Conclusion

Towards a meta-theory of restoration reconciling the tangible and intangible heritages

…when a part of one's person is lost, it should be replaced in kind, bone for bone, muscle for muscle, hairless skin for hairless skin, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth'. Accordingly, when filling in a defect, the first principle of reconstructive surgery is: replace 'like-with-like'.[1]

……….

Part I and Part II of this thesis argued that the tangible and the intangible heritages support diverse interpretations of the past and that each domain appears to come together (and/or fracture) over the concept of authenticity in the practice of restoration. The thesis also argued that recent movements with respect to intangible heritage (now understood as the overarching paradigm through which all heritages are perceived) have challenged traditional notions of authenticity that were formerly based solely on materials and form but now are also understood in terms of process. Part III argued that process was central to the Heritage Preservation Movement of the C19th. and that the idea of intangible heritage was equally important and, although not hitherto formally sanctioned, has recently had an important influence on aspects of the heritage sector in the United Kingdom – in particular architectural preservation and the role of museums. Crucially, however, the professionalisation of conservation has not formally incorporated these wider developments; and, indeed, in many ways is diametrically opposed to them.

In addition to this, the theoretical analysis provided throughout the text highlighted how scientific epistemology affects the 'stock of knowledge' in the field and argued that this, in turn, contributes to the historical 'separation' of the tangible heritage from the intangible heritage – a characteristic of Western culture, wherein intangible heritage remains of only secondary importance. This has been described in this thesis as a process of naturalisation – whereby unique, value-laden, and historically-transcendent perspectives of 'heritage' are subsumed into the authorised, the given and the consensual – as part of an essentially reductive and 'closed' view of the past.

For this reason, the thesis has drawn attention to methodological tools used for

---

[1]   Dr. R. Millard, *Principlization of Plastic Surgery*, Little Brown and Co., Boston, 1986 (p.685).

interpreting the past (and our subsequent intentions) which have their own lineage and why it argues that this must be taken into account if we are to understand the breadth and depth of intangible heritage. This is based on the hypothesis that the central philosophical problem of preserving 'heritage' (in the fullest sense) is essentially *epistemological* in nature. It is with this in mind that the conclusion to this thesis calls for an 'opening up' of our understanding of the past, in part, to counter these reductionist tendencies.

The accomplishment of this would necessitate the creation of an intellectual 'pathway' into a broader (and therefore more inclusive) understanding of 'heritage' which would enable the transmutation from the exclusivity of a 'modern' to the plurality of a 'post-modern' vision. Indeed, this seems essential when one considers the recent broad paradigmatic movements in global heritage concerns (with respect to values and diversity) and the 'world picture' which is subsequently emerging. Such an approach would in effect aim to (re-)synthesise ontology with epistemology (fractured by naturalisation) and heal a historical rupture brought about by methodological abstraction and reduction, which (this thesis has argued) has brought about a sense of disconnectedness and discontinuity (and therefore disinheritance and disenfranchisement) within the heritage community; hence the separation of the tangible v. intangible domains.

In order to achieve this ontological / epistemological synthesis, it is first necessary to understand the intangible heritage of European culture. We are, therefore, invariably led to the historical movements in European thought which formulated the historical antecedents of our present day intentions – some of which have become institutionalised and subsequently administered (i.e. 'authorised'), others not. With respect to this, a clear turning point concerned the 'authentic' and (in particular) how our understanding of this concept was historically transformed through the (so-called) intellectual evolution from 'faith to fact' – which has been described herein as a transition from religion to science, from the spiritual to the material, from the inner to the outer, from the living subject to the inanimate object, from ontology to (scientific) epistemology and from the intangible to the tangible and so on.

This dualistic character of European thought has also been described as reflecting a

hermeneutical shift from a *hermeneutic interius* to a *hermeneutic extrinsecus* which is connected to the emergence of Western materialism (sometimes derogatorily referred to as 'scientistic materialism'). This is historically inextricably bound to the European Church Reforms and the intellectual developments of the succeeding centuries, such as the European Enlightenment, which can be understood as part of the 'Great Transformation' of modernity – a phrase used to describe the changes which occurred in European culture from about 1700 to about 1900.[2] It is for this reason why a broad interpretation opens this conclusion (in Section 4.1.1, next), which also helps to 'locate' the 'intangible' within a wider historiographical context; thus offering breadth and depth.

4.1.1: Understanding the past: prelude to an era

The issues concerning restoration that emerged in the early C19th. in the United Kingdom and continued throughout the C20th. can be connected historically to the European Church Reforms of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Reforms were the precursor to the period of European Enlightenment which saw a new consciousness emerge particularly in Protestant countries. The interpretation and subsequent re-inscription of the New Testament was a characteristic of Protestantism. The search for *original meaning* through textual exegesis was essentially a response to the questions raised by the Reformation debate about the authentic meaning of the Biblical text and by the Enlightenment questions about epistemology and philology.

The Reformers challenged the Roman Catholic understanding that the text could only be interpreted through the lens of a tradition of understanding and that its true meaning was not immediately evident to the individual reader. They (the Reformers) asserted that 'truth' *was* accessible to the contemporary reader and that the basis for faith and doctrine could (therefore) be developed *sola scriptura* without reference to tradition. This had the effect of cultivating a hermeneutical consciousness which

---

2   The changes most central to the Great Transformation are: the growth of modern market economies; the development of modern nation-states and a state-based system of international relations; technological changes involved in the industrial revolution; advances in military technology and organisation; and the expansion of the franchise and erosion of aristocratic privileges. See for example, Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Beacon Press, 2002 (first published in 1944).

pervaded all aspects of the 'modern' civilisation.[3]

In contrast with Protestantism, Catholicism (the formative religion of Europe) maintained a predilection for continuity and belief in or advocacy of change *by degrees* and the authority of the clergy (based on a tradition of understanding). Catholicism, therefore, tended to resist 'going back' to origins in favour of accumulated meaning (which may also be called 'incrementalism' or 'gradualism'). The influence of this theological schism (which has become familiarly known as the Reformation), and the resultant hermeneutical consciousness, may thus be understood as a kind of Protestant *restoration*. Its emphasis on the individual became a characteristic of the Protestant era.

The attempt to reform the Church by a restoration of primitive Christianity (i.e. based on the study of Scripture) was largely instigated by the work of Desiderius Erasmus. It had the effect of breaking the continuity of the Western religious tradition, invariably leading to a hiatus in the continuity and unity of the common inheritance of culture. The 'separation' from Rome, and the subsequent assertion of the Nation States of Europe (a characteristic of the Great Transformation of modernity) were part of this historical process.[4] However, the tradition of Western culture continued to be transmitted through the Guilds of the craftsmen and the workshops of the artisans at the vernacular-level.

In thought, observation and explanation shaped modern intellectualism in the 'new' Protestant era; reason and rationality became the guiding 'lights' of modern 'Enlightenment' philosophers who came to 'rescue' civilisation from the 'dogma' of tradition and laid the foundations of the Western epistemological tradition. All things knowable could henceforth be ascertained in a *rational* manner; anything that could not was not *reasonable*. The 'new' hermeneutical consciousness, postulating the supremacy of reason and rationality, empiricism and methodological reductionism and objectivity (i.e. impartiality) demanded evidence in the form of observable,

---

[3]   Friedrich Ast (1778 – 1841) was an important early writer on the subject. See also, P. Harrison, *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
[4]   H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Sheed and Ward, 1975 (first published in German in 1960) and Christopher Dawson, *The Crisis of Western Education*, Sheed and Ward, 1961, combined with *The Eighteenth Century*, edited by A. Cobban, Thames and Hudson, London, 1969 and N. Hampson, *The Enlightenment*, Penguin, 1968 are recommended further reading.

measurable phenomena.[5] Such 'unprejudiced' knowledge implied control which conferred 'power'.[6] Directed towards the natural world (i.e. *hermeneutic extrinsecus*) this led to advances in the physical sciences; (such as, physics, chemistry and biology). 'Origin' subsequently became a guiding metaphor; Newtonian mechanics searched for *originary* laws while Darwin, *originary* species. The human sciences followed; for example, in politics, economics, history and later the social sciences – which became 'the true heirs of humanism' (but perhaps without the spiritual dimension of a Religion).[7]

It was the quest for positive factual knowledge that characterised the Western (scientific) epistemological tradition; museums and universities – which became the intellectual 'engine rooms' of the Secular State – are (arguably) its contemporary heirs.[8] Scientific economics has its origins in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*.[9] Its outcome was Capitalism; later consumerism. When Capitalism fused with Newtonian mechanics; the practical (i.e. rational and reasonable – and perhaps inevitable) outcome was C19th. industrialism.[10] Capitalistic industrialism – the basis of political economy (the so-called 'dismal science' whose driving force is profit)[11] thus (in a sense) entered the vacuum created by the separation of the newly reformed Church from the Secular State – marking the shift from Theocracy to Polity (and forming modern democracy) which characterised modern liberalism. Its success was most noticeable amongst the Protestant peoples – in particular in Holland and the

---

5   Francis Bacon (1561-1626); John Locke (1632-1704); Isaac Newton (1643-1727) and René Descartes (1596-1650) were important early influences.

6   This is a reference to Francis Bacon's (1561-1626) the *Meditationes Sacrae,* 1597 in which he declared *scientia potentia est* – a Latin maxim which has been translated into English as: *knowledge is power*. Bacon preached the instrumental character of science and its power to transform – so that man might become the master of nature. This recalls the distinction between the Ruskinian and Viollet-le-Ducian conceptions of history discussed in Section 3.1.1.

7   H-G. Gadamer *Truth and Method*, Sheed and Ward, 1975 (p.10).

8   According to Christopher Dawson political nationalism took the place of Christian humanism over the past two centuries as part of the secularisation of education (p.68); and was eventually superseded by the ideal of scientific specialisation (p.119); for him scientific specialisms do not provide a complete intellectual education and tend to disintegrate into 'technologies'. Such a technologist is not an educated person but merely an instrument of the industrialist or the bureaucrat (p.132); in *The Crisis of Western Education*, Sheed and Ward, 1961.

9   A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and the Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 1776 was a cornerstone in its development.

10   Some believe the Industrial Revolution to be applied Newtonian Science; see *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader*, edited by P. Rabinow and W. Sullivan, University of California Press, 1979 (p.281).

11   This derogatory view of modern political economy was expressed by Thomas Carlyle; see Section 3.1.1.

United Kingdom.[12]

Through this 'Great Transformation', the United Kingdom emerged as one of the most prosperous nations in the C19th. but at the same time responsible for vast environmental pollution. Thomas Carlyle, Augustus Pugin and John Ruskin and their followers were important critical voices in their concerns for the environment (especially Ruskin) and for the moral well-being of mankind which had (for them) been corrupted by various aspects of a modern civilisation which had become dominated by a new scientific order. Its materialistic, individualistic, money-grubbing 'trading' characteristics (which had the effect of liberating mankind's natural impulse to greed); its tendency to mechanise human thought; and the progressive alienation of mankind from nature and from the roots of his origins were all abhorrent to them. It was the creed of the Enlightenment that Western civilisation was destined to expand by the progressive influence of science, trade and humanitarian ideals until it became a true world civilisation. The processes of globalisation are (arguably) a continuation of this goal.[13]

This historical process has thus determined (in the widest sense) our methodological tools of interpretation and our subsequent modes of practice. The C19th. Arts and Crafts Movement, for example, imbued with a Christian moral ethic, rejected the scientific management of the 'alienated' modern worker who in the process was reduced to a mere mechanical contrivance – stifling his spiritual well-being and denigrating his freedom of expression.[14] This would be resisted by supporting the continuity of *practice* – the antithesis to the 'non-participating observer' who attempts to 'restore' knowledge about the past that he himself has not inherited *through* practice. The traditional Arts and Crafts were sanctified in the process, and at the same time became an anachronism in the context of the new 'technocratic'

---

[12] A useful source here is Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Dover Publications, 2003 (first published in German in 1905 and first translated into English in 1926) which the author recommends should be read together with R.H. Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, Penguin, 1922.

[13] See for example, *The Cultures of Globalization*, edited by Fredric Jameson (*et. al*), Duke University Press, 2003 (first published in 1998). Organisations such as UNESCO and the World Bank and concepts such as One World Archaeology are (arguably) part of this crusade.

[14] This is not unlike ECCO's understanding of the conservator-restorer as requiring merely 'manual dexterity' and the ability to think in accordance with the bureaucratic system (i.e. the profession) that envelopes him; quite the antithesis of intangible heritage.

civilisation.

Crucially, it was Ruskin's and Morris's view that the modern alienated worker had no right to restore the monuments that belonged more properly to 'Christendom' and which thus represented the creative spirit of a bygone era. The Arts and Crafts Movement sought to harness this spirit through traditions of practice (which also provided the knowledge-base for the work of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings). History would be lived out in practice in order to ensure deeper and, therefore, more complete understanding of the past. This was seen by its followers as a form of restitution – it was pre-capitalistic, pre-industrial, pre-mechanical and (for that reason) pre-scientific in character – creating a tendency towards pre-lapsarianism.

This understanding established the need for an *ecology of human life* – perhaps the greatest of all possible preservation theories; an idea which has (in recent times) found its way into UNESCO through the formal recognition of intangible heritage. The thesis argues, therefore, that a similar hermeneutical consciousness, based on people and their values (i.e. *hermeneutic interius*), characterises the post-modern period. The Arts and Crafts Movement thus can be seen in some ways to anticipate the post-modern conception of heritage preservation. It was a comprehensive understanding of 'heritage' that sought to sustain and incorporate what has subsequently become known as the safeguarding of the intangible heritage. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) in 1877 and the Arts and Crafts Movement (which followed shortly after) taken together were a modern *cult of authenticity*[15] which synthesised the tangible / intangible heritages; and, overcame the diachronic / synchronic paradox[16] through an elevated concept of an historical document.

However, the C20th. has seen the field riven by competing theories. The practice of scientific conservation (for example) emerged in the first quarter of the C20th. and found favour in the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors in Europe

---

[15] *From William Morris: Building Conservation and the Arts and Crafts Cult of Authenticity 1877-1939*, edited by C. Miele, Yale University Press, 2005.
[16] Refer to Part I and Part II conclusions.

and throughout the West. This essentially archaeo-museological approach (which also now draws on fine arts restoration theory) subsequently formed the basis of tangible heritage preservation.

4.1.2: Tangible heritage preservation

In broad terms, in Europe and throughout the West, tangible heritage preservation was established upon an essentially 'scientific' interpretation of existing material remains. This was characterised by an essentially positivistic historiography combined with technical studies in the physical sciences (for example, chemistry and physics). This approach continues to predominate in the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors. This provided the basis for professional conservation practice (as reflected in the formalisation of ethics and guidelines for education and training and continuing development). The C20th. has introduced this approach to the preservation of wider heritage domains. It may be generically referred to as 'scientific conservation' or 'scientific restoration'. Some consider scientific conservation-restoration to be the second phase of ideas instigated by the C19th. Arts and Crafts-oriented Heritage Preservation Movement – gaining wide acceptance in the post-WWII period (particularly in advanced 'technological' societies).[17]

The practice of conservation and restoration is essentially what might be termed a creative practical discipline. Thus the restorer, the preserver of tangible heritage, is necessarily an artist of his time.[18] However, education and training in the heritage sector has become increasingly scientific; and thus technical and rational *in its thinking* rather than being artistic and based on ideologies that are informed by custom. This is attributable, in part, to the on-going aspiration for professional standing (historically, technical / rational studies and 'professionality' are synonymous in the United Kingdom) and the difficulty that training institutions have in cultivating high levels of artistic / creative capabilities (and associated aesthetic sensibilities) which are vital in some disciplines, such as furniture and decorative art. Like the discipline of archaeological conservation (which has been hugely influential

---

[17] B. Feilden, 'Conservation – Is There No Limit? – A Review', in *Journal of Architectural Conservation,* Volume 1, Number 1 March 1995. Available from:
http://www.donhead.com/vol1.htm [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

[18] H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Sheed and Ward, 1975 (pp.138-139) – about the preservation of ancient monuments.

in the shaping of the profession in the United Kingdom), the discipline of artefact conservation emphasises the positive interpretation of materials and their subsequent documentation. Documentation of interventive practice is also fundamental. The availability of resources, such as libraries, advanced technologies and funding, is a major factor in its success in public sector institutions.

In such contexts, the practice of restoration (which is formally defined as *adding to* not *removing from* the historical document) is generally not favoured; it may even be considered unethical. In practice, the primary concern of conservation (as reflected in education and training) lies in the revelation, identification and subsequent preservation of original material fabric. This places greater value in originality *not* in later alterations / additions (hence the tendency to reject restoration by *adding to*). This can lead to the tendency to remove later additions (i.e. restoration by *removing from*) which are shown (typically by textual research and technical examination) to not be historically 'appropriate'. In the case of furniture and decorative art, for example, the removal of surface coatings through 'cleaning' – sometimes referred to (in a derogatory sense) as stripping – is not uncommon. When restoration (interpreted as *adding to*) is deemed necessary, 'non-like' materials may be used 'ethically'. This is usually determined on two primary grounds; i: to preserve the original historical fabric and ii: to unify the object visually to make it more aesthetically 'legible'. This approach relates to the values that are attributed to the object; in this case 'historical' and 'aesthetic', respectively. In line with the introduction of conservation teaching, the use of 'non-like' 'conservation grade' materials has increased substantially in this domain in recent years.

In loss-compensation, the use of 'non-like' materials is typically not considered restoration because it only seeks to realise *visual unity* (or 'oneness' in Brandian terms). Casting modern synthetic resins in order to replicate wood-carving is a typical example, but this may also include modern foams used to replace traditional upholstery or modern synthetic coatings to replace traditional lacquer and so on. Conservation ethics, such as reversibility, are designed to ensure their removal without causing harm to the 'valued' historical fabric – which bears out that such added material is *not* valued. Minimum-intervention (another ethical principle) may also be used to justify the use of 'non-like' materials. Justification (in terms of the

written word) is based on compatibility – which, in scientific conservation is determined scientifically – and not necessarily on any conceptual grounds, such as authenticity. Such restorations may be referred to as 'neutral'. In furniture and decorative arts – a highly skilled area requiring a great deal of 'hands-on' practical expertise (i.e. *knowledge of how*) – complex restorative intervention tends not be undertaken in public institutions.[19] This is largely due to time / cost factors and the availability of the necessary expertise. In such cases, restoration work tends either to be contracted out (to appropriate artists and/or craftspeople) or it is acquired by the institution having already been restored by the same. In this sense, the (so-called) craftsman-restorer is anonymous because his/her (arguably vital) contribution to the field tends not to be included in the 'authorised' literature (more on this later).[20]

It is upheld in scientific conservation that authenticity cannot be *added to* the object; it can only be revealed in so far as it exists. This is consistent with the general disliking of restoration (in the *adding to* sense of the meaning) and the associated traditional arts and crafts practices. The object is also understood as an historical document – which (supposedly) represents physically human activity stratified in time. This is central to the object's accumulated symbolic meaning and acquired aging characteristics (i.e. 'age-value'). However, this interpretation of authenticity has the effect of denying the continuity of the historical document (understood as the tangible expression of intangible heritage) from the time when it 'emerges' as historically significant. In museums, for example, aesthetic and historical values (intangibles but *not* intangible heritage) are given preference while others, such as function and use, materials and substance; spirit and feeling, traditions, techniques and original creative propriety (other aspects of authenticity) typically change and tend to be downplayed. From then on an attempt is made to suspend (or 'freeze') the

---

[19] The author has examined every conservation journal published by the Victoria and Albert Museum (from 1992 to 2005) but was unable to find a highly complex restoration project in furniture. Examples looked for were such things as major splits and/or warps in table-tops, missing legs on chairs (such as cabriole – which are difficult to make), major losses (at least 30%) in decorative veneer-work (such as marquetry or Boulle-work); no suitable examples were found.

[20] A good example of this can be found in Oddy's introduction to *The Art of the Conservator*, edited by A. Oddy, British Museum Press, 1992 in which he criticises 'craftspeople' but does not take into account that the British Museum's Horological Department contracts out to such specialists when the restoration work is too difficult to do in-house. This information was obtained in a discussion with Jeremy Evans (who has been working in the Horological Department for over thirty years) during an arranged site visit to the British Museum on 8th November 2005. The discussion has not been transcribed.

object in time. It is for this reason that the primary goal of conservation practice is to understand, explain and retard the underlying causes of material deterioration (i.e. to arrest mutability). This goal is a specific condition of the museum (or gallery) environment in which these ideas first emerged and have subsequently been deployed.

