croatia was one of the six components of the federal state. This made it possible for Croatia to build the most ambitiously ordered system of monument protection until that time, with four regional and several local conservation centers. It was supported by legislation, trained personnel, quality publications and professional associations. The profession had changed significantly between 1945 and 1970: the concept of conservation was abandoned and interventionist methods of restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpolation were adopted.

Whilst dealing with the inevitable presence of politics in the Croatian conservation of the time, one should take into account the specificity of the Yugoslav model. Tito's influence on conservation issues cannot be compared to Ulbricht's interference in the planning of destroyed cities of GDR or Gomulka's opposition to the reconstruction of the Warsaw Royal Castle. Tito focused on the role of 'acceptable' parts of the past, and expressed trust in professionals responsible for the creation of a new perception of cultural heritage. Admittedly, he did use phrases like 'forgery' and 'cleaning our history of unnecessary impurities', but there is no indication that he interfered in specific conservation problems.

As a result, by the beginning of the 1970s Croatian conservators had reached an agreement between the 'traditionalists' favoring the slogan *Conserve, not restore*, and the 'interventionists' who were more inclined to accept Zachwatowicz and Gazzola's reconstructive principle and Zevi and Perret's conviction that a modernist city can replace destroyed parts or the whole of the historic town. Thus the conservators at the time of the persecution of prelates and the setting up of new historiographic interpretations of the

Venetian and Habsburg administrations re-evaluated their contribution, and by the late 1940s architect Harold Bilinić reconstructed the bombed cathedral in Senj and the sacristy of the cathedral and the town loggia in Šibenik dating from the time of the Venetian rule. On the other hand, modernist architects designed interpolations (Ivan Vitić in Šibenik) or completely redesigned entire towns (Bruno Milić and his colleagues in the bombed Zadar).

Because of the post-war reprisals, forced migration, and nationalization, Croatian conservators were able to redefine historic towns. The new *polis* was therefore not surrendered to politicians who, as was the case in the two Germanys, would pose with urban planners and their city models. As an art historian, Cvito Fisković had the power to decide what will be preserved, removed or reconstructed in the Dalmatian towns after 1945, and already at the beginning of the 1960s conservator Marija Baltić protected the center of Croatia's capital after the architectural competition in late 1950s, according to which the 'Austrian Zagreb' was to be replaced by large sections of modernist buildings.

Despite the strengthening of the conservation system and engagement of its leading figures after 1945, the public was largely disinterested. As early as the 1950s conservators complained that the citizens of the new state did not care about the environments from which they came or into which they had moved after the death or emigration of previous inhabitants (Jews, Germans or Italians). Part of the political narrative in the work of the conservation movement after 1945 was the myth of the participation of the community in the socialist model of governance. This represented a direct link between the ideologues of the self-governing socialism (Tito, Boris Kidrič and Edvard Kardelj) and the President of the *Federal Institute for Protection of Monuments* Vlado Mađarić, who tried to operationalize the political metalanguage in the practice of conservation (Mađarić 1953–1954, 12). We can conclude that the Yugoslav political system in its rhetoric favored the inclusion of the population in decision-making process as a constituent part of the self-governing socialist model, and this was supposed to be applied in conservation issues as early as 1950s, but this didn't work. This fact is important for the understanding of successes and failures in the 1970s when, following the projects in the heart of Bologna, the role of collective memory and participation became one of the recipes or narratives for successful treatment of abandoned centers of Europe's historic towns.

2. RES PUBLICA? ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICIANS, CONSERVATORS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC IN THE EARLY 1970s

In Croatia during the 1960s the problem of national identity, which was thought to have been resolved in 1945, was raised. In the late 1960s, the movement grew from a cultural into a volatile political movement, and is remembered as the *Croatian Spring* or the *Mass Movement*. Interestingly, the questions of identity and cultural specificity of the Croats in the federation were not linked to the perception of architectural heritage. However, the enthusiasm that ended with Tito crushing the movement in the autumn of 1971 and the twenty-year 'apathy' (Goldstein 1999, 183) can be interesting for a discussion about the efforts of conservators to engage the public in their work. Tito's interpretation of dialectical materialism led to the idea that to an obedient citizen the spirituality of the past should become irrelevant in relation to the materialism represented by a sufficiently spacious home in a concrete skyscraper.

