Muted Emotions and Architectural Conservation in Contemporary Croatia

MARKO ŠPIKIĆ

SUMMARY

Marked by vandalism and altruism, architectural conservation in the past two centuries has become a field of interest for different social groups. Emotional responses to uncomfortable or existentially important structures testify to an energy that accompanies their reception by their heirs. The fruits of this energy, in the form of destructive or productive interventions performed on heritage, spread across Europe starting in the Romantic period. Croatia was no exception to this. Collective emotions were instrumentalized in the Historicist age through the introduction of stylistic restoration as a tool for imagining national community. After 1900, Croatian conservators adopted a cautious and tolerant concept of *Denkmalpflege*, modeled on that of Austria and Germany with its growing social relevance. Political discontinuities and the destructive effects of successive wars in the 20th century saw the contestation of this democratizing and substance-based approach, which led to various uses of heritage in Croatia after 1918, 1945 and 1990. This paper discusses the role of the history of emotions in the reception of architectural heritage in Croatia from an ethical point of view. Considering the place of collective and politically driven emotions that affected the material nature of architectural heritage in the first decade of Croatia's independence, it focuses on the phenomena of perception and treatment of this heritage over the past twenty years.

The History of emotions and the history of conservation

While scholarly interest in the study of affect has increased in the past few decades, the new discipline has experienced considerable expansion in recent times, attracting psychologists, linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, neuro- and cognitive scientists, and last but not least, historians. Due to its diversity in classifying emotions it has acquired a polyphonic nature.[1] Recently, the scholars surrounding Ute Frevert at Berlin's *Max-Planck-Institut für Bildungsforschung* have developed a new area of interest dedicated to the history of emotions (Kant's *Gefühle*) and are striving to answer Lucien Febvre's question "How to reconstruct the emotional life of the past?" from his 1941 paper *La sensibilité et l'histoire.*[2] Accompanied by theoretical systems, the new historiography has been auto-reflexive since its inception. Interest in the affective aspects of the human past has thus generated two broad effects: it has helped constitute the historiography of emotions as a genre, but it has also encouraged other, diverse scholarly approaches to the study of affect.

One approach it offers is comparison with the history of architectural conservation. Most manifestations of this genre – from Paul Léon and Carlo Ceschi to Françoise Choay, Jukka Jokilehto and Miles Glendinning[3] – imply a history of professional responses to *emotional* states, such as individual and collective enthusiasm, defiance, threat, horror, or catharsis, arising from the perception of recognized and almost chronically endangered heritage. These works show that the history of conservation is also an anthropocentric history, in that the consequences of human acts are visible on the seemingly "tacit" testimonies of the past. It is a history of human perceptive abilities and of the various individual and collective emotional responses that accompany the phenomena of intervention in the image and substance of built heritage. The history of architectural conservation is therefore more than

Marko Špikić, Muted Emotions and Architectural Conservation in Contemporary Croatia, in: Herold, Vinken (Hrsg.), Denkmal_Emotion. Politisierung – Mobilisierung – Bindung, Heidelberg: arthistoricum.net, 2021, S. 62-69, https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.920.c13259

suitable for exploring emotions. Architecture was for centuries seen as form of artistic expression accessible virtually to everyone, and that accessibility opened the path, not only to individual contemplation, but also to collective action.

As can be seen in Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, the perception of sudden or gradual changes in the image, form and substance of the built environment implied the appearance of a certain emotion (*moveo, conturbatio, aegritudo*), or as Greek and Roman philosophers called it, *pathos*.[4] The Renaissance discovery of classical antiquity – as a set of originally emotional responses to phenomena of mediaeval oblivion, fragmentation, destruction, or the transformation of a paradigmatic ancient culture – represents for the European cult of monuments a starting point in the *civilizing process*. But contrary to Norbert Elias' belief, this process did not gradually distance itself from emotions, in introducing the principle of restraint.[5] By merging a pre-Romantic sensibility and the public violence committed by the hitherto anonymous members of the Third Estate in the revolutionary vandalism of late 18th-century France, the perception and treatment of cultural heritage suddenly became a public matter. The threat of uncontrolled emotion among the crowds that devastated the symbols of *ancien régime* reverberated long afterward, not only in the paranoid political programs of European 19th-century authorities, but also as late as 1951 in Paul Léon's historical account of the "biography of French monuments".[6]

