



Interview with Ing. arch. Eva Dvořáková and Ing. arch. Tereza Bartošíková, Ph.D., about protection of technical and industrial cultural heritage in the Czech and Slovak Republic

As part of the December issue of VTEI, which is entirely devoted to the topic of technical and industrial cultural heritage and the "Programme of applied research and development of national and cultural identity (NAKI II)" of the Ministry of Culture, we asked for an interview with two specialists in this field, Ing. arch. Eva Dvořáková from the National Heritage Institute (Národní památkový ústav, NPÚ) and Ing. arch. Tereza Bartošíková, Ph.D., from the Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic (Pamiatkový úrad Slovenskej republiky, PÚ SR).

Ladies, how did you come to deal professionally with the subject of technical and industrial heritage?

Dvořáková: Shortly after graduating from CTU, I joined the then State Institute for Monument Preservation and Nature Conservation in the Department of Folk Architecture and Technical Monuments. At first, my work focused only on folk architecture, which was already close to me because I graduated from the Department of Reconstruction under the architect Svatopluk Voděra. His publications on folk architecture and its adaptations were an example for us at the time of how beautiful folk buildings are and how

to approach their adaptation sensitively. Dr. Jiří Vondra was in charge of technical monuments in the Department at that time, and he gradually handed over part of his agenda to me. It is necessary to realize that at the time I am talking about, i.e. at the beginning of the 1980s, "technical monument" meant at most a mill, a forge, or a bridge. Apart from some significant architectural buildings, such as Kotěra's elevated water tank in Pankrác, industrial heritage was not considered to be of historical value at all. After the retirement of Dr. Vondra, no one cared much about the agenda of technical monuments at the then State Institute for Monument Preservation. At that time, technical monuments were not perceived in art-historical circles as an adequate part of cultural heritage, so it automatically became "my agenda".

Bartošíková: When I was choosing a university in my school graduation year, I said that I wanted to repair castles or build bridges. The talent exams secured me a place at the Faculty of architecture. I had the opportunity to specialize in history of architecture and restoration of monuments. Nevertheless, I was drawn to technical constructions, so I focused mainly on the renovation of industrial facilities. I wrote my diploma thesis and later also my dissertation thesis on this topic. After my studies, I took up the position of methodologist

for technical monuments at the Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic. So I can say that I have a job that I wanted, and I have combined history and technical constructions in my work.

Can you explain to the readers what a technical monument is, what industrial heritage is, and how their protection is anchored in legislation in the Czech and Slovak Republics?

Dvořáková: The following general definition is most often used for technical monument: *“A technical monument is unique or typical material remains that demonstrate the development of technology and its level in certain historical conditions. It is a document of the historical development of human society.”* However, it should be pointed out that technical monument is a general designation and it is not anchored, nor was it, in the two laws issued so far aimed at protecting monuments. The law recognizes only the term ‘cultural monument’

Act No. 22 of 1958 on cultural monuments defined the category of monuments, including technical monuments, as *“... a cultural asset that is evidence of the historical development of society, its art, technology, science, and other fields of human work and life, or is a preserved historical environment of housing estates and architectural ensembles or a thing related to prominent persons and events of history and culture.”*

On 1 January 1988, Act No. 20/87 Coll., on State Monument Preservation, came into effect, replacing Act No. 22/58. It does not leave out science and technology either. It considers cultural monuments to be those that are important documents of the historical development, way of life, and environment of society from the earliest times to the present, as manifestations of the creative abilities and work of man from various fields of human activity for their revolutionary, historical, artistic, scientific, and technical values.

When it comes to the term ‘industrial heritage’, the interpretation in the Czech language is somewhat complicated. The term *industria*, given by some dictionaries, is translated from Latin as diligence, industriousness, while other professional publications use the term industry for *industria*. So the border is a bit blurred in this case. I would like to also point out that the State Monument Preservation Act does not recognize the term. The concept of industrial heritage is probably best explained in the *Methodology for Evaluation and Protection of the Industrial Heritage from the Perspective of Heritage Management* by Miloš Matěj and Michaela Ryšková, published by the National Heritage Institute in 2018.

Bartošíková: The biggest difference between the Czech and Slovak understanding of monuments is based on differences in legislation. In Slovakia, we have a relatively new law on monuments, which has added many competencies and obligations to preservationists. We are an authority and we directly decide on the restoration and declaration of new monuments. The law also changed the nomenclature of the monument fund, where we no longer have the categories of national cultural monument and cultural monument as in the Czech Republic. All our legally protected buildings are national cultural monuments.