However, in museums the hermeneutical function of time becomes distorted *through* time; which has been referred to in this thesis as the 'time-wall' of historicism. This is largely attributable to a scientific interpretation of the heritage which is based solely on its materiality; the tangible object being the evidence which provides information or 'factual' data about the past. This positivist historiography is, for the most part, constructed by 'non-participating' observers and not lived out in practice by 'connected' participators; i.e. it is disconnected from relative 'human' concerns. This informs the 'synchronic' conception of heritage preservation; a conception which *predominates* in the Western scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors of Europe and the West. It is superimposed upon culture itself – primarily through education; for example, by museums and universities. The acquired effect has been described in this thesis as a feeling within Western civilisations that the past is a completed development – as if viewed through a *diorama* – leading to a feeling of disconnectedness or disinheritance; a product of the so-called 'time-wall'. Scientific conservation (as informed by an essentially archaeo-museological / fine arts model), brings this conception of 'tangible heritage preservation' into wider disciplinary and cultural contexts through its administrative organisation (associated with professionalisation). It is theoretically diametrically opposed to intangible heritage (and the *diachronic* viewpoint).

4.1.3: The safeguarding of the intangible heritage

The intangible heritage has been defined (broadly) in this thesis as essentially referring to the values that are attributed to a historicity of understanding as represented by the activities of people in the present; for example, through continuity of *practice*. Essentially it is knowledge-led rather than information-led. This may be manifested in individuals, groups, communities, regions or even nations. It may thus be an entire way of life or a unique specialism. But essentially it concerns particular forms of knowledge, and may incorporate the (so-called) 'tacit dimension'. Value is

attributed to this knowledge which typically has been shaped through time in the form of *technique* (i.e. *knowledge of how*). The continuity of its 'performance' determines its significance as a meaning-conferring activity which (in turn) determines its essentially *ontological* status. It is distinct from scientific epistemology – but it is nonetheless knowledge. For this reason intangible heritage can be described as ontological and epistemological (in the *knowledge of how* sense). Such practices are associated with custom; which may extend for many generations remaining relatively unchanged. Typically, this intensifies their meaning-conferring qualities (and therefore value). However, they are not *static*. Intangible heritage is in constant flux; relative to the environment (as with tangible heritage). But unlike tangible heritage (which is inanimate) intangible heritage is 'living' through its embodiment in people. The person (or subject) is thus the bearer and transmitter of this knowledge and his/her work is its physical (i.e. tangible) manifestation.

Intangible heritage is associated with traditional arts and crafts practices. It is typically highly skilled and characterised by heightened aesthetic understanding. It has deep significance to the bearer who will have a highly emotive 'connection' with the activity – i.e. it is subliminal. Practice is informed by a body of knowledge manifested in traditional skills, typically (but not always) associated with the use of simple technology and natural materials (as opposed to advanced technology and synthetic materials). The kinds of tools (i.e. technology) have been designed and thus evolved historically in relation to the knowledge and the material. A change in the material necessarily means a change in the technology and, by extension, the knowledge required in its use (and a potential break in continuity). Intangible heritage, in this sense, is 'pre-scientific' (and thus pre-synthetic) in character. Such modalities of knowing are typically extant in localised, non-institutionalised, contexts – a traditional craft workshop, for instance. In the past this would have been conditioned by local need; although this is less relevant today – particularly in advanced technological societies. They, nonetheless, have a social and cultural *connectedness* which provides a living mediation of an otherwise 'de-humanised' tangible record 'of the past'.

For the bearers of intangible heritage the past (i.e. history) is experienced as a mode of understanding. It represents the aggregate of human thoughts which have been

conditioned by a world of complex values and meanings. It is an inheritance. And practice is the idiom of performance. As such, the continuity of practice may be experienced as a process of self-realisation; like an unbroken 'stream of consciousness' which has been shaped and sustained in practice by the transmission of 'knowing' from one generation to the next – from one bearer to another. This may be described (intellectually) as a historicist historiography. The continuity of intangible heritage links the past to the present in living form – which contrasts with the positivist historiography (which understands history as a form of enquiry about what actually happened *in the past*).[21] In the traditional arts and crafts, for instance, this sense of continuity was typically achieved through father-to-son apprenticeship (i.e. subliminal apprenticeship) or from master to apprentice (i.e. formal or contract apprenticeship). This method of knowledge-transfer is highly valued amongst artist / craftspeople for its attainment of high levels of artistic / creative capability.[22]

Being practice-based, artefacts (which are frequently considered to be part of the history of *that* practice) are interpreted as *conveyors of meaning* – rather than solely (or even primarily) as evidence or data-carriers (as typified by the positivistic interpretation). The approach to restoration requires an ability to 'negotiate' with the creator but not in a literal sense (which is clearly impossible) but in a knowledge-of-practice sense and in a sublimated way. Without the historicity of understanding this *de facto* cannot occur. High standards in training – which must surely seek to cultivate this – are thus vital to its safeguarding. Accordingly, for the bearer of intangible heritage the action of restoration may be an emotive experience (not merely a mechanical one). For instance, a contemporary master wood-carver is likely to know when Grinling Gibbons 'had a bad day' because he/she will have cultivated the ability to 'read' his work; he/she will see his failings and equally appreciate his genius. In this sense, he will be in 'negotiation' with the maker at a high level of sublimation. This clearly cannot be achieved by the technical study of materials, or allied academic disciplines such as, design or art history – which are merely an adjunct to restoration. Nor can it be achieved by learning how to cast with modern

---

[21] This has been described by Michael Oakeshott in Roy Tseng's *The Sceptical Idealist*, Imprint Academic, 2003.

[22] In fact, many highly skilled artists and/or craftspeople that I communicated with during this research believe that the heritage sector has suffered at the demise of the traditional apprenticeship training system. The formal training that replaced this (i.e. universities and colleges) is clearly not very good at transmitting this 'tacit dimension' from one generation to the next.

synthetic resins instead of learning how to carve in wood. Yet, this is the present national (possibly international) requirement of conservation training to become a (so-called) 'Master of Art'.

In understanding the work in this way the trained practitioner (be he/her referred to as a 'conservator' or 'restorer') is 'connected' to the original maker – epistemologically and (to some extent) ontologically. The continuity of *that* practice, which, in terms of knowledge, is (arguably) its closest connection to the present, is surely a testament to the continuity of the maker's field of expertise?[23] It is for this reason that such knowledge links the past to the present (and thus bridges the 'gap' of historicism). Typically, therefore, the object to be worked on is not understood as a material thing that has ailments. And although some technical understanding may be useful in practice, this is generally considered subsidiary – useful information which can (nowadays) be called upon whenever needed. It can be argued that only at this level of understanding can judgements about restoration (i.e. materials, techniques and extent of intervention) be truly ethical because without this there is no reliable datum for such judgements to take place.

With intangible heritage there is no formalisation in ethics or guides and/or codes of practice but in relation to restoration there may be an implicit understanding of authenticity; which is often reflected in the use of such terms as 'respect', 'integrity' and 'feeling' (hence its subliminal nature). Because of its complexity it cannot readily be 'reduced' to the level of rational criteria (such as inscribed values) or delineated in the form of a text; it is objectified in the work carried out. Typically (but not always), restoration follows a 'like-with-like' approach as the materials used are closely related to the techniques employed (and therefore central to the continuity of practice). Importantly, it *can* follow a 'like-with-like' approach (whenever deemed necessary) because the knowledge is in place which allows for this; it cannot happen otherwise. Attitudes to minimum-intervention tend to be less hostile. There is less emphasis on the scientific identification of original material fabric – largely because of the lack of availability of (and therefore reliance upon) advanced technologies in

---

[23]   According to Gadamer, true historical knowledge can be gained only by seeing the past in its continuity with the present; see Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Sheed and Ward, 1975 (pp.292-293).

'localised' working contexts (where intangible heritage exists).

Some deviation to materials (and therefore techniques) may occur as part of the advancement of the practice but this tends to be gradual and not usually done in such a way that it subordinates practice. As such, when a new material or process gains preference, this must be determined within the tradition itself and not by anyone who has not been 'enculturated' into *that* tradition; the very purpose of education (the very basis of culture). However, this can lead to insularity which has often been criticised in a derogatory way by 'outsiders' as secretive or narrow-minded (consider, for example, the phrase 'trade secrets'), but which originates historically in a form of protection.[24] Intangible heritage can thus be recognised for its insularity which becomes a habit of mind for its bearers. It safeguards against appropriation from 'outsiders' who do not understand the more subliminal, meaning-conferring aspects – because they are not trained to (or they simply do not value them). Such insularity is essential for its survival as a 'living entity' (i.e. as a 'stream of consciousness') which transcends individual partakers. This is especially so in advanced technological societies. This is arguably one of the reasons why it is difficult to gain entry into certain disciplines in Japan, Germany and France. In the United Kingdom attitudes are more open but, as this thesis has shown, many feel that standards of practice have declined – both quantitatively *and* qualitatively.[25]

With intangible heritage, authenticity tends to be guided by the *continuity* of the historical document; it is an *incremental* perspective based on an implicit recognition of the necessity of constant renewal, embedded in practice. Thus the *process* of restoration (in terms of what is *added to* the historical document) is considered to be an important aspect of the 'authentic'. In other words, authenticity does not solely reside in existing material fabric but can equally be confirmed by the nature of the restorative intervention – which is fundamentally different to restoration understood

---

[24] In many ways, this is what the conservation profession is doing; by creating an ideological framework which (according to ECCO) is seeking legal enforcement which would effectively criminalise non-professionals ('outsiders'). Intangible heritage does not presently enjoy the benefit of such legal enforcement – so it becomes secretive as a safeguarding mechanism. See for example: Janet Blake, *Developing a New Standard-setting Instrument for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2001.

[25] This was confirmed in conversations with Yannick Chastang (from France) and Dr Edgar Mantz (from Germany) and with various Japanese students on UK conservation courses (because they could not train – and therefore gain entry – in Japan).

in the context of scientific conservation. Consequently, there is less emphasis on returning to historical accuracy (i.e. originality) and on control (by suspending the original object in time) and greater acceptance of transformation.

Intangible heritage reflects what has been described as a 'diachronic' conception of 'heritage' which seeks also to incorporate the continuity of history as sustained by people in traditions of practice. What is key here is that restoration is *expressive* and *artistic* (over and above *mechanistic* and *scientistic*); it resists subornation by formalised ethics (and the narrowing into particular 'value-domains') which are frequently felt to be oppressive in their administration (especially when they are applied by 'outsiders' who are felt to know little of their practice). The function of intangible heritage in restoration is to put the history of practice into the *lacunae* in order to sustain the symbolic meaning of the historical document because it is the physical object's being in history that is to be understood as constituting its significance. So understood, the restorer is an author of history; the 'artist of his time'. For him/her there are no 'time-wall' and no impasse of historicism to overcome and no sense of metaphysical 'neutrality'. Intangible heritage is, therefore, the antithesis of the purely 'synchronic' conception of heritage.

At the centre of the tangible v. intangible dichotomy is a bifurcation in history, engrained in Western consciousness, which, this thesis argues, is a product of Western (scientific) epistemology.

4.1.4: The Western epistemological tradition

In broad historical terms, Western scientific epistemology is based upon the systematic observation and subsequent explanation of things or occurrences. Typically, phenomena are interpreted and the 'data' objectified in textual form (i.e. books). This process of 'media-conversion' can be seen to be linked historically to the European Church Reforms of the C17th. (through, for instance, the instigating works of Erasmus). The dissemination of the New Testament (i.e. a text) henceforth became the primary means of disseminating knowledge *per se*.

In the natural sciences data may be encoded in numbers which are combined with a form of abstract symbolism (as with, for example, physics or chemistry). A major

part of training in science is learning this language. Positive knowledge is validated by scientific method – in accordance to pre-given 'qualifying' criteria – such as, standards. Scientific method is systematic; its methods are technological; and scientific methodologically is objective. In practice, the process of objectification can be described as representing a 'separation' of *knowledge of what* from *knowledge of how* (a phenomenon which reveals itself through time). But in thinking it attempts to be impartial to relative 'life-worldly' (in Husserlian terms) concerns, such as religious feelings or any other form of relative 'metaphysical' cultural preferences; it is 'beyond' metaphysical intrusion.

For Husserl, the 'life-world' is the world in which we are immersed in the 'natural attitude' (of everydayness) that never becomes an object but which constitutes the pre-given basis of all experience – and which is historically-grounded. The 'life-world' exists in a movement of constant relativity and validity and is, therefore, the antithesis of all scientific objectivism.[26] The scientific nature of modern science consists precisely in making tradition objective and methodologically eliminates any influence of the interpreter on understanding; hence the 'non-participating' observer.[27] Consequently, its objectifying tendencies involve the dissolution of the connection with life. This owes much to its foundation in mathematics (i.e. logic); for instance, two plus two is always four, ten plus ten always twenty – regardless of one's religious or cultural distinctiveness or personal preferences.

According to Kant, the explanatory power of science is the consequence of its basis in a logical, epistemic subject whose activities can be generalised and understood as 'context-free' operations.[28] This logic ensures consistency, measurability and repeatability. It is universally applicable – an essential requirement of standardisation (in terms of thinking) and the reason why it denies metaphysical complexity in preference for (apparently) objective 'neutrality'. However, the domination of the scientific epistemological model in Western culture leads to the discrediting of all the possibilities of knowing that lie outside of its methodological horizons – leading

---

26 H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Sheed and Ward, 1975 (p.218).
27 H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Sheed and Ward, 1975 (p.297)
28 P. Rabinow and W. Sullivan, 'The Interpretive Turn: Emergence of an Approach', in *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader*, edited by P. Rabinow and W. Sullivan, University of California Press, 1979 (p.3).

(inevitably) to metaphysical (i.e. ontological) liquidation. It is for this reason (the thesis argues) why 'heritage' in Western civilisations is (erroneously) perceived as a completed development. And why methodological objectivity is recognised to be a major factor in the demise of the world's cultural diversity.[29]

In conservation (in terms of practice), scientific / technical studies improve understanding of underlying causes of deterioration and thus form an important part of preserving tangible heritage. The information gained (which can be disseminated in textual form) is *instrumental* to interventive practice. Training in the scientific aspects of conservation usually involves mastering the use of advanced technologies, such as using a Scanning Electron Microscope to see a surface topology. Using instrumental analysis to understand material problems (and potentially reveal other data) ensures more informed judgements (and arguably more technical problems). However, complex restoration frequently requires additional kinds of knowledge and judgement which scientific / technical knowledge does not provide on its own. The predominance of one over the other has been described in this thesis as sustaining a process of 'epistemological fission' (i.e. the separation of *knowledge of what* from *knowledge of how*).

In the practice of conservation, 'epistemological fission' is reflected in the gradual (i.e. historical) transformation of the literature – from books that describe techniques (which are *practice-centred*) to what are essentially recipe books (which are *material-centred*).[30] This is part of the process of naturalisation (i.e. sciencing) which is reflected in the discipline's development throughout much of the last century – but it is especially noticeable in recent times. In furniture and decorative arts (for example), this transformation has occurred since the early 1990's – coinciding with the various processes of professionalisation. The new literature (which is public knowledge) becomes the basis for educating the next generation of practitioners thus leading to a (so-called) knowledge-based discipline.

However, in education, practice (in the form of restoration) has been subordinated by

---

[29] See for example: *Objectivity and Cultural Divergence*, edited by S. Brown, Cambridge University Press, 1984. And: *Rethinking Objectivity*, edited by A. Megill, Duke University Press, 1994.

[30] Examples of literature have been provided in Section 1.3.4: 'Education and training'.

(scientific) academic studies, recording and writing reports. This has decreased the time spent on mastering creative techniques (i.e. the additional kinds of knowledge). Higher education – provided by museums and universities – is the primary training route (which is a requirement of the profession at European-level) but such institutions do not provide training in specialist craft techniques to any credible standard. They, therefore, (in turn) do not provide training in restoration (in the *adding to* sense) to any credible standard. This is reflected in the rapid decline in standards – voiced by many in the field (and documented by this thesis) – which has occurred at the same time as professionalisation (i.e. since the early 1990's).[31]

This has led to degree of polarisation in the field. This 'stereotyping' (which has occurred on *both* the art/craft and the academic/science sides) is linked to connotations of 'professionality' and the cognitive supremacy of science and research-based education and continuing development which, in the United Kingdom, is synonymous with status, reward and social class. However, the profession does make explicit that a conservator is not an artist or craftsperson, so one could reasonably argue that the professionalisation of conservation (and all that this entails) has been a causal factor in the decline of such capability by explicit denial of its value.[32] This is the unfortunate outcome of what was essentially archaeological conservation (which had no theory of its own) adopting a fine arts approach as the basis of professionalisation – which, in turn, has (arguably) become an anti-craft movement; the very thing that John Ruskin (and his followers) deplored about the (so-called) 'Mechanical Age'. In this sense, the association of Ruskin with scientific conservation in contemporary literature (it can be argued) represents a debasement of his legacy.

Crucially, understanding material heritage does not lie solely in the *nature* of the materials of fabrication because the making process is always 'culturally-specific' (otherwise it would not *be* cultural heritage). This means that the materials used in its making cannot be considered 'context-free' (i.e. in purely objective terms) in their

---

[31] Discussed in Section 1.3.4: 'Education and training'.
[32] Refer to Section 1.4.3: 'Modern historical consciousness' where Philippot characterised the traditional crafts as fraudulent; originally cited from: P. Philippot, 'Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines', in *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices,* Proceedings of the North American International Regional Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1972, Washington Preservation Press, 1976 (pp.367-374).

selection and, by extension, neither can the materials and techniques of conservation and restoration. In other words, in scientific conservation the *symbolic meaning* of the object which is (*ipso facto*) 'culturally-specific' lies outside of the formal methodology of interpretation. As a consequence of this, interventive actions frequently bear no relation whatsoever to the original maker's work and, therefore, what he/she is likely to have wanted, expected or even been able to comprehend. This is why, on this conceptual level, traditions of practice are important because they maintain a thread of implicit understanding; the 'stream of consciousness'.

When the new form of data (i.e. the books that form the basis of education) subordinates capability in practice, the long-term effect inevitably leads to the de-sublimation of the tradition of practice and the negation of its historicity of understanding (and related aesthetic sensibilities, aspirations, spirit and so on) in favour of the technical / rational interpretation, which eventually takes its place. Crucially, this may not be felt by the newly trained generation of practitioners (until they enter practice) leading to a 'why shouldn't I do it that way?' attitude. This is a common response from conservation students. The overall effect is a loss of intangible heritage which (from the bearer's perspective) is replaced by what might be described as a kind of learned ignorance; an apparent education without training.[33]

This difficulty is routed in the predominating 'materialist' view of history. Unlike intangible heritage (when the 'partaker' is a descendent of the 'living' tradition of practice – in the historicist historiography sense), the positivist historiography (in this sense) prefers 'dead' history in that it does not connect to the present through living practice. The pieced together data becomes 'effective history' when it is superimposed upon culture itself. This anomaly (i.e. between the world understood as lived experience and the world studied as data) causes epistemic tension in interpreting heritage. It has been argued in this thesis that this tension is felt most strongly at the point in time when history becomes 'nearer' to the present; when the horizons of the positivist historiography 'fuse' with the horizons of the present reality. The positivist historiography must focus on the past in order to exist at all.

---

[33] Many experienced practitioners I communicated with explained that they felt that newly 'trained' graduates often possessed some knowledge about what should be done but lacked the capability to do it – even at a *very basic* level.

There is, therefore, an abridgement to be overcome between the past (as constructed within a positivist historiography) and the present. The fact that all activities in the present are the culmination of the past does not enter into its horizon of knowing because this historical method recognises only the past as historical (essentially in materials) while 'forgetting' the historicity of the present (in people). It is for this reason that it requires an (undefined) lapse in time before it takes effect. In conservation, for example, not knowing whether to remove an earlier repair (even though aesthetically acceptable but historically 'wrong') is partly a reflection of this tension; leading to the 'conundrum' discussed in Section 2.2.2. Also linked to this is the general anonymity of the restorer, who is, in a very real sense, the author of the historical document,[34] but whose work only later becomes valued once it enters the horizon of the positivist historiography. By contrast, intangible heritage *because* it is embodied in people, and thus 'living' in the present reality, requires no time-lapse for the work to have intrinsic historical worth; it is instantaneously historical. And there is (therefore) no abridgement (or impasse) to overcome.

It is largely as a result of this that the historicity of *practice* is not valued commensurate with its importance to the heritage sector. The *authors* of history are thus alienated from the *material* of history which 'their' tradition of practice (which they have inherited) created in the first instance (and subsequently fashioned through their work). In other words, the subjects of history are separated from the objects of history. This object / subject dualism is replicated today in the competing claims of the tangible v. intangible heritages internationally. Consequently, it is not considered (for example) that much of the architectural heritage throughout Europe *in reality* represents the work of contemporary 'authors'.[35] Much the same may be said of our national collections.

