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1. **Preface**

“Prague became the city of cubism with cubist apartment blocks full of cubist flats furnished with cubist furniture. The inhabitants could drink coffee from cubist cups, put flowers in cubist vases, keep the time on cubist clocks, light their rooms with cubist lamps and read books in cubist type.” (Miroslav Lamac, art historian)

The bizarre style of Cubism left behind an impressive legacy, from houses to bridges and from Franz Kafka’s gravestone to factories. Since I encountered the style during my first visit to Prague I take every opportunity to search and discover for me unknown Cubist structures.

Cubism was not the only style that emerged around the turn of the century. But unlike other architectural styles, Cubism never reached an international level. Neo-styles, Art Nouveau, Jugendstil, Functionalism and Rationalism can be seen throughout Europe and perhaps around the World. However, Cubism appeared only in the Czechoslovak Republic, mostly in Prague were the majority of the buildings were built. The unique phenomenon that an architectural style only appears in one country adds up to my interest in the style. This together with my interest in architecture from the turn of the century made the choice to explore Cubism for a paper evidently.

The trigger to propose architectural Cubism for nomination on the World Heritage List as a subject for my paper was a proposal of France. France proposed to nominate a series of designs of Le Corbusier on the World Heritage List. If the works of one architect are seen as a single inscription, why would it not be possible to put a particular style on the World Heritage List?

Besides writing this paper for the study Built Heritage Conservation and Development at AINova institute, Slovakia, I had the change to comprehend the style Czech Cubism, and to fully study the process of inscription on the World Heritage List.

Reinder Zwart  
Bratislava, June 19, 2008
2. **Should architectural Cubism be put on the World Heritage List?**

*Should architectural Cubism be put in the World Heritage List, and if yes, how? These simple questions do not have simple answers. Inscription on the World Heritage List is a long and demanding process. But before even thinking of inscription the next questions should be posed: Should architectural Cubism be on the World Heritage List? Is the style unique enough? Does it have an outstanding universal value that should be preserved for present and future generations of whole mankind? I have made an attempt to answer these and other questions in this paper. This paper focuses on the intellectual process of inscription, not on the practical implementation.*

In chapter three a closer look will be taken at the style architectural Cubism, from the key figures of the style to the legacy that is left behind.

Chapter four explores where the World Heritage List stands for and what the inscription process contains of.

Chapter five takes a closer look at the intellectual process of inscription and gives a possible different approach.

Chapter six combines architectural Cubism and the World Heritage List; in this chapter the justification of a possible inscription is implemented.

The justification of chapter six is applied in chapter seven on a selection of objects.

Chapter eight looks beyond the procedural challenges at some dilemmas concerning the inscription of architectural Cubism.

Chapter nine summarises the paper.

Chapter ten concludes the paper.

In the paper a lot of questions are posted. Every subject that is covered in the paper raises questions and considerations. Eventually every matter is reflected in the light of the overall question, should architectural Cubism be put on the World Heritage List?
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3. Architectural Cubism

Before we explore the process for inscription on the World Heritage List we have to find out what Cubism is as an architectural style. Who are the key figures of the style and what were the underlying reasons why this style emerged?

As architectural Cubism mainly emerged in the Czechoslovak Republic it is often referred to as Czech Cubism. This reference makes it easier to distinguish Cubism as a fine art movement from architectural Cubism. Hereinafter both Czech Cubism and architectural Cubism are used for describing the architecture.

3.1. What is Architectural Cubism?

Sharp points, slicing planes, crystalline shapes. These are the trademarks of the Czech Cubists – a unique, avant-garde group, feverishly active in Prague between 1911 and 1917. Apart from fine art, they left behind building facades with little pyramids, furniture bursting with energy, and dynamic decorative objects with stark black lines.

Czech Cubism architecture represents an unusual episode of architecture history; apparently without predecessors and successors. While the fine art of Czech Cubism was similar to the 'mainstream' Cubism of Europe at the time, the applied art and especially the architecture of Czech Cubism was a one of a kind. The only example of a non-Czechoslovak design up to now is a model from the French artist Raymond Duchamp-Villon. His design for “La maison cubist,” 1912 shows a similarity with the Czech Cubist designs.

The style developed out of apparently nothing, flourished a short period and imploded almost at the same speed. The style set off when the works of Braque and Picasso became familiar for the artists in Prague. It marked the turn-away from imperial capitol Vienna and a new orientation towards France.

In contrast with the Modernist Movement the goal of Cubist architects was not to reject ornaments. Making the shape itself so dynamic that it could alone fulfil an ornamental function became the goal. Josef Chochol wrote in his essay "On the function of the architectural detail": "This is why we have lost interest in the minor architectural detail and why we do not believe in it. We are enthusiastic about total form, felt and presented with excitement, form that is all-compassing and has a total and instant effect." The architects did want to impress, but also had a deeper meaning with the way they formed their facades.

The essence of architectural Cubism is described aptly on the website of the Modernista gallery1: “The Czech Cubists believed that an object's true internal energy could only be released by breaking up the vertical and horizontal surfaces that restrain and repress it in conventional design. By incorporating angled planes into the design of everyday objects, they tried to give them a dynamism that turned them into works of art in their own right. For them, the pyramid was the pinnacle of architectural design and the crystal the ideal natural form.

1 Josef Chochol, “K funkci architektonického článku” (On the function of the architectural detail), published in Styl nr. 5, 1913, page 93-94.

The Modernista gallery sells reproductions of Cubist design and designs from young Czech designers.
Bohemia's culturally adventurous elite was open to these radical ideas and happily financed the young designers' cubist transformation of everything from cups and saucers, desks and chairs to villas and office buildings. Nowhere else in the world was cubism taken so far.\textsuperscript{4}

The Czech Cubism architects were multi-talented, they did not only design buildings but also furniture, household objects, books and they painted. In their vision all these objects together created the true Cubist environment.

3.2. KEY FIGURES

The key figures of the Cubist movement included not only architects but also painters, sculptors, printmakers, stenographers and art theoreticians. The leading representatives of the bloom period (1911-1914) included the painter Bohumil Kubišta, Emil Filla, Antonín Procházka, Václav Špála, Josef Čapek, Otokar Kubín, the sculptor Otto Gutfreund (who created many statues on Cubist buildings) and architect, printmaker and stenographer Vlastislav Hofman. The leading architects besides Vlastislav Hofman were Pavel Janák, Josef Gocár and Josef Chochol. Along with several other artists, art theoreticians and architects these men left the Mánes association, at that time the dominant artists’ society, and founded the Group of Fine Artists. They started their own magazine, Art Monthly, in which they presented their theoretical ideas. Pavel Janák, the most influential person within the group, is considered the founding father of the movement.\textsuperscript{5}

3.3. INSPIRATION SOURCES

Cubism architecture had more than one source of inspiration. Of course there were the works of Braque and Picasso. \textit{“Inspired by the revolutionary work of Braque and Picasso, and urgently seeking a new style that would be their own, Pavel Janák, Josef Gocár, Josef Chochol and Vlastislav Hofman adapted the painters’ cubist principles, and stretched them not only to another dimension, but also to everyday life.”}\textsuperscript{6}

But besides the cubist paintings there was a major inspiration found in Czech historical architecture. \textit{“Especially the late Gothic diamond vaults of Bohemia and southern Moravia and the early eighteenth century work of Giovanni Santini-Aichel, conceived in the spirit of the Baroque Gothic inspired designers. Important were Santini-Aichel’s 1772 cemetery and burial chapel at St. Jan Mepomucen in Žďár nad Sázavou, Czech Republic, (already a World Heritage Site), with strong plastic and expressive ambitions.”}\textsuperscript{7} Respect for the historical architecture enabled Cubist architecture to mingle in with its Gothic and Baroque neighbours in the old town centres of Czechoslovakia.