Therefore, the history of preservation from its earliest appearance implicitly strove to present the repercussions of enthusiasms and dissatisfactions of the first individual discoverers of heritage values and their collective followers. Although historians presented the *consequences* of the individual and public energies of regret, criticism, creative imagination and destructiveness, they also implied the existence of rational or emotional *incentives* for these efforts. I am glad that this conference is opening these perspectives: not only towards hitherto known facts about the deeds of former generations of professionals, seen as guardians of reason in the service of the barely controllable emotions of the social majority, but also towards the *instigating factors* represented by the masses and their desires.

Types of emotions related to heritage and their origin

Focusing on recent times and events in Croatia, I think it is important to analyse and distinguish among the types of emotions relevant for the wider set of professional contexts. I will therefore try to determine those specific emotions, discussing their affiliation and aspects of their purpose and durability.

Different approaches to the study of affect show that bearers of emotions can be both individuals and collectives. In philosophical and scientific discussions, attention has mostly focused on a universalized human being, so this individual is seen as representative of his or her type. Jerome Kagan reminds of some ancient writers' definition of emotions as "an appraisal of a change in feeling".[7] Greek and Roman philosophers discussed the ability of passions to stir, move, and transform a person's condition into one of perturbation – and to provoke a reaction of the mind in order to achieve stoic equanimity, or *apatheia*.[8]

Although this tradition considered the origin of emotional states, the focus was primarily directed to the consequences manifested in the human mind. If we now turn to Renaissance antiquarianism and the theory of art as sources for the modern cult of monuments, we will find that emotions in both fields represented a prerequisite for cognition, and that the affective response originated in the perception of the fragmented state of the material world – be it the ruins of Rome or the squalid basement of the library at St. Gall.[9] What Renaissance studies offer to the study of affect and the history of conservation is the vitality of ancient learnings. *Passiones* and *perturbationes* originated from external prompts or stimuli. So, in parallel with affect scholarship's fixation on states of mind, these studies offer a useful tradition of relational, consequential dialog between the observed, formed or deformed parts of the material world on the one hand, and the human emotions affected by the condition of those parts on the other.

This can be seen in the earliest examples of art theoretical and antiquarian responses to the states of ruins and textual fragments. Leon Battista Alberti wrote in *De pictura* not only about the "strength of the eyes" (*vis oculorum*, 1.5) but also about *affectiones* (2.43), that is, the movements of the mind: anger, grief, joy, fear, and desire, as expressed in movements of the limbs.[10] On the other hand, early antiquarians and humanist textual critics frequent-

ly expressed emotions of bitterness in response to the state of preservation of original testimonies, subsequently turned into monuments.[11]

With the advent of mass movements in Europe at the end of the 18th century, this perception was relocated in the field of collective emotional response. It brought about a wealth of experiences and behaviors concerning the construction of public memory and collective identity. As already mentioned, Paul Léon was later inspired by the revolutionary vandalism of this period when conceiving his modern history of French monuments. Violence was succeeded by a decidedly rational, analytical system of knowledge, as presented by Viollet-le-Duc and his followers.[12] Thus, positivist certainty in the prevalence of reason over emotion became modern scientific myth, affecting the public perception of authenticity of monuments.