The positivist historiography can be understood then, as a form of methodological

---

[34] W. Murtagh speaks of the cultural responsibility of the restorer in making history in *Preservation and conservation: principles and practices*, edited by S. Timmons, Preservation Press, Washington DC, 1976 (p.387), cited in P. van Mensch, 'Conservation' (Chapter 10), *Towards a methodology of museology*, PhD thesis, University of Zagreb, 1992.

[35] For illustrative examples see: *The Future of the Past: Attitudes to Conservation 1174-1974*, edited by Jane Fawcett, Thames and Hudson, London, 1976. Alternatively, visit the buildings and look for yourself and while you are there talk to the 'authors of history' (as I do).

abstraction – which forms the foundation of the modern historical consciousness and contributes to a sense of disconnectedness with the past. The predominance of this historical method in Western culture, therefore, not only distorts reality but at the same time annihilates history itself (i.e. history in the making, in the form of practice, or process). Our understanding of the past (and the present) is accordingly made partial; hence the 'closure' of thought. This is a major factor in the broad downgrading of maintenance / repair / restoration practice and the knowledge / expertise associated therewith (which is apparent in conservation literature). It has contributed to the 'us and them' attitudes that have polarised much of the heritage sector throughout the United Kingdom – which is central to the ideological division documented by this thesis and why (it argues) the central philosophical question of preserving heritage is epistemological. This situation is the inevitable outcome of the Western epistemological tradition – the foundation of which is science – which has also been a major influence on fine arts restoration theory.

4.1.5: The misappropriation of Brandian theory

The figure of Cesare Brandi has come to dominate much contemporary discussion. Brandi's *Theory of Restoration*[36] was essentially formulated for the restoration of paintings and sculpture (i.e. the fine arts). It is also well-suited for archaeological restoration (in terms of both moveable and immoveable heritage), although Brandi does place greater emphasis on aesthetics than might normally be called for in the restoration of archaeological objects; but the underlying principles are nonetheless similar.[37] Training institutions (throughout the United Kingdom) such as, universities and museums, use the fine arts model as a template for their courses for furniture and decorative arts conservation-restoration – in accordance with European-wide professional guidelines on education and training provided by ECCO. This is combined with scientific / technical studies (deriving historically from archaeology).

Brandi's ideas were largely influenced by C19th. European 'philosophies' and are thus 'modernist' and 'Euro-centric' (i.e. ethno-centric) in nature. According to his

---

[36] C. Brandi, *Theory of Restoration*, Nardini Editore, 2005 (first pub. 1963).
[37] It has been mentioned (in Section 2.2.3: 'Authentic restoration – from materials and form to process') that Brandi, together with Paul Philippot (ICCROM) and Harold Plenderleith (ICCROM) formed a significant triumvirate in shaping the direction the field of tangible heritage preservation took during the second half of the C20th.

theory, the object for restoration is understood as pure phenomena; as a physical entity which transmits a visual image. Brandi's theory thus starts from a phenomenological position. It does not start from an epistemological, ontological, or spiritual position as would be required, for example, by a theory based on *practice* which, by extension, might effectively incorporate intangible heritage (and authenticity as an aspect of intangible heritage). His theory of restoration is, therefore, *superficial* in the sense that it emphasises visual appearance (or *visual oneness* in Brandian terms) and the retention of historical material fabric. As such, its primary value-domains are the 'aesthetic' and the 'historical', respectively – which are believed to be inherent qualities of objects (rather than attributes of knowing subjects). His theory is, therefore, also reductionist.

In practice, in general terms, objects are considered unique. This is particularly so in the case of paintings which embody the unique genius of the painter's technique; his/her individual brush-strokes are considered sacrosanct, for example, and thus can never be repeated or replicated without aesthetic and historical misrepresentation (i.e. forgery). In addition to this, the painter is frequently known. Much the same can be said of the uniqueness of sculpture. It may also apply (to some extent) in architecture – although the need for 'conservation-led' renewal of architectural fabric (largely due to the devastating effects of pollution in certain regions) is typically quite different to paintings – as restoration frequently is with other 'functional' objects such as, furniture, objects of the (so-called) handicrafts and much decorative art.

When an object is considered archaeological in kind there is considerable time distance (i.e. distanciation) between the time of initial creation and the present. A primary concern of archaeology is to develop 'scientific' knowledge associated with the civilisation to which the object 'belonged' (but not necessarily to which it 'belongs' in the historically-transcendent sense). Distanciation can have the effect of lessening the obvious connectedness with the present. In many ways, archaeology helps to overcome this tendency but it can also contribute to it if the heritage is not understood in the appropriate way. For instance, archaeology is a science (and thus epistemological in the scientific sense) and therefore, as a discipline, not very good at recognising ontological connections that civilisations may have with certain kinds of heritage; such as, religious monuments which cannot be fully understood when

interpreted with a scientific epistemological model (some reasons have been given above). In this sense, archaeology, when it 'sees' only the past as historical, can diminish the object's *living vitality* by not taking into account the ontological 'status' of the artefact in terms of the present reality. A current example of this (arguably) is the issues in the Middle-East between archaeologists (many of whom have trained in Western institutions) and religious leaders and other 'cultural' representatives.

According to Brandian theory then, in 'restoration' *appearance* takes precedent over material substance (as in homogeny of) and (where applicable) the functional qualities of objects (i.e. their 'use-value') are downplayed. For this reason, when *lacunae* are in-filled or losses replaced (i.e. restoration in the *adding to* sense), the primary objective is to re-create visual unity. It thus advocates 'non-like' restoration – which leads to the idea of 'neutrality' (i.e. neutral restoration undertaken in such a way to avoid causing a so-called aesthetic or historical forgery). In architecture (typically archaeological) this may be referred to as *anastylosis* – a term which also has its origins in European practice (such as, the Greek architect Nikolas Balanos); it is also an abstract, reductionist and 'non-like' form of restoration. Conversely, Brandi states that the reverse is true in the handicrafts when the material (as in homogeny of) must take precedence over the image (i.e. appearance) whenever restoration is deemed necessary.

However, Brandi does not expand on this nor does he establish a definition of 'handicrafts' and which objects might be included under the term. This is because his theory is essentially concerned with fine arts (particularly paintings). Nonetheless, the importance placed on material substance over appearance (in 'handicrafts') implies that *process* is important (because the process of restoration is determined by the use to which materials and technology are put). This suggests that an epistemological (i.e. in the *knowledge of how* sense), ontological, and/or spiritual starting point (as would be found in the intangible heritage) may be more appropriate for the handicrafts. The functioning of Brandian theory (through, for example, professionalisation – and all that this entails) in areas typically associated with hand-craft practice would appear then, to offer some explanation as to why there are tensions in the field today relating to *process*. It is essential, therefore, to understand just what constitutes 'hand-craft'.

Well, objects of hand-craft traditions might be understood as the physical manifestation of accumulated knowledge / expertise which has been passed-on through continuity of practice (because it is valued as such). It could be argued that this progression is unique to any given culture and even regions or groups *within* a culture and gives rise to diverse styles, materials and techniques which are characteristic *of* that particular culture, region or group. Indeed, the same could be said for both the portable and importable heritage. But unlike in paintings and sculpture, the creator is nearly always *anonymous* and the object seldom the outcome of a single creative instance (as tends to be assumed in Brandian theory). There is, therefore, rarely an attempt made to identify him/her, although the culture, region or group is often well-studied (in the positivistic historiographical sense). In addition to this, the designer, or perhaps the firm that the maker worked for, may also be known, but seldom the maker *him/herself* which, in furniture and decorative arts (for example) may involve many specialist artists/craftspeople.

Objects tend, therefore, to be understood generically as the products of creative traditions of practice; for instance, 'the cabinet-making tradition' which might incorporate a range of specialists in: surface decoration, finishing techniques, wood-turning and carving, upholstering, veneering, gilding and so on. For the practitioner, the tradition exists prior to his entry and continues after departure from it. It can, therefore, be understood as a living system of knowing that is sustained through continued practice. It does not remain static. As a 'living entity' it transcends the individuals who are merely 'partakers'. The partakers are thus bearers and transmitters of an historical continuum; the (so-called) 'stream of consciousness' – upon which the continuity of *that* tradition resides as a meaningful and 'value-laden'. In other words, through time (i.e. historically) it acquires *intrinsic value* which is the basis of intangible heritage.

The intrinsic value of intangible heritage – *because* it transcends individuals – can only be apprehended on a 'higher' dimension of knowing; hence it is subliminal and thus ontological in character (and not epistemological in the scientific sense). In an attempt to explain this, if one considers a team sport, such as a football or rugby match, one can sense the temper of the game at different stages – competitive,

intense, relaxed, fast or slow moving and so on – this higher sense transcends the individual players and thus cannot be apprehended by focusing on a single player's performance or by any *quantitative* analysis. Yet, it determines the *quality* of the game and, therefore, the way we tend to remember it and attribute value to it. Traditions of practice (this thesis argues) work in much the same way – as living cultural entities. As the intrinsic value becomes associated with a particular mode of practice it attracts new partakers which sustain the living entity – both in terms of its character and its connectedness to the past. Working with particular materials and techniques or using particular tools, or setting up one's workshop in a particular way or area, is all part of the intrinsic value which sustains the tradition of practice. It needs noting, however, that many (so-called) 'partakers' will be aware of this only on a *sub-conscious* level.[38] Therefore, the introduction of another knowledge system – in the case of conservation: 'science' (which brings technological innovation) – would be rather akin to playing hockey in the middle of a football match; although their may be certain 'universal' benefits (such as, keeping fit and healthy, team spirit etc.) it simply does not work because its underlying structure is entirely different. This rationalization is necessary in order to understand the essence of intangible heritage.

The progression of styles is the tangible outcome of this historical process; museum collections, for example, are its temporal realisation – a physical record of intangible heritage. Cultivating and sustaining this depends upon those who are 'enculturated' by appropriate education and training, understanding and experience. Knowledge-transfer is thus essential for its survival. For this reason (the thesis argues), an epistemological, ontological (or spiritual) starting point for a theory of restoration based on *practice* is necessary. The misappropriation of Brandin theory, which is based on an understanding of tangible heritage as pure phenomena and which (therefore) reduces authenticity to an apparent visual integrity alone, in disciplinary and material contexts for which it was not formulated is a *methodological fallacy*. This fallacy is arguably sustained by the international heritage community;

---

[38] The similarity between the size, contents, arrangements and situations of the furniture / decorative arts workshops I visited during this research was undeniable. Indeed this was part of my visual observations. Also, the frequently expressed view that a single practitioner should (ideally) be responsible for each project he/she works on 'from start to finish' (in terms of its repair/restoration) is a legacy of the Ruskinian / Morrisian philosophy.

professionalisation is an aspect of this.

4.1.6: Authenticity

The development of the concept of authenticity has become central to the (so-called) 'post-modern' understanding of heritage. In the discipline of scientific conservation (and in accordance with Brandian theory), authenticity is primarily identified in historical material fabric. With the use of advanced technologies (typically found in public institutions), this can sometimes be taken to extremes. For instance, instrumental analysis (such as the use of a microscope) facilitates the 'positive' identification of original substance from later accretions / additions / alterations which may subsequently be removed because they are not valued as such in *that* working context – despite being considered by some to be a vital part of the historical document. This phenomenon (a common enough occurrence) can lead to so-called 'conservation controversies'.[39] This kind of 'instrumental' interpretation (and problem) tends, therefore, to be 'resource-specific' and, by extension, 'context-specific'.

This thesis argues that it is largely because of this that contemporary practice can lead to a tendency towards *technological-determinism* (i.e. when advancements in technology, through its application in practice, become discernable on the historical document itself) and thus have massive bearing on its future 'reading' and historical authenticity. In fact, continuing professional development (discussed in Chapter 1.3) is largely based on research into new material applications, indicating that the field itself *is* largely driven by technology. It is, however, important to recognise that technological determinism is not necessarily a phenomenon which can be identified on a single object but can be understood in terms of the way in which the discipline is organised and administered and how it 'sees' progress and development. For example, in scientific conservation, technological innovations are understood as part

---

[39] See for example, James Beck's (*et al*.), *Art Restoration: The Culture the Business and the Scandal*, Cambridge University Press, 1993 which discusses the restoration of fine arts heritage – the issues are not unrelated to such technological developments (and especially the use of solvents). In relation to this, ArtWatch International was founded by Beck, Professor of art history at Columbia University, to monitor and campaign for better practices in the conservation of art works. The United Kingdom branch, ArtWatch UK, is run by Michael Daley. Information about ArtWatch International is available from: http://www.artwatchinternational.org/ and ArtWatch UK: http://www.artwatch.org.uk/

of the field's progress – which today has a market-orientation. Such forces are not attributable to single institutions but are part of a wider international movement. It is, therefore, *substantive* in character. This can cause material 'trends' which typically fluctuate according to availability and context (and, this thesis argues, the stock of knowledge in the field at a given time).[40] The use of advanced technologies in practice is a foreseeable outcome of positivism in interpretation because science (more accurately scientific thinking) and advanced technologies are synonymous (as evidenced on conservation courses).

In conservation practice in public institutions there is broad denunciation of *conjectural* restoration (in the *adding to* sense). This tends to be interpreted in terms of *design* (i.e. form) rather than *process* (i.e. the materials and techniques used in practice). However, it can be argued that the use of any material that puts an object's appearance at odds with its structure and substance is also conjectural – on grounds of incomplete understanding of ethical practice and a lack of awareness or consideration of the importance of process. Ruskin, for example, found such practice *wholly undesirable* (see Section 3.1.1). Typically, the age of the object determines its historical worth (i.e. its 'age-value') although other specific factors may also be taken into account, such as 'style'. If later restorations have been undertaken then they *might* be retained on grounds of *their* historical worth. A balance, therefore, tends to be struck between *appearance* and *age-value*; in other words, the object's *aesthetic* and *historical* qualities (which is consistent with Brandian theory). However, the emphasis on retarding deterioration inevitably results in the actual realisation of 'newness-value' (but only in terms of its appearance). Importantly, the uses of modern synthetics have no obvious aesthetically-favourable aging characteristics. It was for this reason (i.e. acquired 'age-value') that Ruskin (for example) strongly opposed the use of modern building materials and techniques, putting him in opposition to Viollet-le-Duc who supported their use.

Therefore, in terms of process, restoration (carried out in the name of scientific

---

[40] In recent years in the domain of furniture and decorative arts (for example) epoxy resin has become popular, as has Paraloid B72 (used as a surface finish). There are a good number of other so-called 'conservation grade' materials that have recently found favour in training institutions. It is important to note here that the author has found *none whatsoever* that requires greater expertise to apply than traditional methods. There use is evidently linked to capability – although this may be masked by ethics.

conservation) typically does not attempt to ensure *acquired historical worth*, i.e. authenticity cannot be *added to* the historical document; it can only be revealed in so far as it exists. This way of understanding authenticity informs the fundamental precepts of 'minimum-intervention' and 'reversibility' (which is today more precisely known as 're-treatability'); while 'discernability' is a (perhaps inevitable) by-product. The function of reversibility, therefore, *denies* the continuity of the historical document and, in terms of restoration (in the *adding to* sense), is arguably an admission of that which is in-authentic. It can further be argued that reversibility (perhaps paradoxically) legitimises repeated restoration – which necessarily works against 'minimum-intervention' over the long term.

Authenticity thus has the effect of subverting the concept of 'living authorship' particularly when interpreted in an extremely positivistic way (which is not uncommon in the United Kingdom). The inevitable subversion of 'living authorship' that this implies is partly due to the lack of an epistemological (as in *knowledge of how*), ontological, or spiritual understanding of restoration practice – the inevitable outcome of Brandian theory. The replacement of *lacunae*, in this sense, is intentionally *a-historical* (i.e. neutralised). As such, restoration practice is *value-less* and rendered *intentionally meaningless* – and, therefore, lacking authenticity; necessarily so. In this way, there can (arguably) be no real possibility of enhancing the symbolic meaning of an historical document – except in so far as the interventive treatments may be of interest exclusively to conservation scholars; for instance, as a tangible record of 'scientific' expression. But this does not represent 'heritage' in the intangible heritage sense of the meaning because it is devoid *of* such meaning (because it pertains to be 'neutral' and thus beyond metaphysical 'intrusion').[41] As a general rule, therefore, in the discipline of scientific conservation, with respect to the practice of restoration and from the standpoint of process; *the greater the historical value of an object the greater the loss of its historical authenticity*.

This is one of the main reasons why in universities (for example) on conservation courses in furniture and decorative arts (which is taught at Bachelor-level up) there is

---

[41] The 'meaninglessness of intentionality' is the antithesis of intangible heritage, cultural diversity and much that the (so-called) 'post-modern' Heritage Preservation Movement has come to stand for (discussed in Part II).

a great deal of 'non-like' restoration carried out which is encouraged by the teachers. This might be anything from fills, to surface coatings and decoration, to the replacement of entire elements. In fact, as a general rule: on conservation courses quite literally *any* material / technique might be used in restoration. Such students frequently do not possess the knowledge / expertise to follow a 'like-with-like' approach.[42] However, at Higher National Diploma (HND)-level (which is usually not considered conservation in the scientific sense) there is more emphasis on practical craft skills. There is, therefore, more emphasis on 'like-with-like' restoration and far less emphasis on 'non-like' restoration. Where both kinds of courses are run at the same institution the contrast in approaches is palpable.[43] The variability in outcomes that this causes correlates with the introduction of conservation teaching in this domain in recent times in line with the professionalisation of the field. Such 'non-like' restoration is not only synonymous with the science component of the courses; it is also evidently synonymous with a fundamental lack of skill nominally associated with traditional craft practice. It is for this reason that conservation ethics are (arguably) untenable. And further, that the contemporary concept of authenticity (i.e. authentic process) is not achievable.

The movement in the concept of authenticity (i.e. from materials and form to *process*) reflects a 'world view' of heritage in all of its diverse tangible and intangible manifestations which has come about largely because of the global context within which heritage preservation is today understood. The realisation in the West that not all cultures interpret authenticity solely in the materials of fabrication is (theoretically) diametrically opposed to the essentially 'authorised' positivistic methodology. Other cultures appear to be better able to 'see' beyond the material dimension by exalting other values and understandings of 'heritage' and other reasons for its preservation – as evidenced in formal documentation.[44] The West would typically describe such cultures as either 'traditional', 'underdeveloped' or 'third world' (and sometimes as all three).

---

[42] One student I spoke with returned to the same institute to undertake an HND following successful completing of a BSc(Hons) in conservation the previous year.

[43] This was discussed in Chapter 1.3: 'Professionalisation in the United Kingdom'; see in particular Section 1.3.4: 'Education and training'.

[44] It needs stressing here that these are the formally 'authorised' views; many artists/craftspeople I communicated with have no problem 'seeing' beyond the material dimension.

This 'trans-culturalisation' of the Heritage Preservation Movement has thus revealed other 'life-worlds' (in Husserlian terms), manifested in complex systems of knowing and experience, which have transcended time and continue in the form of meaning-conferring practice into the present. In many ways, this is a reminder of our own pre-industrial and pre-scientific and pre-mechanical past (which, although declined in the form of practice, has evidently *not* entirely disappeared); their validity surely lies in their rarity. The continuation of traditional art/craft practices in the United Kingdom throughout the C20th. owes a great deal to John Ruskin and William Morris and their supporters. Their continued influence is (no doubt) among the primary reasons why the (so-called) 'paradigm shift' from craft to science in the field of conservation (brought about by professionalisation) has been such a problematical transition. These difficulties (it can be argued) are largely the result of the homogenising effects of international standardisation and the subsequent loss of cultural specificity and diversity – embodied in the traditional arts and crafts – which Ruskin and Morris sought to safeguard. That is why they are associated with intangible heritage and why (in turn) they are central to the contemporary concept of authenticity.

This broadening of the heritage horizon first makes known and then undermines 'modern' Euro-centrism (or ethno-centrism). The concept of 'heritage' in the post-modern period is characteristically *relativistic, plural* and *democratic* in nature which contrasts with the modern 'Enlightenment' tendency towards foundationalism in philosophy and absolutism in knowledge (in the scientific sense).[45] Recent times have brought growing respect for cultural diversity and recognition that there are sub-groups *within* cultures that are important to our understanding of the past. New terms such as, 'inclusivity', 'sustainability', 'values' and 'renewal' create a new understanding of heritage preservation as one that is based on 'the cautious management of change'[46] – it is, therefore, less 'rigid' and cannot be scientifically 'reduced' (or simplified) and it is more complex than merely *retarding decay*. Not only is transformation recognised to be inevitable; but *agreeable*.

