

**PROTECTION OF HISTORICAL MONUMENTS FROM SIBIU COUNTY**  
**BETWEEN 1965-2001**

I have chosen to talk about this subject due to the importance that the activity of protecting historical monuments within Sibiu County had in a period of extensive political, economical, social and also ideological transformations. The transition from communism to democracy has left its mark, with the good and the bad, upon the situation of the monuments and upon the rules that governed their existence. Unfortunately, not only before the revolution, but also after the revolution, the monuments were left on a second place regarding the concerns and priorities of the central and local authorities. The same authorities that were giving too much credit to the various investors who were involved in the economical life from Sibiu, authorities that closed their eyes to the interventions carried out on protected sights or architectural preserves of the municipality.

Even though much has been written about Sibiu, about its monuments of unquestionable value, about one of the most valuable and best preserved natures of architecture in Romania, the problem of protecting this unique heritage has been tackled only tangentially in very few treatises, studies that were regarding only isolated aspects of this important activity.

Then, the activity of institutions in the field of protecting the cultural heritage from this period, especially the County Office for National Cultural Heritage Sibiu and Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites from Eastern Transylvania, was not interesting for the specialists, and I consider that the effort, dedication and sacrifice of the representatives of these institutions who fought, often against wind mills, to save the heritage from Sibiu have to be well-known by the specialists in this field. And it was not easy not even in a Communist society with an extremely strict doctrine and with non-existent possibilities of free expression of ideas, or in one Post-Decembrist, dominated by political and material interests. If, initially, in the first period of the Communist system, the activity of protecting cultural heritage property has experienced a significant burst, along with the policy in this field from 1977 the activity has been changed radically, being dismantled not only the building sites of restoration, left without funds, but also institutions that were coordinating or realizing these activities. Then, after the revolution, the same historical monuments have stood in the way of major real developers who

saw only obstacles in front of lifting more profitable forests of blocks or imposing business quarters.

Through our approach we did not try to rewrite the history of Sibiu, nor to revolutionize the professional literature, but we wanted to get to light through documents from the archives of the County Office for Culture and National Heritage Sibiu, a particularly important episode in the long and tumultuous existence of historical monuments of this city - to bring to the attention of the public and not only their issues and even to determine, for further discussions and debates that would be in the interest of the theme I have approached. And these in terms of a person that activates directly, in this battle for keeping the historical monuments in proper conditions.

The base on which I have developed my paper was the study of archive, many unpublished documents that are thrown away after the lockers and offices from the County Office for Culture and National Heritage Sibiu. Here I have found a huge amount of information, which had to be selected, processed, analyzed, synthesized and interpreted.

### ***1. THE CURRENT LEVEL OF THE RESEARCHERS***

About the historical monuments in Sibiu was written relatively much, a number of historians, most from Sibiu, approaching different aspects of this problem, from the description and evolution up to the transformations recorded in time, in papers and studies with general pattern. However, very few were bent on actual activities for the protection and preservation of these monuments carried out, in the last nearly four decades, by the institutions with attributions in this field from county or regional level, respectively the County Office for National Cultural Heritage Sibiu and the Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites from Eastern Transylvania. And this is because the vast majority of the documents related to this activity is in the archive of the County Office for Culture and National Heritage Sibiu. A limited number of people have access to these documents, because there was no interest to bring to light these pages from the history of Sibiu's monuments.

Of a great importance for the study and detailed knowledge of the historical monuments from Sibiu and the activity of institutions with attributions in the field, fact that should be remembered in this brief summary, are topographies of the City of Sibiu and Mediaș (Dr.

Alexandru Avram for Medias together with Ioan Bucur for Sibiu), works which should constitute the basis for any restoration project, presenting both the current situation and the one assumed initially, benchmark for all future activities for the protection of historical monuments, both in terms of scientific research and restoration interventions or completion of the urbanistic plans of the localities concerned.

It should also be mentioned two articles of a great importance for the protection of cultural heritage property from Sibiu and for the institutions with attributions in the field of the same authors, dr. Alexandru Avram and Ioan Bucur, the first entitled *Din problematica ocrotirii monumentelor arhitectonice sibiene în perioada 1977 – 1989 (The problematic issues of architectural monuments from Sibiu in the period 1977-1989)*, which has its debut with the abolition year of the County Office for National Cultural Heritage Sibiu, which came after a period of relatively favorable heritage built in Sibiu, several monuments of the historic centre of the city being restored (the Small Market buildings, fortifications on Citadel Street, Powder Tower, etc.), many other works being in progress of execution, and the second, entitled *Aspecte privind ocrotirea monumentelor istorice în județul Sibiu în perioada 1990 – 1996 (Aspects of the protection of historical monuments in the Sibiu County in the period 1990-1996)*, where it is given the activity of protecting national cultural heritage in Sibiu, after the revolution of December 1989, activity that has seen a significant bend by setting up, after 13 years from the dissolution of the County Office for National Cultural Heritage Sibiu, the National Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites, especially of the regional commissions.

## **2. ROMANIAN LEGISLATION IN THE FIELD OF NATIONAL CULTURAL HERITAGE BETWEEN 1965-2001**

### **2.1. THE LEGISLATION BETWEEN 1965-1989**

The idea of preserving and protecting the national cultural heritage and the awareness of liability towards it had a long and difficult evolution, both on land of the legislation and on the land of its implementation. Cultural heritage was viewed differently from one area to another, from one period to another, depending on the interests that governed the society at that time and

the ability of those in positions of responsibility to perceive the importance of preserving all materials of the evolution of each nation.

Since 1946, through Decree-Law, which later became Law No. 803/20 September 1946 for organizing national museums, a series of measures are established for the protection of national cultural heritage, being targeted, in particular, the cultural personal property. It is important to mention, with noticeable effects for the protection of historical monuments, the establishment of regional inspectorates that could manage this problem, an aspect that was not succeeded by the previous legislation. It should be noted even the fact that there were made, for the first time in this law, mentions regarding historical monuments through the presentation of the attributions of these inspectorates that were in charge of the public evidence of the monuments from the entire country.

There are some concerns regarding the national cultural heritage - Romania took over and assimilated, to some extent, the global experience in this field. The first regulatory document that controlled in a uniform manner the activity of protecting national cultural heritage in Romania after the Second World War was the Law No. 63 from 30<sup>th</sup> of October 1974, the National Cultural Heritage Protection Law of the Socialist Republic of Romania. This regulatory document was referring both to cultural heritage property and to the real assets. The law was structured in three chapters: the national cultural heritage; the evidence, preservation, conservation and valuing (putting in value not commercialization) the national cultural heritage; sanctions.