The Act on the Protection of Monument Fund does not recognize a special type of monument – technical monuments. The current Slovak law only generally defines the protection of national cultural monuments and heritage sites. According to our law, heritage value is the sum of significant historical, social, landscape, urban, architectural, scientific, technical, artistic or artistic-craft values. Every monument must therefore have a documented historical value.

In practice, we talk about industrial monuments as a subset of technical monuments. Technical monuments also include wells, bridges, and dams that were not used for production. We understand industrial monuments as monuments of industrialization – they are mostly industrial sites built in the 19th and 20th centuries. Technical monuments have been in the monument fund for

a long time, and we are gradually starting to focus on the protection of industrial monuments of a larger scale and from more recent times.

How is the area of industrial heritage covered in your institution (NPÚ/PÚ SR) and who else do you cooperate with in matters of its rescue, protection, restoration, or eventual conversions?

Dvořáková: When I joined the then State Institute for Monument Preservation and Nature Conservation, there were five employees working in the Department of Folk Architecture and Technical Monuments, only one of whom was in charge of the agenda then called monuments of science, production, and technology. Since the establishment of the Institute in 1958, only thanks to the efforts of the then director Ing. arch. Jiří Gwuzd was it possible, in the 1980^s, to establish a separate department of technical monuments at the Regional Centre for State Monument Preservation and Nature Conservation in Ostrava. Other regional workplaces only rarely had an expert who would deal with this agenda.

Since then, much has changed for the better. There is one position for an industrial heritage specialist in each regional workplace of the National Monuments Institute. The establishment of the Methodological Centre of Industrial Heritage in Ostrava also contributed to the qualified assessment of technical heritage, which arose out of the need to improve the knowledge, documentation, and protection of technical and industrial monuments and under whose leadership it is gradually becoming possible to start research within individual manufacturing sectors.

Collaboration with the National Technical Museum dates back to the establishment of the Institution as it follows the idea that technical museums will take over exceptional technologies in their collections. At the end of the 1960^s, cooperation with the newly established Technical Museum in Brno increased, where it was possible to establish the first workplace of industrial archaeology in our country. With it, this professional institution responded to the initiatives of the newly established International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage TICCIH (1975).

Since the 1990^s, when the Ministry of Culture announced the first science and research programme projects, in which not only monument preservation institutions but also universities or individual scientific institutions participated from the beginning, we have started cooperation mainly with the Czech Technical University. Cooperation with the Czech Chamber of authorized Engineers and Construction Technicians (Česká komora autorizovaných inženýrů a techniků činných ve výstavbě), and the Czech Association of Civil Engineers (Český svaz stavebních inženýrů), with whom the National Heritage Institute has concluded a long-term cooperation agreement through the Board for Technical Monuments (Kolegium pro technické památky), can be considered significant in the field of technical heritage.

Currently, a Memorandum of Cooperation with the Railway Administration has been signed; both institutions hope to improve the situation during the restoration of the railway fund.

Within science and research, the Methodological Centre of Industrial Heritage cooperates with a number of institutions. One of the examples is the cooperation on the methodology of classifying and evaluating water management objects, which was established in collaboration with T. G. Masaryk Water Research Institute, the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Palacky University in Olomouc, the National Heritage Institute, and a number of experts and consultants outside these institutions.

Bartošíková: Currently, the Office operates a section of technical monuments, which is an advisory body to the General Director composed of employees of the PÚ SR and regional monument offices. In Slovakia, I am the only one solely in charge of technical monuments, that is, the report on technical

monuments of the PÚ SR. There are several colleagues at the regional monuments offices who, as part of their work, deal with technical monuments, but not exclusively.

We have established cooperation with the Slovak Technical Museum and its branches and with the Slovak Mining Museum. From an institutional point of view, cooperation with the Mining Archive in Banská Štiavnica as well as with local technical museums is important for us.

Cooperation with universities has deteriorated because long-time teachers dedicated to technical monuments have retired. However, we are open to cooperation.

A separate category consists of cooperation with civic associations and enthusiasts. Often in interaction with passionate owners of monuments, such collaboration brings the best results for both the monument and learning about the history of the given type of object.

For many monuments, there is a clash of different points of view and interests. For example, nature conservation, safety of water works, economic interests. Do you think that monument preservation is currently able to balance the individual aspects? And where do you see potential for improvement?

