Part III

Culture, Conflict and Inheritance: the Tangible and the Intangible

It was argued in Part I and Part II of this thesis that the tangible and the intangible heritages both support diverse interpretations of (and motives for) preserving the past, reflecting the dualistic nature of the heritage field. It was also argued that each paradigmatic domain appears to come together (and/or fracture) over the concept of authenticity in the practice of restoration and that this tends to be reflected in the materials and techniques and the value attributed to this. Recent movements with respect to intangible heritage – now understood as the overarching paradigm through which all heritages are perceived – has challenged traditional notions of authenticity formerly based solely on materials and form but which now might also be understood in terms of *process*.

Part III of this thesis discusses, in the first instance, the C19th. heritage Preservation Movement in the United Kingdom – founded *prior to* the discipline of scientific conservation (which emerged in the first quarter of the succeeding century). It argues that the United Kingdom has a unique historical trajectory with respect to the competing claims of the tangible and intangible heritages and that this (similarly) centred around the issue of restoration, authenticity and the role of the traditional arts and crafts (and therefore *process*). It is suggested that this 'pre-scientific' period in many ways anticipates recent developments in global heritage preservation theory – particularly with respect to the safeguarding of the intangible heritage (which formed the substance of Part II). This is shown to have influenced thinking in the United Kingdom in recent times (most noticeably in architectural and environmental preservation) but is a view which has not yet been formally sanctioned in (for example) accordance with the documentation recently published by, or in association with, UNESCO.

Part III also considers how these wider movements are posing a challenge to traditional museology (a major influence on the professional practice of

conservation), leading to the re-definition of the role of museums, many of which are now looking to re-align their policies and practices with respect to the intangible heritage (accepting the view that this now defines the overarching paradigm through which all heritages are understood). The recognition of intangible heritage (and authenticity as an aspect of this) inevitably raises questions about restoration within museums and, by extension, the professional practice of conservation.

Part III comprises one chapter, Chapter 3.1: 'Conservation-Restoration in the United Kingdom'.

3.1. Conservation-Restoration in the United Kingdom

This chapter argues that the United Kingdom has a unique historical trajectory with respect to the competing claims of the tangible and intangible heritages by examining the development of the C19th. Heritage Preservation Movement in the United Kingdom. Particular attention is given to the *thinking* behind the leading protagonists which later materialised in the founding of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) and the Arts and Crafts Movement. It is argued that the founding ideologies – through its consideration of the intangible (and authenticity as an aspect of this) – in many ways anticipated the 'post-modern' conception of 'heritage'. It is, therefore, further argued that thinking about intangible heritage existed in the United Kingdom *long before* 're-emerging' in (for example) the recent work of UNESCO.[1]

However, in this connection, the second part of this chapter considers how international developments concerning intangible heritage has influenced our conception of 'heritage' in the United Kingdom in *recent* times. It suggests that the importance historically attributed to it by the arts and crafts was consistent with the thinking behind the C19th. Heritage Preservation Movement which was driven by an aspiration to sustain certain ways of life nominally associated with traditional arts/crafts practices. And that it is the importance conferred upon certain traditional forms of knowledge and expression that in many ways anticipates the post-modern synthesis between the tangible and intangible heritages – discussed in Part II of this thesis.

The final section of this chapter discusses how these wider international movements (led by UNESCO) have changed the role of museums in recent times – as reflected in the emergence of (so-called) 'Inclusive Museology'. It suggests that the idea of authentic restoration has significant implications with respect to the stock of knowledge in the field – in particular with regard to the value attributed to this and the provision to ensure its safeguarding, its enhancement and its transference to future generations as a legitimate aspect of cultural inheritance.

---

[1] Although the term 'intangible' was not hitherto coined, the thinking behind the concept did not originate in Marrakech, Morocco in the 1970's – the impetus behind UNESCO's concern about intangible heritage in recent times – as discussed in Section 2.1.1: 'UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972 (World Heritage Convention)'.