It is well known what happened to this imaginative experiment, especially after the first reactions of John Ruskin, followed by Wilhelm Lübke, William Morris, Camillo Boito, Moritz von Thausing, Hermann Muthesius, Georg Dehio, Cornelius Gurlitt, Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák. This intellectual history brought about two approaches to visible and tangible heritage: that is, principles of interventionism and abstinence. But, as Gerard Baldwin Brown noted already in 1905, these movements became forceful expressions of welcome public interest.[13] This confirms that the public was treated as an implied participant – not as a horrified witness to violent retaliation against a subdued political enemy, but as an invited actor, devoting his or her cognitive and emotional powers to the art of inheriting or creating imagined community.

Beginning in the mid-19th century, Croatian followers of the European conservation movement were attracted by models emerging from the German-speaking countries of Central Europe. Romantics echoed the initiatives coming from Karl Friedrich Schinkel, Ferdinand von Quast, Ernst Friedrich Zwirner, Rudolf Eitelberger, Friedrich von Schimdt, Alois Hauser, Paul Clemen and Bodo Ebhardt in the areas of inventorying and stylistic restoration. On the other hand, thanks to the activities of Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák, conservation principles, as promoted in the *Jahrbuch* and *Mitteilungen der Zentralkommission*, as well as in the German periodical *Die Denkmalpflege*, were immediately welcomed as a sign of modern times, implying an innovative conception of monuments by learned individuals and social groups.[14] Conservation tradition, as opposed to restoration principle, prevailed among Croatian conservators roughly between 1900 and 1950. Around 1900 they strove to enforce new concepts as a novel, more sensitive collective perception of monuments.[15]

Emotions and heritage in the early years of Croatia's independence

The problem with creating a tolerant public dialogue with witnesses to the past in 20th century Croatia was the lack of democratic, civic liberties and open exchange. Along with political paternalism, long periods of authoritarianism prevented the development of authentic public debate among three crucial participants: the political authorities, experts, and the general public. In the last years of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and in the first Yugoslavia (1918–1941), the promoters of conservation principles faced disdain from political and ecclesiastical authorities. The Second World War brought polarizations, racial exclusion, violence, destruction and genocide. In the second, communist Yugoslavia (1945–1990), conservators participated in the politically motivated creation of a socialist utopia, joining the political requests for supranational harmony with the healing of the ethnic schism from the Second World War within the regime's program of Brotherhood and Unity.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, Croatian professionals faced new challenges. Any discussion of the contemporary situation in democratized Croatia requires periodization. I see it in three different periods, roughly corresponding to the last three decades: first, the period of the state foundation during the 1990s; then the period of internal reform and preparation for accession to European Union between 2000 and 2013; and third, in some ways overlapping with this second period, in the decade leading up to the present. First two periods involved more or less active participation by the newly founded national community in conservation issues and the manifestation of its changing emotions in the face of different social challenges. With its undemocratic traditions, Croatia experienced phenomena comparable to those that affected other emancipated nations of the former Eastern Bloc: slow evolution of the responsible role of the public with even slower acceptance of social dialogue on questions of "difficult heritage". Even before the bloody conflicts of the 1990s began, political rhetoric created the first nationalist expressions of "the conservative revolution", which brought destruction and neglect

to monuments created during the communist era. It is estimated that around half of the country's 6000 monuments were either destroyed, removed or damaged in this period. The conservative revolution was accompanied by strong collective emotions, instigated by new nationalist elites.

So, when addressing the question of what kind of emotions were prevalent in the collective perception of heritage, it is obvious that research on affect can help. Ute Frevert has written that "whether and how emotions were experienced depended on their relative status in a given society".[16] Therefore, political introduction of the principles of substitution and new historicist invention were not always productive, but could also be the opposite. As in post-Communist Eastern and Central Europe, the birth of national democracies meant the destructive removal or "neutralization" of unacceptable monuments of the collapsed system. These actions were motivated by simultaneous emotions of rediscovered enthusiasm, interest, attraction, joy, contentment and sympathy for previously unapproachable or obscured forms of the past on the one hand, and feelings of indifference, prejudice, aversion, hostility, fear, rage, contempt, hatred and malice towards the monuments of the fallen regime, on the other. This duality, seen as Janus-faced splitting of society, is in many ways typical of periods of social upheaval; that set of emotions was a result of a transgenerational belief in external and internal repression. Or, as Sara Ahmed writes, "Because we love, we hate, and this hate is what brings us together ".[17]