Dvořáková: Compared to the earlier, sometimes extreme doctrinalism, monument preservation today is pluralistic in its approaches and methods. It is always looking for and finding solutions individually, case by case, taking into account the value and character of the monument in question, the degree of its preservation, and the nature of the contemporary needs that the restoration is supposed to fulfil. It is necessary to continuously communicate with society, whose public interest is primarily intended to be protected by monument preservation. Methods of monument preservation have also changed significantly, which reflect the development of architecture as well as the results of current science and research. In the field of technical and industrial heritage, one of the guidelines for informed decision-making is the above-mentioned *Methodology for Evaluation and Protection of the Industrial Heritage from the Perspective of Heritage Management*, which will be followed up by specialized production sector methodologies in the future. A prerequisite for improving contentious issues of conflicts will be the application in practice of subsequent methodologies of individual production sectors, in the creation of which monument preservation closely cooperates with a number of professional institutions, including TGM WRI.

Bartošíková: As preservationists, practically every time a monument is restored we try to find an adequate compromise between the requirements of monument preservation and other interests that enter into it. The economic point of view is present across the entire monument fund because the owner of a cultural monument has their own, mostly limited financial possibilities. The economic aspect is already included in the proceedings for declaration of an object as a cultural monument; the owner is afraid of an increased level of financial and administrative burden in the preservation and handling of their property if they have to meet the demands of monument preservation. Above all, it would be necessary to find appropriate motivational tools so that the owner of a cultural monument does not take it primarily as a burden, but receives a helping hand and appropriate compensation from the state.

We often come across nature conservation when there is a need to maintain some monuments visible from a distance or in cases where trees disturb the structure with their root system. We are starting to encounter questions about the construction of fish channels at larger scale water works. Energy efficiency becomes a serious issue in the operation of technical monuments. As an example, industrial plate windows were replaced with plastic windows at a hydroelectric power station with the justification that they had to prevent

the turbines from freezing in winter. Originally, the building had year-round 24/7 service and room temperature control; it is currently fully automated without heating.

Another issue is barrier-free accessibility of monuments, which is not always possible to ensure in the case of technical monuments. We try to deal with security aspects individually for each monument in order to ensure both the safety and the original appearance of the object. We prefer the use of original material and construction solutions, but when it is necessary to replace the water tanks discharge devices, for example, we allow the use of current technical solutions. We managed to harmonize the solutions of the water and air sides of the dam with the water managers in the case of the mining water reservoir (tajchy).

What are the specifics of monument preservation for objects of a technical nature? Is there any difference in assessing their historical importance from, say, "classic" cultural monuments? Are there methodological guidelines, or specific criteria, for evaluating their historical importance?

Dvořáková: Compared to the classic heritage fund, technical heritage is a very diverse fund made up of specific representatives of many manufacturing sectors, and therefore it is necessary to apply special approaches to the determination of their heritage values. What principles govern the declaration of technical monuments and their inclusion in the *Central List of Cultural Monuments* and what values are prioritized for industrial heritage is given by the above-mentioned *Methodology for evaluating and protecting industrial heritage from the point of view of monument preservation*, which will be followed up in the future by methodologies reflecting the specifics of selected industrial sectors, key for the development of industry and for Czech sites in the Czech Republic.

Bartošíková: By law, the preservation of technical monuments is the same as for other types of monuments. With technical monuments, we come across specific situations, especially if the object still serves its original purpose. In that case, the preservation of the original function is often tied to standards and regulations related to their safe operation. In such cases, it is self-evident to preserve the functionality of technology or process automation at the expense of the authenticity of some small parts.

In Slovakia, we do not have general methodological instructions for assessing the significance and values of monuments. Technical monuments have some specific aspects that are different from other types of monuments, for example the technological flow of the original production. From the point of view of monument preservation, the fact that the preserved object or technology is unique, the first of its kind, or the most efficient in terms of the given industry in Slovakia is also important. However, we also protect typical examples of technical monuments or equipment.

Most technical monuments have a technical value in connection with other monument values, for example, architectural, historical, or artistic-craft value. Preservation of technological equipment is not a condition for registration of the monument as a national cultural monument.

Classic monuments – chateaus, churches – are easier for the public to understand as they are “visually pleasant”, have more decorative elements, and artistic decoration. Gradually, however, industrial aesthetics also begins to penetrate the consciousness of the lay public.