All through this regulatory document, and perhaps the most important aspect of the law, were set up specialized institutions in protecting cultural heritage: the *Central Commission of the National Cultural heritage*, *National Cultural Heritage Directorate*, as well as *offices of the County National Cultural Heritage* and of the municipality of Bucharest. The attributions of these bodies consisted in "ensuring uniform evidence, conservation, scientific research and development of the national cultural heritage".

We believe that, as a whole, the Law No. 63/1974 had positive effects for the protection of national cultural heritage, in particular for the one regarding the personal property, but not only. A positive aspect was the establishment of county offices for national cultural heritage that were able to coordinate, at the local level, the activities of heritage assets and to protect them.

Then, particularly important was the establishment of 10 regional laboratories for restoring these types of goods, including one in Sibiu, in the Brukenthal Museum.

A very important provision of the Law No. 63/1974 was to establish the *National Cultural Heritage Directorate*, achieved through the reorganization of the Department of historical monuments and art, within the approved plan indicators for the Cultural Council and Socialist Education, the *County Offices and for the municipality of Bucharest* within museums established by the Cultural Council and Socialist Education. These offices will be in the following decades, the institutions that will activate effectively for saving the national cultural heritage and the activities of which will depend on, to a large extent, the fate of this heritage. The offices and especially their representatives will act by all legal means, in order to preserve the good condition of the cultural heritage. Thanks to them we can enjoy today the wealth and variety of a heritage often damaged by the measures and actions of the authorities.

As a complement to Law No. 63/1974, two months after its occurrence (but developed earlier), was issued the Decree of the State Council No. 13/1975 where through were laid down, in the end, the attributions of the National and Cultural Heritage Directorate and of that County Offices, that has contributed, along with Law No. 63/1974, to the creation, in the entire country, of a unitary system of protection of the national cultural heritage.

## ***2.2. THE LEGISLATION BETWEEN 1989-2001***

Unfortunately, the Law No. 63/1974 was used by Communist authorities as a tool of political oppression, its provisions allowing committing numerous abuses, thus becoming unpopular. In addition to this, in new conditions after 1989, the institutional system had to be redone in the field of protection of national cultural heritage disorganized through measures adopted after 1977. On the other hand, the concept of protecting cultural heritage gained new values in the countries with a rich tradition in this field, asserting the adaptation of the Romanian legislation to these concepts. There were also approved a number of international conventions and bilateral agreements with various European countries, not only with the ones regarding the protection of national and universal heritage.

For assuring the evidence, the protection, conservation, restoration and the value of historical monuments, assemblies and sites, immediately after the revolution, due to the vacuum in the field of legislative protection of historical monuments and due to the need to govern the status of this important field, on 5<sup>th</sup> February 1990, the National Salvation Front Council issued the *Decree No. 91/1990* regarding the establishment and organization of the National Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies Sites. This decree has practically abolished the Law No. 63/1974.

In May 1990, among the eight commissions organized at the national level was also established the Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites from Eastern Transylvania, with headquarters in Sibiu, which were allocated the counties of Sibiu, Braşov, Covasna, Harghita, Mureş and Bistriţa Năsăud. After a year from its establishment the Commission was reorganized by co-opting members from each county awarded (most were not remunerated for this activity).

An important regulatory document for this field was the Government Ordinance No. 68 from 26<sup>th</sup> of August 1994 regarding the protection of the national cultural heritage. For the first time in Romania, legislative norms treated with greater importance the problem of historical monuments, classified the protected sights, defined terms of specialty and clearly established their protected areas.

The first Romanian law that approached exclusively the problem of immobile cultural heritage under all its aspects was the Law No. 422 of 18<sup>th</sup> July 2001 concerning the protection of historical monuments, republished in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 938 from 20<sup>th</sup> of November 2006, regulatory document that controls even today the general legal status of the monuments.

The Law No. 422/2001 also lays down the scientific, legal, administrative, financial, technical and fiscal measures designed to ensure the identification, research, inventory, ranking, tracking, conservation, including protection and maintenance, consolidation, restoration, putting in value the historical monuments and their social-economic and cultural integration in the life of local communities. Incentive measures with economical character, but not only, were established in order to protect the historical monuments.

### **3. EVOLUTION OF THE LIST OF HISTORICAL MONUMENTS**

#### **3.1. INSTITUTIONS WITH ATTRIBUTIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE LIST OF HISTORICAL MONUMENTS**

Managing the problem of historical monuments in the County of Sibiu and thereby the lists with evidence of these sights has returned in a first phase to the *Committee of Culture and Socialist Education of Sibiu County*. Established in 1968 and named initially the Committee of Culture and Art, the institution operated under the Folk County Council. After 1974, these duties were taken over by the County Office for National Cultural Heritage Sibiu that worked initially as a section within the Brukenthal National Museum. After the revolution, on this line there was established the *National Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites* with duties in the field of the evidence, the protection, conservation, restoration and the value of the historical monuments, assemblies and sites, regardless of their property condition. Zonal commissions have been organized in the territory.

In May 1990, it was established the Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites from Eastern Transylvania, with headquarters in Sibiu, which were allocated the counties of Sibiu, Braşov, Covasna, Harghita, Mureş and Bistriţa Năsăud. Later, this activity has passed into the prerogatives of the *County Inspectorate for Culture* and of the *County Department for Culture, Cults and National Cultural Heritage Sibiu*.

#### **3.2. EVOLUTION OF THE LIST OF HISTORICAL MONUMENTS IN THE PERIOD 1955-2001**

The problem of evaluation of historical monuments was, from the beginning, a complex and difficult intercession to achieve both scientifically and practically. The first list of historical monuments in Romania was established in 1955 and legislated by the Decree regarding the declaration of monuments of culture of some archaeological monuments, architecture, plastic art and historic with No. 1160/1955. Doing an abstract analysis of the list, we consider that the main shortcomings of them were constituted by the lack of many sights of a real value from the protected monuments and their bad bordering in categories, on the value criterion. However, it

should be noted that for the first time there was legislated, with all the legal consequences deriving from it, an inventory, although an incomplete one, of the historical monuments in Romania. A major shortcoming of it, at least in the case of Sibiu, but also in the case of other medieval cities, is that the built-up areas and the preserve of architecture were not included among the historical monuments.

