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Abstract
Bosnia and Herzegovina is one of the successor states of former Yugoslavia, with a history of dramatic conflicts and ruptures. These have left a unique heritage of interchanging prosperity and destruction, in which the built environment and architecture provide a rich evidence of the many complex identity narratives. The public function and architecture of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, once purposely built to commemorate the national liberation in World War 2, encapsulates the current situation in the country, which is navigating through a complicated period of reconstruction and transformation after the war in 1990s. Once considered as the embodiment of a purist Modernist architecture, now a damaged structure with negligible institutional patronage, the Museum shelters the fractured artefacts of life during the three and a half year siege of Sarajevo. This paper introduces research into symbiotic elements of architecture and public function of the Museum. The impact of conflict on its survival, resilience and continuity of use is explored through its potentially mediatory role, and modelling for similar cases of reuse of 20th century architectural heritage.
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INTRODUCTION

The Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina is situated along the main east-west traffic artery Ulica Zmaja od Bosne [the Dragon of Bosnia Street], which cuts through Sarajevo's Marijin Dvor area. The street name has changed a number of times in the past but during the 1990s war it was poignantly known as The Sniper Alley, signifying a deadly route targeted by the besieging Serb-nationalist forces. The Historical Museum was built in 1963 and is still remembered by its original name: Muzej revolucije [the Museum of Revolution]. Its immediate neighbour is a neoclassical block of the Zemaljski muzej [the National Museum], the oldest museum in the country, built in the 19th century during the Austro-Hungarian rule.

At street level, the Historical Museum building looks somewhat dwarfed by the height of its newer neighbour, the neo-Modernist volume of the Austrian Sparkasse Bank. The Museum’s main exhibition block, nicknamed Kocka [the Cube], hovers over the battered street-level stone-clad wall, which hides the recessed glazed base with the main entrance, accessed from a slip road over the raised terrace (See Fig. 1). The street façade is over-ridden by the black and white banner, reminiscent of a celluloid film ribbon, evoking the French philosopher and cultural historian Pierre Nora’s coined phrase ‘the ephemeral film of actuality’ (Nora, 2001). Mounted in 2012 to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the war, the red lettering “Sarajevo 1992-2012” over background images of atrocities and the dark visual language of the banner seems to be appealing to the urban film-watching generations of post-Yugoslav Bosnia and Herzegovina, and to international tourists.

Figure1. The Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, view from Zmaja od Bosne street (Source: S.Harrington, 2012)

Close-up, the building shows bullet scars, severe marks of water damage, steady loss of stone cladding, exposed concrete and corroding steel. The long blank canvas of the terrace wall hosts graffiti scribbles. A few brass letters are missing from the official nameplate of the
Museum and overgrown shrubs obscure the main entrance. All speaks of neglect. The weary body of the building is bitten by rain and frost, and its once sharp edges and smooth volumes are deformed. The dilapidation caused by war damage and post-war lack of maintenance is slowly turning the building into an urban ruin. Often, on a gloomy Sarajevo winter’s day, it looks as if the building is abandoned. Walking past the entrance towards the river Miljacka and negotiating by a rusty armoured vehicle from World War 2, the view opens to a café named after the former Yugoslav President Tito. The café occupies part of the dysfunctional plant room at the basement level, its walls and alcoves adorned with posters, slogans and memorabilia clearly themed on the leading figure and symbolism of former Yugoslav times.

WAR AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Having declared independence from former Yugoslavia in March 1992, Bosnia and Herzegovina, (its acronym BiH used henceforth in citing local references), plunged into a major regional conflict. The siege of its capital, Sarajevo, was televised internationally with live recording of the enormous suffering of its people, many of whom were forced from homes, raped, imprisoned, maimed and killed, over a three and a half year period. This catastrophe created huge loss and trauma, with unanswered questions regarding the violations of a once shared life lived under the banner of bratstvo i jedinstvo [brotherhood and unity] in former Yugoslavia. This is particularly poignant as Bosnia and Herzegovina was and remains multi-cultural, but the 1990s war ruthlessly disregarded the shared cultural narratives based on memories of the anti-fascist national-liberation struggle, socialism and a supra national Yugoslav identity. What seems to have been the unifying founding myths, disappeared as if it never existed. The new post-war reality is dominated by the polarization among three main nationalistic parties, who continue their hold on power based on an uneasy and complicated system of governance that was negotiated through significant international engagement and measures to stop the war. The war left a legacy of ethnic cleansing, internal displacement and emigration, together with a radical change of political system and economy.