Is there any closer form of cooperation – for example a professional platform – in this area between your two institutions?

Dvořáková: Cooperation between the two organizations, albeit modest, dates back to the 1970s, when the first contacts appeared, more so between

technical museums, but in which representatives of monument preservation also took part. Here I would like to recall the activities of the late Dr. Laco Mlynka in the field of water mills and participation in various excursions and lectures at conferences. Reciprocal meetings between the staff of both our institutions also contribute to bilateral cooperation at the moment.

Bartošíková: On behalf of the PÚ SR, I cooperate on various technical topics with the Methodological Centre of Industrial Heritage in Ostrava, with individual employees of the NPÚ, with the Research Centre for Industrial Heritage under the Faculty of architecture of the Czech Technical University, but also with the mill experts behind the vodnimlynny.cz portal, for example.

Do you see something mutually inspiring in the approach to the issue of industrial heritage on the Czech and Slovak sides?

Dvořáková: There is a lot of inspiration on both sides, and the obvious effort of the professional staff of both institutions is to preserve the most outstanding representatives of industrial heritage, including assistance in their restoration and the search for new uses. What distinguishes the two institutions is their legislative status within the state. While in the Czech Republic the National Heritage Institute is a professional organization ensuring the protection of cultural heritage without executive powers, the Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic combines both components, i.e. both professional and executive. Which is better, it is hard to judge.

Bartošíková: Our Czech colleagues inspire us in particular with their extremely broad publishing activity and the creation of methodological materials. The educational activities and popularization of technical monuments by the NPÚ is more extensive and worth following. In general, in the Czech Republic, the financing of research, publishing activities, and restoration of monuments is handled better and more diversely from the sources of the Ministry of Culture, but also of regional units, municipalities, and the European Union. There are many areas where we could be inspired.

Can you give an approximate representation of technical and industrial heritage among listed buildings in the Czech and Slovak Republics? And what is the representation of water management objects within the technical and industrial heritage?

Dvořáková: If the first inventories of cultural monuments taken during the 1960s registered a little over 1,000 monuments of science, production, and technology, today's *Central List of Cultural Monuments* includes around 3,000 of them. Even the current completion of high-quality representatives of industrial heritage based on professional research is still not finished. Nevertheless, it can be stated that, of the approximately 3,000 declared technical representatives, industrial constructions make up less than 10 per cent. This data comes from the *Industrial Topography* database of the Industrial Heritage Research Centre of CTU.

As for the numbers of water management structures listed in the *Central List of Cultural Monuments*, it is difficult to find them, since it is not clear whether water mills that no longer have a water wheel can be considered as water management structures or as folk architecture. In addition, searching in the current *Monument Catalogue* is somewhat difficult in this regard.

Bartošíková: In Slovakia, we have a monument registration system which divides national cultural monuments (sites) into individual monument objects. Technical monuments have a representation in the monument fund of less than four per cent. However, water management structures are represented relatively abundantly among technical monuments. Of the 680 technical

monuments, 170 are directly related to water management – water reservoirs, dams, levees, waterworks, water tanks, pumping stations, and the corresponding technologies. Another 85 are monuments that were powered by water – power stations, mills, sawmills, hammer mills, and technologies for their propulsion. This means that 37 per cent of technical monuments in Slovakia are directly connected to water.

The high rate of occurrence of water management objects in the monument fund is due, on the one hand, to the geographical characteristics of Slovakia, where water power is present throughout the whole country and was the impetus for the beginning of production. It is also due to the historical practice of preservation, when important mining monuments were declared as monuments in the first place, which also included mining water reservoirs (tajchy) and, subsequently, the interest in the protection of monuments shifted to craft production buildings, especially water mills, sawmills, and hammer mills. The representation of preserved technological equipment is also significant since hydroelectric power stations are mostly still functioning, mill turbines were not removed from mills, and water reservoirs must also be kept in operation.

From your point of view, which listed historical water management buildings are unique and iconic within the Czech and Slovak Republics? And which water management facilities, on the other hand, are not protected, but from your point of view would deserve preservation?