In the mid 1970s, after about two decades after the first appearance of an official register of historical monuments, there was drawn up a new list that contained these kind of sights in Sibiu County (more complete than the previous one), without, however, being published in any regulatory document and having only an internal circuit. In Sibiu and the border communes are mentioned 198 monuments, in Mediaş there are 66 sights and overall Sibiu County has 461 monuments. We see a high concentration of historical monuments in the two municipalities of the County, where we find more than half of the total number of sights (57, 27%).

In a relatively short period after the revolution, in 1991, there was developed a third list regarding the evidence of historical monuments in Romania. This one corresponds, besides the previous one, with other social, political, economical and cultural realities that left needs their mark on it. During the period of drawing up these lists, several sights have received the status of historical monuments through classification, others have disappeared, earlier lists being supplemented and updated. For the first time, the sights have been differentiated on value criteria, being laid down 5 levels of bordering.

List of historical monuments from 1991 remained valid, with several changes (both classification and reclassification of sights) for 13 years when, by the order of the Minister of Culture and Cults with no. 2314/2004, it is adopted a new list that contained initially, on Sibiu's territory, a number of 926 historical monuments (compared with 665 in the previous one and 229 in the first list from 1955), a number that will increase steadily, once with the new classification of these kind of sights. And this list of historical monuments is realized on counties. From the structural point of view, the monuments are grouped into four categories, depending on their nature, respectively monuments of archaeology, architecture, for public and memorial and funeral monuments. From the point of view of their value, the sights are classified into two categories: A-monuments of national interest and universal and B-monuments of local interest.



**4. THE ESTABLISHMENT AND THE ACTIVITY OF THE REGIONAL AND ZONAL COMMISSION OF HISTORICAL MONUMENTS, ASSEMBLIES AND SITES FROM EASTERN TRANSYLVANIA. COLLABORATION WITH THE COUNTY OFFICE FOR NATIONAL CULTURAL HERITAGE SIBIU**

**4.1. ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANISATION OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION OF MONUMENTS, ASSEMBLIES AND SITES**

Immediately after the revolution, because of the need of establishing an institution to represent an interest for protecting historical monuments, took place the first meeting of specialists in this field (art historians, architects, historians, archaeologists, restorers etc.), which debated the problem of re-establishing the Department of Historical Monuments and Historical Monuments Commission. Thus, on 5<sup>th</sup> February 1990, the Decree no. 91/1990 of The National Salvation Front Council was elaborated. Hereby, it was founded The National Commission of Monuments, Assemblies and Historical Sites (C.N.M.A.S.I.), an autonomous authority, near Ministry of Culture, which had the power to decide in the historical monuments field. According to the decree, the Commission was coordinating the entire activity of protection, conservation, renovation and putting in value the monuments.

The activity of C.N.M.A.S.I. was divided into five sections: archaeology, architecture and engineering, assemblies and historical areas, rural architecture, artistic components of the monuments (picture, sculpture etc.). The problems of each section were solved by secretaries, which were employees of the D.M.A.S.I. At debates or meetings for approving a project were taking part not only members of the Commission, but also other guests (specialists and collaborators), which had the role to identify optimal solutions for the problems.

**4.2. THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANISATION OF ZONAL COMMISSIONS OF HISTORICAL MONUMENTS, ASSEMBLIES AND SITES**

C.N.M.A.S.I., autonomous authority, near Ministry of Culture (according to C.F.S.N. Decree no. 91/1990), whose decisions are indispensable in this field, was sustained in its own activity deployment on Zonal Commissions, which were forming part of historical countryside.

These zonal commissions were founded in May-September 1990 and they were created for realizing the decentralization of the activity to protect historical monuments, for a more effective involvement in the territory of the central authorities in the field and for involvement in this field of specialists at the local level. A decentralization of the national cultural heritage protection was absolutely necessary after the Communist system in which the central institutions have full decision-making power, to the detriment of territorial structures, yet better engaged in the realities on the ground and knowing better the problems of activity areas monuments.

According to legislation in the field, the Zonal Commissions received a number of duties in this area, many of them in expanding and in support of the National Commission: suggestions for monuments in the territory, policy suggestions for the restoration plan, county commissions, relations with other institutions, opinions on the restoration projects, changes of destination locations, orders investigations and projects, direct and indirect relations with other institutions, monitoring and controlling works in the territory, suggestions to complete the lists, organization of regular scientific events, suggestions for the general norm of restoration, tracking the activity of investigation, design and execution, keeping quarterly meetings, movements in the territory related to C.N.M.A.S.I.

#### ***4.3. THE ESTABLISHMENT, ORGANIZATION AND THE ACTIVITY OF ZONAL COMMISSION OF HISTORICAL MONUMENTS, ASSMEBLIES AND SITES C.Z.M.A.S.I. EASTERN TRANSYLVANIA SIBIU***

C.Z.M.A.S.I. Eastern Transylvania Sibiu was one of the eight bodies organized on the territory of the country as extensions of the National Commission of Monuments. Established in May 1990, the Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites East Transylvania, with headquarters in Sibiu, was also assigned with some counties: Sibiu, Braşov, Mureş, Covasna, Harghita and Bistriţa Năsăud. For a short period of time the Commission was led by Dr. Thomas Nagler, and from the second half of 1991, the Commission was led by Dr. Alexandru Avram, both of them specialists with an important experience in this field. After a period of researches, the activity was started again in 1991 when the Commission was reorganized by co-opting members from each county assigned.

The Zonal Commission was taking in hand a part of the specific activities of the National Commission in the territory, focusing on the track of monuments, documentation and approval control. In accordance with international practice, it was important to follow the increasing role and the importance of these commissions. In the period 1991-first half of 1993, the activity of the Commission has progressed continuously, reaching the implementation in the consciousness of local administration authorities from the 6 counties the importance of heritage protection and of keeping the law, as there were in the field.

Broadly, the Commission's regional activity has focused on analyzing and approving projects submitted on interventions on historical monuments, controls in the territory to identify acts constituting infringements and the appeal in law enforcement, monitoring of the sights within the competence, updating the list of specialty (suggestions for introduction or erasers monuments), establishing/maintaining the collaboration with other institutions with responsibilities in the field and legislative proposals.

Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites East Transylvania and the County Office for National Cultural Heritage Sibiu collaborated on all levels in the business of protecting historical monuments within Sibiu County. The two institutions responded immediately and vehemently to all violations of the legal procedures, whether at fault was a physical person, a State institution (numerous differences with City Hall and the Prefecture of Sibiu) or representatives of religious denominations. At the same time, in the period in which they worked together, the two institutions have conducted many surveys, in Sibiu and in the territory, in order to identify and to sanction infringements of the legal procedures in the field.

## ***5. ACTIVITY PERFORMED BY THE INSTITUTIONS WITH RESPONSIBILITIES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE LEGISLATION IN THE FIELD OF NATIONAL CULTURAL HERITAGE***

### ***5.1. NOTICES ISSUED BY O.J.P.C.N. SIBIU/C.Z.M.A.S.I. TRANSILVANIA EST***

The present chapter is based almost exclusively on archival documents concerning the activity of the County Office for National Cultural Heritage Sibiu and the Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites East Transylvania. After studying and interpreting the documents, it appears clearly that the two institutions have held a remarkable activity altogether regarding the protection of historical monuments in the cities of Sibiu and Medias, as well as in the County, whether if we are talking about ecclesiastical monuments, fortifications, sights of civil architecture (commercial spaces, houses) or even entire urban areas.

#### ***5.1.1. ECCLESIASTIC MONUMENTS***

##### ***A. ORTHODOX CHURCHES***

Due to the large number of Orthodox churches with the status of architectural monument and the several problems caused by the age of the construction and by the destructives factors which have acted on them, O.J.P.C.N. and C.Z.M.A.S.I. have developed a broad activity for analyzing projects submitted, spot checks and confirming interventions performed on these structures and mural paintings. This broad activity has issued not only favorable opinions, but also negative ones. In a considerable proportion, the notices concerning interventions upon the cult objectives have been released until 1990, after that, the number of documents required for aproval have been significantly decreased. Then, the proportion was undertaken again along with the market liberalization and with the establishment of many companies, by the interventions on buildings belonging to architectural reserves of Sibiu and Medias.

Although there were projects which, after analysis and checks on the ground, were rejected, their number was relatively small (8%). The O.J.P.C.N. /C.Z.M.A.S.I. specialists have tried to correct the erroneous aspects and previsions or unsuitable projects through the conditioning of certain works or by the use of recommended materials for interventions on

historical monuments, necessary conditions for issuing the requested notice. The proposals and conditions for the issuance of approvals and agreements have proven the professionalism and total involvement of the representatives of the Office and of the Zonal Commission in Sibiu's cultural heritage issues, although their number was very small related to the volume of work and to the number of goals and although they were provided with a more than modest material endowment.

At the request of the Romanian Orthodox Archdiocese in Sibiu or its subordinate parishes, agreements have been issued, mainly for restoring works of painting and repair, maintenance and demolition.

### ***A.1. Painting restoration***

O.J.P.C.N. set, in mural painting restoration, a set of necessary rules, in order to save the old paintings, most of them having a particular value, rules set through the issue conditions of the favorable notices. To all demands addressed to O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I., the specialists of these institutions have requested, to avoid the destruction of older paintings and to avoid hidden under layers of plaster, that the etching should run carefully, especially on the inside, where the first operation was supposed to remove the paint layer by layer, in random places determined by the painter - restorer or other competent person. It also had to be performed in advance, drawing copies and photos for each side painted differently, for restoration.

Through its policy, O.J.P.C.N., opted for keeping original paintings where it was possible, even if the applicant didn't intend to do so. But there were situations in which keeping old murals were not possible, mostly because of scanty conservation status and sight in general.

### ***A.2. Restoration and maintenance***

In close connection with restoring paintings and as a condition to completion of this operation, numerous projects submitted by O.J.P.C.N. and C.C.E.S., later C.Z.M.A.S.I., were carrying out works of repairing and maintenance of the Orthodox churches. Thus, at the repeated requests of the Romanian Orthodox Archdiocese, the Office has communicated the agreement on carrying out maintenance repairs specifying that, in the case of the removal of plasters, this

operation is to be carried out with special attention and if anything could affected the painting the work had to be stooped and the specialists be notified immediately.

The repairs which were the most solicited to be approved were regarding rooftops, components of construction which are constantly a subject to the action of the weather, very necessary because their damage affect the entire edifice with decorative elements and interior painting. O.J.P.C.N. pursued, by approving these works and through the imposed conditions, keeping the shape and materials of the roof coverings, being totally against any changes in shape or volume.

Also, numerous requests were submitted on obtaining approvals required for dismantling (in particular annexes or enclosure walls of the churches which are historical monuments) or introduction of electric current, and in these cases, relevant conditions for the approval of these interventions being set.

## **B. EVANGELICAL CHURCHES, GREEK AND ROMAN CATHOLIC**

Less numerous than those drawn up and submitted for an opinion to the interventions at the Orthodox churches (a result of the lower number of these structures and the limited materials and possibilities of parishes), a number of projects looked up interventions at Evangelical Churches on Sibiu's territory, namely restoration of paintings (especially those inner ones), exterior repairs and painting, consolidation, restoration, and even building new places of worship.

The proposed works through projects submitted were of a great diversity, more or less extensive, depending on the needs and the material possibilities of the parishes. O.J.P.C.N. reviewed each case and tried to find favorable solutions for both the preservation of historical monuments, restoration and conservation in best conditions, as well as for ensuring their functionality.

### ***B.1. Polychromes***

Due to the age and the vicissitudes of the monuments which have undergone throughout many centuries of existence, in addition to and in connection with damage occurred to their structure (in particular the problems of roof coverings) paintings were affected. Many projects

concerning the restoration of the painting of Evangelical churches were addressed to O.J.P.C.N. or C.Z.M.A.S.I. and many of them were drawn up by Hermann Fabini, doctor in archeology a specialist with experience in the field. The projects were based on memoirs on the history and evolution of the objectives in question, especially paintings that were the subject of the project, but also on construction stages.

In all cases they were required to conduct surveys in order to identify possible under existing painting frescoes at the time, as well as to determine the main color used for the sights' interior. The polychromic proposals submitted depended on the results of these surveys. The completed projects had to be analyzed very carefully.

### ***B.2. Exterior repairs***

Exterior repairs for the Evangelical rite buildings were of a great complexity . To meet the strict requirements of the approved projects and resolving any problems occurring throughout the completion of the work, required interventions were carried out only under the direct supervision of the designer and designated by O.J.P.C.N. specialist.