The emotions of prejudice, hostility and contempt that led to the neglect of such iconic Modernist expressions of sorrow as Bogdan Bogdanović's monumental complex in the Jasenovac concentration camp, or to the dismantling of Vojin Bakić's Partisan Monument on Petrova Gora (Fig. 1), or else to the total destruction of Bakić's Partisan Monument in Kamenska,[18] can be compared with examples from the history of politics and preservation: from the French Revolution and the Paris Commune to the toppling of Lenin's monuments after the fall of Communism in Eastern Europe, and on to the recent removals of confederate, colonial and racism-inspired monuments around Europe and the US. In the Croatia of the 1990s, these acts were not committed by the masses, but by anonymous individuals and by militant and military groups, with tacit consent from a general public that was either convinced or else intimidated.

Figure 1: Petrova Gora, Monument to the Uprising of the People of Banija and Kordun (2019)

Figure 2: Medvedgrad Burg after remodelling in 1994, state in 2007

In order to secure public support, the authorities of the 1990s also acted to create imagined community. This can be seen in the project of turning the picturesque ruins of Medvedgrad (Fig. 2) above the nation's capital Zagreb into the Altar of the Homeland, initiated by the first democratic president Franjo Tuđman.[19] Accompanied by the destruction of socialist monuments, and opposed by only a few individual professionals, in the midst of war the project became a clear manifestation of the dictation of public emotions in direct service of the ruling class. In this part of Europe, marked as it was by retaliations at the expense of the political and ethnic Other, as well as by coordinated acts of dismemberment of both human and monumental bodies, the sense of fear prevented reasonable attempts at calm and open exchange.

Engineering patriotic souls and contrasting new cults

These gestures did not predominate, however, for the conservation community continued to perform its daily duties and Croatian monuments kept appearing on the World Heritage List; nevertheless they did reshape the professional system, which was directly subjugated to the political one. Then, in the second period – after 2000, and with promising socio-political changes on the horizon – the younger generation conceived a novel interest in the character of everyday life during the communist period. This was followed by first initiatives for protecting its *intentional monuments*, built to commemorate civilian casualties of the Second World War but mistreated during the 1990s. Responding to this interest and in accordance with revived conservative policies in Central Europe, a new expressive "form of construction of national identity" appeared: namely, the martyr complex, or victimization.[20] In the words of Ulrich Schmid: "Nations that build their identity basically on self-victimization do not allow for a new perspective or even a new assessment of their history of suffering". This led to the "canonization of a certain historical discourse."[21]

The roots of these phenomena in Croatia can be found in Romantic visions of the past, where piety was accompanied by a sense of injustice and revolt with regard to the poor state of national heritage. Evoking the models from the 1990s, and with strong support from church authorities, new monuments were installed to commemorate the *sacrifice* of the newly recognized national heroes of revisionist historical discourse. The Church of Croatian Martyrs in Udbina (Fig. 3), consecrated in 2010, is a central example: it imitates supposedly typical ecclesiastical forms of mediaeval Croatian Christianity, with reinforced collective participation in the new narrative of historicist self-victimization.

An example of reconstructing historical monuments for the purpose of cultivating the martyr complex can be seen in the pilgrim shrine at Gora (Fig. 4).[22] As at Medvedgrad, this stylistically multi-layered church, destroyed in the 1990s conflict and reconstructed in "mediaeval" forms in 2014, was turned into a pilgrimage site, a place of collective pride and remembrance of the fallen for the Christian and national cause. Therefore, new historicist architecture and reconstructed historic buildings became places with binding force – and with the potential for inciting emotions. The instigators of the new emotions were mostly Catholic Church authorities and their flocks.