There is a significant dependence on the international patronage represented by the Office of High Representative and other agencies, which makes the contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina in many ways ‘a country- in -waiting’. Its citizens and institutions are caught in a state of in-betweenness, where memories of the conflict clash with memories of life previously lived and where the new way of life is not yet fully owned. With a collective memory of other historic conflicts in the past, each generation needs an enormous adaptability in order to live through dramatic changes of regimes, as each one had radically interrupted and altered previous conditions of life.

The Dayton Peace Agreement in 1995 put an end to war and in recognition of the significance and scale of the cultural heritage destruction, unlike other peace treaties, it included a special Annex 8, designed to address and assist in potentially redressing this situation (Walasek et al, 2015). Under the provisions of Annex 8, a Commission to Preserve National Monuments was formed, with the aim to ‘guarantee[…] the right to reconstruct, rehabilitate and protect national monuments that have been damaged or destroyed during the war’. Together with Annex 7, these two Annexes ‘provide for a unique right for return, not only of people, but potentially of the culture, history and identity that existed in the region before the damaging results of war’ (Perry, 2015, p. 186). However, despite the ambition of such provisions, the situation with cultural heritage is quite complex and its renewal is not as straightforward.
An American biographer of Sarajevo, Robert Donia, described the selected targeting and shelling of cultural institutions in the war as acts of ‘obliteration of memory’, but he equally condemned the subsequent ‘segmentation of memory’ in which Sarajevo’s archives, libraries and museums, have been either devastated or actively neglected by the post-war political structure (Donia, 2004). Such segmentation is in evidence today and it feeds into the agenda of active two or three-way-separation along the nationalist lines, where each side is striving to appropriate and ‘reformulate’ value, meaning, interpretation and use of the records kept in the cultural institutions (Donia, 2004). As Donia correctly observed, the active nationalist agendas selectively undermined and marginalized the institutions that survived the war by a ‘studied neglect’, which means that the pursuit of ‘de-construction’ by military means has been continued by apparently peaceful measures or the lack of them, with the same effect (Donia, 2004).

The burning of the National Archives in February 2014 during a hastily coined ‘Sarajevo spring’ was an added episode in this process (Skorupan-Husejnović, 2014). The claims regarding the extent of damage to the building and especially the archival documents from the Austro-Hungarian period were controversial, but the short-lived popular revolt revealed deeper problems felt by many. As a result, the cultural heritage agenda sunk deeper, from neglect to ignorance and vandalism.

Figure 2. The Museum of Revolution building, 1964 (Source: Courtesy of Commission to Preserve National Monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2012).

This situation leaves in a precarious position the seven national institutions from the socialist period and among them the Zemaljski Muzej [National museum], the Historical Museum and Umjetnička galerija [Art Gallery] of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Accommodated in various historic buildings in Sarajevo, these constitute the national cultural heritage. However, according to the website Platform Cultureshutdown.net, their status is ‘[u]nresolved […] in
terms of the legal framework in which they operate (BiH Constitution, Dayton Peace Accord, laws inherited from former Yugoslavia)’ (Platform Cultureshutdown, 2012). The post-Dayton constitutional arrangements and political legacies of the conflict persistently undermine the state and impact on the sense of ownership and investment in cultural heritage. The notion of ‘national’ and what it means to different groups in power in Bosnia and Herzegovina is at very heart of the problem and this unresolved status of seven national institutions points to the over-reaching systemic issues that affect this post-conflict society. Therefore, these institutions are practically being positioned in a category of ‘contested’ and ‘unwanted’ heritage. Among these, the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina is of a particular interest and serves as a trigger for this research. Originally built as a Museum of Revolution, it bears a legacy of specific identity and cultural narrative developed in the socialist period, which is projected in the architecture that displays the hallmarks of an early Modernist period. However, even though the Museum was listed in 2012 as a national monument by the Commission to Preserve National Monuments (Government BiH, 2012), its condition is alarmingly deteriorating, which glaringly suggests that the institution is outside the attention of the authorities.