Chapter 3.1 consists of the following sub-sections: 3.1.1: 'The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) and the Arts and Crafts Movement'; 3.1.2: 'Recent developments with respect to intangible heritage'; and 3.1.3: 'Museums and intangible heritage'. This is followed by 3.1.4: 'Conclusion to Part III'.

3.1.1: The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) and the Arts and Crafts Movement

Authenticity and the design of alterations and repairs to historical architecture – generically known as 'restoration' – fuelled vigorous debate in the United Kingdom in the mid-C19th.[2] One of the most well-known critics of restoration was John Ruskin who, for much of the second half of the C19th, was the dominating figure in the English world of art. His views on restoration were made known in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, first published in 1849.[3] However, in order to understand Ruskin's thinking it is first necessary to consider his influences – in particular Augustus Pugin (1812-1852) and Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881).

Pugin was an English-born architect, designer and theorist of design. He was an advocate of Gothic architecture which he believed to be the true Christian form of architecture and is today perhaps best remembered for his work on churches and the Houses of Parliament, London. Pugin (a Roman Catholic convert) was filled with a fervent desire to express his faith through architecture. He regarded the period of 1280-1340 as the apex of human history, when people expressed their faith through the creative arts. In support of his arguments in favour of authentic Gothic, Pugin produced his master work, *Contrasts* in 1836 in which he contrasted the glories of Medieval architecture and its civilised society with the tired 'pagan' Classical constructions that were the product of the degraded, modern, industrial society and secular culture.[4] Pugin abhorred, for example, the Classical work of James Wyatt and

---

[2]   The author wishes to point out here that he is well aware of the complexity of the issues raised in this section and that one section alone cannot do justice to this. Nonetheless, it was felt necessary to pick up on *some* of the key influences on C19th. heritage preservation – too important to omit, especially in light of recent developments with respect to the emergence of intangible heritage on the international heritage scene.

[3]   J. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Cassell edition, 1909.

[4]   A. Pugin, *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*

his early C19th. contemporaries who, for him, merely copied the *form* of Gothic style but used inferior materials or supported their work with iron.[5]

In his second major work, *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture*, Pugin revealed the principles of the medieval builder and the enlightened skill of their craftsmen. He favoured naturalism in design and the symbolic meaning of every detail of construction and called for the revival of the forgotten crafts.[6] In this sense, it can be argued that Pugin worked for a restoration (perhaps most appropriately understood as a form of *restitution*).

As well as being influenced by the architectural theories of Pugin, as a thinker Ruskin confessed himself the pupil of Thomas Carlyle.[7] Carlyle was a prominent writer whose work appealed to many Victorians who were grappling with the scientific, technological and political changes that threatened the traditional social order. Carlyle's thinking was heavily influenced by German transcendental philosophy – in particular the work of Fichte.[8] In his book *Past and Present*,[9] Carlyle compared the lives of the dissipated C19th. man and a medieval abbot. For Carlyle, the monastic community was unified by human and spiritual values, while modern culture deified impersonal economic forces and abstract theories of human 'rights' and natural 'laws'. Carlyle believed that communal values were collapsing into isolated individualism and ruthless *laissez-faire* capitalism, justified by what he

---

Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture; this combined version published by Spire Books 2003 – see preface.

[5] As a note of interest: it was Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768), a German art historian and archaeologist, who became famous for founding the 'Greek revival'; an art movement based on Greek art that influenced the rise of the Neoclassical movement during the late C18th. Winckelmann was also one of the founders of modern scientific archaeology and first applied the categories of style on a large, systematic basis to the history of art. The 'Neoclassical Style' emerged in England from about the early C18th. – led by Colen Campbell (1676-1729) as part of an international ideological movement supporting 'noble simplicity'; see J. Summerson, 'Royalty, Religion and the Urban Background', in *The Eighteenth Century*, edited by A. Cobban, Thames and Hudson, 1969 (p.86).

[6] A. Pugin, *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*, Spire Books 2003 – see preface.

[7] J. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Cassell, 1909 – editor's note.

[8] As a reminder to the reader: Cesare Brandi's thinking was also influenced by Johan Fichte, but via Georg Hegel. However, crucially, Brandi's methodological approach to restoration was also influenced by Benedetto Croce who believed that all of reality could be reduced to purely logical concepts. In so being, Croce rejected all forms of religion as not logical enough and came to view most metaphysics in the same manner.