Dvořáková: Every water work deserves recognition. The idea of how the first millers probably built the shafts or how they built the dams must necessarily arouse our admiration. The medieval pond systems built on the Pernštejn or Rožmberk estates can certainly be considered iconic in our country. After all, the Třeboň ponds are still listed under the name Třeboň Pond Heritage as a cultural asset of the Czech Republic proposed for inclusion in the *List of World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. A number of specific water management structures, including artificial linear constructions, have not yet been sufficiently explored. Similarly, modern landscapes of water works are not appreciated, especially the Vltava Cascade, which certainly deserves protection. The convolute of elevated water tanks from the First Republic also deserves special attention, for example a unique elevated water tank in Kladno-Rozdělův with the first ever metal structure made of carbon steel and a non-load-bearing brick casing, which is now non-functional, but is among the good examples of new use in the form of a hi-tech water control centre and a cyber security centre.

Bartošíková: Of the protected buildings, an interesting system of monuments in Kremnické vrchy, the so-called Turček aqueduct from the 15th century – underground power station – 11 kilometres long hereditary adit of Emperor Ferdinand. It is a work that is significant for historical reasons, but also because of its technical values. The hydroelectric power station was started in 1922; it is located 245 metres underground and has three horizontal Pelton turbines installed. It is the deepest underground power station in Europe. A well-known UNESCO water management monument is the system of mining water reservoirs (tajchy) in Banská Štiavnica, which were used to drive mining and metallurgical equipment.

We are currently trying to register the system of water works on Starohorský potok. These are two water reservoirs with Ambursen-type dams, two derivation power stations, and technological accessories. They are significant not only because of the unique type of dams and overflow device, but also because it was the first attempt to operate a pumped storage Hydropower plant in our country.

What is your role as an institution in conversions of historical industrial buildings? Is there a methodical procedure, a guide to achieve a successful conversion? And what exactly is a successful conversion?

Dvořáková: A successful conversion, or a new use, can be considered such a modification where the main attributes of the original production building are preserved to the greatest extent possible. New interventions should not erase the original operational, technological, and typological features and should not cover the overall character of the building and the atmosphere of the environment with a new expression. The basis for understanding the production structure and its subsequent new use is perfect knowledge of the construction as well as knowledge of the production process. Within the field research of the National Heritage Institute, one of the new methodologies is specifically focused on conversions. In the field of water management constructions, I would probably mention the very refined conversion of the water tower at Letná, for which the architectural team received an award from the General Director of the National Heritage Institute.

Bartošíková: According to the Monuments Act, the decision on the intention to restore a national cultural monument is issued by the regional monument authorities which, from a methodological point of view, guide the restoration of all monuments and buildings in conservation areas. Unfortunately, the protection of technical monuments cannot be given priority, and that is why conversions of factories are often methodologically guided by the same people as castles and churches. We would like to enable higher specialization of fellow methodologists in the future. Personally, I consider a good conversion to be one that not only ensures continued functioning of the object, but is also appropriately sensitive to it. Choosing the right function is the most important step in a good conversion. It often happens that the object loses a lot of period details and technologies through conversion, which unfortunately give way to the demands of new use.

In what ways is your institution educating or popularizing this topic towards the public? And as part of this education, do you also cooperate with institutions and entities supporting tourism?

Dvořáková: of course, one of the aims of monument preservation is to popularize industrial heritage. This is done through organizing exhibitions, lectures, and cooperation, especially with the local municipalities and associations. At the same time, since 2014, the National Heritage Institute has been awarding the Patrimonium pro futuro awards every year with the subtitle Social appreciation of examples of good practice, in an effort to evaluate and highlight what has been achieved in the field of monument preservation and to recognize those who have contributed to successful work. In recent years, technical monuments have also received this award, whether it was the Jizera Mountains Technical Museum (Jizerskohorské technické muzeum) in Bílý Potok, or the renovation of railway roundhouse in Kořenov.

Bartošíková: We organize lectures, conferences, and educational events for families with children on the topic of technical monuments. Unfortunately, there are not very many of them. I also publish on the topic of technical monuments, but these are mainly more professional articles; popularization would need more mass media and a simpler approach. I regularly try to prepare events for the public connected with technical monuments during European Heritage Month.

In terms of media, we have the best collaboration with Slovak Radio, which has been broadcasting the series "Heritage of mills" this year and the series "Around technical monuments with a backpack" last year. This year, in cooperation with the Slovak Technical Museum, we are preparing an exhibition and

conference dedicated to ironworks. We should also publish a digital almanac dedicated to mill research.

What do you think are the biggest challenges in protecting this type of cultural heritage at the moment? Can an approach of some other European countries be inspiring in this regard and why?