---

[45] This is an Oakeshottian interpretation, explained in Roy Tseng's *The Sceptical Idealist*, Imprint Academic, 2003. See in particular Chapter II, Section II.2.5: 'Foundationalism in Philosophy' (p.26).

[46] The idea of 'managing change' is accredited to Jonathan Ashley-Smith who is presently writing a chapter of a book about these wider 'cultural' issues.

Authenticity understood as a form of process is a celebration of the 'living' – as the embodiment of the past – thus overcoming the conception of 'heritage' as one based purely on materials and 'disengaged' memory (and perhaps overcoming the impasses of modern historical consciousness and the subsequent 'time-wall' of preservation). Authenticity is no longer solely based on the 'aesthetic' and the 'historical' – it is cultural, meaningful and *historically-transcendent*.

4.1.7: Authenticity understood in relation to intangible heritage

It has been noted above that the discipline of conservation throughout the Western scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors does not recognise the concept of *adding to* authenticity. Interventions (especially noticeable in loss-compensation) are subsequently not undertaken with the intention of *enhancing meaning* in terms of *restoration process* but may be intended to enhance *understanding* (of the physical object) by re-creating *visual oneness*. This is the derivation of European restoration theory which has been most comprehensively articulated by Cesare Brandi (following a number of earlier European theorists). Ethics attempts to ensure that such interventions are not permitted to become *part of* the historical document in any historically-transcendent meaningful way (except perhaps for scholars of conservation who might wish to retain them). The primary purpose of restoration is merely to re-create visual parity in order to improve the object's visual legibility – nothing more.

This diminution of authenticity to an apparent visual integrity alone has been identified as being attributable to Brandi's phenomenological starting point. This 'superficial' interpretation of the 'external and given material' is largely because the conceptualisation of the materials found in works of art is lacking. In Western aesthetics this can be traced back (through Brandi) to Georg Hegel's 'epiphany of the image' – a view which has been attributed to his attraction to mysticism in his youth (see Section 1.4.2). It is this lack in the conceptualisation of the materials which allows for the use of 'non-like' materials in restoration (in the *adding to* sense). But it is, nonetheless, still restoration. However, the material used has a great bearing on the stock of knowledge in the field – especially with respect to the role and status of the historic arts and crafts (which represent centuries of heritage in European culture). Indeed, it could be argued that Hegel's continuing influence has contributed

to anti-craft sentiment within the international heritage community which clearly has religious / spiritual underpinnings.

The suitability of such 'non-like' restoration is invariably considered from the point of view of not harming the 'valued' material – hence a 'synchronic' conception of restoration. Making judgements about compatibility is usually achieved (in the first instance) by identifying a problem and then, by experimentation and testing, 'scientifically' validating the solution. The application of such a treatment is thus *technologically-determined* from start to finish. The scientific basis of practice leads to an 'infinity of tasks' (a Husserlian concept) which gives purpose to the problem-solution activity of science; which, in turn, gives rise to a self-perpetuating dynamic – which subsequently becomes the basis of professional development. This 'problem-solution' dynamic is typically understood as progress. The association with advanced technologies (including materials) gives the impression of advancement, while the cognitive supremacy of science (synonymous with 'invention', 'discovery' and 'breakthrough') confers authority, leadership (and perhaps: 'Vanguard'). Science has the peculiar tendency to present itself as the solution to the problems *it* has created, but none of this means that restoration (in the *adding to* sense) is carried out with corresponding supremacy. Indeed, quite the opposite may be the case – as this thesis has attempted to bring to light. And, of course, it fails to take into account associated 'intangibles'.

Attempts to restore only visual parity tends to have the effect of 'reducing' the interventive process to a pragmatic (or empirical) level; thereby arguably rendering the newly restored item quite unrepresentative – and thus a falsification – of the creative tradition whence it derived. The examples referenced periodically throughout this text may appear pedantic but the contention presented applies to numerous objects and many heritage domains. Therefore, it is surely vital that the conservation profession understands that the materials and techniques used in any work of art or fine craft will not have been 'context-free' in their selection and application, respectively – as tends to be assumed. Much the same, therefore, can be said of any making tradition that *intentionally* uses natural materials. And the sole reason why makers such as, Alan Peters, Martin Grierson and Humphrey Sladden – who are arguably 'authentic' heirs to the Ruskin-Morris-Webb-Lethaby legacy in

furniture and decorative arts – all insist upon a 'like-with-like' approach to restoration (which is also consistent with SPAB's 'unique philosophy').

The attempts that the field of conservation makes in order to retard decay (the principal problem) has been particularly necessary in public institutions which have the responsibility of *caring* for artefacts. This has been hugely beneficial to their preservation; but this is not the same as *restoring* them. In their 'new' environments, the artefacts have been removed from their cultural contexts (i.e. their 'life-worldly' contexts) by a process of phenomenological reduction[47] (museum collections often having been put together from all regions of the world). In the process, they have different values ascribed to them (typically 'aesthetic' and 'historical'). As such, they are *de-contextualised* which, in a broad sense, can have the effect of denying their cultural specificity – especially in the sense of their ontological connectedness – causing them to become partially 'muted' in terms of their symbolic meaning and 'performative power' (and perhaps even, *depleted* as works of art). This has surely occurred in some measure and has (it would seem) become an issue facing Western museums in the contemporary 'post-modern' era; embodied in the concept of 'Inclusive Museology'. In other words, the museum *itself* has become disengaged and culturally abstract (on the ontological level) which is surely the inevitable conclusion of methodological reductionism (and physical re-location) relating to the 'scientific' objectification of the past in material form only.

In a sense, by creating an archive of material remains, and thus laying the foundation of a positive historiography, haven't the objects been systematically 'separated' from their subjects? And, isn't this why the tangible heritage has inevitably lost its sense of connectedness to culture itself – particularly on a higher subliminal level? Is this not then, also the sum achievement of an essentially scientific epistemological interpretive model which engenders the discrediting of all the possibilities of knowing that lie outside of its paradigmatic horizons, thus leading to the overwhelming of the performative qualities of 'heritage', 'accessible' through, what might be called, an ontological paradigm? If this is the case then this is another reason why there is a need to (re-)synthesise ontology with epistemology and the

---

[47]   This methodological approach was examined in Section 1.4.2: 'Phenomenological reduction'.

rupture brought about by 'scientific' epistemological reductionism (and subsequent 'closure') – argued in this thesis. Surely this is all the more vital as the (essentially occidental) Heritage Preservation Movement expands into a global context?

Many museums tend to acquire their collections in an already 'restored' state. More often than not the objects 'do not require extensive work' – hence there is an emphasis on *care*.[48] This is because such objects have already been restored by artists and craftspeople; the (so-called) 'authors' of the historical document. Outside of the museum context, work is often highly complex and frequently demands a great deal of artistic / creative expertise. This helps to sustain certain forms of knowledge which has been inherited (and is valued accordingly).[49] Yet, this essential knowledge is grossly under-developed *within* conservation practice in the United Kingdom.[50] This is partly because museums (which have been influential in the development of the conservation profession and all that this entails) do not recognise the *need* for it, partly because they do not appear to *value* it and partly because they do not appear to *understand* it. And the professionalisation of conservation (based on an essentially archaeo-museological model) aims to standardise practice throughout Europe – something which bearers of intangible heritage would surely wish to resist and which is inconsistent with wider concerns relating to cultural diversity.

Crucially, intangible heritage is 'organic'; it lives. As such, recording the practitioners' (i.e. the bearers') actions (or even collating oral histories) would provide no more than a tangible recording of intangible heritage *not* intangible heritage *as it is in itself*. And, as noted earlier, museums (for example) already possess a tangible record of intangible heritage. The living heritage would be

---

[48] J. Kitchin, *Interview with the author*, 12th June 2005.

[49] One of the interviewees is a fifth-generation cabinet-maker – inheriting a practice which extends (in the same family) for over 250 years. He values its continuity. He considers himself essentially a craftsman-restorer and teaches 'qualified' conservators who lack necessary expertise while at the same time (ironically) feeling marginalised by the 'scientific' conservation profession.

[50] See Chapter 1.3: 'Professionalisation in the United Kingdom'. This appears to be the case throughout the heritage sector in the UK – as expressed in various reports in Section 3.1.2: 'Recent developments with respect to intangible heritage'. However, this situation is also consistent with many of the views expressed to me by specialists in various heritage domains internationally through online discussion. Mark Gottsegen, Associate Professor, University of North Carolina, Greensboro provided his (unpublished) paper: *The Decline of Visual Arts Education, and a Remedy*, 2005 which explains how craftsmanship has been downplayed in higher education and emphasises the importance of knowledge of materials and techniques in conserving and restoring art (in this case paintings).

different every time it was recorded *because* it is a lived experience which does not stop at the time of objectification (and subsequent media-conversion). In fact, attempts to record intangible heritage might even constrain its vitality and subsequent on-going transformation. It can live only in a *free state*. It, therefore, cannot readily be controlled in a scientific way. In other words, full (not partial) knowledge of intangible heritage comes only through *performance*; it is thus objectified only through the practitioners' actions in the form of practice. Value is attributed to the historicality of the performance – which is an expression of the past but which always resides in the present reality. Therefore, in order to safeguard it, the factors that cause it to diminish must be removed, or at least reduced (as with all preservation), and the factors that sustain must be recognised and enhanced so that it may flourish.

It *must* resist the objectifying tendencies of science because (this thesis has argued) it is largely because of this why, in Western heritage administrations, the tangible heritage became 'separated' from intangible heritage – both *consciously* through methodological reduction (i.e. reduction to aesthetic and historical values), representing the closure of all possible value-domains; and *spatially* through methodological abstraction (i.e. physical separation from its 'life-worldly' context; for example, by museum-acquisition). However, objects (portable and moveable) cannot be 'authentically' sustained for an indefinite period without intangible heritage (despite the attempt to 'freeze' them in time). Treatment interventions are always an expression of their time (which reveals itself *in* time). Consider for instance, architecture (because it is easily observable); a great deal of the most significant buildings throughout Europe, due to the need for constant renewal of their material fabric – both inside and outside – represents (in terms of form and substance, techniques, feeling, expression etc.) the restoration works of C20th. 'authors'. They are artists of their time. Yet, this is under-acknowledged in heritage preservation discourse; the perspective is simply not developed.

For example, a superficial observation (as indeed most people will make) of the North entrance of Westminster Abbey in London confirms that it is a contemporary building. A substantial amount of material was, in fact, put in place within the past twenty years. However, what tends to remain most powerful to one's mind is the

idea of Westminster Abbey (typically understood in terms of style, period, social, cultural and political context and so on) but frequently with such buildings very little (if any) of the original idea remains a physical reality. Surely (one can argue) what keeps it unmistakeably and thus 'authentically' Westminster Abbey, or St Paul's, or Hampton Court Palace (or Cologne, or Trondheim, or St Ouen – and so on) is its connectedness to culture itself; restoration, by the constant renewal of material fabric, sustains this connection and prevents it from becoming symbolically depleted.[51]

In this sense, if their fabric was restored in a radically 'non-like' way; for instance, with a modern material, such as prefabricated concrete, then, due to the rapid deterioration of their existing fabric and the subsequent need for its constant renewal, surely they would *in a very short period of time* lose their authenticity? It is for this reason that it can be convincingly argued that such restoration sustains (historical) authenticity and also sustains intangible heritage. The idea that authenticity cannot be *added to* the historical document is extremely restrictive and (in any case) tends not to reflect much of what is actually done in practice – as the examples above illustrate. Moreover, if authenticity exists only in the original (i.e. it can only be revealed in so far as it exists), then what part of a monument (for example) that may have taken one, two, three, five or six-centuries (or even longer) to build is authentic? In other words, what is the fixed point upon which authenticity (so conceived) is determined? Surely such buildings are never completed *without* being restored?

It has been argued in this thesis that this is partly the effect of positivism in historiography which does not 'see' (and therefore value) the historicity of the present, although the present restoration work will become valued 'historically' in time (but only *after* a 'time-lapse'); and typically, therefore, when the original 'author' of the restoration is dead (hence conservation's affinity with dead history). There is always a requirement of a lapse in time before what is done in the present

---

[51] See for example, *The Future of the Past: Attitudes to Conservation 1174-1974*, edited by Jane Fawcett, Thames and Hudson, London, 1976 in which images of Westminster Abbey taken in 1654 and 1880 (p.89) show the extent of transformation – which is quite different again today due to the work which has been carried out since WWII but particularly in the past two decades. Other examples can be found in Stephen Tschudi-Madsen's, *Restoration and Anti-Restoration: A Study in English Restoration Philosophy*, Universitetsforlaget, 1976.

enters its horizon of knowing. Hence it sees only the past as historical while 'forgetting' the historicity of the present – leading to the (so-called) 'time-wall' of heritage preservation. To restate, it is essentially history that has been re-created and inscribed by non-participating observers (who attempt to restore meaning in the form of historical knowledge they themselves have not inherited through practice).

This lack of participation confirms its abstract (methodologically 'objective' or 'neutral') stand-point. It is a product of the objectifying tendencies of scientific thought (and the subsequent liquidation of metaphysics) which lies beneath the Western epistemological tradition. It has the effect of overpowering perspectives that have developed around the continuity of practice (which are essentially incremental and not necessarily backward-looking).[52] It is interesting to consider then, in what ways (other than in terms of information or its physical structure) might a (so-called) non-participating observer 'know' a piece of finely-crafted work, more completely than a practising master craftsman who has inherited an age-old tradition – over two, three, four, five or even ten centuries – in the full richness of *its* authenticity? This abstract approach to interpreting 'heritage' has (arguably) contributed to the feeling that the past is a completed development and thus 'separated' from the present (which, of course, is a factual impossibility).[53]

Authentic process is determined by the use of particular materials and techniques and by particular people in particular contexts. This departure, which represents a comparatively recent bifurcation in history, tends therefore, to be revealed in the way in which technologies (including materials) are used in restoration practice. This has caused disagreement between the essentially Eastern and Western approaches to heritage preservation. In some areas of Japan (for example) intangible heritage rejects the Western conception of conservation-restoration by resisting modern scientific / technological means. In other words, Japan seeks to sustain the (so-called) historical 'streams of consciousness' by supporting traditional practices and,

---

[52] This became clear to the author when Beckford described how he adds to his collection of wood-carving chisels – a step-by-step incremental process of advancement. One who uses a modern tool (that is not the correct shape) is necessarily taking a backward step.

[53] One of the outcomes of this is the contemporary phenomenon of (so-called) 'live interpretations' and/or 're-enactments' which might be described as a kind of post-modern pathological idiosyncrasy – suggesting a loss of inherited understanding. Surely such phenomenon would be logically incomprehensible to other civilisations – especially pre-industrial and pre-scientific cultures that maintain a strong sense of continuity?

therefore, authentic restoration process. They appear to know that the Western scientific approach to 'heritage' severs this continuity and annihilates intangible heritage in the process – just as it is (arguably) in danger of doing in the United Kingdom.

Notwithstanding, the traditional arts and crafts throughout the West are in many ways similar to Japan *in their thinking* (for that is surely what makes them what they are). But the prevailing professional conservation ideology, which is dominated by the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors throughout the West, does not see it this way. This is one of the main reasons (this thesis argues) why there have been so many issues in the United Kingdom with respect to *process* (such as, standards of capability, materials / techniques used, exclusion / marginalisation from the field and so on).[54] Consequently, the traditional arts and crafts, as a bona-fide aspect of intangible heritage are eradicated, and such 'academic bullying' (based largely upon the cognitive supremacy of science) is *de facto* a form of cultural (or *sub*-cultural) negation.

One of the underlying problems of globalisation, as underpinned by Western political economies (which are information-led and founded on an essentially scientific epistemology), is the threat it poses to the world's cultural (and natural) diversity. It was mentioned earlier in this conclusion that the objectifying tendencies of science are recognised as a major contributory factor in the demise of the world's cultural diversity. The emergence of scientific thinking has also (in this conclusion) been linked historically to the European Church Reforms and the subsequent success of political economies in Europe; the (so-called) 'dismal science'. Thus, globalisation may be understood as an extension of the (so-called) 'Protestant era' but which is (arguably) devoid of its spiritual content which has become extinguished (or maybe hidden) by its materialist and consumerist virtues. The homogenisation of cultural divergence – which is essentially a process of standardisation and thus conformity – is not unrelated to the present reaction, manifested in the upsurge in religious consciousness in various regions of the world. It seems then, that what happened in the United Kingdom in the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries with respect to the

---

[54] Discussed in Chapter 1.3: 'Professionalisation in the United Kingdom'.

(so-called) 'Mechanical Age' has in many ways become a global issue.

This is one of the reasons why UNESCO, among others, has recognised the need to safeguard the world's intangible heritage. It is also one of the reasons why environmentalism has become a global concern – which was given impetus by John Ruskin in the C19th, coinciding with the rise of the 'Mechanical Age'. The proliferation of advanced technologies, which globalisation brings to new regions of the world, poses a serious threat to the continuity of intangible heritage. In fact, by extension, this has a great bearing on the world's 'stock of knowledge' which has shifted massively in recent times from knowledge to information (led essentially by occidental trans-national corporations). In broad terms, this is one of the main reasons why, throughout the last two centuries, the peoples of other civilisations have tended to become 'Westernised' rather than Westerners becoming 'Easternised' (for example).[55] The net effect is a gradual homogenisation of humankind – according to Western 'universal' ideals – and a simultaneous loss of the world's cultural (and biological) diversity, culminating in the need for an ecology of human life (intangible heritage).

UNESCO (which is essentially a Western scientific organisation), although it recognises the need to safeguard intangible heritage, formally maintains the separation between the tangible and intangible domains. This is a reflection of the bifurcation in history (expressed by this thesis) which is symptomatic of the subject / object dualism in Western thought. This organisation (as with the Western political-institutional sectors in general) still largely circulates the idea of 'universal value'. This is also reductionist in the sense that it can have the effect of homogenising difference instead of nurturing plurality. How, for example, can the deeply symbolic aspects of different cultures (and inherited customs and practices), which may have been cultivated for thousands of years, be valued universally without being levelled out (i.e. reduced) in the process? The advocacy of universal values does not reflect reality; it is an *ideology*; a *scientistic ideology*. How can, for example, a creation that is steeped in the evolution of one civilisation be 'valued' in the same way by someone from outside of that civilisation? It is palpably impossible – as it is

---

55 Useful sources here are *The Cultures of Globalization*, edited by Fredric Jameson (*et al*), Duke University Press, 1998; and the writings of Noam Chomsky and Immanuel Wallerstein.

impossible to convey the full depth of meaning of speaking in another person's tongue by merely reproducing the same sounds. Universal recognition or appeal or responsibility perhaps; but universal value, no.[56]

In the United Kingdom (and throughout much of Europe and the West), although recognition of intangible heritage is gaining acceptance, the (authorised) conception of 'heritage' as a completed development stills tends to prevail. This is an extension of the modern historical consciousness that emerged in Europe at the end of the C18th. – as a product of the Enlightenment philosophies. It has been largely 'manufactured' (and sustained) by the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors of the State (such as, museums, universities and other heritage organisations) through an educational system which is established upon an essentially scientific epistemology; but it is not established on the historicity of practice (and related ways of life) and the values that may be attributed to this and necessary in order to sustain it.

This conclusion began by arguing that intangible heritage remains of only secondary importance within the context of the Heritage Preservation Movement of Western culture. The (so-called) 'authorised' approach to 'heritage' was described as perpetuating a general shift from ontology (of practice) towards technology (a consequence of scientific methodology). With respect to the practice of restoration, this (so-called) 'sciencing' necessarily contributes to the de-sublimation of the field, manifested in the loss of aesthetic sensibilities and certain kinds of 'tacit knowledge' (which is under-valued and/or becomes de-valued). This was described (in philosophical terms) as a process of *naturalisation*, whereby unique, value-laden, and historically-transcendent perspectives of 'heritage' become subsumed into the authorised, the given and the consensual – and in effect 'reduced' to the 'aesthetic' and the 'historical' in the process.

The subsequent 'closure' of thought is arguably the sum achievement of the so-called 'paradigm shift' from craft to science augmented by professionalisation (ICOM, ECCO, ICON etc.) and which (in terms of practice) has its origins in archaeology.

---

[56] UNESCO's *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, 2001 in some respects concedes this.

Consequently, put in simple terms, the United Kingdom, Europe and the West are *not very good at sustaining intangible heritage* – as evidenced in comparing the UNESCO 'World Tangible Heritage List' with its equivalent 'World Intangible Heritage List'. Crucially, the prevailing conception of heritage does not reflect the aspirations of many practitioners within the wider heritage community who wish to sustain their practices in living form but who have been marginalised by mainstream conservation discourse in recent years.