[9] T. Carlyle, *Past and Present*, New York University Press, 1977 (first published in 1843).

called the 'dismal science' of economics.[10]

In *Sign of the Times*, Carlyle criticised what he called the 'Mechanical Age':

> Were we required to characterise this age of ours by any single epithet, we should be tempted to call it, not an Heroical, Devotional, Philosophical, or Moral Age, but, above all others, the Mechanical Age. It is the Age of Machinery, in every outward and inward sense of that word; the age which, with its whole undivided might, forwards, teaches and practises the great art of adapting means to ends. Nothing is now done directly, or by hand; all is by rule and calculated contrivance. For the simplest operation, some helps and accompaniments, some cunning abbreviating process is in readiness. Our old modes of exertion are all discredited, and thrown aside. On every hand, the living artisan is driven from his workshop, to make room for a speedier, inanimate one.[11]

Importantly, it was not just the emphasis on economic expediency and material utilitarianism that characterised the 'modern' age that concerned Carlyle but also the effect this was having on mankind's moral and spiritual well-being which he attributed to science:

> …let us observe how the mechanical genius of our time has diffused itself into quite other provinces. Not the external and physical alone is now managed by machinery, but the internal and spiritual also. …For the same habit regulates not our modes of action alone, but our modes of thought and feeling. Men are grown mechanical in head and in heart, as well as in hand. ...The science of the age, in short, is physical, chemical, and physiological; in all shapes mechanical. …our whole Metaphysics

---

[10] 'Dismal science' was an often derogatory name for economists devised by Carlyle. It was an inversion of the phrase 'gay science' (meaning 'life-enhancing knowledge' *not* to be confused with 'homosexual'). This was a familiar expression of the time, and was later adopted as the title of a book by Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science* (first published in 1882) in which he expressed the view that 'God is dead' – which became a metaphor for the perceived moral decline of the period.

[11] T. Carlyle, 'Sign of the Times', *The Collected Works of Thomas Carlyle*, Chapman and Hall, 1858 (first published in the Edinburgh Review in 1829). This version available from: http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/carlyle/signs1.html [Accessed 15th May 2006].

itself, from Locke's[12] time downward, has been physical; not a spiritual philosophy, but a material one. …the outward, cultivated exclusively on mechanical principles; the inward, finally abandoned, because, cultivated on such principles, it is found to yield no result, sufficiently indicates the intellectual bias of our time, its all-pervading disposition towards that line of inquiry.

…By our skill in Mechanism, it has come to pass, that in the management of external things we excel all other ages; while in whatever respects the pure moral nature, in true dignity of soul and character, we are perhaps inferior to most civilised ages. …men have lost their belief in the Invisible, and believe, and hope, and work only in the Visible. …This is not a Religious age. Only the material, the immediately practical, not the divine and spiritual, is important to us. The infinite, absolute character of Virtue has passed into a finite, conditional one; it is no longer a worship of the Beautiful and Good; but a calculation of the Profitable.[13]

Carlyle is here describing a hermeneutical shift in Western thought from the 'internal and spiritual' (or intangible) to the 'external and physical' (or tangible) – which may also be described as a shift from a *hermeneutic interius* to a *hermeneutic extrinsecus*, brought about by the emergence of scientific epistemology.

With respect to this, Carlyle also expressed the effect of the 'Mechanical Age' on the intellect:

…Our first question with regard to any object is not, What is it? but, How is it? We are no longer instinctively driven to apprehend, and lay to heart, what is Good and Lovely, but rather to inquire, as onlookers, how it is produced, whence it comes, whither it goes. …It is by tangible, material considerations that we are guided, not by inward and spiritual.

---

[12] John Locke (1632-1704) was an English philosopher, widely regarded as one of the most influential Enlightenment thinkers. In epistemology Locke has often been classified as a British Empiricist but he was also a leading theorist of 'political economy'; the so-called 'dismal science'.