[r]EVOLUTION IN THE MUSEUM

The Museum building and its contents have today become a public display of scars, wounds and fragments of the former life, practically an exhibition of what can be termed as an *archaeology of conflict*. The supporting documentation to the Decision by the Commission, shows that the national monument status was awarded exclusively based on the quality of the original architecture of the building (Government BiH, 2012). The dossier contains a factual account of history and cultural mission of the Museum since its foundation to date, providing the short general guidelines for carrying out any works on the building (See Fig. 2).

Designed by Boris Magaš, Edo Šmidihen and Radovan Horvat, the Museum was originally founded to develop a collection of documents, art and artefacts to commemorate the national liberation movement with an emphasis on its anti-fascist character. This is explicitly stated by a large, partly damaged, stained glass wall decoration by the local artist Vojo Dimitrijević, in the entrance hall of the building (See Fig. 3).

The three slogans integrated into each panel of the glazed triptych are a reference to the three distinct moments around World War 2 and signify the Yugoslav peoples’ opposition to the occupation of the country, to fascism and to external territorial claims. During the solidarity campaigns among regional and international museums, started in March 2013 in protest of the neglect of cultural institutions, this artwork took the form of an *installation art*, with the addition of a yellow tape, reminiscent of the ones around 1990s war landmine sites in Bosnia (Cultureshutdown, 2013).

Since 2003, the Museum has had a permanent exhibition “The Siege of Sarajevo”, dedicated to the resilience of its people. The exhibition is made up of artefacts donated by citizens, illustrating the practical modes of survival during the 1990s war (See Fig. 4). Through the eye of a contemporary European back-packer, seemingly a typical Museum visitor today, it is at first difficult to understand what it is about. Despite signs of damage, the sparkling whiteness of the minimalist exhibition space still shines through. The ceiling tiles are ripped off, exposing the light aluminium grid and bare concrete soffit above, with partly broken reinforced glass of the roof-lights. It can be gloomy and cold, except in summer. The roof leaks when it rains. The rare original modular exhibition cabinets support unusual exhibits: a
plastic crate on wheels, a recycled cardboard lamp pedestal, a remodelled pressure cooker/stove and other improvised designs. These are objects made out of necessity and commemorate the period when Sarajevo was cut off from normality, enduring shortages of electricity, gas, food and water for almost four years, while being continuously shelled from the surrounding hills (Goodman, 2014).

According to the Museum director Elma Hašimbegović, when the war was over, people ‘got rid of everything that reminded them of it’ and nobody wanted to remember (Goodman, 2014). However, when asked to donate objects for the exhibition ‘hundreds of stoves, ovens, guns and other handmade items’ poured in, giving evidence of a unique form of psychological resistance and resilience of the Sarajevans (Goodman, 2014, p. 57). These objects and souvenirs of personal experiences of the war, expressed through real and virtual records, represent a heritage of destruction, pieces of shattered life and trauma, not yet fully interpreted. There is an on-going initiative and a cross-disciplinary international review of the exhibition, with a view to assess and improve visitor engagement through presentation and narration of the siege ("Wake up Europe, Sarajevo Calling", 2017).

Figure 3. Stained glass artwork in the entrance hall, The Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Source: S.Harrington, 2016).

MUSEUM ARCHITECTURE AND HERITAGE IN CONFLICT: GAPS AND SOURCES

Until recently the European and international discourse on Modern architecture in the English language has by-passed the former Yugoslav space. Developed under a once unifying egalitarian political system and shaped by composite and contrasting cultures and history, the regional architectures in its successor states coexist today with a legacy of complicated
shared identity, remembered, resented or surpassed. Generally unrepresented in the Western discourse, this complex built heritage is often hastily ‘othered’ as ‘Eastern European’, a ‘part of the Communist Block’, and a space behind the former barrier of the Cold War.