Another reason why this style set of is more straightforward. The most important architects of Czech Cubism were trained in ateliers of leading rationalist architects Otto Wagner (Vienna) and Jan Kotera (Prague). But often the pupils reject the designs of their masters. \textit{“The Cubist architects criticised the rationality and utility of the modernist style of architecture, which in their opinion, when working with buildings and objects of household furnishings, neglected to work with more emphatic shapes and ignored the needs of the human soul. Cubists attempted to replace the right-angled forms of modernism with oblique, broken, pyramidal ones; they desired to give shape to the boxlike, modernist interiors through the use of forms reminiscent of the inside of a crystal.”}\textsuperscript{8} As a result architectural Cubism is considered one of the first anti-modernism styles.

A style never emerges out of nothing, there is always a transitional period before and afterwards. The transitional style before Cubism is geometrical Art Nouveau (1905-1914). This style features motifs of polygons, crystals or facets and bevelled areas. These predecessors of Cubism should not be underestimated for their inspirational source.


3.4. THEORIES

What distinguishes Czech Cubism from styles like Art Nouveau and Art Deco is that the style is based on theoretical grounds. Cubist architects wrote several theoretical essays wherein they proclaimed their theories. This is unlike the mentioned styles that ‘naturally’ evolved. The architects radically used their theories and reflected them on their designs. Their designs could not always be realized because they were technically too complicated or expensive to make with the then known materials.

The Czech Cubists took inspiration from the paintings and theories of the French Cubists and incorporated them with traditional architecture. Although the theories by the Czech Cubists are not the same as the French Cubists, they use the same basic principles; breaking down the form of an object in little pieces and rebuild them through ‘Cubistic’ shapes.

3.5. INSIDE VERSUS OUTSIDE

Designers from the Cubist movement had a clear vision on the outside of buildings but were conservative regarding interior design. "When we walk by cubist houses and are affected by their unusually dramatic exterior walls, we must wonder about their interior space. Do these interiors offer the spatial experience that is indicated by the facade? Once inside, would we encounter sharply fractured walls and angled planes? The floor plans of cubist buildings provide more than enough evidence that their interiors remained within the conventional scheme of traditional living, be it villas or tenements – there was no revolutionary concept regarding the interior organisation of space as such. If we enter, we find in the halls and stairways preserved parts of grilles, iron fittings, door panels and floor mosaics, occasionally a shaped stuccoed ceiling in the foyer – no more than a few ornamental signs of the grandeur of the exterior".9 All the Cubist architects believed that their new style was meant to become ‘a complex work of art’. The house and its interior would become one with cubist furniture and lights, cubist coffee and tea sets, vases, cases and ashtrays, cubist paintings on the wallpaper and cubist decorations. Altogether they would form the ultimate Cubist Gesamtkunstwerk.


*Picture 6:*
Josef Gočár, Stach an Hoffmann house 1912-1913.
Perhaps the step to change the spatial design was a bridge too far for the designers. Modernism, which really started off after 1920 was more suitable for a radical change of outside and inside. Moreover modernism succeeded to connect in and outside.

3.6. TIMEFRAME

The timeframe of architectural Cubism is relatively short, from 1911 till 1927. This period can be separated into two parts, up to the end of World War I (1911-1917) and after the end of the War (1918-1927).

3.6.1. THE FIRST PERIOD OF ARCHITECTURAL CUBISM: 1911 - 1917

The first period from 1911 till 1917 was the heyday of architectural Cubism. In 1911 Pavel Janák wrote his key theoretical essay “The Prism and the Pyramid” for the magazine “Art Monthly”. This essay, in which he laid the foundations of a new trend in architecture, is seen as the birth of Cubism. The leading architects of the movement were Pavel Janák, Josef Gocár, Josef Chochol and Vlastislav Hofman. They dominated this period with their buildings and theoretical articles. Particularly Josef Chochol was successful in building according to theories. Although considered as the founding father of the movement, Pavel Janák already rejected Cubism in 1913. Vlastislav Hofman on the other hand did not build much, because his radical Cubist designs were often technically too complicated.

Architects who did not belong to the ‘leading’ group only used motifs and elements from Cubism, mixing them with Art Nouveau and Modernism. This careful approach is no wonder as Cubism met opposition from the beginning on from most critics, builders and clients. The designs seemed to them eccentric, impractical and sombre. In 1914 World War I started and the building sector collapsed. Between 1914 and 1918 hardly any Cubist building was built. Cubism appeared to be a dead end.

3.6.2. THE SECOND PERIOD OF ARCHITECTURAL CUBISM: 1918 - 1927

After the First World War, we see two movements within Cubism. On one hand the ‘pure’ Cubistic style continued, but not by the architects of the inner circle of Czech Cubism from before the War. Others took over and their buildings were designed in the spirit of Cubism. Only Vlastislav Hofman stayed loyal to Cubism and his crematorium in Ostrava (1922-1924, destroyed despite severe protest in 1980) is considered to be one of the few ‘pure’ Cubist building. But architectural Cubism was approaching its end. From 1920 on, modernism was knocking increasingly louder on the door and all the Cubist architects slowly but steadily changed their designs towards modernism. Already by the mid-twenties most of the Cubists had turned to rationalism or functionalism. The Cubist architects started to criticise their earlier labour as a temporary detour. The last known work of ‘pure’ architectural Cubism is a facade for a cinema in Kroměříž from 1928. Although this last work is noteworthy, the style in fact ended in 1925. From 1925 on no Cubist building was erected apart from the cinema in Kroměříž.

The other movement that simultaneously took place was the conversion of Cubism into Rondo-Cubism. In 1918, an independent Czechoslovak Republic was established. The young Czechoslovak nation, looking for a style of its own, adapted Cubism as the ‘national’ style after 1920.

The broken and crystal-like ornamentation was replaced with colourful circles and arcs. In fact Rondo-Cubism was a Czechoslovak version of Art Deco. There was no attempt to create a specific style as had been the case with Cubism. But unlike ‘pure’ Cubism, this style was enthusiastically received by critics and the general public. Pavel Janák and Josef Gocár, architects from the first hour, promoted this national style passionately. Nevertheless just like ‘pure’ Cubism, Rondo-Cubism went down due to the rise of modernism.

---

3.7. THE LEGACY

The Czech Cubists left behind one of the most original forms of modern artistic expression in Europe. Within small geographical limits, a unique style was developed.

The geographical spreading of Cubism is limited to Czechoslovakia of the 1920’s. The majority of the ‘pure’ Cubist buildings were built in Prague and its vicinity. A number of buildings are spread around today’s Czech Republic (see annex 2). As a national style however, Rondo-Cubistic buildings were built throughout the whole of Czechoslovakia. This is the reason that in nowadays Slovakia mostly Rondo-Cubism architecture or buildings with some Cubist elements are noticeable.