Following these models, local clergy and authorities indulged in the reconstruction of war ruins (churches in Voćin, Gora, Pridraga, or the Eltz castle in Vukovar), as well as in stylistic restoration, eliminating stylistically stratified parish churches and palaces (in Gora, Našice, Bapska, or in Odescalchi Palace in Ilok). Except for the church in Gora, none of these projects were celebrated on a national level comparable with the completion of the Frau-

Figure 3: Udbina, Church of the Croatian Martyrs, consecrated in 2010, state in 2011

enkirche in Dresden or Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow. Their utilitarian and symbolic values were therefore localized, preventing emotions from spreading and assuming a larger cohesiveness.

This undeclared "engineering of emotions" was based on discriminatory acts, with the emphasis placed on the acceptable layers and forms of monuments. Crowds gathering around reclaimed monuments, such as the equestrian statue of Ban Jelačić reinstated on Zagreb's central square in 1990, seldom got a national response.[23] This was connected with the role of political and ecclesiastical patrons, with silenced and co-opted professionals engaged in the forging of new, heroic images of the national past. Considering the teleological aspect of the evoked emotions, I conclude that within the socio-political system structured in Croatia over the past 30 years, they changed (or imploded) from mass enthusiasm to localization and indifference, following the discouraging trends in the socio-political sphere.

Figure 4: Gora, Shrine of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, consecrated in 2014

Coda: Apatheia or Apathy?

Considering the historical magnitude of its national emancipation and the importance of cultural heritage for the tourism industry in Croatia, the reluctance of the general public to participate in expressing its emotions is at first glance astonishing. The discussion among the three social actors on the meaning of the past was thus never fully achieved, corresponding to their failure to enable authentic social dialogue. Thanks to revisions to the legislation on cultural heritage made in 1999, the leading role of the political actors has been cemented, and bureaucratic routine has discouraged dialogue, stifled criticism and blocked fruitful affective response from the tacitly recreated Third Estate in Croatia. Emotions were thus strictly confined to isolated interest groups: regret and nostalgia among younger researchers engaged in the protection of anti-fascist monuments, industrial heritage, post-Second World War modernist architecture and urban planning; and emotions of contentment and religious ecstasy among the proponents of victorious conservative and national narratives, including parishioners and the keepers of the social order resulting from the war of the 1990s.

This has led to recent occurrences of muted emotions. The increase of "emotional detachment" and "expressive suppression" has been accompanied by a lack of social dialogue, by depopulation and massive emigration, and by enthusiasm for the nationalist discourse in the post-truth narrative or by its bitter refusal. Even if it is only a form of transitional social pathology or a phase in Croatia's democratic evolution, the result for conservators and social groups has not been the achievement of apatheia, but the consolidation of indifference, even apathy.

To be able to experience cathartic emotions, it is not enough simply to have a declared democratic situation. In the past three decades, collective emotions in Croatia, Hungary, Poland, and the Balkan and Baltic states have been dominated more by the sense of an historical right to a "democratic reprisal" of the victorious national collectives from which they perceive themselves to have been disenfranchised, and less by a sense of historical responsibility which might synthesise the free expression of positive and negative emotions with tolerant rationalization. The feeling that there is an historical opportunity for "creating historical traces" in conservation and new invention should therefore encompass continuous critical dialogue on Norbert Huse's *unbequeme Denkmale*, as well as willingness to face the traumatic events of the past with truthfulness and courage.