Life, of course, did not stop in 1971. In the following years large new housing developments were built (New Zagreb, Split 3), huge industrial complexes and tourist architecture appeared in previously well-preserved landscapes of the Adriatic coast, but historical towns continued to be neglected. Conservation thus failed to attract public attention. This can be seen in a special issue of the magazine *Arhitektura* published at the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the 'new organization of the monument protection', in which art historian Ana Deanović (1919–1989) wrote about the "helplessness of the protection service to *crush* the indifference of the present generation towards the cultural heritage of their country" (Deanović 1975, 3). When one juxtaposes this statement with Tito's words at the beginning of the article ("It is not

good when the present generation thinks that history begins with them”), one gets the impression of discrepancy between government policy and conservation experts before the public. It appears that due to the lack of the freedom of speech we could only talk about mere rhetoric instead of creating a serious social contract that would define an active attitude towards the past. So, what was the reception of the European initiatives that were launched in the early 1970s?

3. ACTIVE AND PASSIVE: RECEPTION OF 1975 IN CROATIA

In the → *European Charter of the Architectural Heritage* (see appendix), adopted in October 1975 by the Council of Europe, the political counterpart of the concurrent → *Declaration of Amsterdam* (see appendix), it was pointed out the European heritage has to be protected by the principles of integrated conservation. This concept was to encompass the geographical scope of the heritage and the social complexity of its perception. Ambitions harbored by professionals and politicians were high, encompassing equally the problems of aesthetics and ecology, social ethics and regional policy.

The reception of these views in Croatia was tremendous and interesting. Art historian Tomislav Marasović devoted an entire chapter to the interpretation of the post-war era of architectural preservation, which he called ‘active protection’, in his manual for postgraduate study of architectural heritage, which he founded in Split in 1975. This paradigm should be preceded by a *biological* protection of monuments, which he called ‘passive’ because it refrained from “introducing modern life into neglected old settings” (Marasović 1983, 98). Two years later, Marasović devoted an entire book to ‘active protection’ (Marasović 1985, 15–38). He believed in narrative of citizen involvement in the processes of managing, maintaining and adapting architectural heritage. The activity also meant social engagement, which was supposed to facilitate the work of conservators. In his view, this started to emerge soon after 1945, when a revision of the *fin-de-siècle* conservation principles began. Critics of the work of Tomislav and Jerko Marasović, the brothers who managed the preservation of Diocletian’s Palace in Split from the 1950s, noted that because of the ‘active approach’ the concepts of Riegl, Dvořák and Gurlitt, who were in favor of conserving the existing situation and the heterogeneous image of the city, were obscured. When they presented the results of their work in the past decade in 1975, they wrote about ‘renewal’, ‘housing construction’ and a ‘planned relocation of residents’ in their program of the revitalization of the Palace. They predicted that by 1980 over a hundred residents would be relocated from the Palace, which was placed on the World Heritage List in 1979 (Marasović and Marasović 1975, 17). This coincided with extensive Yugoslav-American archaeological investigations that led to

evictions, demolition and significant conservation and social problems for Split, which continue to this day.



Fig. 1: A stamp series of Yugoslavia with the symbol of the EAHY 1975, also depicting the Diocletian’s Palace in Split (Personal archive Ernst-Rainer Hönes)

There was another side to the reception of the European initiative, which had to do with the apathetic public. One of the first initiatives to end the neglect of the old city centers came in the form of an article by art historian Nada Križić (1940–2012). She conveyed her impressions on the article *Eine Zukunft für die Vergangenheit* from the magazine *Der Spiegel* in the Croatian conservator's journal. Križić felt the arrival of a new paradigm to be quite certain, so she presented the crisis of modernism (illustrated by the example of the Berlin Märkische Viertel) as a European struggle for the old towns on both sides of the Iron Curtain. In the year the → *Amsterdam Declaration* and the ICOMOS' *Resolutions on the Conservation of Smaller Historic Towns* were adopted, the struggle was based on the conclusion that a change occurred in the minds of European citizens. Križić wrote about an "extraordinary quality turn [...] in modern man," which originated in the feeling of "dissatisfaction, confusion, and deep unhappiness." This was the "point of defeat" of modern architecture, conflicting "with man who lives in it." Idolization of abandoned towns gained romantic contours: Križić wrote about new pilgrims from the suburbs who return to historical centers "in the evening" (Križić 1975, 33–37). This text is one of the earliest appeals to transpose examples of 'revitalization and refunctionalization' from cities of West and East Germany, Poland and Bologna to socialist Croatia and present them to its citizens.