The number of Cubist buildings is hard to determine. To start with, the definition of architectural Cubism is not clear. There is a thin line between ‘pure’ Cubism and geometrical Art Nouveau with Cubist elements. Furthermore new Cubists buildings are sometimes discovered. The reason for these late discoveries is that until the end of the 1920’s it was the responsible builders who signed plans, not the architects.

The survey that is used as a base for this paper, counts up to about 55 objects that represent ‘pure’ Cubistic architecture. The number of buildings that has Cubistic elements but is in fact Art Nouveau, modernistic or Art Deco runs into dozens. These buildings, just like the Rondo-Cubism designs, are left out of the scope of this paper.

Hereafter, I will discuss whether this style qualifies for inscription on the World Heritage List.

---

4. UNESCO'S WORLD HERITAGE LIST

What is the World Heritage List and how can a property be inscribed? What does a nomination for the World Heritage List represent? These questions will briefly be answered in this chapter.

4.1. WHAT IS UNESCO'S WORLD HERITAGE LIST?

Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) seeks to encourage the identification, protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world considered to be of outstanding value to humanity. This is embodied in an international treaty called the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereinafter referred to as the ‘World Heritage Convention’), adopted by UNESCO in 1972.12

The World Heritage Convention is one of the most successful international legal instruments ever drafted. Its success is evident in terms of the number of countries that have ratified it, the number of properties inscribed in the World Heritage List, and the number of nominations put forward every year for inscription. As of November 2007 out of the 192 United Nations member states, 185 have ratified the World Heritage Convention.13

As a part of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage List was established. Member parties are encouraged to propose properties for the list which have an “outstanding universal value”. This outstanding universal value means that a property has a significance which is: “so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity.”14

The World Heritage List currently numbers 851 works including 660 cultural, 166 natural and 25 mixed properties in 141 countries. The list contains twenty-six monuments or complexes from the 20th or late 19th century (see annex 1). Up to now there is no case of inscription based on a specific style.15

4.2. WHAT DOES A NOMINATION FOR THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST REPRESENT?

It is considered that World Heritage sites are mankind’s heritage and belong to all people of the world. Inscription on the World Heritage List is a label whereby UNESCO recognizes the quality of a work. For these reasons, the international community has the duty to protect them. “While fully respecting the sovereignty of the States on whose territory the cultural or natural heritage is situated, States Parties to the convention recognise the collective interest of the international community to cooperate in the protection of the heritage.”16

Listing means that State Parties accept that the rest of the world will look over their shoulders how the inscribed property is managed. Listing does not replace existing national heritage protection legislation, but rather encourages each State Party to the convention to be more cautious within their legal framework. Listing means ensuring that there is a proper management and development programme that will guarantee the outstanding universal value.

A misconception of nominating organisations is that after inscription the work is done. The organisations hope for a new flow of visitors (which is often the case) and with these visitors new income. They do not think of the burden an inscription brings. The property has to be protected and maintained up to a high level. A good management plan with regular monitoring must be made. Continuous account for actions, observation by the rest of the world and regular visits from the advisory board of the World Heritage Committee create a lot of work. Negative and worldwide attention will be the result if choices are made which harm the inscribed property.

14 Article 49 of “The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention”.
16 Article 15 of “The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention”.
4.3. How can a property be inscribed in the World Heritage List?

The process of inscription is laid down in “The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention” (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Operational Guidelines’). In the Operational Guidelines different terms are defined and the requirements which have to be met to be inscribed are explained.

Since UNESCO is an intergovernmental organisation, nominations have to be submitted by representatives of the government (up to now referred to as the State Party). A public organisation can take the initiative to submit, but the State Party will be in the end the submitting party. Thus the State Party is the first filter of what will be nominated. The second filter is in a way the Tentative List. Each State Party is encouraged to create a Tentative List. The Tentative List is an inventory of properties that are considered by each State Party to be of outstanding universal value. Without being on the Tentative List a property is not considered for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Advisory Boards of the World Heritage List evaluate the Tentative List and recommendations about the proposals on the Tentative List can be suggested to State Parties.

The inscription process for the World Heritage List can be divided in two parts; the first part is preparation period in which State Parties define their nomination. The second part is decision period which the Advisory Boards of the World Heritage Committee uses to examine the submitted nominations. The Advisory Boards examination period takes one and a half year from submitting up to the decision from the World Heritage Committee. The time it takes for the first part depends totally on the State Party. Besides the normal process there is a possibility to place a property on the World Heritage List through an emergency procedure.

The requirements necessary for inscription can be divided in three categories: a practical, a justifying and a management category. In the practical category the property is identified, described, documented, the responsible authorities are identified and a signature on behalf of the State Party is included. The justification category hosts the criteria under which the property is proposed, arguments for each criterion, the statement of outstanding universal value, a comparative analysis and the statement of authenticity and integrity. The management category contains information about the present state of conservation, factors affecting the property, state of protection (such as the existing legislation), management plan and monitoring plan.

4.4. Justification

The justification category defines the reasons why the property is proposed and inscribed. Although this paper focuses on the justification category of the requirements it will also touch the others.

From the justifications the most visible is the outstanding universal value. This value is used as the basic justification of the property. The universal value is assessed through preset criteria under which the property is inscribed. Although a property can be inscribed under a single criterion, State Parties are encouraged to nominate properties under more.

The comparative analysis helps to place the proposed property in its context. Comparing a property with similar ones clarifies its outstanding universal value.

Besides the outstanding universal value and the underlying criteria a property has to meet the test of authenticity (cultural property) and integrity (all properties). The test of authenticity and integrity has been introduced to look at the outstanding universal value through a filter. This filter permits verification that the physical state of the property and its surrounding conditions are adequate to contain and express the outstanding universal value. The filter was introduced to limit the placing of reconstructed historic places on the World Heritage List. 37 Because the concepts of authenticity and integrity are often misunderstood by nominating parties and I may not be an exception, I use for this paper the ‘proposed new framework’ by Herbert Stovel (Effective use of authenticity and integrity as world heritage qualifying conditions. City & Time 2 (3): 3. 2007).

If the condition of the property is faced with ‘specific and proven’ imminent danger the property can be put on the List of World Heritage in Danger 38. The management plan should therefore focus on protecting the conditions.

37 H. Stovel, Effective use of authenticity and integrity as world heritage qualifying conditions.
38 The List of World Heritage in Danger hosts properties that are threatened by serious danger and where major operations are necessary for the conservation of the property. The placement on the list is the last stage before exclusion from the World Heritage List.
### 5. Different Approaches to Inscription

As can be read in the previous chapter, several steps have to be taken to be inscribed in the World Heritage List. These steps are similar for all inscriptions. The approach before inscription however can be different. The posted theoretical situation, ‘how can architectural Cubism be put on the World Heritage List’ has a different starting point than a ‘normal’ situation.

Although there is no procedure defined about the intellectual route to inscription, a ‘natural’ process can be extracted from the guidelines. The process described is of course arguable but in my point of view the most natural one. The ‘natural’ process for inscription on the World Heritage List starts with an object. For the selected object the outstanding universal value has to be found which than has to be assessed through the criteria set for the World Heritage List. Although in the Operational Guidelines the specification of the outstanding universal value is the opening, often first the criteria are selected and afterwards the outstanding universal value is set. From the criteria the process goes on with the test on authenticity and integrity, the comparative analysis and the creation of a management plan. This all has to lead to an eventual inscription in the World Heritage List.