[13] T. Carlyle, 'Sign of the Times', *Collected Works*, 1858

…In all senses, we worship and follow after Power; which may be called a physical pursuit. …This deep, paralysed subjection to physical objects comes not from Nature, but from our own unwise mode of viewing Nature.[14]

Carlyle is here expressing his distain for an age of (so-called) 'scientistic materialism' which may (arguably) be described as reflecting an epistemological shift from an historically-transcendent understanding towards a scientific *knowledge of what* – manufactured by the 'disinterested onlooker'; in other words, as 'non-participating' and/or 'metaphysically neutral' observers. Such knowledge intentionally lacks perspective and might (thus) also be described as derived from nowhere in particular. One can argue then, that the emergence of scientific thinking at this time represents a kind of methodological departure from the past and thus from continuity – like a kind of intellectual exodus.

The combined influence of Pugin and Carlyle is apparent in Ruskin's literary style which was often elevated, subliminal, metaphysical and theological in tone. Like Carlyle, Ruskin criticised the rampant industrialism of his age. Aside from his own views on the perceived moral decline of the age, in a lecture in 1884, 'The Storm Cloud of the Nineteenth Century' Ruskin perceptively described what he believed to be the environmental costs of mechanical progress which he had observed over forty years between 1831 and 1871, as follows:

[I]… propose to bring to your notice a series of cloud phenomena. …This wind is the plague wind of the eighth decade of years in the nineteenth-century; a period which will assuredly be recognised in future meteorological history as one of phenomena hitherto unrecorded in the courses of nature, and characterised pre-eminently by the almost, ceaseless action of this calamitous wind. …For the sky is covered with grey cloud – not rain-cloud, but a dry black veil which no ray of sunshine can pierce. …It looks partly as if it were made of poisonous smoke; very possibly it may be: there are at least two hundred furnace chimneys in a square of two miles on every side of me. …By the plague-wind every

---

[14]   T. Carlyle, 'Sign of the Times', *Collected Works*, 1858

breath of air you draw is polluted half round the world; in a London fog the air itself is pure, though you chose to mix up dirt with it, and choke yourself with your own nastiness.[15]

This is one of the earliest commentaries on Environmentalism. Ruskin's concerns for the environment and his critical disposition towards the 'Mechanical Age' – which, for him, represented the progressive alienation of mankind from nature – informed his understanding of cultural heritage preservation; the traditional arts and crafts were sanctified in the process. Among Ruskin's more public outbursts were his criticisms of the restoration work of French architect Eugene Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc – which will be taken up later in this section.

Again, inspired by the writings of Pugin and Carlyle and by the philosophical transcendentalism of the period (especially Hegel), Ruskin wrote *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*[16] and *The Stones of Venice*;[17] these two books were of great importance with respect to the practice of restoration. In *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, for example, Ruskin condemns the restoration of the day in the following terms:

Neither by the public, nor by those who have the care of public monuments, is the true meaning of the word restoration understood. It means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the thing destroyed. Do not let us deceive ourselves in this important matter; it is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture. That which I have above insisted upon as the life of the whole, that spirit which is given only by the hand of the workman, never can be recalled. Another spirit may be given by another time, and it is then a new building; but the spirit of the dead workman cannot be summoned up, and commanded to direct other hands, and other

15   J. Ruskin, *The Storm Cloud of the Nineteenth Century*, 1884. Available from:
     http://www.uta.edu/English/danahay/storm.html [Accessed on 15th April 2005].
16   J. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, 1849.
17   J. Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice*, 1851.

thoughts.[18]

This is clearly quite a polemical statement which had a major influence on the development of the heritage preservation movement in the C20th.[19] It is, therefore, imperative to understand just what 'restoration' implied in Ruskin's time, as Summerson has explained:

> What Ruskin mainly understood by restoration was a process very frequently employed in the 1840's and 1850's which consisted in the tooling away at decayed stone to reach a new, firm, and smooth surface. Naturally in this process mouldings were distorted out of recognition, while all marks of handling and age were lost. And this loss of the visible marks of antiquity [i.e. age-value] was to Ruskin the most dreadful fate which could befall any building [my comment].[20]