The proposed works were analyzed in detail by representatives of the Office or Regional Commission, the notices depending on a number of conditions designed to ensure the best possible restoration of the monument. These specialists required, in each case, that the recapping of plasters should be used to detect any elements of architecture or the original plaster, under the current layer, the execution of surveys in several points, near the walls of the Church, for determining the level of native treading.

### ***B.3. Restoration***

Due to external factors that acted on them and due to the age of buildings, for preserving the integrity and the value of the objectives and decorative elements wherewith they were referred, Evangelical churches have imposed some extensive restoration work. Restoration works presented, in general, an important degree of difficulty. This happened, on the one hand, due to the serious damage they accumulated (in many cases the cracks of walls and vaults), and on the other hand due to the successive interventions, that did not respected not even the basic principles of the restoration of a historical monument. In several cases, on interior or exterior

walls, the plaster with mortar cement was identified, which was disbanded to allow the airing of the wall. Sometimes it was used mortar of cement which is against interventions on monuments.

Analyzing each project individually, O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I. specialists required, depending on the situation of each monument, found most often on the spot, the carrying out of works in order to repair inappropriate interventions and to save sights, such as: removal of the cement mortar in such way that the stone items would not be deteriorated, restoration of the cracks and fissures, with lime mortar, the removal of paintings in multiple layers of the plaster on the walls and vaults and reworking some embrasures or broken parcels in the pieces of stone laid flat with mortar.

In addition to the above-mentioned requests, in a lower number, projects have been submitted for the *construction of new buildings, developments* (for interior and exterior plastering, embrasures, organization of interior space, indoor and outdoor flooring, woodwork etc., often the basic rules of restoration in contradiction with the interests of promoters), *exterior paintings, consolidations* (which presented serious weaknesses of the structure) or mounting of *electrical wiring*.

### 5.1.2. THE MEDIEVAL FORTIFICATION

Although the majority of projects submitted to the two institutions were aiming the approval for interventions on civil, public buildings or houses, there were drawn up even projects relating to the restoration and consolidation works of *military buildings*, especially of the medieval fortifications of Sibiu, most of them drawn up before the revolution from December 1989. After this, there were only isolated interventions of this nature, some of them of a major importance, local authorities after December 1989 (most of them remaining in the functions of the previous period, maintaining dismissive attitude and concepts of national cultural heritage issues) were no longer interested in the new socio-economic conditions of preservation and protection of some historical monuments which didn't bring immediate benefits.



### **5.1.3. THE CIVIL ARCHITECTURE OBJECTIVES**

#### ***A. PUBLIC EDIFICES***

In the same tumultuous first years, after the fall of the Communist system, the Office for Heritage and the Zonal Commission were confronted with a number of requests for building-up large edifices, located in protected areas (especially in the architectural preserve from Sibiu and Medias), which would significantly change the appearance of the areas where they were designed. Often the notices submitted were rejected for restudying and reanalyzing certain aspects that were in contradiction with urbanity laws, for the provision of materials and finishes that do not enter into contradiction with traditional architecture and for using woodwork similar to that are etc. In all cases it was required to draft feasibility studies in order to establish concrete ways for laying out the sights for protecting the monuments in the surroundings of the County.

There have been cases in which representatives of the Office or the Zonal Commission have approved the submitted documentation, which respected the conditions indicated, without changes in the architecture of the buildings and the facades, the existing wholes, in which were located those extensions. This happened many times, even though, they were not recommended in protected areas. In other cases, the specialists of the two institutions have approved some extensions provided fully to restore the original building. The extension was supposed to respect the architectural style, the decorative elements and the volumetric analysis of the building. In some cases, however, the proposals for the projects submitted were not in a proper condition to be approved, either because of the proposed addition or either because of the urbanity value of the area, severely affected if these extensions were built-up.

#### ***B. COMMERCIAL SPACES***

After the Revolution from December 1989, due to the deep changes in the social, economic and political areas, even the activity of the institutions involved in the protection of the national cultural heritage from Sibiu County was adapted to the new requirements. Since 1990 the market liberalization and a large increase in the number of companies took place. The architecture of the buildings, most built-up many centuries ago, designed as spaces for living, were not compatible with the new requirements. As a result, to ensure an appropriate framework

of economic activities, the demands of citizens for leading constructive nature works in the architectural reserve have been multiplied.

### ***B.1. Interior and exterior facilities***

Applications concerning interior facilities were the most numerous projects submitted for approval. In most cases, specialists followed the construction of the first floor of a building in order to transform it in commercial spaces. The vast majority of documentation submitted (90%) was positive, but they were given with a number of very strict and pertinent conditions. Some of them were rejected, because they were either incomplete or defective drawn up, either because they were not a proper solution for complex problems for protected buildings. In other cases, the methods and materials proposed to be used were totally incompatible with interventions on historical monuments. They required, in general, making surveys to verify the existence of mural paintings and the repair of water spouts, gutters and sanitary facilities to prevent the infiltration of water in the walls. Based on the results of these surveys, the projects previously submitted were re-established. It was avoided the refusal of projects submitted. This measure was taken only in cases where the works provided could have affected the status of monuments. The obliquity of the rules regarding interventions on historical monuments was so important that it could not be corrected by O.J.P.C.N. /C.Z.M.A.S.I specialists.

### ***B.2. Building embrasure on façades***

A significant part of the façade projects submitted to O.J.P.C.N. or C.Z.M.A.S.I. for approval was setting objectives on some embrasure on the facades of buildings (generally processing of windows in the doors) in order to modify the first floor into commercial spaces, at installation companies and facades of buildings at various interior and exterior facilities of these spaces. After analyzing the documentation submitted (sometimes even photographic documentation on the evolution of facades and other documentation) and ground checks, if the appearance, structure and real resistance were not affected, C.Z.M.A.S.I. issued favorable agreements for projects concerning the opening of some doors transformed from windows. In general, in situations where the creation of embrasure in facades referred to recent buildings or to

buildings with no architectural or historical value, favorable notices were issued by the O.J.P.C.N. /C.Z.M.A.S.I., a number of projects being approved.

### ***B.3. Location of companies***

In connection with the work of interior or exterior facilities and with openings in facades, many projects submitted for approval referred to laying out some advertising agencies on these facades.

At all demands for a company's location on historical monuments or on the protected area of architectural preserve, O.J.P.C.N. /C.Z.M.A.S.I. were requiring not only separate projects for these companies to comply with specific area, materials, dimensions, colors and records compatible with the architecture of the place, but also a great position in relation to the structure and location of openings in facades.