Instead of selecting an object and finding the values for it, the process to inscribe a group of buildings belonging to a certain style is somehow reversed. The outstanding universal value has to be defined for the whole style. Furthermore the criteria have to be set for the whole style. Even the comparison analysis can be done before any buildings are selected. The test of authenticity and integrity has to be done for every single object. After all these norms are set the selection of buildings can start.

This reverse thinking before inscribing a property could improve the quality of inscribed properties. The objects that should stand the self-set norms are not selected yet. This could prevent that the criteria and outstanding universal value are written towards the object without a critical view.

For inscription of architectural Cubism on the World Heritage List, it is best to use the ‘reversed’ process.

---

**Figure 1:**
Possible processes before inscription

![Diagram of processes](image_url)
6. Justification of the Inscription

Does architectural Cubism belong on the World Heritage List? This question should be answered before thinking about examining the requirements set by the Operational Guidelines. After questioning if Cubism belongs on the World Heritage List, a closer look will be taken into the requirements.

6.1. Should Cubism be put on the World Heritage List?

Is there a fundamental reason to put architectural Cubism on the World Heritage List? A fundamental reason is in case when the buildings are threatened by severe decay; or in case when the buildings would be rigorously changed. In these situations they would need instant protection. But this is not the case for buildings of architectural Cubism. If Cubism will be inscribed, it has to be done on the basis of its intrinsic qualities and values.

Concerning qualities and values there are different angles to look at Cubism. Looking at different arguments one could argue that Cubism is not worth putting on the World Heritage List. One could state that Cubism was only a brief, local rupture in architectural history which hardly had any successors. Czech Cubism was a style that is used for facades only, without even pretending to change architecture completely. It is merely a modern variation of Baroque where appearance is more important than philosophy.

But in my opinion, stating that the philosophy is less important than the appearance is a misinterpretation. It may be true that Czech Cubism was less ambitious than modernism. But the Cubists did not want to change the world through the means of architecture as the modernists wanted, Czech Cubist architects wanted to change architecture itself. This is characterised by the title of one of the theoretical essays by Pavel Janák entitled ‘From Modern Architecture to Architecture’ wherein he revolts against his master Jan Kotera. Having a modest philosophy does not rule out that there is a common concept among the Cubist architects.

The large number of buildings that were designed on the same theoretical basis and that have a distinct appearance but are not from the same architect is something to value. This common concept and appearance is one of the qualities why a possible inscription should not be based on a single building.
The argument that Czech Cubism is only a brief, local rupture in architectural history and not a contribution to world architectural development can be reversed. Even if it may be a blind alley architectural style, it is a unique style unprecedented in world. Czech Cubism was one of the first style reactions against Modernism. It is also said that the style is the connection between Art Nouveau and Rationalism.

But the most important feature of architectural Cubism is that the architects were able to use the inspiration they gained from the fine arts of French Cubists in their designs. The Czech Cubist architects used the same basic principles; breaking down the form of an object in little pieces and rebuild them through ‘Cubistic’ shapes.

Considering these arguments, architectural Cubism earns its place in the history of architecture. The Czech Cubist architects left behind a set of unique buildings bursting with dynamic energy.

Just as Baroque architecture is on the World Heritage List, this ‘modern’ variation of Baroque may be inscribed in the List.

6.2. OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Outstanding universal value means that a property has a significance which is: “so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity.”

Is Cubism exceptional, does it transcend national boundaries and is it important for our present and future generations? Cubism is exceptional; this style is unique in its appearance and forms. But does this transcend national boundaries? Cubism’s legacy is geographically not widespread. It can simply not be considered as an international phenomenon. With one sole exception in France, it did not influence other countries or styles. Is it thus a style that is only important for the Czech Republic?

In my opinion, architectural Cubism transcends the national boundaries. The fine arts movement Cubism, with Braque and Picasso as main representatives, was an international movement. Although the architects did not use the principles of the art Cubists, they were inspired by them and were able to transform the basic ideas of fine arts Cubism into three-dimensional designs. The Czech Cubist architects succeeded to design buildings that are as energetic as Cubist paintings. One could say that as a part of the international Cubist movement, the architectural Cubism can be marked as to transcend the national boundaries.

If the positive arguments prevail, the following statement of outstanding universal value can be posed.

‘Architects who built according the Czech Cubism principles left behind one of the most original forms of modern artistic expression in Europe. The architecture adapts the fine arts Cubist principles, and stretches them not only to another dimension, but also to everyday life. The buildings burst with dynamic energy through broken and crystal-like ornamentation. This architectural style is unprecedented and truly unique.’

Picture 9:
Pavel Janák, Fára house in Pelhřimov, 1913-1914
6.3. CRITERIA

The style can meet several criteria. An assessment which criterion architectural Cubism meets follows below.

Cultural monuments can meet up to six criteria. Recommended by the World Heritage Committee is to nominate properties under more than one criterion. Architectural Cubism will probably meet criteria i and vi (see annex 1) just like most 19th and 20th century inscriptions on the World Heritage List. Besides these two criteria ii and iv will also be assessed.

6.3.1. CRITERION (i): ARCHITECTURAL CUBISM REPRESENTS A MASTERPIECE OF HUMAN CREATIVE GENIUS.

Czech Cubism received opposition from the beginning on from builders, critics and clients. Even the Cubist architects themselves criticised their designs when they altered their styles. Can a style that thus has’ failed’ be called a masterpiece of human creative genius?

New trends often receive opposition and criticism but can still be a masterpiece of human creative genius. The appreciation for architectural Cubism started only at the end of the seventies of the 20th century just like appreciation for Art Nouveau and Art Deco. All these styles were considered to be solely decorative. Unlike for example modernism which pretended to change the world through architecture. After the notion that the world would not change through architecture, decorative styles were more appreciated.

The expressed criticism is focused on the decorative facades without noticing the underlying thoughts. The creative genius lies specifically in the architectural interpretation of the fine arts Cubist principles.

Justification of criterion (i): ‘Architectural Cubism represents a masterpiece of human creative genius, for the reason that the architects of the movement were able to convert the fine arts Cubist principles of Braque and Picasso into objects of everyday life.’

6.3.2. CRITERION (ii): ARCHITECTURAL CUBISM EXHIBITS AN IMPORTANT INTERCHANGE OF HUMAN VALUES, OVER A SPAN OF TIME AND WITHIN A CULTURAL AREA OF THE WORLD, ON DEVELOPMENTS IN ARCHITECTURE.

Architectural Cubism can be seen as the link between Art Nouveau and Modernism. This together with the previous mentioned conversion of fine arts Cubist principles into objects of everyday life (like buildings) exhibits an important development in architecture. The span of time is clear, 1909 till 1925, and so is the cultural area, the Czech Republic, with a focal point on Prague (see annex 2). Concluding the before mentioned arguments a justification of criterion (ii) can be formed.

Justification of criterion (ii): ‘Architectural Cubism exhibits a unique style within the architectural history. Cubism flourished in Prague, the Central Europe centre of cultural change in first three decades of the 20th century.’