Image sources

1–4 Marko Špikić

Notes

1 See Stearns, Peter N. and Stearns, Carol Z.: Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards, in: The American Historical Review 90, No. 4, 1985, pp. 813–836; Wierzbicka, Anna: Human Emotions: Universal or Culture-Specific?, in: American Anthropologist 88, No. 3, 1986, pp. 584–594; Reddy, William: The Navigation of Feeling. A Framework for the History of Emotions, Cambridge 2004; Oatley, Keith: Emotions: A Brief History, Oxford 2004; Handbook of Emotions, ed. by Lisa Feldman Barrett, Michael Lewis and Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones, New York and London 2008; Matt, Susan J. and Stearns, Peter N.: Doing Emotions History, Chicago and Springfield, 2014; Emotional Lexicons. Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700–2000, ed. by Ute Frevert et al., Oxford 2014; Von Scheve, Christian and Salmela, Mikko: Collective Emotions, Oxford 2014; Plamper, Jan: The History of Emotions: An Introduction, Oxford 2015.

2 Febvre, Lucien: La sensibilité et l'histoire: Comment reconstituer la vie affective d'autrefois?, in: Annales d'histoire sociale 3, No. 1–2, 1941, pp. 5–20.

3 Léon, Paul: La vie des monuments français: destruction, restoration, Paris 1951; Ceschi, Carlo: Teoria e storia del restauro, Roma 1970; Choay, Françoise: The Invention of the Historic Monument, Cambridge 2001; Jokilehto, Jukka: A History of Architectural Conservation, Oxford 2002; Glendinning, Miles: The Conservation Movement. A History of Architectural Preservation: Antiquity to Modernity, Abingdon 2013.

4 Cicero: Tusculanae Disputationes, III.22.52–53.

5 Elias, Norbert: The Civilizing Process. Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations, Oxford 2000, pp. 86, 96, 109.

6 Paul Léon wrote about *ferveur pour les monuments* in the mid-19th century; Léon, La vie des monuments français, 1951
(as in note 3), p. 9..

7 Kagan, Jerome: What is Emotion? History, Measures and Meanings, New Haven 2007, p. 10.

8 Frevert, Ute: The History of Emotions, in: Handbook of Emotions, Fourth Edition, ed. by Lisa Feldman Barrett et al. 2016
(as in note 2), pp. 49–65, here pp. 50–51.

9 Early 15th-century antiquarians heavily criticized the condition of discovered Roman antiquities and manuscripts. While early researchers of architectural and sculptural forms (Brunelleschi, Donatello, Alberti) shared their disappointment as well as their enthusiasm for the richness and fragmentary nature of antiquities, literati such as Cencio de'Rustici, Poggio Bracciolini and Lorenzo Valla were openly critical of the ignorance of their mediaeval heirs. Poggio's description of St. Gall's squalid library tower, where he discovered Quintilian (represented as a person covered with mold and dust) in 1416, is a good example. Poggio writes: Quintilianum comperimus adhuc salvum et incolumem, plenum tamen situ et pulvere squalentem. see Garin, Eugenio: Prosatori latini del Quattrocento, Milano/Napoli 1952, pp. 244–245.

10 Alberti, Leon Battista: Opere volgari, III, ed. by Cecil Grayson, Bari 1973, pp. 74–75: Sono alcuni movimenti d'animo detti affezione, come ira, dolore, gaudio e timore, desiderio e simili and Sunt namque motus alii animorum, quos docti affectiones nuncupant, ut ira, dolor, gaudium, timor, desiderium et eisumodi.

11 In his Elegantiae linguae latinae of around 1440, Lorenzo Valla wrote: Everything is turned upside down and burnt, and the Capitol was barely preserved. See Garin, Prosatori latini, 1952 (as in note 9), pp. 596–599. In his lamentations, Valla also mentions his emotions: pain (*dolor*), which tears him apart (*exulcerat*) and makes him cry (*lacrymanque cogit*).

12 Viollet-le-Duc, Eugène-Emmanuel: Restauration, in: Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle, Paris 1866, where he emphasizes the role of scientific insight into heritage. Two decades earlier, his collaborator Lassus demanded that the restorer should "effacer complétement (…) sès instincts", claiming that restoration should simply become science and archaeology. See Lassus, Jean-Baptiste: De l'art et l'archéologie, in: Annales archeologiques II, 1845, p. 554.