There have been several cases in which C.Z.M.A.S.I. rejected requests for the location of firms on the facades of buildings or of the historical monuments of architecture, because they were not in accordance to the specifics of the area, location, dimensions, material used.

### ***B.4. The operating agreements***

C.Z.M.A.S.I. /O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu Prerogative, for communicating the activity of trading companies in the historical monuments edifices or in those edifices located in protected area, as a condition of the grant of the authorization of the activity by the Mayor of Sibiu, has proved particularly useful in the context in which it was one of the few levers that was available to fix the deplorable situation in which many buildings were in this area in the early years of the democracy gained after the revolution from 1989. These aspects were doubly so as important and effective, because coercive measures applied by the institutions with attributions in case of infringements of the legal procedures in case of unauthorized interventions on historical monuments were entirely missing.

## **C. DWELLING HOUSES**

In the period before the revolution of December 1989 the main problems wherewith historical monuments were confronted with were the total lack of interest shown by the central

and local authorities, insufficient funds allocated to the restoration and the maintenance of these sights by the owners and tenants, in the first years after the fall of the Communist system and the establishment of democracy. This was, unfortunately, poorly understood by the majority of the population, apart from the previous deficiencies and this led to many problems concerning direct interventions on monuments during the process of privatization and modernization. These interventions can be grouped into several broad categories:

- tackling of the substance of the monument by destroying certain parts or valuable items; the use of materials or techniques that endanger the health of the monument (concrete screed, cement, faience, polyvinyl painting); structural transformations through embrasures of no effect, dismantling or removal of walls, etc.

- applying some unaesthetic elements on the monument or on those located in the preserve of architecture (painting, bars, etc.).

### ***C.1. Extensions***

Due to increased number of population, diversification and enhancement of social and economic problems, industrial buildings built centuries ago, both those owned as private property and as private have become insufficient and ineffective for new requirements, aiming, in many cases, their extension. Problems have arisen, especially, in protected areas, these having a limited area and stricter rules for building. For these reasons, the majority of the projects submitted were rejected.

### ***C.2. Interior and exterior facilities***

The real situation of conservation of buildings owned by state companies subordinated to local authorities left much to be desired, these being rented to persons who were not the owners, who were not interested to invest in restoring and preserving the quality of real situation of used sights by doing just absolutely necessary works, often without any kind of project and without respecting the minimum rules on such interventions on historical monuments.

For each request to issue notices on interventions on historical monuments or buildings located in the protected areas and for adopting the best solutions in the interest of these sights, together with the analysis of the project drawn up, O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I representatives were

making controls on the territory for the establishment of the situation of preservation and evaluation of the opportunity and the effects caused by the proposed changes. Often there have been detected several deficiencies produced in recent decades, which on the long term could affect the stability and sustainability of buildings as a whole. In these cases, the owners were required to remedy these problems, being directly responsible, in accordance with the legislation rule, with the real situation of the owned monument.

### ***C.3. Intervention on facades***

Issuing notices and monitoring the restoration and renovation of the facades of buildings or historical monuments located in the architectural preserves of Sibiu County was one of the most important aspects of O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I. due to the major impact that these components had on the layout of monuments and, generally, on the protected areas. In the majority of cases, where was required, representatives of these institutions have requested the aesthetic decamping of drop plasters, executed over the original plaster, present at many properties on the entire surface of the facade. Special attention was given to decorative elements, sometimes located above the gates and pillars, which had to be kept as a whole, but also for realizing surveys in successive layers of painting for detecting chromatic range and the decamping with cement recently used, executed mainly in the lower part of the facade.

### ***C.4. Dismantling***

After 1990, due to increased number of population and due to the need to ensure a comfort for buildings, many owners of edifices in the protected areas within Sibiu County have addressed requests to O.J.P.C.N. /C.Z.M.A.S.I. concerning the dismantling of buildings or annexes, in most cases for the reconstruction of new buildings adapted to the requirements and necessities of the period. Each request was individually analyzed by these institutions, being accepted or rejected according to the proposed interventions and to the value of the building itself. Dismantling of buildings or annexes that did not contained elements with artistic, historic or documentary value, annexes that were built relatively recently without legal approvals and contributing to increasing the exaggerated the density on the plot were approved.

### ***C.5. Rejected projects***

After analyzing the documentation submitted, due to the way of drawing up their defectiveness or solutions totally inappropriate concerning interventions on historical monuments, some of them of great importance, provided with decorative elements extremely valuable and rare, O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu representatives and those of the C.Z.M.A.S.I. have rejected many projects of this kind. Projects where through the proposed interventions were likely to radically alter the look of the area, doubly so as more the urbanity law of localities did not provide the possibility of placing such building in the public space of the medieval area, were also rejected.

### **D. URBAN AREAS**

In addition to analyzing and approving building-ups/dismantling or other interventions on historical monument or located in protected areas within the competence, O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu and C.Z.M.A.S.I. East Transylvania have endorsed more large-scale works on major interventions on protected areas containing many buildings. Damage caused by these works consists exactly of the largeness of interventions aimed upon which it left hall-marks, often these changes being unfortunately irreparable. We can enumerate here the work of upgrading telephone networks, cable input works in Sibiu (historical area), placing/replacing pipelines and gas pipes from protected areas of the competence O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I. We are talking about absolutely required works, institutions from Sibiu pursuing that buildings from protected areas should be less affected by these interventions. Unfortunately, the legal framework and, not at least, faulty application of the procedures of the legislation by the competent state institutions have prompted numerous interventions carried out with blatant breaks of these rules. Several times, though O.J.P.C.N. or C.Z.M.A.S.I. has found deviations from the legal framework, measures have not been taken, facts which have encouraged illegal subsequent interventions.

### ***E. PLACING STATUES AND COMMEMORATIVE PLATES***

Another attribution of O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I. was the approval of projects for realizing the monuments (busts) or the commemorative plates which were to be located in areas within the

competence. The specialists of these institutions have been reviewed, in each case, not only the monument itself (dimensions, constructive material, features, plinth), but also its location (the surroundings, the relation with the surrounding buildings with other monuments), making concrete proposals, regarding these important issues. In this regard, a number of proposals regarding the location of busts/commemorative plates depicting personalities who have left their mark on the city or in a specific field were submitted.