The year 1975 as a turning point in the understanding of European heritage, human rights and modernism, had an impact in socialist Croatia mainly in professional circles. The importance of the initiatives was indisputably reported by experts in magazines. Furthermore, in 1975 the country commemorated the 30th anniversary of the victory of Tito's faction in World War II. In the Belgrade magazine *Zbornik zaštite spomenika kulture* the introductory paragraphs were devoted to the promises to "dear and beloved Comrade Tito" that conservators "will selflessly continue the responsible and honourable work that our socialist community entrusted us with." Although the volume was dedicated to local conservation issues, architect Ivan Zdravković also reported on the first results of EAHY 1975, as well as the Assembly of ICOMOS in Rothenburg, where the aforementioned Resolutions on smaller historic towns were adopted (Zdravković 1975, 209–210).

The 154th edition of the Zagreb magazine *Arhitektura* was dedicated to the issue of treating old settings, and not to new architecture. Many articles about the relationship between the old and the new can be found in this edition. The chief expert on Croatian modernist architecture Tomislav Premerl published an article about the relationship between creation and preservation. He thought of the act of creation as designing a new world, especially in terms of revitalizing old environments. Convinced that this was a methodological tool, he wrote that "the correct interpretation of the monument is the work of the creator and it is the essence of a creative and real protection" (Premerl 1975, 6). In the same edition, art historian Ivo Maroević (1937–2007) published an article about interpolations. Prompted by the conclusions of the *Charter of Venice* and ICOMOS' *Resolutions on the Introduction of Contemporary Architecture into Ancient Groups of Buildings* of 1972, the author proposed a distinction between four methods of interpolation: facsimile, adaptation, highlighting and contrast (Maroević 1975, 7–9). These methods helped generations of Croatian architects to define contributions or threats to an existing environment more easily which has in turn helped to shift attention from the suburbs back to old town centers.

Architect Miroslav Begović in discussing the illumination of architectural monuments wrote about the "respect for the audience towards inherited cultural values" developed in the last decade (Begović 1975, 12), wondering whether this was a "recompensation by indifferent people who live in new residential areas." Begović saw the new spectacularization of cultural heritage as a problem of evaluation. His interesting dilemma on the lighting of Diocletian's Palace can be seen in the following question: "By illuminating the Palace do you illuminate only individual fragments or should the lighting include the incorporated parasitic fabric of the city, so vibrant, picturesque and clear in its structure?" (Begović 1975, 13).

Along with such a phenomenological approach, interventions in individual historic buildings by adaptation and reconstruction were also discussed at the time. Architect Boris Magaš, who was appointed to adapt the dilapidated Renaissance Hektorović Palace into a hotel in the island town of Hvar, wrote about the former. Although he proposed a synthesis of "orthodox reconstruction" and "intervention of

our time” (Magaš 1975, 63), the project was never realized. At the same time Cvito Fisković and architect Nikica Ivančević proposed a reconstruction of the western part of the medieval town of Korčula, which was reshaped in the 18th and 19th centuries. They argued for a transformation of part of the town skyline with a re-integration after partial demolition. With these corrections they wanted to prove that Mumford’s pessimism about the future of cities could be countered by “man’s need to comprehend his own continuity” (Fisković and Ivančević 1975, 66–69).

The views of conservator Ksenija Radulić (1933–1975) on urban environments should also be pointed out. She managed the protection service in the town of Zadar, bombed in World War II, and was among the first to notice the problem of uncontrolled traffic in a modernist town built on a Roman urban matrix. Part of the unsystematic work in the development of Zadar could be found in the fact that the most beautiful squares were “turned into parking lots, from which cars are increasingly penetrating the surrounding streets” (Radulić 1975, 23).