The disciplines of cultural studies and humanities tend to position the post-World War 2 architecture from Central and Eastern Europe within memory, trauma and identity studies. Despite its prominence, the Modernist period of architecture in countries of the former East, is often in a state of abandonment and neglect. It is tempting to see this architecture as synonymous with ruins and fragments of dismantled ideologies and societies, and therefore either as condoned, out-rightly rejected, or at times gazed at with nostalgia. However, emerging work by authors culturally connected with that region, calls for a more nuanced approach and suggests that architecture of Communist and Socialist regimes provides a visual pattern for examining the perceived division of modernity between East and West (Gafijczuk, 2013). The notion that somehow the modernity failed more in Europe’s East than in its West is put to test, together with assertions that physical ruination and neglect of architecture is synonymous with the ideological collapse of former regimes established after World War 2 in this geographical space.

The violent political collapse of the Yugoslav state project towards the end of 20th century initially created deep trenches among the newly formed states, which superseded the former Yugoslav republics. Apart from the colossal impact of the separation on societies as a whole, the views and attitudes to architecture and built heritage now had to be aligned with the fractures and with reframing of the new national identities in the region. Such shift added to the complexity of defining the scope and definition of research as well as terminology and perhaps that could explain the lack of representation of Yugoslav architectural space in the international discourse. It is important to highlight the existence of this gap, given the renewed tendency to reject the linear view of the architectural history, dominated by Western thought. This has already been recognized, but not rectified, by many authors arguing for the multivalent approach (Jancks, 1982) or the critical regionalism study (Frampton, 1992).
Adding to this plurality, other research has emerged, placing architecture into Utopian studies, arguing for a more complex reading of a presumption that ‘modern architecture[…] has been fundamentally utopian in its aims and delusions’ and cautioning against the automatic assumption that therefore all postmodern architecture is anti-utopian (Coleman, 2014). This important focus shift leans towards the rapprochement of architectural discourse with the social, political and cultural value systems, and wishes to clarify and untangle often-misused terms *Utopia, Dystopia and visionary*, while attempting to reclaim the visionary social and political role for architecture (Coleman, 2014). However, this is still confined to a Western discourse.

A recent edited volume *East, West, Central, Re-Building Europe 1950-1990* geographically broadens and relocates the architectural Modernism discourse into the field of European politics and identity, arguing for more nuanced understanding of diverse developments as well as of ‘transnational exchanges […] and post-colonial context of the global south’ (Moravanszky & Lange, 2017). Among others, a contribution by the former Magaš’s assistant aims to position the Croatian architect’s work in the European Modernist and Post-modernist discourse, charting his early projects, which include the Museum of Revolution in Sarajevo. Similarly, the publication and research outcome of the project *Unfinished Modernisations, Between Pragmatism and Utopia*, narrows the focus to former Yugoslav architectural and urban space (Mrduljaš & Kulić, 2012). The authors reinforce not only the argument for a subtler reading of Yugoslav architecture, but also suggest the necessity of putting it on an equal footing with Western. They argue that in some cases the Yugoslav architecture and urbanism had more vision and have acted as drivers of ‘the idea of the city as a collective endeavour’, which consequently implies the specificity of a ‘socialist city’ (Mrduljaš & Kulić, 2012). Following with the *Modernism in-between*, the same authors further develop the ‘in-betweenness’ concept of architecture in socialist Yugoslavia suggesting its important mediatory role in the modernization of the country (Mrduljaš et al., 2012).

The pre-1990s original literature in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian language points to the local authors, mainly architects, who recorded buildings designed in Yugoslavia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina and the work of early local Modernists in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (Milošević, 1997). Much of this work tends to be of a descriptive nature, documenting the architectural opus with a limited analysis and lack of its contextual positioning within broader international contemporary movements in architecture. As an exception, the earlier *Architecture of Bosnia and the road to Modernity*, offers a clear positioning and explains the direct links with the Modern movement in architecture, elaborating the transposition and own interpretation of the regional vernacular, thus setting out direction for new regional concepts (Najdhar & Grabrijan, 1957). These were successfully developed in practice by a number of later protagonists in Bosnia and Herzegovina like Zlatko Ugljen, Ahmed Duvić, Mirko Ovadia, Amir Vuk and others. It can be said that the ideas and work of Juraj Najdhardt represent the original strand of regional Modernism, thus foreshadowing what Frampton will later term as *critical regionalism*, albeit observed in other parts of the world (Frampton, 1992).