6.3.3. CRITERION (iv): ARCHITECTURAL CUBISM IS AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF AN ARCHITECTURAL ENSEMBLE WHICH ILLUSTRATES A SIGNIFICANT STAGE IN HUMAN HISTORY.

A justification of criterion (iv) can be formed, but the justification will be a combination of the justification criterion (i) and (ii). Architectural Cubism is an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble. The Czech Cubists were a group of architects who stood behind the same ideas and produced an ensemble of buildings with a distinguishable appearance. This appearance of sharp points, slicing planes and crystal-like ornamentation is unprecedented in the world.

The revolutionary fine art of the Cubist movement changed the arts at that moment. The translation of fine arts Cubists principles into buildings can be considered as a significant stage in human history.

Justification of criterion (iv): ‘Architectural Cubism is an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble where common style elements based on a theoretical ground create a unique appearance. The interpretation of fine arts Cubism, which changed the arts at that time, into an architecture style illustrates a significant stage in human history.’

---

60 Article 77 of “The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.”
6.3.4. **Criterion (vi): Architectural Cubism is directly associated with artistic works of outstanding universal significance.**

Criteria (vi) considers that a property can directly be associated with artistic works of outstanding universal value. The interpretation of French Cubism is clearly associated with Czech architectural Cubism. Although the fine arts Cubism principles were not used as intended by Braque and Picasso by the architects, the interpretation is undoubtedly recognisable as Cubism.

**Justification of criterion (vi):** ‘Architectural Cubism is associated with artistic works of French Cubism through the interpretation of the fine arts Cubism into objects of daily live.’

6.3.5. **Conclusion of the Justifications**

The red lines through the different justifications of the criteria are the adaption of the French fine arts Cubist principles and the uniqueness of the style. The similarity between the justifications shows that a choice has to be made which justifications prevail. In my opinion the strongest justifications are the justifications of criteria (i), (iv) and (vi). They have the same grounds and support the outstanding universal value.

6.4. **Comparative Analysis**

Is architectural Cubism as unique as is mentioned before? Are there more styles like Cubism that also originates from the early 20th century, which are as expressive, energetic and unique?

Perhaps the Dutch style ‘Amsterdam School’ can be compared with Czech Cubism. ‘The Amsterdam School is a style of architecture that arose in the early part of the 20th Century in the Netherlands. From 1912 till 1925 this style dominated the architecture of the Netherlands and especially that of Amsterdam. The style, highly influenced by Expressionism, was characterized by the use of rounded, organic facades with many purely decorative, non-functional elements such as spires, sculptures and “ladder” windows (with horizontal bars reminiscent of ladder steps). The Scheepvaarthuis is the prototype for Amsterdam School work: brick construction with complicated masonry, traditional massing, and the integration of an elaborate scheme of building elements (decorative masonry, art glass, wrought ironwork, spatial grammar, and especially integrated figurative sculpture) that embodies and expresses the identity of the building. The aim was to create a total architectural experience, interior and exterior, that carried social meaning.’

Just like Cubism, the Amsterdam School was confined to a small area, and flourished between 1910 and 1925. Both are an expressive, energetic architectural style using mostly geometric decorations. Both styles were ‘founded’ by a small leading group of architects who rejected their masters’ designs. The differences are that Cubism is based on theoretical grounds where the Amsterdam School evolved out of existing styles. But both styles integrated traditional historic elements in their buildings. Unlike Czech Cubism, the Amsterdam School was well accepted and is still a source of inspiration.

Above all both styles are unique and unequalled; worldwide they are recognised for these values.

---

7. **Selection of Objects**

Summarising the justification of the inscription should lead to a set of values. With these values the selection of objects can be carried out.

As mentioned before some 55 objects are considered to be Cubistic. Within these 55 objects there are some buildings with a more Art Nouveau or Art Deco character. There are also buildings that do not have a total Cubist design but are traditional with decorations in Cubist style. Architectural Cubism as an ensemble should include all structures that are directly associated with the outstanding universal value. The very essence of the proposed universal value is the unique adaption of fine arts Cubism. When selecting the objects an attempt should be made to include the most representative objects. These selected objects should correspond to a cross-section of Czech architectural Cubism, in time, style and designers.

A complete selection should be made with help of experts. This choice of architectural Cubism buildings is subjective; every different expert would make a different selection. The complete selection is out of the scope of this paper, I will make a small assessment of some Cubist buildings.

7.1. **Assessment of Chosen Objects**

For this paper I made a small (pre)selection of five buildings from different architects, different years and different appearances. The selection is made relatively random; three buildings from the heydays of architectural Cubism and two from after the First World War.

These buildings will be assessed on the above mentioned outstanding universal value and criteria. Through this assessment the selection will be narrowed. Two of the ‘survivors’ will be ‘tested’ on authenticity and integrity.

**Picture 10:**
Josef Chochol, Kovařovič house 1912-1913.
Front side with garden
1. **Kovařovič house** in Prague, design by Josef Chochol, 1912-1913.
   Location: Libušina 3, Prague 2-Vyšehrad, number 09 ‘map Prague’, annex 2.
   The Kovařovič house by Josef Chochol is considered as one of the masterpieces of architectural Cubism. It has a distinct architecture with facades of the house that do not have any ornaments or details in a traditional sense of way; it is in fact a complete crystal-like ornament. Together with the small polygonal garden with its Cubist fences the house is a Gesamtkunstwerk.

   The interpretation of fine arts French Cubism is visible through slicing planes, broken ornamentation and fences that are cast as crystals. In my opinion the Kovařovič house meets therefore the proposed description of the outstanding universal value.

*Picture 11:*
Josef Chochol, Kovařovič house 1912-1913.
Back side.

*Picture 12:*
Josef Chochol, Kovařovič house 1912-1913.
Fences of the garden.
2. **Diamond house** in Prague, design by Emil Králíček, 1912-1913.
Location: Spálená 4, Prague 1-New Town, number 13 'map Prague', annex 2.
This house hosts a mix of geometrical Art Nouveau and Cubism. It is an impressive detached building featuring elements of geometrical Art Nouveau and Cubism, with a number of 'diamond' motifs (stone vases on the roof, metal flagpoles, lamps on the staircase, and others). Especially the strongly pronounced entrance in Cubist style is of interest. The ornaments are very detailed and carefully crafted.

The Diamond house features beautiful Cubist elements, but the whole appearance is more Art Nouveau than Cubism. Details and ornaments are added which do not support the idea of the Cubists who wanted to create a building that is a total ornament.

The single elements of the diamond house are undoubtedly Cubistic but the whole concept is not. The appearance as an Art Nouveau building cannot validate the expected interpretation of fine arts Cubism as is stated in the outstanding universal value. Therefore in my opinion the diamond house does not meet the description of the outstanding universal value.

![Picture 13: Emil Králíček, Diamond house 1912-1913. Detail of statue](image13)

![Picture 14: Emil Králíček, Diamond house 1912-1913. Detail of flagpole](image14)

![Picture 15: Emil Králíček, Diamond house 1912-1913.](image15)
3. **Tenement house in Prague**, design by Antonín Belada, 1913.
This tenement house has modest design with integrated star ornaments and slicing planes. The thin line between geometrical Art Nouveau and Cubism is apparent in this building. The ornamentation can be seen as Art Nouveau or as Cubism. Apart from the ornaments the total design is Cubistic. Although the design is not as energetic as the icons of Cubism, this building has a subtle way of expressing Cubism.