4. DEBATE ABOUT THE PROBLEMS OF CROATIAN HISTORIC TOWNS IN 1976

Although somewhat belated, the main reaction to the initiative of the Council of Europe (CoE) came in 1976 and 1977 when Croatian experts raised their voices over the condition of historic towns, which was one of the focal points of EAHY 1975. Practically every month, the state of the architectural heritage was publicly argued about in periodicals. As early as January 1976 city planner Zdenko Kolacio (1912–1987) wrote about the role of new architecture in old environments in the journal *Čovjek i prostor* (Man and Space). He encouraged architects to return to old towns, recalling the examples of Asplund in Gothenburg, Wright, Le Corbusier and Gardella in Venice and the Florentine project to convert the villa Strozzi into a museum of contemporary art by Scarpa, Gardella, Irvine, Michelucci, Aalto, Hollein and Meier (Kolacio 1976, 20–21 and 27).

The problem of maintenance and development can also be seen in the then proposition on a campaign of protection and development of natural and architectural heritage of the Yugoslav Council for Protection and Improvement of the Environment. The campaign was supposed to last from 1975 to 1978, emphasizing that “instead of *protective* it should promote a *developmental* concept” (N. N. 1976, 26–27). Before the debate gained momentum in the entire republic towards the end of 1976, the keyword *revitalization* was already used by many. Thus Ivo Maroević reported on the first results of these processes after

the restoration of two civic buildings in the center of Zagreb. In Tkalčić Street, which was then a neglected neighborhood congested by traffic (Fig. 2), work on two buildings was a “trial revitalization” (Maroević 1976a, 8–9).



Fig. 2: Krešimir Tadić, Tkalčić Street in 1976 (Institute of Art History, Zagreb, Fototeka, 2N-28425)

Although he was dissatisfied with the scope of the project, these examples led to a transformation of the street in the next decade. Today it is a popular pedestrian zone, most of the buildings have been put to use, although instead of the envisaged cultural facilities, drinking and eating establishments prevailed. Tkalčić Street, which connects the two medieval nuclei of Zagreb, was not the only area crying out for revival. In the summer of 1976, Maroević called for a debate on the Upper Town. The area, where only a few hundred inhabitants lived, was (and still remains) the seat of government, parliament, and several museums and schools. For Maroević revitalization was not only one of urban planning and conservation, but also a social and a political process. Experts were supposed to strive to “diffuse life evenly in all the cells of the old organism” (Maroević 1976b, 20).

The timeliness of this issue can also be seen in the publication on the urban problems of Zagreb by lawyer Vladimir Franolić (1894–1977). He believed that public facilities – primarily the political administration – that attracted motorized traffic should be removed from the Upper Town and be replaced by museums (Franolić 1976, 101–109). Although he did not advocate this openly, in this way a peaceful part of the city five years after the fall of the Croatian Spring would have become the center of study of Croatian cultural, political and natural history. Liberated from the presence of party potentates, it would have become a reserve for the contemplation of national culture.

5. CAMPAIGN *SOS FOR HERITAGE* IN CROATIA IN 1976 AND 1977

The key debate directly linked to the initiative of the CoE took place in late 1976 and throughout 1977. The name of the campaign, which included public debates, radio shows and exhibitions in Zagreb, highlighted a clear social criticism by professionals on the condition of historical centers of Croatian towns. The double edition of the magazine *Arhitektura* in 1977 brings a rich documentation of these events. The campaign was launched “to warn the public about the issue of preservation of valuable architectural heritage in conditions of modern urban life” and because of the desire for “integration of heritage into contemporary life.” Appeals were made because of the disturbing state of Trogir, Ston (near Dubrovnik), Zadar town centre, the archaeological site of Salona near Split, and the historic center of Zagreb.

Art historian Ivo Babić wrote about the problems of Trogir. He saw Trogir as a ‘collective work of art’, which experienced its greatest crisis in the 1970s due to the uncontrolled construction of the urban environment and the neglect of the town center. Installations were introduced into public areas of the old town with complete disregard to their environment (Fig. 3), and economic and environmental problems were brought to the fore. Babić pointed out several problems: ecological and communal (the problem of parking and air transport), the crisis of urban life (people leaving the town center, the



Fig. 3: Nada Orel, Electrical installations in the centre of Trogir, 1976, published in *Arhitektura* 160–161/1977, 5

ruralization of the town), conservational (inability of the service to stop the degradation processes), organizational and material (lack of educational campaigns among the population). Babić noted that the public, the third participant in the process of protecting, had not yet been constituted in terms of “creating a new spirit of parochialism and emotional embeddedness” in the old environment (Babić 1977, 7–11).