This thesis (therefore) has established the need to synthesise the tangible v. intangible heritages by acknowledging *authenticity of process*. Achieving this will re-create the subject / object relationship that has become 'separated' historically in the West by the processes of methodological abstraction and reduction and subsequent objectification (the basis of scientific thought). In practice, how materials and technology are used in restoration (in terms of what is *added to* the historical document) and our ability to interpret and understand this will determine the nature (and therefore the authenticity) of the historical document of the future. It will also determine the fate of intangible heritage the world-over. It is because of this that this thesis calls for an 'opening up' of our understanding of the past (and the present) in order to counter these reductionist tendencies. Authenticity must surely be understood in relation to intangible heritage – especially given that intangible heritage is understood to be the overarching paradigm through which all heritages are perceived. It was made clear at the beginning of this conclusion that this necessitates the fostering of a broader (and therefore inclusive) understanding of 'heritage' which would enable the transmutation from the exclusivity of a modern to the plurality of a post-modern view. It is largely because of this that the central philosophical problem of preserving 'heritage' is epistemological. This forms the basis of the reflections / recommendations outlined below.

4.1.8: Reflections / recommendations

A contemporary theory of restoration

This thesis recognises the need to cultivate a more broadly conceived view of 'heritage'. In order to achieve this, Cesare Brandi's (and much of the West's) theory of restoration would need to be rethought from a broader epistemological starting

point and not a phenomenological one. 'Epistemological' in this sense does not solely refer to scientific knowledge (i.e. in the *knowledge of what* sense) nor does it preclude it; it also reflects knowledge which is sustained in the form of practice (i.e. *knowledge of how*) and the value that may be attributed *to* that practice; the so-called 'tacit dimension'. As such, the complex 'life-worldly' modalities of experience related to this, which presently support alternative reasons for preserving the past which often lie beyond aesthetic and historical values alone, may also be incorporated; or indeed vice-versa, given that the intangible heritage is now considered to be the overarching paradigm through which all heritages are understood. Knowledge of practice, for example, in its social context, cultural specificity, and its spiritual, religious, ritualistic and/or aesthetic inflections (and so on) are all aspects of intangible heritage. This is surely *no less* relevant to the West, than it is to the East, the North and/or the South?

Formulating a theory of restoration around an epistemological position would open up a 'pathway' into an essentially ontological dimension, which is otherwise precluded by the limitations of the prevailing phenomenological position. The synthesis between epistemology and ontology would at the same time synthesise the tangible and intangible heritages. This might be described as the next phase of the Fichetian / Hegelian triadic 'thesis, antithesis, synthesis'; the synthesis of the tangible v. intangible 'elevates' the heritage sector to a 'higher' dimension which fits well with the post-modern vision of heritage. So understood, the aim of restoration – when it is deemed necessary and in terms of what is *added to* the historical document – would be the restitution of the 'authentic' intention and the re-establishment of historical concordance (thereby overcoming the impasses of historicism and the subsequent 'time-wall' of heritage preservation). Only by recognising this in relation to the process of restoration can we move closer to passing on to future generations, their inheritance – tangible and intangible – 'in the full richness of its authenticity' while at the same time sustaining cultural diversity and ensuring a more representative, inclusive, and thus democratic approach to the past, the present, and the future.

On a more practical level, this recognition of the necessity to rethink a theory of restoration from an epistemological starting point (i.e. to 'incorporate' intangible

heritage and authenticity as an aspect of this) necessitates the formulation of a doctrine based around the conceptualisation of the materials and processes found in tangible heritage. But this must also take into account how such materials sustain intangible heritage; for instance, urishi lacquer sustains the age-old practice of urushi lacquering; wood, wood-carving and so on – *no scientifically formulated substitute does this*. This might represent the first stage towards synthesis between the tangible / intangible domains. It is vital, though, to recognise that the ideas expressed here are not about the wholesale restoration of the tangible heritage – far from it. They are about seeing restoration as a necessary means to sustainable preservation and bringing thinking about the practice of restoration into line with contemporary developments. To that end, interdisciplinary research and leadership is essential.

Interdisciplinary research and leadership

The époque-making *Yamoto Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding the Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2004)[57] might be used as a starting point in developing this 'new' vision of heritage. Perhaps a meeting of experts should similarly be convened to discus the possibilities for Europe and the West. In this connection, national and international authorities, governmental and non-governmental organisations and specialist scholars and practitioners actively engaged in heritage preservation should welcome and explore strategies to integrate – in a consistent and mutually beneficial way – the safeguarding of tangible and intangible heritage. In this connection, the conservation profession would surely benefit by being more willing to embrace the multiplicity of diverse and unique forms of cultural expression which together constitute the tangible and intangible heritages of humanity – the world-over. And public institutions (such as museums and galleries) should perhaps be more transparent with respect to their 'in-house' conservation-restoration activities by (for instance) making readily accessible (to the public) records / documentation pertaining to this.

In terms of leadership in the United Kingdom, the Department for Culture, Media

---

[57] *The Yamoto Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage*, 2004, Japan. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/admin/file_download.php/Yamato_Declaration.pdf?URL_ID=23863&filename=10988742599Yamato_Declaration.pdf&filetype=application%2Fpdf&filesize=35645&name=Yamato_Declaration.pdf&location=user-S/ [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

and Sport (DCMS) might perhaps consider setting up a section (similar to that in France – discussed in Section 3.1.3) responsible for policies (e.g. legal), strategic development (e.g. the creation of national inventories to ensure appropriate stakeholder inclusion) and liaison at UNESCO-level. It might also consider proposals for potential funding for research, development and knowledge-transfer. With respect to this latter point, it is recommended that appropriate means of specialist training provision are identified and established – both formal and informal. This must be done in such a way to attract (potential) bearers of intangible heritage in a variety of disciplines. This might necessitate (for instance) a carefully considered selection process in order to ensure that: i. the bearer has the necessary knowledge; ii. that he/she should desire to promote their knowledge to inspire learning; iii. that he/she is willing and capable of passing this on; and iv. that an equally careful selection process is established for potential trainees.

In addition to establishing a central authority for recognising, promoting and ensuring the direct transmission of intangible heritage, the living context should not be precluded. This would necessitate a broadly conceived approach, which might involve (for instance) liaison with specialists located in various regions and/or groups. Once identified (by selection based, for example, on a national inventory), mechanisms would need to be developed to ensure that it does not conflict with their interests; it would be quite inappropriate to expect specialists to pass on their knowledge if this was not in their personal interests to do so. For example, there may be significant cost factors to consider because it is (typically) time-consuming to pass on the kinds of knowledge that has (often) been inherited from several generations of practice. There may also be issues relating to the availability of tools and equipment or the limitations of the market etc. Appropriate levels of funding would therefore need to be awarded to bearers of intangible heritage in order to alleviate such difficulties and to create a harmonious situation for trainer and trainee. Such funding would be allocated by the DCMS (via the respective funding bodies) in recognition of its overall responsibility to the intangible heritage domain.

All this said. One cannot overstate the magnitude and complexity of the recommendations suggested here. Essentially, it involves *a change in thinking about heritage* by the recognition of a much broader perspective. Therefore, in addition to

377

the above, this must involve the various key institutions and authorities working together with the relevant stakeholders in order to generate the will – so that formal mechanisms can be implemented – and build capacities on a national (or indeed international) scale. This might involve, for instance, input from institutions of Higher Education – in particular museums and universities, which (this thesis has argued) have a central role to play; not least because of their responsibility to care for vast collections of tangible heritage, but also because this can be used to create awareness of the intangible through their numerous communication networks internationally. And teaching about intangible heritage would surely help to foster greater interest amongst subsequent generations. Such institutions might also establish greater links with the architectural sector on aspects of intangible heritage which could add to this momentum.

Some of these 'key' institutions might also work in collaboration with the United Kingdom National Commission for UNESCO which is in regular liaison with UNESCO Headquarters, Paris (and thus in touch with current developments on the international scene). The UK Commission advises the DCMS on such broader developments (with the aim of establishing formal policies which provide direction and encourage outreach) but which also might create incentive for Government in general to recognise the vital role of intangible heritage – to our cultural and creative diversity, to our 'fuller' sense of inheritance and perhaps also as beneficial to the economy at large. This latter point might encourage support for small businesses (SME's) which are (potentially) a dynamic source of intangible heritage. Indeed, there is a vast amount that can be achieved if a comparable effort was committed to the safeguarding of the intangible heritage as is presently being considered (for instance) with respect to 'heritage science'.[58] But it is important to acknowledge that it is likely to be some time before this 'new' perspective of intangible heritage (understood as the overarching paradigm) is fully realised in the United Kingdom. And to that extent, this thesis should be understood as a small step in that direction.

With these suggestions in mind, Ralph Millard's principle of 'like-with-like'

---

[58] See; *Science and Heritage*, House of Lords Science and Technology Committee, 9th Report of Session 2005-2006. Published by the authority of the House of Lords, London, The Stationary Office Ltd., Nov 2006.

restoration / reconstruction in medical surgery (cited at the beginning of this conclusion) invites comment. Firstly, Millard upholds that if 'like-with-like' substitution cannot be accomplished, then one should use the next, 'most similar tissue substitute'; the goal being 'to camouflage the reconstruction as much as possible'. This is done in order to create an effect 'as subtle as a chameleon changing colours'. Therefore, if the surgeon's work can 'pass unnoticed', he/she is to be 'congratulated as having accomplished his/her task as a reconstructive surgeon'. Millard also makes clear that one should 'avoid settling for the simplest procedure just for the sake of simplicity' but acknowledges that more complex problems 'may require more complex solutions', and that 'the simplest approach may be inadequate'. He also recommends that 'a sound plan must provide restoration of function and aesthetic form' which he explains are 'the fundamental goals of plastic and reconstructive surgery'.[59]

Now, although the conservation profession has sometimes been inspired by the idea of medical surgery (as evidenced in contemporary literature), clearly this approach cannot be applied to all heritages; for instance, it would be ridiculous to think that we should simply restore all heritage on this principle. No, it has been included here mainly to emphasise the fact that preserving the past concerns *far more* than retarding the decay of old materials and to make clear that the practice of restoration (in particular) is not 'a necessary evil' and that the historic arts and crafts do not constitute 'faked expression' but are in fact intimately connected to activities which in so many ways embody the past – a past manifested in the idea of the intangible. However, we are in real danger of losing all the wealth of knowledge tied up in a generation who have come to be the guardians of generations of practice and terminating a continuity (and all that this implies) that would otherwise sustain this legacy for the benefit of future generations. Whether specialists such as, Beckford, Sladden or Luckhurst, or the stonemasons at Lincoln, York, Wells or St Paul's call themselves 'conservers' or 'restorers' does not matter. But the idea of intangible heritage, and the way this has in recent times impacted upon the cultural function of restoration, surely does matter. It is with this in mind that it is necessary to stress

---

[59]   Dr. R. Millard, *Principlization of Plastic Surgery*, Little Brown and Co., Boston, 1986 – this appraisal cited from http://www.emedicine.co./plastic/topic241.htm [Accessed on 8th November 2006].

here one last time, that it is ultimately *our* responsibility to safeguard this legacy.

Account of sources

The account of sources is divided by seven sub-headings, as follows: 'References' – which includes all material referred to in the main text in a single alphabetical listing;[60] 'Personal communications' – which includes electronic communications (such as emails) and interviews / discussions. The transcribed interviews / discussions are held in the Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College furniture archives;[61] 'Other personal communications' includes other discussions (not transcribed); 'Exhibitions' – includes visits to various institutions; 'Site visits' – includes visits to various workshops / places of significance etc; 'Conferences / seminars attended' – provides details of those events attended; 'Other useful websites' – provides the web addresses for the various institutions / organisations; and finally, 'Suggested further reading' – provides other references (not referenced in the main text) that may be useful for further research.

---

[60] The single alphabetical listing (rather than divided by sub-headings for various kinds of literature) is based on P. Dunleavy, *Authoring a PhD: How to Plan, Draft, Write and Finish a Doctoral Thesis or Dissertation*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003 who recommends the following: 'A single unified bibliography arranged in a strict and predicable alphabetical ordering is best for all textual materials' (p.130).

[61] These are filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Creativity and Culture (formerly Faculty of Design), Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe and may be made available by contacting Prof. Jake Kaner.

References

A

AIC, *Code of Ethics*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/pubs/ethics.html [Accessed on 31st January 2006].

ALCOUFFE, D. *The Restorers' Handbook of Furniture*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1977.

ALLEN, S. *Classic Finishing Techniques*, Sterling, 1994.

APPELBAUM, B. 'Criteria for Treatment of Collections Housed in Historic Structures', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 33, Number 2, Article 9 (pp.185-191), 1994. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic33-02-009.html [Accessed on 2nd June 2005].

APPELBAUM, B. 'Criteria for Treatment: Reversibility', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 26, Number 2, Article 1 (pp.65-73), 1987. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic26-02-001.html [Accessed on 9th July 2004].

Arts and Crafts Movement 1850-1915 (The) – information available from: http://www.artscrafts.org.uk/branches/handicrafts.html [Accessed on 15th May 2005].

ASHLEY-SMITH, J. 'The Ethics of Conservation' (1982), in C. Caple, *Conservation Skills: Judgement, Method and Decision Making*, Routledge, 2000 (p.59).

Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage, edited by M. de la Torre, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2002. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

B

BACON, F. *The Advancement of Learning*, edited by G. Kitchin, Heron Books, 1861.

BAMBURA, D. 'Authenticity and Dignity – Heritage and Human Dimension', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.279-282).

BAMFORTH, N. 'Ranjit Singh: The Lion of the Punjab', *Conservation Journal of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, London, Number 31, April 1999 (pp.14-15).

BAMFORTH, N. 'Yomeimon of Toshogu', *Conservation Journal of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, London, Number 49, Spring 2005 (pp. 8-9).

BECK, J. and M. Daley, *Art Restoration: The Culture, the Business, the Scandal*, John Murray, 1993.

BELLAH, R. 'New Religious Consciousness and the Crisis of Modernity', in *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader*, edited by P. Rabinow and W. Sullivan, University of California Press, 1979 (pp.341-360).

BENJAMIN, W. 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction', 1936 (this version transcribed by A. Blunden (1998)); proofed and corrected in 2005. Available from: http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/benjamin.htm [Accessed on 15th July 2004].

BENNETT, M. *Discovering and Restoring Antique Furniture*, Cassell, 1990.

BERGER, P. and S. Huntington, *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press, 2003.

BILEN, O. 'The Historicity of Understanding and the Problem of Relativism in Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics', *Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change*, Series I, Culture and Values, Vol. 27, Council for Research and Values, 2001.

BLAKE, J. 'Safeguarding Traditional Culture and Folklore – Existing International Law and Future Developments', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999. Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/blake.htm [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

BLANCHFIELD, D. 'The Research and Treatment of a Late 18th-Century Lyre Guitar: A Collaborative Effort', in *Wooden Artifacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 1996. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/1996/WAG_96_blanchfield.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

Bologna Declaration on the European space for higher education: an explanation, prepared by the Confederation of European Union Rectors' Conferences and the Association of European Universities (CRE). Full text available from: http://66.249.93.104/search?q=cache:Izb9AYBYZ-UJ:www.eu.int/comm/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna.pdf+bologna+declaration&hl=en&gl=uk&ct=clnk&cd=2 [Accessed on 8th May 2005].

Bologna Process proposed at the University of Bologna, 1999. Full text available from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bologna_process [Accessed on 19th September 2005].

Bologna process: next stop Bergen 2005, Europa – Education and Training. Available from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna_en.html [Accessed on 28th January 2006].

BOUCHENAKI, M. 'International Conservation Organizations', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, 14.3, 1999. Available from:
http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/newsletters/14_3/feature1_8.html [Accessed on 26th January 2005].

BOUCHENAKI, M. 'Views and Visions of the Intangible', in *Museum International No. 221-222*, (Vol. 56. No. 1-2), Blackwell Publishing, 2004: (pp. 6-11).

BOYLAN, P. 'The ICOM Curricula Guidelines for Museum Professional Development and the extension of ICOM's official role into the Living Intangible Heritage'. Presentation from the Concurrent Session *Museums and Living Heritage*, organised by ICME, The National Folk Museum of Korea, ICOM Korea and ICTOP, International Council of Museums (ICOM) General Conference, Seoul, Korea, Oct 2004. Available from:
http://www.museumsnett.no/alias/HJEMMESIDE/icme/icme2004/boylan.pdf [Accessed on 15th December 2005]. Full text on Guidelines available from: http://www.city.ac.uk/ictop/curricula.html

BRADFORD, S. 'Global Steps to Local Empowerment in the Next Millennium', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 (pp.56-86). Available from:
http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

BRANDI, C. 'The Cleaning of Pictures in Relation to Patina, Varnish and Glazes', in C. Brandi, *Theory of Restoration*, Nardini Editore, 2005 (pp.101-108).

BRANDI, C. 'Teoria del Restauro' (1977), in F. Matero, 'The Conservation of Immovable Cultural Property: Ethical and Practical Dilemmas', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation, 1993,* Volume 32, Number 1, Article 2 (pp.15-21).

BRANDI, C. *Theory of Restoration*, Nardini Editore, 2005 (original title *Teoria del Restauro* first published 1963).

BRAUN, T. 'A New Material for Producing Faux Tortoise-shell Fills', in *Wooden Artifacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 2002. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2002/WAG_02_braun.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

BRESSANI, M. 'Notes on Viollet-le-Duc's Philosophy of History: Dialectics and Technology', in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* (JSAH) XLVIII: pp.327-350, 1989.

BRINCH MADSEN, H. 'Artifact conservation in Denmark at the beginning of the last century' (1987), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.13).

BROOKS, M. 'International conservation codes of ethics and practice and their implications for teaching and learning ethics in textile conservation with special reference to the Diploma in Textile Conservation taught at the Textile Conservation Centre' (1998), cited in C. Caple, *Conservation Skills: Judgement, Method and Decision Making*, Routledge, 2000 (p.59).

BRUMFIELD, G. 'Craft Apprenticeship in Historic Site Museums', Volume 7, Number 2, Education and Training, May 2003, reprinted from G. Williams, *Apprenticeship in Craft*, Dan Clark Books, 1981. Available from: http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/byorg/abbey/an/an07/an07-2a/an07-a201.html [Accessed on 6th January 2005].

BUCK, R. 'Prosthesis for Aphakia', offprint from Miscellanea in Memoriam Paul Coremans (1908-1965), in *Bullitin de l'Institut royal du Patrimoine artistique*, XV-1975.

BURMAN, P. 'A Question of Ethics', article in *The Conservation and Repair of Ecclesiastical Buildings*, 1995. Available from: http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/ethics/ethics.htm [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

C

CALDERARO, N. 'An Outline History of Conservation in Archaeology and Anthropology as Presented through its Publications', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 26, Number 2, Article 3 (pp.85 to 204), 1987. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic26-02-003.html [Accessed 9th July 2004].

CAPLE, C. *Conservation Skills: Judgement, Method and Decision Making*, Routledge, 2000.

CARLYLE, T. 'Sign of the Times', in *The Collected Works of Thomas Carlyle*, Chapman and Hall, 1858 (first published in the Edinburgh Review, 1829).

CARLYLE, T. *Past and Present*, New York University Press, 1977 (first published in 1843).

CARR, M. 'Lacquer Loss Compensation Revisited: More Big Holes in the Top', in *Wooden Artifacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 2003. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2003/carr_03.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

CARR, M. and J. Driggers, 'Loss Compensation of Lacquer on Two Chinese Tables', in *Wooden Artifacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC) 1997. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/1997/WAG_97_carr.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

CASSAR, M. 'Education and training needs for the conservation and protection of cultural heritage: *Is it a case of one size fits all?* In *Cultural Heritage Research: a pan-European Challenge*, Cracow, 16th-18th May 2002. Available from: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sustainableheritage/learning/MCCracow.htm [Accessed on 4th June 2004].

CASSON, H. 'United Kingdom Museums Association Conference' (1960), cited by R. Strong 'Obituary for Sir Hugh Casson' (1999), in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.73).

CEN, *Conservation of Cultural Property, annex to BT N 6732*. European Committee for Standardisation, Technical Board, December 2003. Available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/encoredocs/9732.pdf [Accessed on 15 January 2005].

Charter of Cracow, drafted at the International Conference on Conservation, Cracow, 2000. Available from: http://www.tscont.ts.it/pag5-e.htm [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

CHOAY, F. 'Seven Propositions on the Concept of Authenticity', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.297-299).