If the aim of the inscription is a cross-section of Cubism, this tenement house should be included. Though not as pronounced or energetic as paintings by Picasso, the facade is broken up just as Cubist painters did. The tenement house by Belada meets the description of the outstanding universal value.

*Picture 16:
Antonín Belada, Tenement house 1913.
Detail of balcony and cornice

*Picture 17:
Antonín Belada, Tenement house 1913.
4. Materna factory and administration building in Prague, design by Rudolf Stockar, 1919-1920.
Location: Dělnická 20, Prague 7 - Holešovice, number 40 ‘map Prague’, annex 2.

With a simple but elegant composition of lines the distinct front of the building is designed as a complete ornament. The building lacks the distinctive Cubist slicing planes, but hosts fine details in the hallway and well designed window frames on the sides of the building.

The description of the outstanding universal value has a stress on uniqueness and interpretation of French Cubism. Projecting this universal value on this building, results in the conclusion that it is too ordinary. Although considered by art historians as a fine example of Cubism, for me the building is, apart from some details, more Art Deco than Cubistic.

Picture 18: Rudolf Stockar, Materna factory 1919-1920. Detail of entrance

Picture 19: Rudolf Stockar, Materna factory 1919-1920.
5. **Block of cooperative housing** in Prague, design by Otokar Novotný, 1919-1921. Location: Elišky Krásnohorské 10-14, Prague 1 - New Town, number 44, 'map Prague', annex 2. This large structure has an interesting dynamic articulation. Also noteworthy is the unusual combination of colours in the artificial stone façade. This colouring is similar to the colouring of Rondo-Cubist buildings, but for a Czech Cubist building very rare.

The tenement building by Novotný is as dynamic as buildings from the heyday before World War I, and can meet the description of the outstanding universal value. In my opinion it is one of the most distinct Cubist buildings.

*Picture 20:*
Otokar Novotný, tenement house 1919-1921. Detail of artificial stone

*Picture 21:*
Otokar Novotný, tenement house 1919-1921.
7.2. Authenticity and Integrity

The concept of authenticity and integrity as World Heritage qualifying conditions are often misunderstood. Since this is the case, I will use the by Herbert Stovel proposed ‘new framework for integrity / authenticity analysis’. He proposes to combine authenticity and integrity. He replaces them for a system which looks at six sub-aspects of integrity / authenticity (wholeness, intactness, material genuineness, organisation of space and form, continuity of function, and continuity of setting) in relation to four cultural heritage typologies (archaeological sites, historic towns, architectural monuments and complexes, cultural landscapes). Although this system is not in use, and at the moment meant to provoke discussion, it is in my opinion better comprehensible than the concepts laid down in the Operational Guidelines.

The framework for ‘Architectural monuments and complexes’ as proposed by H. Stovel is put into practice for the ‘survivors’ of the pre-selection of Czech architectural Cubism objects. Implementation of the test on authenticity and integrity for a style is somehow artificial. There should be an assessment on the individual buildings. Only for some sub-aspects of authenticity and integrity architectural Cubism can be assessed as a whole.

**Wholeness:** “A monument should include all those elements, features and structures which are directly associated with the outstanding universal value of the nominated property.”

- Considering wholeness of Chochol’s Kovařovič house, the garden with its fences should be a part of the property.
- Belada’s tenement has no special requirements concerning the wholeness; it is a building in a row.
- Novotný’s tenement is also without any requirements.

The selection of objects for inscription must be carried out having the concept of wholeness in mind. This concept will create the cross-section of Cubist architecture.

**Intactness:** “A monument nominated to the World Heritage List should generally be in a good physical state of repair. The physical, social and economic conditions necessary to maintain the monument in good condition should also be present.”

- Chochol’s Kovařovič house is in a good state of repair. The building is owned by a company who rent out offices in the house. Although this is not ideal, the building and garden are maintained.
- Belada’s tenement has some lack of maintenance, but the main structure is in a good condition. The tenement is still in use so the building gets at least little maintenance.
- Novotný’s tenement is in a good state of repair and still in use. Recently is has been restored.

Concerning the social conditions; in general the buildings of Cubism are valued by the citizens of Prague, creating a social condition which is in favour of the buildings. For example, there is a well involved ngo, the Czech Cubism Foundation, which has the goal to preserve buildings from the Cubist period.

The physical condition of most Cubist buildings is relatively good. At the time of building the investors did not cut back on material costs. Another reason for their good condition is that the basic structure of the buildings is fairly traditional. The only problem is that there are a lot of surfaces where water runs over which causes stains.

**Material genuineness:** “Surviving historic fabric which contributes to the outstanding universal value of the monument should be protected.”

The materialisation of the selected buildings is mostly cement plaster, often looking like (artificial) stone. This material is often in a good condition. A bigger threat is the loss of interior items as fixed lamps, wooden floors and iron elements. A recommendation would be to make a thorough survey of interior items of the selected buildings.

**Genuineness of organization of space and form:** “The particular aspects of a monument’s design, formal arrangement or patterns of spatial organization which contribute to the outstanding universal value of the property should be present and legible.”

The present day situation gives no reason for intervention; the buildings are relatively untouched in their space and form.

**Continuity of function:** “If the primary historic functions of a monument contribute to its outstanding universal value, then every effort should be made to ensure continuity of function over time. Where these functions may now be obsolete, efforts should be in place to encourage compatible functions.”

---

• Chochol’s Kovařovič house is owned by a company who rent out offices in the house; this is a change of function with consequences. To what extent these consequences go is unknown.
• Belada’s tenement is still in use as an apartment building.
• Novotný’s tenement still in use as an apartment building.

**Continuity of setting:** "Nominations should demonstrate the extent to which the current setting of the historic settlement reflects the quality of the setting associated with the outstanding universal value of the property."

The threat to the buildings in the case of continuity of setting is the changing environment. The majority of the buildings are located near the centre of Prague. These areas are under a constant threat of development. New buildings next to Cubist can harm their appearance. Present day situation gives no reason for concern.

### 7.3. CONCLUSION OF THE SELECTION OF OBJECTS

I conclude this chapter as follows: not all Cubist buildings fall within the description of the outstanding universal value. But the ones which fall within the description stand the test on authenticity and integrity. Furthermore this test proved that it is not possible to test a style on authenticity and integrity, every building has to be assessed individually.

*Pictures 22:*
8. CHALLENGES FOR INSCRIPTION

Besides the abovementioned procedural challenge, there are other possible challenges.

8.1. FILLING THE GAPS, POLITICS

Firstly, in 2004 more than half of the inscribed properties on the World Heritage List were from Europe and North America (this is also the case for the number of properties on the Tentative List)\(^1\). The World Heritage Committee has made solving this imbalance one of her top priorities (often referred to by insiders as ‘Filling the Gaps’). This is a complete right thing to do; the imbalance will not solve itself so interfering is agreeable.

Secondly, the political climate in the World Heritage Committee is not favourable for any European proposal. The World Heritage Committee consists of representatives from 21 of the States Parties to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, elected by the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention. The current composition (June 2008) of the Committee is: Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, and United States of America. Out of the 21 representatives only 2 are from European countries. Although the Committee is non-political, a possible effect of a majority from non-European countries could be that non-European proposals will be looked after better. After several years of dominance by European countries this effect is perhaps a good thing.