From this we can understand that restoration then (which often also involved complete re-design)[21] was how we might understand complete reconstruction today and that Ruskin was no less critical of restoration in the *subtracting from* sense of the meaning – which later became known as the 'Anti-Scrape' philosophy (as the title of Summerson's paper alludes to). This was made clearer by Philippot in referring to the same passage (cited above) and inserting his own comments in the following way:

> Neither the public, nor by those who have the care of public monuments, is the true meaning of the word restoration [*meaning the reconstruction, whether total or partial, suggested by revivalism*] understood. It means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with

[18]   J. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Cassell, 1909 (first published in 1849) (p.269).
[19]   P. Burman, 'A Question of Ethics', in *The Conservation and Repair of Ecclesiastical Buildings*, 1995. Available from: http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/ethics/ethics.htm [Accessed on 18th April 2004].
[20]   J. Summerson, 'Ruskin, Morris, and the "Anti-Scrape" Philosophy', in *Historic Preservation Today: Essays Presented to the Seminar on Preservation and Restoration*, Williamsburg, Virginia, September 8-11, 1963, University Press of Virginia, 1966.
[21]   For photographic examples of C19th. ideas for re-designs see: *The Future of the Past: Attitudes to Conservation 1174-1974*, edited by J. Fawcett, Thames and Hudson, London, 1976.

false description of the thing destroyed. Do not let us deceive ourselves in this important matter; it is impossible, as impossible to raise the dead, to restore [*meaning reconstruct*] anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture. That which I have above insisted upon as the life of the whole, that spirit which is given only by the hand and eye of the workman, can never be recalled. Another spirit may be given by another time, and it is then a new building; but the spirit of the dead workman cannot be summoned up, and commanded to direct other hands, and other thoughts' [*Philippot's comments are bracketed in italics*].[22]

Now, what needs to be clarified here is that the distinction Philippot makes between restoration (i.e. reconstruction) and the post-Ruskinian idea of restoration (which essentially meant maintenance and repair) *did* in fact necessitate a revival of the traditional arts and crafts. To that end, William Morris (guided by Ruskin) founded the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) in 1877. It does, however, need pointing out that Philippot was primarily concerned with the *most artistically and historically substantial aspects of a work of fine art* (as was Cesare Brandi) and (perhaps) less so with the general problems of structural maintenance and repair such as, replacing rainwater pipes, or roof-tiles, or perished (un-sculpted) stone work.[23]

However, neither Ruskin nor Morris (despite his early apprenticeship) was architect or engineer:

The ethics of preservation which Ruskin and Morris established was wholly concerned with the treatment of buildings of great age, the protection of their substance and their *strictly honest repair*. When the society [SPAB] went into action this protective treatment had to be seen in a more technical light than either Ruskin or Morris understood… [*my*

---

[22] J. Ruskin, 'The Seven Lamps of Architecture', cited by Paul Philippot 'Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines, I', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price (*et al*) The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996 (p.269).

[23] Although Brandi did speak of a work of art's 'indivisible oneness' it is not always clear what kind of art this specifically referred to.

italics].[24]

Consequently, Ruskin and Morris (whose ideas might be described as primitive – frequently leading to far greater problems) were not in a position to provide an adequate solution to the fact that restoration (in the repair / maintenance sense) became an inevitable necessity in the C20th. This was largely because of the damaging effects of pollution (which Ruskin had in some sense foreseen decades earlier in his 'Storm Cloud of the Nineteenth Century') and because of the growth of the heritage preservation movement (which, of course, today extends way beyond medieval architecture). It is important, therefore, to not interpret their ideas about restoration in too literal a sense.