The unpublished doctoral thesis by Boris Magaš, completed two decades after the winning competition entry for the design of the Museum in Sarajevo, is an important primary source for insight in his architectural philosophy and ethos (Magaš, 1977). Preoccupied with the nature of creativity and the dynamism between the intellectual and emotional forces, the author exposes the conditionality of the architectural practice within a social and historical power base. Written in somewhat difficult expressionist style, his analysis and language
demonstrate the influence of the dialectic materialism, rooted in the official rhetoric of the period.

It can be said that a literature search on architecture in Bosnia and Herzegovina and former Yugoslavia shows up a modest number of publications in local language and practically none in English created up to 1990s. The search does not include periodicals and exhibition catalogues. What is known and documented is that what was built and what is still in evidence across former Yugoslav space. So in defining the scope of knowledge and gaps, it is necessary to say that any study of architecture and urbanism in that space has to commence by framing a system which was founded and existed for some four decades, until its subsequent collapse, fragmentation, reframing and current state of fluidity. The system was manifested as a unique form of society, economy, culture and politics, within which architecture and urban space performed functions perceived to reflect the values of the system. Hence, the system's collapse, or more accurately targeted de(con)struction, together with the passage of time, have pushed the architecture synonymous and synchronous with it, in the domain of heritage and at the extreme, in a category of heritage at risk.

METHODS, AIMS AND STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH

The complexity of understanding the architecture of this space requires a cross-disciplinary approach. Therefore, this research is undertaken from the perspective of an architect and cultural historian, looking at two disciplinary fields: architecture and public history, which will underpin the composite methodological framework. Initially, this will be developed by the content analysis of literature in English and in Bosnian/Croat/Serbian language, the analysis of local archival material, and development of a qualitative case study based on the architecture of the Historical Museum in Sarajevo.

Broadly speaking, the research is constructed as a form of dialogic action derived from the concept of knowledge development, which begins with an 'epistemological distance', or in plain words, with 'circling around' the object (Freire, 1997). The illustration of similar concepts, such as the dialogic inquiry approach (Wells, 1999) or the theory of communicative action (Habermas, 1984), will later support this approach. As a starting point, a dialogic action is applied here to a process of parallel examination of form, content and meaning, embodied in a system of public building space, which will be followed through the dynamics of ruptures and continuities in the life span of the Museum and described further in the outline themes of the Thesis. At the outset, three principal aims are stated below:

• To contribute to the critical heritage discourse, by positioning the public history narrative of the Historical Museum closer to the representations of identity politics and conflict in the European context
• To contribute to the other Modernisms discourse, by positioning the architecture of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the revision of the post-World War 2 Modernist architecture representations
• To contribute to a broader cross-disciplinary approach in environmental sustainability discourse, by examining the resilience of the Museum as a micro system in a post-conflict society, arguing that an architectural object, space, content and meaning of architecture is a part of strategy to achieve balance between environmental, economic, political and societal aspects of a system in general.
Firstly, a preliminary position is formed using a critical heritage discourse lens, applied to the examination of the museum as a public institution associated with national identity and the history of social conflict. This observes the historical patterns of social stratification in heritage preservation practices differentiated by scale, scope, exclusivity and inclusivity of heritage in different environments, as presented in the edited volume *Heritage, Identity and Ideology in Central and Eastern Europe* (Rampley, 2013). Here, the key contributor Rampley reflects on the British heritage discourse and politics, seeing it as an evolution, which spans from the 19th century sentimentalism and celebration of the Imperial past to the 20th century heritage industry, subordinate to a commodity culture and adaptable to the changing nature of tourism and education (Harrington, 2013). Other contributors examine the contemporary heritage and museum policies from perspectives of ownership and varied claims on heritage narratives by different communities and social groups (Rampley, 2013). The distinctions are drawn between dominant and minority cultures, linking the attitudes to heritage, development of nationhood and a sense of national belonging to a specific history within or without a colonial and foreign rule. The second edited volume, *Heritage and Museums, Shaping National Identity*, is of particular interest as it gives a record of the debates, plans and realization of the building of the National Museum of Scotland in Edinburgh (Fladmark, 2000). Here, the Scottish contributors from academia, architecture, museum studies, administration and practice examine the complex history, collections, curatorship, identity and briefing, while the international authors discuss the national museums’ experiences of Nordic and other countries, suggesting that some of these approach heritage in a more inclusive manner, in line with the present-day culture (Fladmark, 2000).