The political climate together with filling the gaps could have the effect that proposals from European countries will stand less chance than proposals from non-European countries.

8.2. FILLING THE GAPS, MODERN HERITAGE

A specific challenge for architectural Cubism could be the effect of the ‘filling the gaps’ publication in 2004. In this publication the gaps of the World Heritage List were made


\(^{\text{24}}\)Article 61 of “The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.”

clear. As a result of the publication State Parties proposed properties that would fill the gaps.

One of the gaps was the underrepresentation of modern heritage. But since 2004, the number of modern heritage properties has almost doubled (see annex 1). The positive effect of nominating architectural Cubism as modern heritage is consequently lost.

8.3. CZECH REPUBLIC PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The World Heritage Committee has made the decision to take only two nominations per State Party per year into consideration (at least one nomination has to a natural property). Furthermore the Committee has set a limit of 45 nominations it will review each year.\(^{\text{24}}\) These restrictions will delay a possible inscription of architectural Cubism.

Furthermore, the Czech Republic currently has 12 properties on the World Heritage List and 14 properties on the Tentative List. This high number of properties is not favourable for a new nomination.
9. Summary

Should architectural Cubism be put on the World Heritage List, if yes, how? The paper tries to answer these questions.

To understand if architectural Cubism should be put on the List the exploration of the architectural Czech Cubism style is carried out.

The trademarks of the Czech Cubists are sharp points, slicing planes and crystalline shapes; the group was feverishly active in Prague between 1911 and 1917. Czech Cubism architecture represents an unusual episode of architecture history; apparently without predecessors and successors. The Czech Cubism architects were multi-talented, they did not only design buildings but also furniture, household objects, books and they painted. In their vision all these objects together created the true Cubist environment. The leading architects were: Vlastislav Hofman, Pavel Janák, Josef Gocár and Josef Chochol. The Cubist architects wrote several theoretical essays wherein they proclaimed their theories.

Cubism architecture had more than one source of inspiration. Of course there were the works of Braque and Picasso. But besides the cubist paintings there was a major inspiration found in Czech historical architecture. The transitional style before Cubism, geometrical Art Nouveau, should not be underestimated for their inspirational source. Another reason why the style developed was that the pupils, the leading architects of architectural Cubism rejected the designs of their masters, the rationalist architects Otto Wagner (Vienna) and Jan Kotera (Prague).

Designers from the Cubist movement had a clear vision on the outside of buildings but were conservative regarding interior design. Perhaps the step to change the spatial design was a bridge too far for the designers. The timeframe of architectural Cubism is relatively short, from 1911 till 1927. The first period from 1911 till 1917 was the heyday of architectural Cubism. After the First World War, we see two movements within Cubism. On one hand the 'pure' Cubistic style continued. At the other hand the conversion of Cubism into Rondo-Cubism took place. The Czech Cubists left behind one of the most original forms of modern artistic expression in Europe. Within small geographical limits, a unique style was developed.

Knowing the style, and possibly recognising the intrinsic qualities of it, leads us to the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Convention is one of the most successful international legal instruments ever drafted. As a part of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage List was established. Member parties are encouraged to propose properties for the list which have an “outstanding universal value”. It is considered that World Heritage sites are mankind’s heritage and belong to all people of the world. The process of inscription is laid down in “The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention”. The inscription process for the World Heritage List can be divided in two parts: preparation period for a State Parties and the decision period in which the Advisory Boards of the World Heritage Committee examines the nomination. The requirements necessary for inscription can be divided in three categories: a practical, a justifying and a management category.

The approach during the preparation period before inscription can be different. Although there is no procedure defined about the intellectual route to inscription, a ‘natural’ process can be extracted from the guidelines. Instead of selecting an object and finding the values for it (the natural process), the process to inscribe a group of buildings belonging to a certain style is somehow reversed. This reversed process selects the object after all the norms are set.

Should architectural Cubism be put in the World Heritage List is the question before the intellectual process of inscription can continue.

Since there is no fundamental reason to put Cubism on the List, it has to be done on the basis of its intrinsic qualities and values. The most important feature of architectural Cubism is that the architects were able to use the inspiration they gained from the fine arts of French Cubists in their designs. The Czech Cubist architects used the same basic principles; breaking down the form of an object in little pieces and rebuild them through ‘Cubistic’ shapes. By doing this the group of architects left behind a set of unique buildings bursting with dynamic energy.

The outstanding universal value for architectural Cubism could thus be: ‘Architects who built according the Czech Cubism principles left behind one of the most original forms of
modern artistic expression in Europe. The architecture adapts the fine arts Cubist principles, and stretches them not only to another dimension, but also to everyday life. The buildings burst with dynamic energy through broken and crystal-like ornamentation. This architectural style is unprecedented and truly unique.

This outstanding universal value is assessed through criteria. The criteria have the same grounds and support the outstanding universal value.

Criterion (i): Architectural Cubism represents a masterpiece of human creative genius. In my opinion architectural Cubism represents a masterpiece of human creative genius; for the reason that the architects of the movement were able to convert the fine arts Cubist principles of Braque and Picasso into objects of everyday life.

Criterion (iv): Architectural Cubism is an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble which illustrates a significant stage in human history. For me, architectural Cubism is an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble where common style elements based on a theoretical ground create a unique appearance. The interpretation of fine arts Cubism, which changed the arts at that time, into an architecture style illustrates a significant stage in human history.

Criterion (vi): Architectural Cubism is directly associated with artistic works of outstanding universal significance. Architectural Cubism is associated with artistic works of French Cubism through the interpretation of the fine arts Cubism into objects of daily live.

Is architectural Cubism as unique as is mentioned before? Are there more styles like Cubism that also originates from the early 20th century, which are as expressive, energetic and unique? Perhaps the Dutch style ‘Amsterdam School’ can be compared with Czech Cubism. Just like Cubism, the Amsterdam School was confined to a small area, and flourished between 1910 and 1925. Both styles have expressive, energetic architecture using mostly geometric decorations, are unique and worldwide recognised for these values.

Besides the abovementioned procedural challenge, there are other possible challenges. The political climate of the World Heritage Committee together with the process of filling the gaps on the World Heritage List could have the effect that the proposal for inscription of architectural Cubism will not have a change. One of the gaps was the underrepresentation of modern heritage. But since 2004 the number of modern heritage properties has already almost doubled. The positive effect of nominating architectural Cubism as modern heritage is consequently lost. Furthermore the Czech Republic has at the moment already 12 properties on the World Heritage List and 14 properties on the Tentative List. This high number of properties is not favourable for new nominations.
10. CONCLUSION

Should architectural Cubism be on the World Heritage List?

I fully believe that architectural Cubism should be on the World Heritage List, it meets all the requirements set by the World Heritage Committee and it will be a wonderful addition to the List.

As with most nominations, the nomination to put architectural Cubism on the List is arguable. Is it worthwhile or necessary to do this; are there not other, maybe even more valuable objects that need inscription? But which property should be nominated is not for me to decide, I can only make recommendations, which I hope I have motivated in this paper. I think architectural Cubism deserves more attention and through inscription this will happen.