The publication of Ruskin's *The Stones of Venice* – in particular his essay 'The Nature of Gothic' – was to prove a decisive factor in the practice of conservation and restoration that emerged in the latter part of the C19th; its own 'pre-scientific' period. In this essay Ruskin discussed the various moral or imaginative elements which composed the inner spirit of Gothic architecture, in terms such as: 'savageness', 'changefulness', 'naturalism', 'grotesque', 'rigidity' and 'redundance'.[25] Similarly to Carlyle, Ruskin believed that: 'The charts of the world which have been drawn up by modern science have thrown into a narrow space the expression of a vast amount of knowledge…'[26]

What then, can be made of this? Ruskin appears to be suggesting here the 'closure' of thought caused by modern science (which might also be described as 'scientistic reductionism') – and perhaps also (arguably) the loss of 'tacit knowledge'. In reaction to this, Ruskin identified with what he believed to be the free expression of the Christian spirit in the Gothic workman:

> Whenever the workman is utterly enslaved, the parts of the building must

---

[24] J. Summerson, 'Ruskin, Morris, and the "Anti-Scrape" Philosophy', in *Historic Preservation Today: Essays Presented to the Seminar on Preservation and Restoration*, Williamsburg, Virginia, September 8-11, 1963, University Press of Virginia, 1966. I have emphasised *strictly honest repair* because this is important to the way in which materials and techniques are used in restoration (in the *adding to* sense) which will be discussed later in this section.

[25] J. Ruskin (edited and abridged by J.G. Links), *The Stones of Venice*, Pallas Editions, 2001 (p.142).

[26] J. Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice*, Pallas, 2001 (p.143).

of course be absolutely like each other; for the perfection of his execution can only be reached by exercising him in doing only one thing, and giving him nothing else to do. The degree to which the workman is degraded may be thus known at a glance…if, as in Gothic work, there is perpetual change both in design and execution; the workman must have been altogether set free.[27]

It is apparent then, that Ruskin was criticising the 'alienated'[28] modern worker who he believed had become 'mechanised' in thought and action – leading to the de-spiritualisation and subsequent de-sublimation of his faculties. The influence of Pugin and Carlyle here is undeniable. One can argue that this was a process of 'sciencing'; or 'naturalisation' in philosophical terms. For Ruskin, it was the nature of the material needs of the time and the means used to satisfy them which, in the modern 'political economy', were largely dictated by the mechanisms of the State. Consequently, the artist or craftsman was no longer in a one-to-one relationship with his work; he was reduced to a mere mechanical contrivance resulting in his disenfranchisement – following what was essentially government-controlled procedure.[29] Ruskin believed that the modern 'alienated' worker was not fit to restore monuments of a bygone age because the unity – i.e. the 'subject / object' (and arguably 'tangible / intangible') synthesis – was lost:

> …it is again no question of expediency [economic expediency] or feeling whether we shall preserve the buildings of past times or not. We have no right whatever to touch them. They are not ours. They belong partly to those who built them, and partly to all the generations of mankind who are to follow us [my comment].[30]

In fact, Ruskin believed that the very worst Gothic architecture was that:

---

[27] J. Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice*, Pallas, 2001 (pp.145-146).
[28] The alienated (or lacerated) consciousness is a Hegelian concept.
[29] It was for this reason that William Morris became politically active. The author wishes to stress here that 'authenticity' in the heritage sector is the object of this study – not overthrowing the government.
[30] J. Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Cassell, 1909 (first published in 1849). Curiously, the present generation are not mentioned in this statement. This view of heritage is *de facto* for the 'non-living'.

…in which mechanism has taken the place of design… so that, on the whole, very accurate workmanship is to be deemed a bad sign; and if there is nothing remarkable about the building but its precision, it may be passed at once with contempt.[31]

This understanding led to his denunciation of the architectural 'laws' of Classical architecture which he saw as analogous to a process of manufacture, than real artistic creativity:

Exactly so far as architecture works on known rules, and from given models, it is not art, but a manufacture; and it is, of the two procedures, rather less rational (because more easy) to copy capitals or mouldings from Phidias, and call ourselves architects, than to copy heads and hands from Titian and call ourselves painters.[32]