#### **F. DISMANTLING OF THE CONSTITUTION AREA**

Through the destructive policy pursued by the Communist system in the field of national cultural heritage, in general, and historical monuments, in particular, especially since 1977 in Sibiu valuable buildings were demolished. But, unfortunately, not even after the revolution of December 1989, at least in the first years after this event, the perception and attitude for this important field has not being changed too much.

The next target area for the dismantling was the one that contained the buildings from Constitution Street No. 1, 3, 5, 9 Mai Street No. 79, 81, 83, and Magheru Street No. 46 and 48. The reason for this was a part of the architectural preserve that was widening the roadway on more tapes. Apart from the urbanity and historical value that characterizes the whole assembly, most of these buildings had a great architectural and historical value and were dating from the 18th century.

However, at the beginning of 1991, in the area mentioned before, I.J.G.C.L. Sibiu, following the dismantling of these buildings, has started their evacuation and disposal of woodwork, actions that were leading, to their degradation and, in the end, to their dismantling. They were then used as sources for building materials by proprietary. The dismantling action of these properties started disagreement and negative opinions about these works, disregarding the several addresses where through O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu and C.Z.M.A.S.I. Eastern Transylvania communicated everything to the City Hall, the Prefecture and I.J.G.C.L. Sibiu, clearly and vehemently.

Between O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I. and Mayor of Sibiu (project promoter) began, on the edge of these impending dismantling, a real conflict where the Office and the Zonal Commission

have worn out all the prerogatives held to prevent the implementation of the project. They tried several times, at the initiative of the two institutions, to find compromising solutions to save from dismantling the most valuable buildings in the area, even with the immolation of some buildings that were not that important.

## **5.2. CONTROLS PERFORMED BY O.J.P.C.N. SIBIU/C.Z.M.A.S.I. EASTERN TRANSYLVANIA**

One of the most important prerogatives, besides approving projects submitted on interventions on historical monuments, of O.J.P.C.N., and later C.Z.M.A.S.I., was making controls to identify infringements of regulatory documents in the field, even if we speak about works made on historical monuments (or located in protected areas), churches, archaeological sites, cemeteries or commemorative monuments and intimation to local authorities to take action accordingly. Thus, the two institutions have performed several controls and verifications on the request of upper authorities, persons, institutions or of its own initiative. Regardless of how the intimation and the goal, the controls have proved extremely effective in the fight for saving and preserving the integrity of the national cultural heritage of County territory, measures and recommendations being vital for the survival of this valuable heritage.

The fact that today, Sibiu, is considered one of the best preserved medieval towns in this part of the continent; it is the glory of the battle extended, over several decades, by specialists from O.J.P.C.N., then C.Z.M.A.S.I. from Sibiu.

### ***5.2.1. CONTROLS PERFORMED ON ECCLESIASTICAL MONUMENTS***

#### ***A. ORTHODOX CHURCHES***

Over the years, several interventions were made on Orthodox and Evangelical churches from Sibiu County, without drawing up projects or without approving them by O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I. These aspects were detected when the two institutions made controls in the territory. Whereas after checkouts, significant deficiencies were found about keeping the law



regarding the protection of the national cultural heritage, the Administration of the Office and The Regional Commission has repeatedly addressed information to the superior religious forums represented at the county level - the Romanian Orthodox Archdiocese of Sibiu and the Consistory of the Evangelical Church C.A. from Romania, with headquarters in Sibiu, requesting to respect the laws in the field.

Due to repeated interventions which have been made, several sights of this kind have been continuously in the attention of the two institutions, among which we can remember the St. Archangels Michael and Gabriel Church from Arpasul de Jos, „Adormirea Maicii Domnului” Church from Sadu, The Orthodox Church from the village Vale or the one from Gales.

### **B. EVANGHELICAL CHURCHES**

But, although most unauthorized works identified were made at Orthodox churches, there were cases in which infringements of legislation in the field were found after controls accomplished by the specialists O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu, even at the Evangelical churches. Such aspects have been identified mostly in Evangelical churches from Mălâncrav and Valea Viilor.

#### **5.2.2. FORTIFICATIONS**

Due to outstanding value of historical monuments in Sibiu County, among which a major importance had the fortifications, in addition to regular controls made by the two institutions with duties at local/regional levels, in monitoring their situation were involved even the central structures of the Ministry of Culture, being targeted the medieval fortifications from Sibiu, as well as other representative (Dacian Citadel from Tilișca).

Protecting the fortified churches, valuable historical monuments, presented in large numbers within the County of Sibiu, was one of the priorities of the O.J.P.C.N. activity, and then C.Z.M.A.S.I. Specialists from these institutions have made periodic controls regarding the conservation of these sights and they were also monitoring the interventions. The conclusions of controls were not always the greatest, that's why concrete and effective proposals were made for remedying deficiencies.

### ***5.2.3. THE CIVIL ARCHITECTURAL SIGHTS***

Monuments of civil architecture were, besides the ecclesiastical and fortifications, covered by several controls by O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu and representatives of C.Z.M.A.S.I., often together with central bodies with attributions in the field (C.C.E.S., C.N.M.A.S.I.). But, the policy taken by the central authorities, especially by the local ones was not in favor of protecting historical monuments, often abandoned, attitude that prompted and accelerated the process of damage.

Especially after 1990, many urbanity problems have arisen related to the relation between sights and assembly, implantation in nature or in the area of protection of monuments. The major activity of the Regional Commission was bound in this way to the documentation regarding protection, putting in value, restoration of the monuments and the architectural resources, as well as to the relations between these economic values and overall texture of the city.

#### ***A. PUBLIC EDIFICIES***

A particularly difficult moment for the existence and protection of historical monuments in Romania, and in Sibiu, was year 1977, the year of abolition of National Cultural Heritage Office, the act that produced important effects long after its enactment. These measures are affected by many public edifices from Sibiu, many of them being in the process of restoration. Institutions from Sibiu have controlled and monitored continuously the condition of their conservation, proposing measures for remedying problems identified with these occasions.

#### ***B. COMMERCIAL SPACES***

In conjunction with controls that aimed streets or areas of protected buildings, O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu specialists and those from C.Z.M.A.S.I. have, through regular controls, monitoring, certain sights, especially those within the municipality of Sibiu, with a particular value and that suffered repeated interventions. Many of these controls were following the work at commercial spaces placed in the historical monuments, spaces that were more exposed to the interventions and damage, especially due to the higher frequency of use.