Putting a style on the List is something new. However, an inscription of a group of buildings based on a single architect already exists (works of Antoni Gaudí, Spain, and town houses of Victor Horta, Belgium). Such an inscription is comparable with my proposal. The only difference is that more buildings come into consideration for inclusion when inscription is based on a style. With a thorough selection based on the right outstanding universal value and criteria, the number of buildings for my proposal can be narrowed down to a qualitative well balanced list of buildings. A cross-section of architectural Cubism can then be presented for inscription to the World Heritage Committee.

I know there are enough questions and challenges left before even a start can be made for inscription. But I hope I give an impulse to consider nominating architectural Cubism for inscription on the World Heritage List.

Pictures 23:
Josef Chochoł, tenement house 1913-1914.
### 11. Annex 1, Listed Properties from End 19th and 20th Century

Modern heritage properties (nineteenth and twentieth century’s) on the World Heritage List (as at June 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Cultural / Natural</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Construction date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architectural Cubism (proposed nomination)</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1911-1920</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensemble (single)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Works of Antoni Gaudí</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii, iv</td>
<td>1984, 2005</td>
<td>1890-1925</td>
<td>ensemble (single)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brasilia</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, iv</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>ensemble (city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii, iv</td>
<td>1990, 1992, 1999</td>
<td>1730-1916</td>
<td>cultural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Skogskyrkogården</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1917-1920</td>
<td>ensemble (complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv, vi</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1919-1933</td>
<td>ensemble (complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Palau de la Música Catalana and Hospital de Sant Pau in Barcelona</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii, iv</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>early 20th century</td>
<td>ensemble (single)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hospicio Cabañas, Guadalajara</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii, iii, iv</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>19th – 20th century</td>
<td>ensemble (complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Museumsinsel (Museum Island) Berlin</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1824 - 1930</td>
<td>ensemble (complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rietveld Schröderhuis (Rietveld Schröder House)</td>
<td>the Netherlands</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, iv</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1940-1960</td>
<td>ensemble (complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tugendhat Villa in Brno</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaiso</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>late 19th century</td>
<td>ensemble (city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The White City of Tel-Aviv - the Modern Movement</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1930-1950</td>
<td>ensemble (city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Cultural / Natural</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Year of inscription</td>
<td>Construction date</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Royal Exhibition Building and Carleton Gardens</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv, vi</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1880-1888</td>
<td>ensemble (complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dresden Elbe Valley</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>C+CL</td>
<td>ii, iii, iv, v</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18th – 19th century</td>
<td>cultural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Muskauer Park / Park Muzakowski</td>
<td>Germany/Poland</td>
<td>C+CL</td>
<td>i, iv</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1815 - 1844</td>
<td>cultural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (formerly Victoria Terminus)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1878-1898</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Luis Barragán House and Studio</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Varberg Radio Station</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1922-1924</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Liverpool - Maritime Mercantile City</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iii, iv</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18th – 19th century</td>
<td>ensemble (city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Urban Historic Centre of Cienfuegos</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>early 19th century</td>
<td>ensemble (city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Le Havre, the city rebuilt by Auguste Perret</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ii, iv</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1945-1964</td>
<td>ensemble (city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Centennial Hall in Wroclaw</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii, iv</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1911-1913</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Central University City Campus of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i, ii, iv</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1949-1952</td>
<td>ensemble (complex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sydney Opera House</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. ANNEX 2, GEOGRAPHICAL SPREADING OF ARCHITECTURAL CUBISM

Czech Republic
Centre of Prague
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14. PICTURES AND FIGURES

Picture on front page
*Picture by R. Zwart, 10-04-2007.*

Picture 1
Josef Chochol, tenement house in Prague-Vyšehrad, 1913-1914. Nekla nova 30, Prague 2-Vyšehrad. This building is considered as one of the most important examples of architectural Cubism. The tenement house has a distinct angular crown cornice and has a motif of a slender corner pillar. Cubist elements can also be found in the interior.
*Picture is obtained from website of Modernista, www.modernista.cz.*

Picture 2
Vlastislav Hofman, The Hofman chair, 1911. Stained oak veneered, leather W 43 cm D 46 cm H 91 cm. Vlastislav Hofman designed this chair as part of an interior for the sculptor Josef Maratka. Its austere appearance is softened by the detail of the slanted planes of the legs and the triangular surfaces of the veneer covering the whole piece.
*Picture is obtained from website of Modernista, www.modernista.cz.*

Picture 3
Pavol Janáč lidded box, 1911. Glazed earthenware, black decoration, height 12cm. Uměleckoprůmyslové museum, Prague. No other object captures the spirit of Janáč’s early cubist works better than this crystal-inspired box. Probably produced as a one-off, the box is a complex composition of angles, sharp points and folded planes. The thin black lines complete the dynamic sculpture and distract from its basic function as a box.
*Picture is obtained from website of Modernista, www.modernista.cz.*

Picture 4
Staircase of “The house of the Black Madonna”. Josef Gočár, 1912-1913. The house of the Black Madonna is considered as one of the most important buildings of Prague Cubism. Nowadays it hosts among others the Czech Cubism museum and Kubista gallery.
*Picture by R. Zwart, 20-04-2008.*

Picture 5
Raymond Duchamp-Villon, “La maison cubist,” 1912, model. The only known architectural design not originating from the Czech Republic.

Picture 6
Josef Gočár, Stach and Hoffmann house 1912-1913. Originally this house was not intended to be Cubist but later ‘decorations’ were added in Cubist style.
*Picture by R. Zwart, 07-07-2007.*

Picture 7
Josef Chochol, tenement house in Prague-Vyšehrad, 1913-1914.
*Picture by R. Zwart, 24-05-2008.*

Picture 8
Emil Králíček, Cubist streetlamp in Prague, 1912-1913. The streetlamp is a part of a project for outdoor furniture for a building company. After the lamp was finished it encountered a wave of disdain from the conservative critics of Prague preservationists.
*Picture by R. Zwart, 24-05-2008.*

Picture 9
Pavel Janáč, Fára house in Pělhrimov, 1913-1914. A reconstruction of a facade with Cubist details, proving that Cubist details can be successfully be combined with historic structures.
*Picture is obtained from website of Modernista, www.modernista.cz.*

Picture 10, 11&12
Josef Chochol, Kovařovič house in Prague, 1913-1914.
*Picture 10&12 by R. Zwart, 24-05-2008.*
*Picture 11 by S. Rothenberger, 24-05-2008.*

Picture 13, 14&15
Emil Králíček, Diamond House in Prague, 1912-1913.
*Pictures by R. Zwart, 10-04-2008.*
Picture 16 & 17
Antonín Belada, Tenement house 1913

Pictures 18 & 19:
Rudolf Stockar, Materna factory 1919-1920.

Pictures 20 & 21:
Otokar Novotný, tenement house 1919-1921.

Picture 22
Josef Chochoł, tenement house in Prague-Vyšehrad, 1913-1914.

Figure 1
Flowchart of possible processes before inscription.

Database of Annex 1
Information in database of annex 1 is obtained from the website of world heritage centre, http://whc.unesco.org.
Created by R. Zwart, 09-06-2008.

Maps of Annex 2
“An original, yet erring, aesthetic formula.”

(Karel Teige, a leading theorist of the Czech interwar avant garde, commenting architectural Cubism)