13 Brown wrote about "the present popular movement" and the attention of "the public in general" in the German Empire around 1900. See Brown, Gerard Baldwin: The Care of Ancient Monuments, Cambridge 1905, p. 98.

14 The reception of new concepts in Croatia around 1900 is evidenced in two cultural centres, Zagreb and Split. Zagreb conservators subscribed to Die Denkmalpflege from the start, and in 1908 they welcomed Cornelius Gurlitt as a key promoter of innovative views. Zagreb architects published Gurlitt's speech in German in 1909. Professionals and administrators from Split changed their views after the establishment of the special Commission for Diocletian's Palace in 1903, a process which can be traced in the Mitteilungen der Zentralkommission of the period.

15 A teacher of German from Zagreb, Gjuro Szabo (1875–1943) became the most vocal promoter of the new concepts, both in newspapers and in the first scholarly journals. See Špikić, Marko: Denkmalschutz in Kroatien in den letzten Jahren der Habsburger Monarchie, in: Internationales Kulturhistorisches Symposion Mogersdorf 2012. Entwicklungen und Aufgaben von Gedächtnisorten in der Erinnerungskultur im pannonischen Raum vom 19. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert, ed. by Michael Hess, Eisenstadt 2012, pp. 227–233.

16 Frevert, The History of Emotions, 2016, (as in note 8), p. 53.

17 Ahmed, Sara: The Cultural Politics of Emotion, Second Edition, Edinburgh 2014, 43. Ahmed studied cases of the white supremacist "organization of hate".

18 See Towards a Concrete Utopia: Architecture in Yugoslavia, 1948–1980, ed. by Martino Stierli, New York 2018; Spomenik Monument Database, ed. by Donald Niebyl, London 2018.

19 The best account of the remodelling of Medvedgrad is given by Miletić, Drago: Medvedgrad na Oltaru domovine – pogled izbliza (Medvedgrad on the Altar of the Homeland: a close-up view), Zagreb 2020. See also Špikić, Marko: The Concepts of Altruism and Values in the Perception of Cultural Heritage in Contemporary Croatia, in: The Limits of Heritage. The 2nd Heritage Forum of Central Europe, ed. by Katarzyna Jagodzińska and Jacek Purchla, Krakow 2015, pp. 102–118.

20 MacDonald, David Bruce: Balkan holocausts? Serbian and Croatian victim-centred propaganda and the war in Yugoslavia, Manchester and New York 2002.

21 Schmid, Ulrich: Nation and Emotion: The Competition for Victimhood in Europe, in: Melodrama After the Tears: New Perspectives on the Politics of Victimhood, ed. by Scott Loren and Jörg Metelmann, Amsterdam 2016, pp. 281–294, here p. 282.

22 The shrine was heavily damaged by a strong earthquake on 29 December 2020. It remains to be seen what emotions will guide the fate of this repeatedly demolished church.

23 The monument to the viceroy (ban) Josip Jelačić (1801–1859), famous for his role in suppression of the Hungarian revolution in 1848, was erected in 1866. The equestrian statue by Anton Dominik Fernkorn was removed from Zagreb's central Jelačić Square by the communist authorities in 1947 and the square was renamed Republic Square. The monument was restored and re-erected in October 1990 with national(ist) enthusiasm. See Kukić, Boris: Erinnerungs- und Gedächtniskultur am Beispiel des Ban Josip Jelačić-Denkmals (1866–1947–1990) in Zagreb, in: Internationales Kulturhistorisches Symposion Mogersdorf 2012. Entwicklungen und Aufgaben von Gedächtnisorten in der Erinnerungskultur im pannonischen Raum vom 19. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert, ed. by Michael Hess, Eisenstadt 2012, pp. 55–98.