Secondly, advancing the concept of other Modernisms in architecture, the architecture of the Historical Museum will be examined through its formative qualities, its monumentality, and its international and regional conceptual precedents. The content analysis of the recently available primary material will include the original correspondence and meeting records, documenting the intent and detail in the process of developing the Museum building and ideological positions of the design and management team. The comparative analysis of the Scottish National Museum building, based on “The Architect’s Vision. Designing for Context and Content” will be used as a dialogic precedent, (Benson, 2000). The analysis of approaches to architectural interventions at the National Museum of Ireland and Ulster Museum in Belfast will also form part of the argument.

As part of data gathering, an international Focus group has been formed, representing individuals, institutions and museums with responsibility for safeguarding, managing, curating and interpreting complex heritage assets associated with national identity and conflict narratives. Geographically, the Focus group represents the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, with an implication that the participants have knowledge and understanding of institutional foundation, representation, conflict and fluidity, arising, but not exclusively, from encounters and/or coexistence between minority and dominant cultural narratives. The work with the Focus group will include three seminars and direct communication, examining the themes arising from a basic question of why museum matters today, taking a lead from a comprehensive edited volume *A Companion to Museum Studies* (Macdonald, 2011). A number of key issues will be developed by exploring a number of themes, as follows:

**Systems Thinking and Resilience Theory**

The occurrence of heritage at risk is sadly rising at an alarming pace. Since the later part of the 20th century, natural disasters, climate change and modern warfare affect people and
their cultural heritage throughout the world. The increase of the category of heritage at risk, buildings and historic sites subjected to targeted and massive destruction, highlights the relevance of resilience thinking. Resilience implies a more inclusive and more complex approach to understanding the values of protecting buildings, sites and cities for communities and society, demanding that cultural and societal factors must be included in decision-making processes concerning built heritage, alongside financial, technical and environmental ones. Here, the definition adopted for the resilience thinking is a process ‘framed in a context of understanding and governing complex social-ecological dynamics for sustainability as part of a dynamic biosphere’ (Falke, 2016). A basic model for the analysis considers three central aspects of a system: resilience, adaptability and transformability (Pisano, 2012) (See Fig. 5).

Applying the concept of resilience thinking to the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a specific case is put forward, anticipating its potential to inform the resilience modelling in similar post-conflict environments. The Museum will be analysed as a micro-system, which is representative, symbolic and symptomatic of a condition of a larger social, cultural, political and economic system in the country.

Figure 5. System Resilience Aspects (S. Harrington, based on Falke’s definition in Pisano, 2012)

**National Museums, Architecture, Identity and Conflict Narratives**

The broader context will be established by examination of several selected national institutions with legacies of composite and contested identities and conflict. Considered representative of ‘Europe’s peripheries’ with historic parallels relevant to the case of the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, these initially include the institutions represented by the Focus group. Expanding on earlier research by the lead author, the contextual analysis of the Historical Museum will include two other Bosnian museums: Zemaljski muzej [the National Museum] and a former Muzej Mlada Bosna [Young Bosnia Museum] in Sarajevo. These are considered as identity forming precedents to the Museum of Revolution (Harrington, 2013). The analysis will focus on the factors and narratives contributing to the continued use of built heritage, seeking to expose the policy and politics of cultural heritage, as well as obstacles and strategies vital in its survival.