CLAVIR, M. 'Reflections on Changes in Museums and the Conservation of Collections from Indigenous Peoples', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 35, Number 2, Article 2 (pp.99-107), 1996. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic35-02-002.html [Accessed on 9th July 2004].

CLEERE, H. 'The Evaluation of Authenticity in the Context of the World Heritage Convention', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.57-66).

CON.BE.FOR, *Conservator-Restorers of Cultural Heritage in Europe: Education Centres and Institutes. A Comparative Research.* CON.BE.FOR. Associaziones Giovanni Secco Suardo, Laruno (BG), Italy, 2000.

Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions, One World Archaeology, edited by R. Layton, Routledge, 1988.

Conservation of Decorative Arts (The), edited by V. Horie, Archetype Publications, the United Kingdom Institute of Conservation (UKIC), 1999.

Conserving Culture: A New Discourse on Heritage, edited by M. Hufford, University of Illinois Press, 1994.

Conserving the Textile Traditions of Oaxaca, edited by K. Klein, Getty Conservation Institute, 1997.

Convergence Consultation Document, 'Questionnaire Feedback Report', Bluespark Consulting, May 2005. Available from: http:///www.bapcr.org.uk/Convergence%20Consultation%20Document.htm [Accessed 11th March 2005].

CRAMER F. 'Durability and change: a biochemist's view' (1994), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.74).

Culture of Craft (The), edited by P. Dormer, Manchester University Press, 1997.

Cultures of Globalisation (The), edited by F. Jameson and M. Miyoshi, Duke University Press, 1998.

D

DALY HARTIN, D. 'An Historical Introduction to Conservation' (1990), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (pp.40-41).

DAWSON, C. *The Crisis of Western Education*, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1961.

Declaration of Oaxaca (The), adopted at the Seminar on Education, Work and Cultural Pluralism, convened by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and the Mexican National Commission for UNESCO, 1993. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/unesco/oaxaca.html [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

Declaration of San Antonio (The) held at the InterAmerican Symposium on Authenticity in the Conservation and Management of the Cultural Heritage in association with ICOMOS National Committees, San Antonio, Texas, United States of America, 1996. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/docs/san_antonio.html [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

DELLER, C. 'French polish from a conservator's point of view: Some ideas for a better coating', in *Wooden Artefacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 1998. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/1998/WAG_98_deller.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

DEMEL, S. *Architectural Additions*, MA Thesis, 1997. Available from: http://www.demel.net/th-ch1.html [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

DENNEY, M. *Arts and Crafts and Vernacular Furniture*, PhD Thesis, 1997.

Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property, edited by R. Layton, P. Stone and J. Thomas, Routledge, 2001.

Document of Pavia (The). Available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/documents/Pavia.html [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

Document of Vienna (The), 1998. Available from: http:www.encore-edu.org/encore/documents/vienna.htm [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

DODDS, R. 'Knowing ways / ways of knowing: reconciling science and tradition', in *Debates in World Archaeology*, Volume 36(4): pp.547-557, Routledge, 2004. Available from: http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/(02gwegaqzkncc14511nbgd45)/app/home/contribution.asp?referrer=parent&backto=issue,9,18;journal,8,24;linkingpublicationresults,1:104736,1 [Accessed on 15th October 2005].

DONKIN, L. *Crafts and Conservation: Synthesis Report for ICCROM*, International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), e-doc 2004/02, Version 1.0, released 2004. Available from: http://www.iccrom.org/eng/02info_en/02_04pdf-pubs_en/ICCROM_doc02_CraftsandConservation.pdf [Accessed on 5th July 2005].

DORGE, V. 'Photographic Reproductions Used to Replace Decorative Veneer Losses on a Small Sewing Box', in *Wooden Artifacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 1992. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/1992/WAG_92_dorge.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

DREYFUS, S.E. (1981) and H.L. Dreyfus (1984) 'Novice to Expert Scale', cited in *Professional Accreditation of Conservator-Restorers (PACR) 'Candidate Pack'*, Institute of Conservation, July 2003 (updated 2005). Available from: http://www.pacr.org.uk/docs/pacr_candidate_packv2005.pdf [Accessed on 9th Mat 2006].

DROSTE, B. von and U. Bertilsson, 'Authenticity and World Heritage', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.3-15).

DUNLEAVY, P. *Authoring a PhD: How to Plan, Draft, Write and Finish a Doctoral Thesis or Dissertation*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.

DYKSTRA, S. 'The Artist's Intentions and the Intentional Fallacy in Fine Arts Conservation', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 35, Number 3, Article 3, 1996 (pp.197-218). Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic35-03-003.html [Accessed on 20th October 2003].

E

EASTER, J. 'Craft and Art in France (or, the need to keep up the good work)', in *Furniture in France: 2004*, Wooden Artefacts Group (WAG) of the American Institute for Conservation (AIC), 2004 (pp.62-63). Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2004/France2004.pdf [Accessed on 15th April 2006].

EASTOP, D. and K. Gill, *Upholstery Conservation: principles and practice*, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2001.

ECCO – ENCoRE Paper on Education and Access to the Conservation Profession, approved by the General Assembly of ECCO (Brussels 7th March 2003) and by the General Assembly of ENCoRE (Turin 9th May 2003). Available from: http://72.14.203.104/search?q=cache:pI5e81kbemIJ:www.encore.edu.org/encore/encoredocs/ECCO -ENCoRE.pdf+ecco+-+encore+Paper+%22access+to+the+conservation- restoration+profession%22&hl=en&gl=uk&ct=clnk&cd=1 [Accessed 15th March 2005].

ECCO, *Professional Guidelines (I): The Role of the Conservator-Restorer*, Official documents of the European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers' Organisations (ECCO), adopted by its General Assembly, Brussels, 1993. Available from: http://www.ecco- eu.info/index.php?container_id=163&doc_id=170 [Accessed on 1st February 2006].

ECCO, *Professional Guidelines (II): Obligations towards Cultural Property*. Official documents of the European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers' Organisations (ECCO), adopted by its General Assembly, Brussels, 1993. Available from: http://www.ecco- eu.info/index.php?container_id=163&doc_id=170 [Accessed on 1st February 2006].

ECCO, *Professional Guidelines (III): Basic Requirements for Education in Conservation / Restoration*. Official documents of the European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers' Organisations (ECCO), adopted by its General Assembly, Brussels, 1994. Available from: http://www.ecco-eu.info/index.php?container_id=163&doc_id=170 [Accessed on 1st February 2006].

ECCO-ENCoRE Draft Proposal for Amendment to P6_TA-PROV(2005)0173, Recognition of professional qualifications ***II. Section X, Article 3: *Acquired rights specific to conservation- restoration practitioners/conservator-restorers*. Annex I.1 Conservator-restorer, 1.1.1 'Knowledge and Skills'. Official documents of the European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers' Organisations (ECCO), June 2005.

Economics and Heritage Conservation, edited by R. Mandy, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1999. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/econrpt.pdf [Accessed on 15th May 2006].

EDWARDS, C. 'The Castration of Skill?' in *Obscure objects of Desire: Reviewing the Crafts of the 20th-Century*, edited by T. Harrod, Crafts Council, 1997 (p.350).

ELLIS, L. and A. Higginbotham, 'An Evaluation of Four Barrier Coatings and Epoxy Combinations in the Structural Repair of Wooden Objects', in *Wooden Artefacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 2002. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2002/WAG_02_ellis.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

ENCoRE, *Background to European Network for Conservation-Restoration Education* (ENCoRE) – documents available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/AboutENCoRE.html [Accessed on 7th February 2005].

European Higher Education Area: joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education, Bologna, 1999. Available from: http://www.encore-edu,org/encore/documents/bologna.htm [Accessed on 7th February 2005].

Exhibiting cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display, edited by I. Karp and S. Lavine, Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.

F

FAGAN, B. 'A Responsibility for the Past: Integrating Conservation and Archaeology', *Conservation at the Getty*, Newsletter 18.1, 2003. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/newsletters/18_1/feature.html [Accessed on 22nd June 2005].

FEILDEN, B. 'Conservation – Is There No Limit? – A Review', in *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, Volume 1, Number 1 March 1995. Available from: http://www.donhead.com/vol1.htm [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

FITZ, S. 'Saving Cultural Heritage in Germany: A Spotlight on the Present Situation at the Beginning of the New Millennium', 2001. Available from: http://www.arcchip.cz/w06/w06_fitz.pdf [Accessed 18th October 2004].

FLICK, U. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, Sage 2002 (first published in 1998).

FMB, 'Fired by Conservation' (author not stated), *Master Builder*, Federation of Master Builders, August 2004.

FODDY, W. *Constructing Questions for Interviews and Questionnaires*, Cambridge, 1993

FOLEY, K. 'Conservation Future Challenges' (1999), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.175).

FOLEY, K. 'Education and Training for Practice', in *Archaeological Conservation, Training and Employment*, papers presented at a meeting organised by the Archaeological Section of the United Kingdom Institute of Conservation (UKIC), 1991 (pp.27-28).

FOLEY, K. 'FULCO, a framework for competence for professional conservation-restoration practice: the project discussed', in *ICOM Committee for Conservation Preprints of the 12th Triennial Meeting Lyon 29th Aug-3rd Sept, 1999*, James and James, 1999 (pp.139-146).

FOLEY, K. and S. Scholten, 'FULCO – a Framework of Competence for Conservator-Restorers in Europe' (1998), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.175).

FOLEY, K. *Education and Training in Conservation: A Report for the Conservation Unit of the Museums and Galleries Commission*, Museum and Galleries Commission, London, 1989.

FRIEDLANDER, M. 'On Restorations', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (pp.332-334).

From William Morris: Building Conservation and the Arts and Crafts Cult of Authenticity 1877-1939, edited by C. Miele, Yale University Press, 2005.

Future of the Past: Attitudes to Conservation 1174-1974 (The), edited by J. Fawcett, Thames and Hudson, London, 1976.

G

GADAMER, H-G. *Truth and Method*, Sheed and Ward, 1975.

GARCES, E. 'Heritage, policies of memory and the institutionalization of culture', in *City and Time* 2(1): 2, 2006. Available from: http://www.ct.ceci-br.org [Accessed on 15th February 2006].

GEAR, J., A. McIntosh and G. Squires, 'Informal learning in the professions' (1994), cited in S. Lester, 'Professional bodies, CPD and informal learning: the case of conservation', in *Continuing Professional Development* 3 (4), 1999 (pp.110-121). Available from: http:www.devmts.demon.co.uk/cpd.htm [Accessed on 6th February 2006].

GETTY, 'Finding a Certain Balance: A Discussion about Surface Cleaning' (joint discussion), *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, 15.3, 2000. Available from: http://www.edu/conservation/resources/newsletter/15_3/dialogue.html [Accessed on 22nd January 2004].

GILBERG, M. 'Alfred Lucas: Egypt's Sherlock Holmes', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 36, Number 1, Article 3 (pp.31 to 48), 1997. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic36-01-003_1.html [Accessed 2nd February 2003].

GILBERG, M. 'Friedrich Rathgen: The Father of Modern Archaeological Conservation', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 26, Number 2, Article 4 (pp.105 to 120), 1987. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic26-02-004_1.html [Accessed 15th October 2003].

Gilded Wood: Conservation and History, edited by C. Hutchins, Sound View Press, 1991.

GILL, K. 'The development in upholstery conservation as a practice of investigation, interpretation and preservation', *Reviews in Conservation*, the International Institute for Conservation (ICON), Number 5, 2004.

Globalisation and Intangible Cultural Heritage: Opportunities, Threats and Challenges, held at the United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan, 26th-27th August 2004. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/fr/ev.php-URL_ID=22099&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

GLOVER, H. 'Two Furnishings from Strawberry Hill: Exploration and Treatment', in *Wooden Artifacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 2002. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2002/WAG_02_glover.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

GODWIN, K. *'William Morris' 'New and Lighter Design'*, in *The Journal of the William Morris Society*, Vol. II, No. 3, 1968.

GUTIERREZ-CORTINES, C. 'Cultural Heritage Research: a view from the European Parliament', *Welcome addresses and plenary lectures*. Available from: http://www.heritage.xtd.pl/pdf/full_gutierrez-cortines.pdf [Accessed on 26th October 2005]

GUTIERREZ-CORTINES, C. 'Session summaries', keynote speaker at the *6th European Commission Conference on Sustaining Europe's Cultural Heritage: From Research to Policy*, held at the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, Westminster, London, United Kingdom, 1st-3rd September 2004, Centre for Sustainable Heritage, University College London. Text available from: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sustainableheritage/conference-proceedings/session-summaries/cortines.html

H

HACKNEY, S. in L. Backhouse, *Work Placement in the Frame Conservation Department of the Tate Gallery*, 30th Aug-28th Oct 2005, BSc(Hons) Restoration and Conservation, Sir John Cass Department of Art, Media and Design, London Metropolitan University, submitted December 2005.

HACKNEY, S. 'The Development of Conservation Science at the Tate Gallery', in *The Interface between Science and Conservation*, edited by S. Bradley, British Museum Occasional Paper, No.116, British Museum, 1997 (pp. 9-13).

Hague Convention, *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*: 'The Hague Convention', The Hague (1954), entering force in 1956. Full text available from: http://www.icomos.org/hague/ [Accessed on 30th September 2005].

HARPAINTER, M. 'Tips on Removable Upholstery Caps and Backing Fretted Panels', in *Wooden Artefacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 2002. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2002/WAG_02_harpainter.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

HARRISON, P. *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

HAYWARD, C. *Antique Furniture Repairs*, Evans Brothers, 1976.

HEGEL, G. *Phenomenology of Spirit* (translated by A. Miller), Oxford University Press, 1979.

HELD, K. 'The Origin of Europe with the Greek Discovery of the World' (translated by S. Kirkland), in *Epoche*, Volume 7, Issue 1, 2002 (pp.81-105).

HIGINBOTHAM, A. 'What's Old is New: B-72 and the Treatment of Degraded Furniture Finishes', in *Wooden Artefacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 2001. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2001/WAG_01_heginbotham.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

Historic Environment: A Force for the Future (The), Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), 2001. Available from: http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2001/his_force_future.htm [Accessed on 27th April 2006].

Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996.

HLF, 'Heritage Lottery Fund new £4million bursary scheme to save heritage skills', *The National Lottery Good Causes Portal,* Heritage Lottery Fund, (no date stated). Available from: http://www.lotterygoodcauses.org.uk/includes/print_page.cfm [Accessed 14th February 2005].

HLF, *Sustaining our Living Heritage,* Heritage Lottery Fund, 2002. Available from: http://www.hlf.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/AF4898F5-ADD7-4735-BC01-D2080BEC62B4/0/sustaining_heritage.pdf [Accessed on 27th April 2006].

HOENIGER, C. 'The Restoration of the Early Italian "Primitives" During the 20th Century: Valuing Art and its Consequences', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 38, Number 2, Article 3 (pp. 144 to 161), 1999. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic38-02-003.html [Accessed 15th October 2003].

HOOPER-GREENHILL, E. *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*, Routledge, 1992.

HUNTINGTON, S. *The Clash of Civilizations: And the Remaking of World Order*, Free Press, 2002.

HUSSERL, E. 'Philosophy and the Crisis of European Man', lecture delivered in Vienna, 10th May 1935 ('The Vienna Lecture'), in Edmund Husserl, *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*, (translated with Notes and an Introduction by Quentin Lauer), Harper Torchbooks, 1965.

I

ICOM Chronology 1946-1998, International Council of Museums (ICOM). Available from: http://icom.museums/chronology.html [Accessed on 12th February 2006].

ICOM, 'Museums and Cultural Diversity: Policy Statement', *Report of the Working Group on Cross Cultural Issues of the International Council of Museums (ICOM)*, presented at the 89th session of the Executive Council of ICOM, 1997. Web version prepared by P. Boylan, City University, London, 1998. Available from: http://wwwicom.museum/diversity.html [Accessed on 7th February 2005].

ICOM, 'The Conservator-Restorer: A Definition of the Profession', *ICOM – Code of Ethics*, International Council of Museums (ICOM), 1984. Available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/documents/ICOM1984.html [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

ICOM, *Development of the Museum Definition according to ICOM Statutes (1946-2001)*, International Council of Museums (ICOM) Statutes, amended by the 20th General Assembly of ICOM, Barcelona, Spain, July 2001. Available from: http://icom.museum/hist_def_eng.html [Accessed on 20th May 2006].

ICOM-CC, 'A Qualified Community: towards internationally agreed standards of qualification for conservation', in *Proceedings of the Interim Meeting of the Working Group on Training in Conservation and Restoration of the ICOM-CC*, Maastricht, 6th-8th April 1995, edited by J. Cronyn and K. Foley, International Council of Museums (ICOM) Committee for Conservation, 1996.

ICOM-CC, 'Role of Science in Conservation Training', in *Proceedings of the Interim Meeting of the Working Group on Training in Conservation and Restoration of the ICOM-CC*, British Museum, 6th-10th October 1986, edited by C. Pearson, International Council of Museums (ICOM) Committee for Conservation, 1996.

ICOMOS – UNESCO, Intangible Heritage Bibliography, 2005. Centre of Documentation, International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/centre_documentation/intangible.pdf

ICOMOS, 'Place – memory – meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites', *ICOMOS 14th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium*, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe 27th-31st October 2003. Full text available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/victoriafalls2003/papers.htm [Accessed on 12th January 2005].

ICOMOS, *Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments*: 'The Athens Charter', adopted at the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Athens, 1931. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/athens_charter.html [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

ICOMOS, *Australian ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance*: 'The Burra Charter', adopted by the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS, 1979. Updated version available from: http://www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html [Accessed on 14th May 2004].

ICOMOS, *Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage*, ratified by the ICOMOS 12th General Assembly, held in Mexico, 2000. Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/vernac-eng.htm [Accessed on 22nd January 2005].

ICOMOS, *The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*: 'The Venice Charter', held at the 2nd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), Venice, 1964. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/docs/venice_charter.html [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

INSALL, D. 'Kelmscott Manor, the Home of William Morris and its Repair for the Society of Antiquaries London', 1968. Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/monumentum/vol8/vol8_2.pdf#search=%22kelmscott%20man or%20the%20home%20of%20william%20morris%22 [Accessed on 30th September 2003].

Interface between Science and Conservation (The), edited by S. Bradley, British Museum Occasional Paper No. 116, British Museum, 1997.

ITO, N. '"Authenticity" Inherent in Cultural Heritage in Asia and Japan', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.35-45).

J

JAMES, D. *Upholstery Restoration*, Guild of Master Craftsman, 1997.

JEDRZEJEWSKA, H. 'Ethics in Conservation' (1976), cited in C. Caple, *Conservation Skills: Judgement, Method and Decision Making*, Routledge, 2000 (p.59).

JOKILEHTO, J. 'Considerations on Authenticity and Integrity in World Heritage Context', in *City and Time* 2(1): 1, 2006. Available from: http://www.ct.ceci-br.org [Accessed on 15th February 2006].

JOKILEHTO, J. *A History of Architectural Conservation*, Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999.

JOKILHETO, J. 'Authenticity: A General Framework for the Concept', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp. 17-34).

K

KECK, C. 'Salute to Paul Coremans', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 30, Number 1, Article 1 (pp. 01 to 02), 1991. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic30-01-001_indx.html [Accessed 16th October 2003].

KECK, C. 'The Position of Conservation in the Last Quarter of the Twentieth Century', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 18, Number 1, Article 1, 1978 (pp.3-7). Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic18-01-001.html [Accessed on 12th October 2003].

KECK, S. 'Some Picture Cleaning Controversies: Past and Present', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 23, Number 2, Article 1 (pp. 73 to 87), 1984. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic35-03-003.html [Accessed 9th July 2004].

KENT, D. cited in 'A Hard Truth', article by Naomi Marks in *Cornerstone*, The Magazine for the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, Vol. 27, No.4, 2006 (pp.45-46).

KINDRED, B. 'Proposed UNESCO Convention on the Intangible Heritage: Implications for the Institute of Historic Building Conservation'. Available from: http://www.ihbc.org.uk/Unesco/intengible_assets.html [Accessed on 14th February 2005].

KIRKINEN, H. 'Problems of Traditional Culture and Folklore in Europe', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999. Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/kirkenen.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

KOLLER, M. 'Surface Cleaning and Conservation', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, 15.3, 2000. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/resources/newsletter/15_3/feature1.html [Accessed on 22nd January 2004].

KOPYTOFF, I. 'The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process' (1986), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.74).

KRESTEV, T. 'Cultural Diversity and the Concept of Authenticity', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.343-345).