Dvořáková: The biggest challenge for us is to continuously complete field research, on the basis of which it is possible to add monuments to the *Central List of Cultural Monuments*, and at the same time follow international trends in their preservation. A great contribution in recent years has been the establishment of cooperation with a partner monument institution in Oslo, because Norway repeatedly contributes to the restoration of cultural monuments in our country. Although some types of monuments are very different, for example Norwegian whaling heritage, the principles of protection remain the same. Another very inspiring country is the Federal Republic of Germany, where a good example is Emscher Park, the restoration of a depressed industrial area in the Ruhr, which can be a guide for the restoration of the former industrial areas of Kladno and Ostrava.

Bartošíková: The main challenges of the protection of technical monuments include more sensitive conversions, better protection of technologies, appreciation of the importance of archaeological technical heritage, as well as protection of mining and industrial cultural landscape. I think the protection of monuments of the second half of the 20th century is a phenomenon that goes beyond the field of technical monuments. Specifically, the protection of industrial sites is not properly understood in our country either – mostly we only manage to ensure the protection of solitary buildings.

Among European countries, Spain's approach to the protection of chimneys is interesting, where even when the factory is demolished, they leave the chimney standing as a reminder of history. In our country, the entire factory is often demolished only for preventive reasons, or because it is possible to draw subsidies for it.

To conclude, we would like to ask a slightly more personal question – which monument from the field of water management do you like the most or have a closer relationship to and why?

Dvořáková: Mostly it is the technical monument where I am currently the guarantor of restoration. From the area of water management constructions, I would probably mention the lock in Hořín and, from my point of view, its successful technical modification. The essence of the lock modifications was to increase the passability of the navigation channel for taller cabin ships and cargo traffic, so that the original reinforced concrete arch of the larger lock chamber was replaced by a steel structure that is hydraulically lifted on pistons. When the upper arch is extended during the passage of ships, it represents a perfect water work, which remains a legitimate cultural monument supplemented by a new technical solution that is in line with the objective of the lock. In the case of technical heritage, it is necessary to accept the idea of other possibilities of innovation of technical devices and technologies while preserving their main function, and that these innovations are permissible from the point of view of monument preservation, because they allow the functionality of the technical work to be preserved.

Bartošíková: From an aesthetic point of view, I like water tanks. In the monument fund, especially the elevated water tanks – in Trnava, Bernolákovo, and Palárikovo – are interesting. The system of two artistically decorated ground reservoirs with preserved technology, but also with the torso of the original orchard treatment with sculptural decoration, which is located in Bratislava, I described in detail in a professional proposal for declaration as a monument.

I was also pleasantly surprised by the system of monuments – a well – a pumping station – a technological facility on the island of Sihoť in Bratislava. Normally, this object is not accessible as it is a still functional source of drinking water. However, it is characterized by a picturesque aesthetic set in a natural environment, which you do not expect in Bratislava.

Thank you both for the interview.

**Ing. Miriam Dzuráková
and Ing. Robert Kořínek, Ph.D.**

Ing. arch. Eva Dvořáková

Ing. arch. Eva Dvořáková is a graduate of the Faculty of Civil Engineering, majoring in architecture, at the Czech Technical University (CTU) in Prague. Since 1974, she has been working in the field of monument preservation. In the National Heritage Institute, within a specialized department, she deals with technical and industrial heritage and also researches industrial and technical facilities and objects. She is one of the initiators of the establishment of the Industrial Heritage Protection Section at the National Technical Museum in Prague (1987) and is a member of the Scientific Council of the Industrial Heritage Research Centre at the Faculty of architecture of CTU. She is also the co-author of a number of publications, including *Industriální skanzen Čechy a Morava* (Prague 1992), *Technické památky v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku* (Prague 2000), *Industriál – paměť – východiska* (Prague 2007), and *Industriální cesty českým středozápadem* (Kladno 2009).



Ing. arch. Tereza Bartošíková, Ph.D.

Ing. arch. Tereza Bartošíková, Ph.D., has been an employee of the Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic since 2015. She graduated from the Faculty of architecture of Slovak University of Technology (STU) in Bratislava, and defended her Ph.D. thesis at the same Faculty. During her studies, she completed an internship at the Industrial Heritage Research Centre at CTU. She deals with technical monuments in the entire area of Slovakia from the earliest times to the second half of the 20th century. She combines research and mapping of technical monuments with publishing and educational activities. On the basis of her proposals, several valuable and interesting technical objects have already been declared cultural monuments, including water management ones.