**Towards ‘Other’ Modernisms Discourse**

This architecture of Bosnia and Herzegovina, within a socialist Yugoslav space in the second part of the 20th century, will be contextualized in a broader European architectural narrative...
by listening to the voices and expressions of local architects (Štraus, 1991). This will include the review of influences and relationships to the originators of the international Modern movement in architecture, gazing back at the two distinct periods of Modernism that were in evidence in the first Kingdom of Yugoslavia (Milošević, 1997) and the subsequent period of Yugoslav socialism (Najdhart & Grabrijan, 1957). In addition, the themes of Architecture, Revolution and Utopia, as a reflection of recent rethinking, will also be considered (Coleman, 2005), as this might provide better understanding of the social role and ideology of the regional architecture and the ideas and practices of the socialist urbanism and socialist city.

**Embodying Revolution: Building the Museum.**

The overview of the unique network of Yugoslav and Bosnian museums set up to commemorate the national liberation struggle, will give a pretext to the case study of the Museum of Revolution in Sarajevo. The design and architecture of the Museum of Revolution building will be observed in their symbiotic relationship with the shared identity narrative constructs, expressed through the Museum’s collections, exhibitions, publications and Annual conference proceedings published from 1975 to 1984. The preliminary study of the original archival material from the Museum indicates a systematic approach in a decade-long preparation, planning and completion of the building on site in Sarajevo. The material consists of original correspondence, briefing and meeting notes, instructions to the design and construction team, some original drawings and subsequent renovation proposals. The information about original construction materials, methods and services, provides a valuable lead to understanding the original condition of the building and potential clues to deterioration of a national monument, caused by factors other than the war damage.

**1990s War: Destruction and Resilience.**

The 1990s war brought about deliberate targeting, damage and destruction of the cultural heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This part of the research will be constructed by applying the content analysis of primary material, revealing the elements of local institutional and individual professional resistance and survival strategies. These include the project “Warchitecture” developed during the first years of the war as a publication and an exhibition “Sarajevo Urbicide”, most likely an evidence of the first professional mapping of the built heritage destruction in the war (The Association of Architects Sarajevo, 1993). The analysis will also look into the proceedings from a major conference devoted to the strategy for renewal of the country, organized at the time by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Sarajevo, with contributions by local experts (Government BiH, 1993).

**Cultural Heritage and the Historical Museum: Cracks and Light.**

A recent comprehensive study Bosnia and the destruction of cultural heritage provides an overview of the scale, scope and problems currently facing the custodians of the built heritage in the country (Walasek at al, 2015). The analysis of the constitutional provisions in Annex 8, for inclusion of the cultural heritage renewal as a condition in the Dayton Peace Agreement, is of particular interest. It provides an important basis for system analysis and critique, in particular in relation to the work of the Commission to Preserve National Monuments and their role in care for the Historical Museum, seen from a perspective of an external expert. This will be presented in a dialogue with local professional voices, expressed in essays and interviews with architects in a special edition of a weekly magazine Dani [Days], painting a fuller picture of the local context and complexity of navigating through the current politics of urban development and built heritage (Urbicid, 2003).
As part of the analysis, a review of selected contemporary activities in the Museum will focus in particular on the initiatives and collaboration with architects and architecture education groups. The base material and data collection is based on the engagement, action research and fieldwork by the lead author, since 2012 to date (Čaušević et al, 2014).

TOWARDS CONCLUSIONS: RESILIENCE, FLUIDITY AND TRANSFORMATION

The research to date and the response by the participants of the Focus group at the Seminar organized in May 2017 at the University of Strathclyde, confirmed the actuality of the research topic. The ethos, mission and policy of the museums and public heritage institutions; physical aspects of architectural space and museum exhibitions; education and public engagement; research, funding and future of museums were presented in the individual contributions with examples of own practices and experiences. The participants confirmed the need to advance the knowledge exchange and insight into current social, economic and environmental contexts within which modern museums operate. Further work with the Focus group will examine partnerships and associations critical to the process at each national level, examining brief development and knowledge exchange, specifically in the context of fluidity of architectural space, design of museum exhibitions and visitors’ engagement. It is expected that the resilience thinking approach will lead to conclusions with an adequate level of modelling and generalization, applicable when discussing the preservation, meaningful appropriation, adaptive use and maintenance of public buildings of national significance and affected by conflicts.
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