KRISHNA MENON, A.G. 'Conservation in India – a search for direction', in *Research, Abstracts and Texts: Conservation in India*, 2002. Available from: http://www.architexturez.net/+/subject-listing/000058.shtml [Accessed on 14th December 2004].

KUHN, T. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, International Encyclopaedia of Unified Science, Volume 2, Number 2, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

KURIN, R. 'The UNESCO Questionnaire on the Application of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore: Preliminary Results', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 (pp.17-31). Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

KURTZ, D. 'Up the Creek without a Paddle: The History and Conservation of an 1870's Birch Bark Canoe', in *Wooden Artefacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 1997. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/1997/WAG_97_kurtz.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

KUTNEY, M., C. Swan and C. Howlett, 'Conservator, Curator, Craftsman: Collaborations at Colonial Williamsburg', in *Wooden Artifacts Group Postprints*, American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 1996. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/1996/WAG_96_kutney.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

L

LAENEN, M. 'Authenticity in Relation to Development', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.351-357).

LAMEI, S. 'Authenticity and the Egyptian Heritage Diversity', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.359-361).

LANGFORD, R. 'Our Heritage – Your Playground' (1983), cited in K. Puri, 'Protection of Traditional Culture and Folklore', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 (pp.43-50). Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

LARSEN, R. 'Clarification of Conservation / Restoration Education at University Level or Equivalent', *European Network for Conservation-Restoration Education (ENCoRE) 3rd General Assembly*, Munich, Germany, June 2001. Available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/encoredocs/cp.pdf [Accessed on 15th January 2005].

LARSEN, R. 'Comments to FULCO – A Framework of Competence for Conservator-Restorers in Europe'. A Discussion Paper for the Vienna Meeting 30th Nov-1st Dec 1998. *European Network for Conservation-Restoration Education (ENCoRE) Newsletter*, March 1999. Available from: http://www.kulturnet.dk/homes/ks/encore/ [Accessed on 7th February 2005].

LARSEN, R. 'Report of the Chairman of the Board on 4th General Assembly', *European Network for Conservation-Restoration Education (ENCoRE)*, 2002. Available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/DesktopDefault.aspx?tabindex=1&tabid=201 [Accessed on 15th January 2005].

Lausanne Charter (The), *Charter for the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage* ('The Lausanne Charter'), International Committee for the Management of Archaeological Heritage (ICAHM), approved by the 9th General Assembly, Lausanne, 1990. Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/arch_e.pdf [Accessed on 15th January 2005].

LESTER, S. 'Becoming a profession: conservation in the United Kingdom', in *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, volume 23, number 1 (pp. 87 to 94), 2002. Available from: http://www.devmts.demon.co.uk/consprof.htm [Accessed on 21st January 2003].

LESTER, S. 'Professional bodies, CPD and informal learning: the case of conservation', in *Continuing Professional Development* 3 (4), 1999 (pp. 110-121) Available from: http://www.devmts.demon.co.uk/cpd.htm [Accessed on 6th February 2006].

LESTER, S. 'The Professional Accreditation of Conservator-Restorers: developing a competence-based professional assessment system', in *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 25 (4), 2000 (pp. 407 to 409). Available from: http:www.devmts.demon.co.uk/pacr.htm [Accessed on 21st January 2003].

Lethaby Scholarship (The), Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB). Available from: http://www.spab.org.uk/edcuation_scholarship_history.html [Accessed on 15th May 2005].

Lausanne Charter (The), *Charter for the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage* ('The Lausanne Charter'), International Committee for the Management of Archaeological Heritage (ICAHM), approved by the 9th General Assembly, Lausanne, 1990. Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/arch_e.pdf [Accessed on 15th January 2005].

LEVIN, J. 'The Future of Conservation', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, 6.1, 1991. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/pf/PF [Accessed on 8th February 2005].

LOWENTHAL, D. 'Age and artefact: dilemmas of appreciation' (1979), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.74).

LOWENTHAL, D. 'Changing Criteria of Authenticity', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.121-135).

LOWENTHAL, D. 'Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History' (1996), cited in C. Caple, *Conservation Skills, Judgement, Method and Decision Making*, Routledge, 2000 (p.140).

LUFT, S. 'Husserl's Theory of Phenomenological Reduction: Between Life-World and Cartesianism', in *Research in Phenomenology*, 34 (pp. 198-234), The Netherlands, 2004.

LYNCH, G. *Brickwork: History, Technology and Practice*, Donhead, 1994.

M

MADDEN, C.A. and V. A. Mitchell, 'Professions, standards and competence: a survey of continuing education for the professions' (1993), cited in S. Lester, 'Professional bodies, CPD and informal learning: the case of conservation', in *Continuing Professional Development* 3 (4), 1999 (pp.110-121). Available from: http:www.devmts.demon.co.uk/cpd.htm [Accessed on 6th February 2006].

Maintenance Education and Training for Listed Buildings 'Maintain our Heritage', submitted by De Montfort Expertise Limited, Leicester, 2003. Available from: http://www.maintainourheritage.co.uk/pdf/module6intro.pdf [Accessed on 15th December 2005].

MARCUSE, H. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, Routledge, 1964.

MASON, R. 'Assessing Values in Conservation Planning', in *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage,* The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2002 (pp.5-30). Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

MATERO, F. 'Ethics and Policy in Conservation', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, Volume 15, Number 1, 2000. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/resources/newsletter/15_1/feature1_2.html [Accessed 22nd January 2003].

MATSUURA, K. 'Towards a Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage', *Press Release No. 2003-15*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), UNESCOPRESS, February 2003. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=9712&URL_DO=DO_PRINTPAGE&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

MATSUURA, K. speaking at the 'First Meeting of the Jury named to select Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage', June, 2000, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Office of Public Information (OPI). Available from: http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2000/00-60e.shtml [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

MATSUURA, K. speaking at the 'First Meeting of the Jury named to select Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage', June, 2000 in *UNESCO to protect Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Office of Public Information (OPI). Available from: http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2000/00-48e.shtml [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

McCANN, A., J. Early, A. Harowitz, R. Kurin, L. Prosterman, A Seeger and P. Seitel, 'The 1989 *Recommendation* Ten Years on: Towards a Critical Analysis', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 (pp.31-35). Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

McINTOSH, A. (Minister for Media and Heritage), speaking at the launch of the National Heritage Training Group research *Building on the Past: Training for the Future*: published in 'English Heritage and CITB-ConstructionSkills tackle skills crisis with the National Heritage Training Group', Oct 2003. Available from: http://www.citb.co.uk/news/press-releases/pr-20031029.asp [Accessed on 7th January 2005].

MENSCH, P. van, 'Magpies on Mount Helicon', paper presented at the joint meeting of ICOFOM and MINOM during the General Conference of the International Council of Museums (ICOM), Stavanger, 4th July, 1995, in *Museum and Community*, ICOFOM Study Series 25 (pp.133-138), Stavanger, 1995. Available from: http://www.mus.ahk.nl/03_onderzoek_ontwikkeling/03_publicaties/13_1996/magpies.jsp [Accessed on 14th February 2005].

MENSCH, P. van, *Towards a Methodology for Museology*, PhD thesis, University of Zagrab, 1992.

MILNER, C. 'One for all and all for one: a new single voice for conservation', *Journal of the National Preservation Office*, 2003. Available from: http://www.instituteofconservation.org.uk/archive/nccr/docs/oneforall_sep03.pdf [Accessed on 11th March 2005].

MORA, P., L. Mora and P. Philippot, 'Problems of Presentation', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (pp. 343-354).

MORRIS, W. *Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings*, 1877. Available from: http://www.marxists.org/archive/morris/works/1877/spabman.html

MUJICA, E. 'Authenticity and Heritage Diversity: Archaeological Sites and Cultural Landscapes in the Andean Countries', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.233-250).

MURCH, A. *People Development in Museums and Galleries*, 2000. Available from: http://www.hlf.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/81B1E074-A75D-4D3F-387951F72D17/0/needs_people.pdf [Accessed on 15th March 2006].

Museum Provision and Professionalism, edited by G. Kavanagh, Routledge, 1994.

N

Nara Document on Authenticity (The), drafted at the Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention, Nara, Japan, 1994. Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/naradoc_eng.htm [Accessed on 14th May 2004].

NCCR, *Introduction to the Professional Accreditation Scheme, PACR 1*, National Council for Conservator-Restorers (NCCR), April 2001. Available from: http://www.ipc.org.uk/PACR1.doc [Accessed on 15th January 2004].

NCCR, *Professional Accreditation of Conservator-Restorers (PACR), Candidate Pack*, National Council for Conservator-Restorers (NCCR), July 2003 (updated 2005). Available from: http://www.pacr.org.uk/docs/pacr_candidate_packv2005.pdf [Accessed on 9th May 2006].

NCCR, *Professionalisation of Conservator-Restorers (PACR), Continuing Professional Development: Principles*, National Council for Conservation-Restoration (NCCR), 2005. Available from: http://www.ipc.org.uk [Accessed on 15th January 2004].

New Museology (The), edited by Peter Vergo, Reaktion Books, 1989.

NIETZSCHE, F. *The Gay Science* (first published in 1882).

NISHIMURA, Y. 'Changing Concept of Authenticity', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp. 175-183).

O

O'HEAR, A. 'Art and Technology: An Old Tension', in *Philosophy and Technology*, edited by R. Fellows, Cambridge University Press, 1995 (pp.143-158).

Objectivity and Cultural Divergence, edited by S. Brown, Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Obscure objects of Desire: Reviewing the Crafts of the 20th-Century, edited by T. Harrod, Crafts Council, 1997.

ODDY, A. *The Art of the Conservator*, edited by A. Oddy, British Museum Press, 1992 (pp.7-27).

ODEGAARD, N. 'Artist's Intent: Material Culture Studies and Conservation', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 34, Number 3, Article 3 (pp.187-193), 1995. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic34-03-003.html [Accessed on 20th October 2003].

P

PEARCE, S. 'Museums, Objects and Collections' (1992), cited in E. Pye, *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001 (p.74).

PETZET, M. '"In the Full Richness of their Authenticity" – The Test of Authenticity and the New Cult of Monuments', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.85-99).

PETZET, M. 'Grundsatz der Denkmalpflege' ('Principles of Monument Conservation'), in *ICOMOS – Journal of the German National Committee*, Volume X, International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), Munich, (undated) (pp.1-42). English version available from: http://www.icomos.org/germany/publ/uk_poc_main.htnl [Accessed on 20th July 2005].

PHILIPPOT, P. 'Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines, I', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (pp.268-274).

PHILIPPOT, P. 'Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines', in *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices,* Proceedings of the North American International Regional Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1972, Washington Preservation Press, 1976 (pp.367-374).

PHILIPPOT, P. 'Restoration from the Perspective of the Humanities', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage* edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (pp. 216-229).

PLENDERLEITH, H. *The Conservation of Antiquities and Works of Art: treatment, repair and restoration*, Oxford University Press, 1971 (first published in 1956).

PLENDERLEITH, H. *The Preservation of Antiquities*, Museums Association, London, 1934.

PODMANICZKY, M. 'Structural Fills for Large Wooden Objects: Contrasting and Complementary Approaches', *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Volume 37, Number 1, Article 8 (pp.111-116), 1998. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/jaic/articles/jaic37-01-008.html [Accessed on 9th July 2004].

POLANYI, K. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Beacon Press, 2002 (first published in 1944).

POLANYI, M. *The Tacit Dimension*, Archer Books, New York, 1967.

Power of Place, English Heritage, 2000. Full text available from: http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1447 [Accessed on 27th April 2006].

Preservation of Cultural Heritage: Towards a European Profile of the Conservator-Restorer, The Document of Pavia, 1997. Available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/DesktopDefault.aspx?tabindex=1&tabid=188 [Accessed on 6th May 2006].

Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 1995.

Proceedings of the Symposium on Decorative Wood, held at the Burrell Collection, Glasgow, 31st March 1984, edited by D. Carthy and C. McWilliam, Scottish Society for Conservation and Restoration, 1984.

Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the recognition of professional qualifications, presented by the Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, March 2002. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/en/qualifications/com02-119_en.pdf [Accessed 15th March 2005].

PROTT, L. 'Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 (pp.50-56). Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

PUGIN, A. *Contrasts or A Parallel between the Noble Edifices of the Middle Ages*, and *Corresponding Buildings of the Present Day: shewing the Present Decay of Taste* (1836) and *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture*. Combined version published by Spire Books, 2003.

PURI, K. 'Protection of Traditional Culture and Folklore', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 (pp.43-50). Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

PUWAINCHIR, M. 'The Globalization of Interculturality', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 (pp.35-36). Available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

PYE, E. and J. Cronyn, 'The Archaeological Conservator Re-examined: a personal view', in *Recent Advances in the Conservation and Analysis of Artefacts*, edited by J. Black, James and James, Summer School Press, 1987 (pp.355-357).

PYE, E. *Caring for the Past*, James and James, 2001.

R

RABINOW, P. and W. Sullivan, 'The Interpretive Turn: Emergence of an Approach', in *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader*, edited by P. Rabinow and W. Sullivan, University of California Press, 1979.

Renaissance in the Regions: a new view for England's museums, The Council of Museums, Archives and Libraries, 2001. Available from: http://www.mla.gov.uk/resources/assets//R/rennais_pdf_4382.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2005].

Renaissance museums for changing lives. Diversify! The impact of Positive Action Traineeships, Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, 2004. Available from: http://www.museumsassociation.org/asset_arena/text/on/diversify_mlaevaluation.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2005].

Restoration '92. Conservation, training, materials and techniques: latest developments, preprints to the conference held at the RAI International Exhibition and Congress Centre, Amsterdam, 20th-22nd October, 1992, edited by V. Todd, United Kingdom Institute of Conservation (UKIC), 1995.

Restoration of Tewkesbury Abbey (The), letter to the Times, 6th September 1890 – available from the SPAB archives.

Restoration: Is it Acceptable? edited by A. Oddy, British Museum Occasional Paper No. 99, British Museum, 1994.

Reversibility - Does It Exist? edited by A. Oddy and S. Carroll, British Museum Occasional Paper 135, British Museum Press, 1999.

RHYNE, C. 'The First International Document for Diverse Cultural Values in Conservation: "The Document of Nara", paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, St. Paul, Minnesota, 7th June 2005. Available from: http://www.reed.edu/~crhyne/papers/first.html [Accessed on 25th August 2004].

RICOUER, P. 'The Hermeneutical Function of Distanciation', in *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action, and Interpretation*, Cambridge University Press, 1981.

RIEGL, A. 'The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Its Development', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institution, J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (pp. 69-83).

RIVERS, S. 'Conservation of Japanese lacquer in Western collections: conserving meaning and substance', *The 14th Triennial Meeting The Hague Preprints*, Volume II, International Council of Museums – Committee for Conservation (ICOM-CC), 2005.

RIVERS, S. and N. Umney, *Conservation of Furniture*, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2003.

ROSE, C. 'Conservation of Museum Collections', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, 14.3, 1999. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/newsletters/14_3/feature1_5.html [Accessed on 26th January 2005].

RUSKIN, J. 'The Seven Lamps of Architecture', cited by P. Philippot 'Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines, I', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996 (p.269).

RUSKIN, J. *Selections from the Writings of John Ruskin*, Smith Elder and Co., London, 1865.

RUSKIN, J. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Cassell, 1909.

RUSKIN, J. *The Stones of Venice*, (edited and abridged by J. Links), Pallas Editions, 2001 (originally published in 1851).

RUSKIN, J. *The Storm Cloud of the Nineteenth Century*, 1884. Available from: http://www.uta.edu/English/danahay/storm.html [Accessed on 15th April 2005].

RUSSELL, B. *A History of Western Philosophy*, Counterpoint, 1984 (first published in 1946 by George Allen and Unwin).

S

SCHON, D.A. 'The Reflective Practitioner: how professionals think in action' (1983), cited in S. Lester, 'The Professional Accreditation of Conservator-Restorers: developing a competence-based professional assessment system', in *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 25 (4), 2000 (pp.407 to 419) Available from: http://www.devmts.demon.co.uk/pacr.htm [Accessed on 21st January 2003].

SCHUTZ, A. *Structures of the Life-World*, William Heinemann, 1974.

Science and Heritage, House of Lords Science and Technology Committee, 9th Report of Session 2005-2006. Published by the authority of the House of Lords, London, The Stationary Office Ltd., November 2006.

SIENA, J. 'From the Heart: A Conservation with Paolo and Laura Mora', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, 6.1, 1991. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/resources/newsletter/6_1/mora.html [Accessed on 22nd January 2004].

SMITH, A. *An Inquiry into the Nature and the Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 1776

SMITH, L. *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, 2006 (in press at time of writing).

Smithsonian Institution, *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999. Full text available from: http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/index.htm [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

Sorbonne Declaration (The): Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System, by the four Ministers in charge for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, Paris, 25th May 1998. Available from: http://www.bmbf.de/pub/sorbonne/_declaration.pdf [Accessed on 16th May 2005].

SPALING, H. 'Cultural Sustainable Development: concepts and principles', in *American Scientific Affiliation*, 1996 (pp.1-13). Available from: http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1996/PSCF12-96Spalling.html [Accessed on 8th February 2005].

Stained Glass of William Morris and His Circle: Text and Illustrations, edited by A. Sewter, Yale University Press, 1974.

STANIFORTH, S. 'Conservation: Significance Relevance and Sustainability', in *Tradition and Innovation: Advances in Conservation*. The Forbes Lecture, Melbourne Conference Papers, International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (IIC) Melbourne Congress, 2000 (pp.1-10). Available from: http://www.iiconservation.org/conference/melbrn/melbnpaper.php [Accessed 15th February 2003].

STOVEL, H. 'Working Towards the Nara Document', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995, 'Foreword'.

SUMMERSON, J. 'Royalty, Religion and the Urban Background', in *The Eighteenth Century*, edited by A. Cobban, Thames and Hudson, 1969 (pp.77-94).

SUMMERSON, J. 'Ruskin, Morris, and the "Anti-Scrape" Philosophy', in *Historic Preservation Today: Essays Presented to the Seminar on Preservation and Restoration*, Williamsburg, Virginia, 8th-11th September 1963, University Press of Virginia, 1966.

T

TAMASZEWSKI, A. (an observer at the Nara Conference), in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (p.254).

TAWNEY, R. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, Penguin, 1938 (first published in 1922).

Technological Requirements for Solutions in the Conservation and Protection of Historic Monuments and Archaeological Remains, edited by M. Cassar, Working Paper for the Scientific and Technological Options Assessment (STOA) Unit, Directorate General for Research, European Parliament, PE 303.120/Fin.St., Luxembourg, 2001. Available from: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sustainableheritage/STOA_report.pdf [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

The Desecularization of the World: the Resurgence of Religion in World Politics, edited by P. Berger, Eerdmans, 1999.

THROSBY, D. 'Cultural Capital and Sustainability Concepts in the Economics of Cultural Heritage', in *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage,* The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2002 (pp.101-118). Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

Too Much Stuff, the National Museum Director's Conference, 2003. Available from: http://www.nationalmuseums.org.uk/images/publications/too_much_stuff.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2005].

TORRACA, G. 'The Scientist in Conservation', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, 14.3, 1999. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/newsletters/14_3/feature1_3.html [Accessed on 26th January 2005].

TORRE, M. de la, and R. Mason, *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage,* The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2002 (pp. 3-4). Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

Tradition and Modernity: Key for European Arts and Crafts in the Year 2000, held in Toledo 26th-27th June 1997: Available from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise.html [Accessed on 21st January 2005].

Traditional Building Craft Skills: Skills Needs Analysis of the Built Heritage Sector in England, National Heritage Training Group (NHTG), 2005. Available from: http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/craft_skills_report.pdf [Accessed on 15th December 2005].

TRAUTMANN, C. speaking at the opening of the 3rd International Heritage Exhibition at the Carrousel du Louvre in 1998, in *Traditional crafts: day-to-day excellence*, Number 35, April, 1999, published by Raphaelle Lucas (journalist). Available from: http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/label_france/ENGLISH/DOSSIER/patrimione/09metiers.html [Accessed on 21st January 2005].

TRAVERS, M. *Qualitative Research through Case Studies*, Sage 2001

TRUPIN, D. 'Bottoms Up! (Some Solutions for Supporting Sprung Seats in Historic Upholstered Furniture)', in *Wooden Artefacts Group Postprints,* American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), 2002. Available from: http://aic.stanford.edu/sg/wag/2002/WAG_02_trupin.pdf [Accessed 3rd August 2006].

TSCHUDI-MADSEN. S. *Restoration and Anti-Restoration: A Study in English Restoration Philosophy*, Universitetsforlaget, 1976.

TSENG, R. *The Sceptical Idealist: Michael Oakeshott as a Critic of the Enlightenment*, Imprint Academic, 2003.