Views similar to those of Babić were expressed by critic Antoaneta Pasinović (1941–1985), who saw “a whole array of pathological processes in urban space: an unhealthy relationship between illegal construction and individual buildings in relation to the historic centre, an unresolved relationship between transport and the urban fabric, a paradoxical proximity of the airport, an almost paranoid frequency of aircraft noise.” Pasinović wrote that unregulated construction around Trogir was “the fruit of the corrupt autocracy” (Pasinović 1977, 14).

After these reviews, listeners of the Third Programme of Radio Zagreb were able to follow a discussion of experts and local politicians on the issues of Trogir, which was followed by a panel discussion in Zagreb. The same model was repeated for Ston, Zadar, Salona and Zagreb. Mate Suić, a distinguished archaeologist, wrote about the role of the ancient Roman forum in modern Zadar, who saw it as a “dead square in a living and flourishing town,” noting that “the archaeological character of the monument’s whole does not prejudice its evaluation in a new space that will be created by new construction” (Suić 1977, 39 and 49). As a major authority on ancient cities, Suić was upset by the indecent situation in the heart of the newly-built Zadar now inhabited by new residents.

Art historian Željko Rapanić wrote about the archaeological site of Salona very critically. The centre of the Roman Province of Dalmatia was endangered by industrial and illegal construction (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4: Unknown, Industrial plants near the ancient Salona, 1977, published in *Arbitektura* 160–161/1977, 70.

He therefore urged for an “openly stated view that heritage has to be defended from ourselves and not from any adversary outside of this society.” The attack spread to the whole environment through digging the slopes of the surrounding mountains, creating trenches several kilometers wide, smoke pollution from the cement plant, chemical industry, the steel mill, and the scrap yard for old ships and through creating huge piles of waste. “Shameful statements by the officials” were responsible for that. This “irreversible

and irreparable crime” was to be opposed by a “reversal” in the understanding of “responsibility of the community” (Rapanić 1977, 71–75). But even such an open appeal yielded no results: in the late 1970s a fast road to Trogir was constructed over parts of the archaeological site, illegal construction continued, as did the destruction of the landscape due to the obtaining of industrial raw materials. Far from the eyes of European experts, the devastation of antique metropolis continued with indifference. This was followed by harsh criticism of Croatian professionals, but to this day it hasn't stopped the destruction of the setting and of the natural surroundings. Finally, four radio programs were broadcast on the cultural and political center of Croatia, which had lost its voice in December 1971; three public debates and an exhibition were organized (Fig. 5a) with a ‘pronounced polemical character’.



Fig. 5a: Krešimir Tadić, Exhibition *SOS for Cultural Heritage* in Zagreb, 1977 (Institute of Art History, Zagreb, Fototeka, 2N-28369)

The degradation of the center of Zagreb should be addressed by regeneration and revitalization, it was asserted. Zagreb was specific, and not only because of its central political role in the Croatian Spring. In the mid-1960s the process of the legislative protection of the medieval centers of the civic Upper Town and ecclesiastical Kaptol was initiated, and in 1968 a decision was made to protect the historical Lower Town, the heritage of Austro-Hungarian urban planning. Discussions were driven by frustration and nostalgia, which was the result of a new sensibility. The publication of the illustrated book *Zagreb in 1900* in 1974 reinforced the myth of the Habsburg town through a variety of historical photographs. It was this Zagreb, less than a century

old, that was under attack due to neglect, pollution and traffic. Owing to pressure from the public, specific proposals for conservation and urban planning were made.