Another aspect of the activity of O.J.P.C.N. and C.Z.M.A.S.I. was to verify building yards where they were building-up historical monuments, in order to see, on the spot, the compliance with the approved projects.

### ***C. RESIDENTIAL HOUSES***

Due to the large number of sights with the destination of dwelling houses and due to the outstanding value of many of these, especially as parts of medieval resources, O.J.P.C.N. Sibiu, and then C.Z.M.A.S.I., have constantly monitoring the condition of conservation and the interventions carried out on them.

Following each control, the representatives of these institutions were giving information to Sibiu City Hall about issued aspects, requesting emergency in taking vigorous measures to stop the building-ups, and returning to its original condition. They were also requesting the approval of any interventions only based on a project, approved in accordance with the legislation.

Not a few times, due to the indifference of local authorities and to the lack of sanction measures taken against those who have broken the law from the field, legislation that has given the infringement status to unauthorized build on the historical monuments, O.J.P.C.N. /C.Z.M.A.S.I. has asked for the help of the County Police in order to take legal measures. Common activities with this institution had a dual role: coercive, to punish people that were guilty for breaking the law and preventative, to avoid new contraventions.

The Regional Commission tried, through a constant correspondence with other City Halls from the County, to popularize the legislation in the field of the protection of historical monuments and to raise awareness of decision makers at the local level concerning this problem.

### ***D. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES***

Lot of problems and contraventions have been identified due to controls made for the archaeological sites within the County by O.J.P.C.N./C.Z.M.A.S.I. In the vast majority of cases

the Law No.63/1974 was broken and also the Investment Law No. 9/1980, diggings being made without releasing the land of historical (archaeological) activity.

### ***E. CEMETERIES AND MONUMENTS FOR COMMEMORATE HEROS***

Other sights affected by the attention of local authorities which, due to the indifference that have “enjoyed”, were cemeteries and monuments for heroes from Sibiu County. They suffered serious and irreparable damage. The controls made by O.J.P.C.N.\C.Z.M.A.S.I. identified many problems at these sights. That’s why alarm signals were drawn up, often, unfortunately, to no result, County authorities and the local ones remaining deaf to these complaints.

\*\*\*

Analyzing that the activity done by the two institutions has a fundamental importance for the protection of national cultural heritage in Sibiu County and beyond, we can conclude that only thanks to the professionalism, commitment and resilience of not giving up to the pressures upon them, proven by O.J.P.C.N., then C.Z.M.A.S.I., we could save, mostly the preserves of architecture from Sibiu County and a large number of historical monuments, without which important projects, such as “Sibiu– European Cultural Capital” (2007) or “Sibiu- Baroque City” (2012) would not have been possible, due to everything that happens from these in economical and social aspects.

The fact that the historic centre from Sibiu is considered one of the best preserved architectural territory in this area of the continent (Sibiu is on the 8th place on the list of the most beautiful cities of Europe according to a Michelin survey) is, firstly, the glory of those who worked, over several decades, with professionalism and dedication in the service of Sibiu’s cultural heritage , within the two institutions O.J.P.C.N. and C.Z.M.A.S.I., mentioning here Dr. Alexandru Avram, Gheorghe Ban, Ioan Bucur, Vasile Crişan, Ovidiu Dunca, Dr.. Herman Fabini, Thomas Nagler, Dr. Paul Niedermaier, etc. A large part of these personalities are yet activists, in the service of protecting Sibiu’s cultural heritage.

## CONCLUSIONS

Regulatory documents that formed the legislation in the area of national cultural heritage have reflected the Romanian society at that time, being influenced, in their spirit, by less international acts in the field and by more indigenous realities, by principles whereupon successive systems have functioned in Romania in different periods. However, sometimes some legal rules have exceeded their time, being even equivalent with the ones from the European states with a rich tradition in the field.

Legislation in the field and in general the whole institutional system for the protection of national cultural heritage ought to lead to the effective protection of this heritage, from identification, finish up until to preservation and restoration measures undertaken. Unfortunately, this has produced the desired effect only in a very small measure. Institutions have been set up and dismantled after the interests of the leaders of that period, the interests for historical monuments being always put in a second place.

After studying the archive of County Department for Culture and National Heritage Sibiu we have drawn a number of conclusions. Firstly, with all the interdictions and limitations of the system and of the conditions of economic, social and political fields, the activity of the County Office for the National Cultural Heritage Sibiu has been particularly effective by ensuring the preservation in good conditions of the historical monuments in the County. And this happened without neglecting the mobile cultural heritage, also of a great importance.

Then, after 1990, the Zonal Commission for Historical Monuments, Assemblies and Sites from Eastern Transylvania, through the personalities of his leadership, was imposed, at least at the level of the centre region, as a defender of the rights of historical monuments.

Set up immediately after the revolution, in a period of extensive transformations (political, economic, administrative, legislative), this body has succeeded, even though with more than limited resources, to keep afloat a heritage which the local authorities have not sustained.

All through the direct contribution of the two institutions were introduced into the list of historical monuments (published successively in that period) several goals which were awarded, through the process of classification, a special status that assured them protection. In this way, the monuments have become more than simple buildings left in the will of fate, available to the

owners that had no interest to invest in saving the substance of monuments and that were following only their own comfort and benefits.

Although with limited resources and with a number of specialists far from needs, the two institutions have managed to ensure an effective protection of historical monuments from Sibiu not only through permanent monitoring, by analyzing the professionalism and accountability of projects submitted for approval of interventions concerning the sights, by the conditions outlined on these occasions, through periodic controls organized throughout the County, but also through the resilience manifested before the destructive tendencies of local authorities and stubbornness to put the interests of historical monuments before personal interests.

Once with the establishment of the County Inspectorate for Culture we noted a lack of concerns in the field of protecting historical monuments, the interest in intangible heritage becoming hereby more important, for different events more or less cultural, organized throughout the County. It was felt at the same time, especially in the establishment of County Department for Culture, Cults and National Cultural Heritage in Sibiu (the original name of the institution) an even stronger politicization of cultural act and this happened at the expense of adoption of effective measures for the protection of historical monuments. This issue has been determined, as I stated in a previous chapter, by the appointment, in general, at the head of the Department of some people of other specialties, without any connection with the field (dentists, engineers, economists). And this it is all the more regrettable as the 2000s conditions became more favorable, special laws that set to rights the activity in the field were adopted, and the number of specialists and equipment divisions were being increased substantially (due to measures required for integration in the European Union).