U

UKIC, *Code of Ethics and Rules of Practice*, United Kingdom Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (UKIC). Official Documents. Available from: http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/ukic/docs.html [Accessed on 15th April 2006].

Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life, Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), Museums and Cultural Property Division, 2005. Available from: http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/31419198-35C1-4A00-8C12-CB0572EC9B57/0/UnderstandingtheFuture.pdf [Accessed on 30th June 2005].

UNESCO to protect Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), Office of Public Information (OPI). Available from: http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2000/00-48e.shtml [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (World Heritage Convention), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), adopted by the General Conference, Paris, 1972. Available from: http://whc.unesco.org/world_he.htm [Accessed 15th February 2005].

UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 2003. Available from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf [Accessed on 15th February 2004].

UNESCO, *Globalisation and Intangible Cultural Heritage: Opportunities, Threats and Challenges,* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), held in association with the United Nations University, August 2004. Available from: http://www.unu.edu/globalization/intangible-cultural-heritage/ [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

UNESCO, *Living Human Treasures*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 1994. Available from: http://poprtal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=2243&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), World Heritage Centre, February 2005. Available from: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide05-en.pdf [Accessed on 15th March 2006].

UNESCO, *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 1998. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=2226&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 1989. Available from: http://www.unesco.org/culture/laws/paris/html_eng/page1.shtml [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

UNESCO, *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), adopted by the 31st Session of the General Conference of UNESCO, Paris, November, 2001. Available from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf [Accessed 15th February 2005].

UNESCO, *World Heritage List*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). Available from: http://whc.unesco.org/en/map [Accessed on 12th February 2006].

UNESCO, *World Map of the Oral and Intangible Heritages of Humanity*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). Available from: http://www.unesco.org/culture/intangible-heritage/index.htm [Accessed on 12th February 2006].

UNESCO, *Yamoto Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 2004, Japan. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/admin/file_download.php/Yamato_Declaration.pdf?URL_ID=23863&filename=10988742599Yamato_Declaration.pdf&filetype=application%2Fpdf&filesize=35645&name=Yamato_Declaration.pdf&location=user-S/ [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

URBANI, G. 'The Science and Art of Conservation of Cultural Property', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (p.445-450).

V

VACCARO, A. 'Historical Perspective', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (pp. 262-267).

Values and Heritage Conservation, Research Report, edited by E. Avrami, R. Mason, M. de la Torre, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2000. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/valuesrpt.pdf

VATELOT, E. (president of the Cou Neil des M étiers d'Art), in *Traditional crafts: day-to-day excellence*, number 35, April, 1999 published by Raphaelle Lucas (journalist). Available from: http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/label_france/ENGLISH/DOSSIER/patrimione/09metiers.html [Accessed on 21st January 2005].

VENNING, P. 'The Continuing Work of the SPAB', in *From William Morris: Building Conservation and the Arts and Crafts Cult of Authenticity, 1877-1939*, edited by C. Miele, Yale University Press, 2005 (pp.259-297).

Victoria and Albert Museum, Conservation Journal, Vol. 1 (October 1991) to Vol. 47 (July, 2004) available from the Victoria and Albert Museum Library. Volume 48 (October, 2004) and all subsequent publications available online from: http://www.vam.ac.uk/res_cons/conservation/journal

VILLERS, C. 'Post Minimal Intervention', in *The Conservator*, Number 28, 2004.

VINAS, S. *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2005.

VIOLLET-LE-DUC, E. 'Lectures on Architecture II' (1872), cited by M. Bressani, 'Notes on Viollet-le-Duc's Philosophy of History: Dialectics and Technology', in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* (JSAH) XLVIII: pp.327-350, 1989.

VIOLLET-LE-DUC, E.E. *The Foundations of Architecture: Selections from the Dictionnaire Raisonne*, 1868. Reprint translated by K. Whitehead, George Brazier, New York, 1990.

W

WALLERSTEIN, I. *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.

WEBB, M. *Lacquer: Technology and Conservation*, Butterworth Heinemann, 2000.

WEBER, M. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Dover Publications, 2003 (first published in German in 1905 and first translated into English in 1926).

WETERING, E. van de, 'The Surface of Objects and the Museum Style', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Talley (Jr.) and A. Melucco Vaccaro, The Getty Conservation Institution, J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (pp. 415-421).

WHALEN, T. 'Conservation at the New Century', *Getty Conservation Newsletter*, Volume 15, Number 1, 2000. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/resources/newsletter/15_1/feature1.html [Accessed on 22nd January 2003].

WILMERING, A. 'Traditions and trends in furniture conservation', in *Reviews in Conservation*, 2004 (pp.23-37).

Z

ZHAN, G. 'The Particularity of "Authenticity" in the Conservation of Cultural Property in China', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (pp.323-325).

Personal communications

ASHLEY-SMITH, J. *Unpublished communication with the author* (by post), 2nd December 2005.

BAMFORTH, N. *Interview with the author*, Victoria and Albert Museum, 16th March 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

BARCLAY, R. (Bob_Barclay@pch.gc.ca) 18th April 2005. *RE: The Advancement of Conservation,* e-mail to F. Hassard (f.hassard@tiscali.co.uk).

BARRINGTON, M. *Personal communication with the author* (by telephone), 15th March 2005.

BARRINGTON, M. (headoffice@bafra.org.uk) 21st March 2005, *RE: Restoration Crafts and CPD*, e-mail to F. Hassard (fhassard@tiscali.co.uk).

BARRINGTON, M. (headoffice@bafra.org.uk) 24th March 2005, *RE: Restoration Crafts and CPD*, e-mail to F. Hassard (fhassard@tiscali.co.uk).

BARRINGTON, M. *Interview with the author* (by telephone), 7th March 2005 with interviewee's amendments 5th August 2006. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

BECKFORD, L. *Interview with the author*, Beckford Artworks, 4th June 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

BRUGMAN, F. (f.brugman@unesco.org) 14th November 2005. *RE: Intangible heritage preservation,* e-mail to F. Hassard (f.hassard@tiscali.co.uk).

CROSS, J. speaking at the interview: E. Gregory, *Interview with the author*, 23rd May 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

GREGORY, E. *Interview with the author*, London Metropolitan University, with amendments by the interviewee 23rd May 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

GOTTSEGEN, M. *The Decline of Visual Arts Education, and a Remedy*, 2005 (unpublished paper), provided by personal communication with the author.

GRIERSON, M. *Interview with the author* (by telephone), 6th January 2006.

HIGGINS, R. *Interview with the author* (by telephone), 11th October 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

HUNTELY, M. *Interview with the author*, Wiltshire, 16th May 2005 with amendments by the interviewee 28th June 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

HYDE, C. *Interview with the author*, Rycotewood Furniture Centre, 7th April 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

KITCHIN, J. *Interview with the author*, 12th June 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

LESTER, S. (s.lester@devmts.demon.co.uk) 9th May 2005, *RE: Conservation – development of the profession,* e-mail to F. Hassard (fhassard@tiscali.co.uk).

LESTER, S. *Unpublished communication with the author* (by post), 15th October 2005.

LOWENTHAL, D. (lowenthal@lowenthal.free-online.co.uk), 26th November 2005, *RE: Conservation Research,* e-mail to F. Hassard (f.hassard@tiscali.co.uk).

LUCKHURST, B. *Interview with the author*, Little Surrenden Workshops, 12th April 2005 with interviewee's amendments 20th May 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

MANTZ, Dr E. *Interview with the author*, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, United Kingdom, 6th July 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

PADFIELD, S. *Interview with the author* (by telephone), 8th March 2005.

PETERS, A. *Interview with the author* (by telephone), 5th February 2006.

POWELL, C. *Interview with the author*, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 12th April 2005 with interviewee's amendments 12th August 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

RIVERS, S. *Interview with the author*, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, with amendments by the interviewee 3rd June 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

SLADDEN, H. Sladden, *Interview with the author*, The Edward Barnsley Workshops, Petersfield, 10th May 2005 with interviewee's amendments 11th June 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

SLOCOMBE, M. Deputy Secretary, The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) (matthew@spab.org.uk), 16th September 2005, *RE: Conservation Discussion,* e-mail to F. Hassard (f.hassard@tiscali.co.uk).

SMITH, A. *Interview with the author*, Windsor Castle, 18th May 2005 with amendments by the interviewee 26th June 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

TEAR, P. *Interview with the author*, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, United Kingdom, 4th April 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

Other personal communications

ALABONE, G. Frames Department, Tate Gallery, 23rd November 2005.

BLACKWELL, M. *Interview with the author*, St. John's College, Oxford, 7th April 2005. Transcript filed at the Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe.

CHASTANG, Y. Sittingbourne Research Centre, Kent, 26th September 2005.

EVANS, J. The Horological Department, British Museum, 8th November 2005.

EDGE, D. The Wallace Collection (discussion at Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe), 14th June 2006.

GREENHILL, Miss. Morris and Co. Case-work, The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), several visits in January and February 2006.

GREENWOOD, J. Lincoln School of Art and Design, University of Lincoln, 30th June 2005.

HIBBERD, A. Carver and Sculpture, specialising in Grinling Gibbons' strap-work, St. Paul's Cathedral.

LEIGH, D. The Institute of Conservation (ICON), 30th November 2005.
LESTER, S. meeting 23rd October 2005.
NEWMAN, N. Conservation Department, British Museum, 28th October 2005.

Exhibitions

Bucks Chilterns University College, High Wycombe, Degree Show, 10th June 2005 and 15th June 2006.
City and Guilds of London Art School, London, Degree Show, 23rd June 2005.
Manchester College of Arts and Technology (MANCAT), Arts and Creative Crafts End of Year Show (including conservation-restoration), 19th June 2005.
Royal College of Art, Victoria and Albert Museum, Degree Show, 27th June 2006.
Rycotewood Furniture Centre, Oxford and Cherwell Valley College, Oxford, Student Show, 21st June 2005.
Sir John Cass Department of Art, Media and Design, London Metropolitan University, Summer Show, 26th June 2005 and 17th June 2006
Textile Conservation Centre, Winchester School of Art, University of Southampton, Winchester, Open Day Visit, 24th June 2005.
Tower of London Show, 17th July 2006.
York College, Furniture Exhibition, The Guildhall, St Helen's Square, York, 20th June 2005.

Site visits

All Saint's Church, York
Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, Oxford
Balliol College, Oxford
Bodleian Library, Oxford
British Museum
Church of St. Michael le Belfrey, York
Darwin Centre, Queen's Gate, London
Edward Barnsley Workshops, Petersfield
Guildhall, London
Houses of Parliament, Westminster
Lincoln Castle
Lincoln Cathedral
Little Surrenden Workshops, Kent
Manchester College, Oxford
Natural History Museum
Radcliffe Camera, Bodleian, Oxford
Royal Albert Hall
Sion House, Middlesex
St. Benedict's Church, York
St. John's Church, York
St. John's College, Oxford
St. Leonard's, York
St. Margaret's Church, Westminster
St. Martin le Grand, York
St. Martin's Church, York
St. Mary the Virgin's Spire, Oxford
St. Mary's Abbey, York
St. Mary's, London
St. Paul's Cathedral
Trinity College, Oxford
Victoria and Albert Museum
Wells Cathedral
Westminster Abbey

Windsor Castle
York Minster Cathedral

Conferences / seminars attended

6th European Commission Conference on Sustaining Europe's Cultural Heritage: From Research to Policy, held at the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, Westminster, London, United Kingdom, 1st-3rd September 2004, Centre for Sustainable Heritage, University College London. Information available from: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/sustainableheritage/conference-proceedings/session-summaries/cortines.html

Period Detail: Interpreting historic locations and their collections, Museums Association Conference, Tower of London, 17th July 2006.

Royal College of Arts / Victoria and Albert Museum Conservation Student Symposium, Lecture Theatre 1, Royal College of Art, Kensington Gore, London, 9th May 2005.

20th-Century Furniture Research Group, Furniture Research Centre, Faculty of Design, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, High Wycombe, 13th November 2004.

BAFRA 10th Student Section Conference, 'Why not this way?' Oxford and Cherwell Valley College, Oxford, 14th March 2005.

Nigel Seeley Memorial Symposium, Faraday Lecture Theatre, Royal Institution of Great Britain, London, 27th May 2005.

Other useful websites

ArtWatch International – information available from: http://www.artwatchinternational.org/

ArtWatch UK – information available from: http://www.artwatch.org.uk/

Best in Heritage – information available from: http://www.thebestinheritage.com/home.php

Council for Research in Values and Philosophy (RVP) – information available from: http://www.crvp.org/

Crafts Council, United Kingdom – information available from: http://www.craftscouncil.org.uk/about/index.html

European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers' Organisations (ECCO) – documents available from: http://www.ecco-eu.info/

European Network for Conservation-Restoration Education (ENCoRE) – documents available from: http://www.encore-edu.org/encore/DesktopDefault.aspx

Institute of Conservation (ICON) – documents available from: http://www.icon.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1&Itemid=2

International Council of Museums – Conservation Committee (ICOM-CC) – documents available from: http://icon-cc.icom.museum/Home/

International Council of Museums (ICOM) – documents available from: http://icom.museum/mission.html

International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP) – information available from: http://206.191.7.19/index_e.shtml

Local Heritage Initiative – Skills for the 21st-Century – information available from: http://www.lhi.org.uk/heritage_matters/editorial_archive/skills_for_the_2.html

Regional Centre for the Safeguarding, Revitalization and Diffusion of Traditional Culture and Folklore Heritage in Europe – information available from: http://www.folkline.hu/index_e.html

Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) – documents available from: http://www.spab.org.uk/edcuation_scholarship_history.html

Stan Lester Developments – documents available from: http://www.devmts.demon.co.uk

UNESCO programme in safeguarding intangible heritage. Information available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=2225&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

UNESCO, Guidelines for the establishment of National 'Living Human Treasures' Systems – information available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/file_download.php/1422690320114549c199903cf8ba93f9Guidelines_lht.pdf

William Morris Internet Archive – information available from:
   http://www.marxists.org/archive/morris/works/index.htm
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) – information available from:
   http://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/

Suggested further reading

ADAMS, J. *Paul Tillich's Philosophy of Culture, Science and Religion*, University Press of America, 1983.

ADORNO, T. *Against Epistemology*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1982.

ADORNO, T. and M. Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Verso, 1986.

ADORNO, T. *The Culture Industry*, Routledge, 1991.

ARENDT, H. *The Human Condition*, University of Chicago Press, 1999 (first published in 1959).

ASHBEE, C.R. *An Endeavour towards the Teachings of John Ruskin and William Morris*, The Essex House Press, 1901.

BARTHES, R. 'The Death of the Author', from *Image, Music, Text,* 1977. Available from: http://faculty.smu.edu/dfoster/theory/Barthes.htm [Accessed on 1st July 2005].

BARTHES, R. *Mythologies*, Cape, London, 1972 (first published in 1957).

BEAR, W. 'Should art or science be preservation's guiding metaphor?' *An examination of historic preservation's underlying philosophy*. Supplied by the British Library (undated).

BEARDSLEY, M. and W. Wimsatt, 'The Intentional Fallacy', *Sewanee Review*, Volume 54, pp.468-488, 1946, reprinted in *Aesthetics: A Critical Anthology*, edited by R. Sclafani, G. Dickie and R. Roblin, Bedford Books, 1989.

BEJCZY, I. *Erasmus and the Middle Ages: The Historical Consciousness of a Christian Humanist*, Brill, 2001.

BOULTON, W. *The Romance of the British Museum*, Sampson Low, London, (undated).

BURLEIGH, M. *Earthly Powers: Religion and Politics in Europe from the French Revolution to the Great War*, Harper/Collins, 2005.

CARR, H. *The Philosophy of Benedetto Croce: The Problem of Art and History*, Macmillan, 1917.

CHOAY, F. *The Invention of the Historic Monument* (translated by L. O'Connell), Cambridge University Press, 2001.

CHOMSKY, N. *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*, Penguin, 2004.

CORMACK, P. *Heritage in Danger*, Quartet Books, 1978.

Cultural Memory and Historical Consciousness in the German-speaking World Since 1500. The Fragile Tradition: Vol. 1, edited by C. Emden and D. Midgley, Peter Lang, 2004.

CURRUTHERS, A. *Edward Barnsley and his Workshop*, White Cockade, 1992.

Eighteenth Century (The), edited by A. Cobban, Thames and Hudson, London, 1969.

ELLUL, J. *The Subversion of Christianity* (translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley), Eerdmans, 1986.

ELLUL, J. *The Technological Society*, Random House, 1967.

ELLUL, J. *The Technological System*, Continuum, 1980.

FARRELL, R. *Feyerabend and Scientific Values: Tightrope-Walking Rationality*, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

FAYERABEND, P. *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*, Verso Books, 1993.

FEENBERG, A. and A. Hannay. *Technology and the Politics of Knowledge*, Indiana Series in the Philosophy of Technology, Indiana University Press, 1995.

FEENBERG, A. *Critical Theory of Technology*, Oxford University Press, 1991.

FOUCAULT, M. *The Order of Things*, Routledge, 2001.

FOUCAULT, M. *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Routledge, 2002.

FOUCAULT, M. *The Essential Works: Subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984*, Vol.1, edited by P. Rabinow, Penguin, 2000.

FRANKS, F. *Polywater*, MIT Press, 1981.

GANGJEE, D. *Geographical Indications Protection for Handicrafts under TRIPS*, M.Phil Thesis, Faculty of Law, University of Oxford, 2002. Available from: http://users.ox.ac.uk/~edip/gangjee.pdf [Accessed on 16th December 2005].

GEERTZ, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Fontana, 1973.

GREENSTEAD, M. *The Arts and Crafts in the Cotswolds*, Allan Sutton, 1996 (first published in 1993).

HAMPSON, N. *The Enlightenment*, Penguin, 1968.

HEIDEGGAR, M. *The question concerning technology and other essays* (translated by W. Lovitt), Harper and Row, 1977.

HOBSBAWM, E. *The Age of Revolution 1789-1848*, Peter Smith, 1999 (first published in 1962).

HORKHEIMER, M. *The Eclipse of Reason*, Continuum, 2001 (first published in 1947).

HUSSERL, E. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, North-western University Press, 1970.

JOAD, C. *Philosophy for our Times*, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1940.

LETHABY, W. *The Study and Practice of Artistic Crafts*, London, 1901.

LUCIE-SMITH, E. *The Story of Craft*, Phaidon, Oxford, 1981.

Making Their Mark: Central School of Arts, 1896-1966, edited by S. Backemeyer, A. & C. Black, 2000.

MANDEL, R. 'Copyrighting Art Restorations', *Bulletin, Copyright Society of the USA*, Volume 28, Number 3, 1981.

MUMFORD, L. *Technics and Civilisation*, Routledge, 1934.

MUMFORD, L. *The Condition of Man*, Secker and Warburg, 1944.

NAYLOR, G. *The Arts and Crafts Movement*, Studio Vista, London, 1971.

PHILLIPS, D. *Exhibiting Authenticity*, Manchester University Press, 1997.

Philosophy and Technology: Readings in the Philosophical Problems of Technology, edited by C. Mitcham and R. Mackey, Free Press, 1983.

PIVCEVIC, E. *Husserl and Phenomenology*, Hutchinson, 1970.

POGGEMILLER, D. 'Hermeneutics and Epistemology: Hirsch's Author Centred Meaning, Radical Historicism and Gadamer's *Truth and Method*', in *PREMISE*, Volume II, Number 8 / (p.10), 1997. Available from: http://capo.org/premise/95/sep/p950810.html [Accessed on 24th October 2003].

POSTMAN, N. *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology*, Vintage, 1993.

Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge (The), edited by J-F Lyotard, Manchester University Press, 1984.

PYE, D. *The Nature and Art of Workmanship*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Rethinking Objectivity, edited by A. Megill, Duke University Press, 1994.

RORTY, R. *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth: Philosophical Papers: Volume 1*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

SAUL, J. *Voltaire's Bastards: The Dictatorship of Reason in the West*, The Free Press, 1992.

SCHWARZER, M. 'Myths of Permanence and Transience in the Discourse on Historic Preservation in the United States', in *Journal of Architectural Education* (pp.2-11), 1994.

STILL, A. *The Future of the Past*, Picador, 2002.

UNESCO, *World Culture Report: Cultural Diversity, Conflict and Pluralism*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 2000.

W.R. Lethaby (1857-1931): Architecture, Design and Education, edited by S. Backemeyer and T. Gronberg, Lund Humphries, 1984.

WEIR, R. *William Richard Lethaby*, London 1938

WILLIAMS, R. *Culture and Society 1780-1950*, Penguin, 1961 (first published by Chatto Windus in 1958).