At that time, conservator Nada Benić-Hlebec wrote about the principles of “active protection of monuments within an interdisciplinary consideration and development of the city area, sanitation and revitalization of urban monumental units and buildings, and their inclusion in the modern ways of life” (Benić-Hlebec 1977, 85). These problems were understood as social and political, and not just aesthetic. Therefore it is not surprising that, along with leading experts (Radovan Ivančević, Slavko Dakić, Vladimir Bedenko, Milan Prelog, Željka Čorak, Snješka Knežević, Žarko Domljan, Ognjen Čaldarović), political strongmen (Stipe Šušvar) joined the debate as well as intermediaries (Božidar Gagro and Stjepan Hummel as heads of conservation bureaus). Because of their frequency and public involvement, discussions were not marked by political doublespeak as much, but more by cautious or ‘constructive’ criticism due to the failure of thirty years of political and conservation systems. Cartoons by Otto Reisinger and Ico Voljevica show this; their sharp comments followed the campaign in the most influential dailies *Vjesnik* and *Večernji list*.

Neglect on the one hand, and a truly caricatural and brutal project (Fig. 5b) to introduce major roads in the historic center of Zagreb (Franković 1977, 106) on the other, alerted about fifty conservators,



Fig. 5b: Krešimir Tadić, Photomontage of an imaginary motorway in the centre of Zagreb. From the exhibition *SOS for Cultural Heritage*, Zagreb 1977 (Institute of Art History, Zagreb, Fototeka, 2N-28711)

architects, urban planners, economists, sociologists, journalists and legal experts who rallied around the issue. Inspired by the European initiative, in a few months they managed to stimulate lethargic citizens into visiting exhibitions and asking questions in open professional fora. *SOS for Heritage* was a campaign with a clear social reception, which is still impressive. On the other hand, most of the environments endangered at the time have in the meantime become accepted by the society or inscribed on UNESCO World Heritage List, which is the most significant result of the efforts of European and Croatian conservators of the 1970s.

If participation and protest were some of the key terms in the age of the EAHY 1975 initiative (Glendinning 2013, 408), it is the case that they were also functional in Croatia. Five years after the collapse of the national emancipation project and four years before the death of Marshal Tito, Croatian conservators wanted to instigate a lively collaboration with citizens in a fight to refocus on the neglected city centers, left to decay. It had a limited success, but it left its mark. In a paradoxical situation that was created during the 1990s with the introduction of democracy and independence, the participation was hushed by political paternalism and the destruction of war. But the experiences of 1976 and 1977, as a reflex of EAHY 1975, can be seen today as predecessors of NGO protests in independent Croatia. In a quite different social and political setting, the problem is still – even though not to such a degree – the neglect of the historic settings in the hearts of the cities. A far bigger problem is the communication between the stakeholders, trying to get used to respecting two important imperatives: memory (“in the whole richness” of the cultural past) and democratic dialogue on these values (see Špikić 2014).

REFERENCES

- Babić, Ivo. 1977. “Problematika zaštite povijesne jezgre Trogira [The Problems of Protecting the Historical Centre of Trogir].” *Arhitektura* XXXI,160-161: 6–12.
- Benić-Hlebec, 1977. “Zaštita spomenika kulture na području grada Zagreba [The Protection of Monuments in the City of Zagreb].” *Arhitektura* XXXI,160-161: 84–85.
- Deanović, Ana. 1975. “Uz tridesetu obljetnicu nove organizacije službe zaštite spomenika kulture u Socijalističkoj republici Hrvatskoj [The 13th Anniversary of the New Organization of the Protection Service for Monuments of Culture in the Socialist Republic of Croatia].” *Arhitektura* XXIX,154: 3–4.
- Fisković, Cvito, and Nikica Ivančević. 1975. “Prijedlog za adaptaciju i rekonstrukciju zapadnog dijela historijske jezgre grada Korčule [A Proposition for an Adaptation and Reconstruction of the Western Part of the Historical Centre of the Town of Korčula].” *Arhitektura* XXIX,154: 66–69.
- Franković, Eugen. 1977. “Petlja za Gornji grad [An Interchange for the Upper Town].” *Arhitektura* XXI,160-161: 106.

- Franolić, Vladimir. 1976. *Urbanistički problemi Zagreba kao velegrada [Urbanistic problems of Zagreb as a Major City]*. Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada Liber.
- Glendinning, Miles. 2013. *The Conservation Movement. A History of Architectural Preservation, Antiquity to Modernity*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Goldstein, Ivo. 1999. *Croatia, a History*. London: Hurst & Company.
- Kolacio, Zdenko. 1976. "Nove arhitektonske strukture u starim prostorima [New Architectural Structures in Old Localities]." *Čovjek i prostor XXIII*,274-1: 20–21 and 27.
- Križić, Nada. 1975. "Evropa se bori za svoje stare gradove [Europe Is Fighting for Its Old Towns]." *Vijesti muzealaca i konzervatora Hrvatske XXIV*,1-6: 33–37.
- Mađarić, Vlado. 1953–1954. "Organizacija službe zaštite spomenika kulture u FNRJ [The Setting Up of the Service for the Protection of Monuments of Culture in FNRJ]." *Zbornik zaštite spomenika kulture* 4-5: 9–14.
- Magaš, Boris. 1975. "Prilog rješavanju problematike arhitektonskih zahvata unutar historijskih cjelina [A Contribution to Solving the Problem of Architectural Changes inside Historical Complexes]." *Arhitektura XXIX*,154: 62–65.
- Marasović, Tomislav, and Jerko Marasović. 1975. "Pregled istraživanja, obnove i revitalizacije Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu od 1965 do 1975. Godine [An Overview of Research, Restoration and Revitalization of the Diocletian's Palace in Split 1965–1975]." *Arhitektura XXIX*,154: 16–22.
- Marasović, Tomislav. 1983. *Zaštita graditeljskog nasljeđa. Povijesni pregled s izborom tekstova i dokumenata [The Protection of the Architectural Heritage. A Historical Overview with a Selection of Texts and Documents]*. Split-Zagreb: Društvo konzervatora Hrvatske, Sveučilište u Splitu, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Marasović, Tomislav. 1985. *Aktivni pristup graditeljskom nasljeđu [An Active Approach to Architectural Heritage]*. Split-Zagreb: Društvo konzervatora Hrvatske, Sveučilište u Splitu, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Maroević, Ivo. 1975. "Novo u starom u arhitekturi Hrvatske, proces interpolacije [The New in the Old in the Architecture of Croatia, the Process of Architectural Insertion]." *Arhitektura XXIX*,154: 7–9.
- Maroević, Ivo. 1976a. "Neuništivnost Tkalčićeve ulice [The Indestructibility of Tkalčićeva Street]." *Čovjek i prostor XXIII*,275-2: 8–9.
- Maroević, Ivo. 1976b. "Umjesto polemike. Poziv na razgovor o revitalizaciji zagrebačkoga Gornjega grada [Instead of a Polemic. An Invitation to a Discussion on the Revitalization of the Upper Town of Zagreb]." *Čovjek i prostor XXIII*,280-281, 7-8: 20.
- N. N. 1976. "Prijedlog za zajedničku akciju zaštite i uređenja prirodne i graditeljske baštine [A Proposition for a Joint Action of Protection and Renovation of Natural and Architectural Heritage]." *Čovjek i prostor XXIII*,274-1: 26–27.
- Pasinović, Antoaneta. 1977. "Grad-razgrad. Teze izložbe *Apel za Trogir* [The Points of the Exhibition *An Appeal for Trogir*]." *Arhitektura XXXI*,160-161: 13–16.
- Premerl, Tomislav. 1975. "Uloga arhitekta kao kreatora u zaštiti spomenika culture [The Role of the Architect as a Creator in the Protection of Monuments of Culture]." *Arhitektura XXIX*,154: 5–6.
- Radulić, Ksenija. 1975. "O nekim problemima zaštite spomenika kulture u regiji Zadra [On Some Problems of the Protection of Monuments of Culture in the Region of Zadar]." *Arhitektura XXIX*,154: 23.
- Rapanić, Željko. 1977. "Dileme i prijedlog za Solin [Dilemmas and a Proposition for Solin]." *Arhitektura XXXI*,160–161: 70–76.
- Suić, Mate. 1977. "Zadarski Forum – stari trg u novom gradu [The Forum of Zadar – the Old Square in a New Town]." *Arhitektura XXXI*,160-161: 38–52.
- Špikić, Marko. 2014. "Zustand, Tendenzen und Perspektiven der Denkmalpflege im heutigen Kroatien." *Kunsttexte* 3: 1–6.
- Zdravković, Ivan. 1975. "Evropska godina arhitektonskog nasleđa 1975 [1975 – the European Year of Architectural Heritage]." *Zbornik zaštite spomenika kulture* 25: 209–210.