For Ruskin then, the naturalistic qualities of Gothic architecture were represented in *the honest use of natural materials – worked by hand*,[33] while Christian humility was shown in the form and the roughness (or imperfection) of the work (by contrast to Classical 'pride' in exactitude). For him, this was central to its living vitality and noble character (and, therefore, also its integrity). This way of thinking became enshrined in the philosophy of the C19th. Arts and Crafts Movement which was established shortly after the founding of the SPAB. It can, therefore, be argued that both the SPAB and the Arts and Crafts Movement were part of the same heritage preservation movement – as conceived by Ruskin and Morris. The 'spirit' of this philosophy embodied respect for the environment (because it was non-industrial and therefore non-exploitative) and the desire to protect historical monuments while venerating the historical arts and crafts (but not just in terms of *process* but as a way of life and for everything that they had come to symbolise in the modern world).[34]

---

[31] J. Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice*, Pallas, 2001 (p.169). The reference here to 'mechanism' is undoubtedly Carlylian.

[32] J. Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice*, Pallas, 2001 (pp.148).

[33] According to Ruskin, Titan and Michelangelo would refuse to use modern technology in their artworks. To do so, would separate the artist from the 'flesh and senses of humanity' – see for instance, A. O'Hear, 'Art and Technology: An Old Tension', in *Philosophy and Technology*, edited by R. Fellows, Cambridge University Press, 1995 (pp.143-158).

[34] This is remarkably consistent with UNESCO's interpretation of intangible heritage.

Now, with respect to the practice of restoration (understood in terms of *strictly honest repair*), Philip Webb and William Lethaby took the lead role. According to Summerson:

> [Webb]: …was of course what Morris was not, a professional architect…
> with a love and knowledge of the crafts unequalled in his time. It was
> Webb who took Ruskin's romantic and technically rather horrifying ideas
> of wooden props and iron hoops and devised more seemly, permanent,
> and effective, but also no less frank and honest substitutes.[35]

Much of the expertise necessary to maintain the architectural heritage was cultivated through the establishment of the Arts and Crafts Movement which had been growing since the mid-C19th. through the founding of various training schools and guilds. The Central School of Arts and Crafts, for example, was founded by Lethaby in 1896. In addition to this were the Century Guild of Artists (1882); the Art Workers Guild (1884); the School of Handicraft (1887); the Guild of Handicraft (1888) and the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society (1888).[36]

There were high minded ideals behind the establishment of community crafts industries, socialist or philanthropic notions for regenerating rural communities where the traditional industry had declined. The Craft Revival was also fuelled by the new ideals of Arts Schools and Colleges in London, Liverpool, Birmingham and Glasgow where there was a push to develop the applied arts. This involved forging links with local industries, the training of local artisans and supporting the development of education in art and craft for the widest possible audiences.[37] With respect to the 'art' of conservation, Lethaby noted that: '…the methods of repair became traditional among the architect members of the Society' [meaning the

---

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

[36] M. Denney, *Arts and Crafts and Vernacular Furniture*, PhD thesis, 1997 provides a comprehensive study of how the arts and crafts philosophy influenced furniture design and construction.

[37] 'The Arts and Crafts Movement 1850-1915'. Available from: http://www.artscrafts.org.uk/branches/handicrafts.html [Accessed on 15th May 2005].

SPAB].[38]

With respect to the importance of the traditional arts and crafts, according to Philippot, John Ruskin was the first to express a full awareness of the consequences of the break in the continuity of tradition introduced by the development of the modern historical consciousness which (according to Philippot) was the main reason why Ruskin decried the restorations (or reconstructions) of the C19th. Philippot also added that this understanding has subsequently led to the scientific approach to the past which has surpassed national borders and considers products of all cultures as part of one cultural patrimony of mankind.[39] However, with respect to this latter point, the support that Ruskin gave to the traditional arts and crafts which inspired the founding of the Arts and Crafts Movement and its various Guilds and training programs and his broad criticisms of science and technology suggests that this was *not* Ruskin's vision at all. Indeed, one of the first attempts to establish a Guild was John Ruskin's Guild of St. George in 1871.

In fact, it can be argued that the synthesis between the traditional arts and crafts and the conservation and restoration of historical architecture – as an aspect of the Ruskin-Morris-Webb-Lethaby philosophy – represented the overcoming of the impasses of modern historical consciousness because it sought to uphold historical continuity (in terms of practice) which was understood (and valued) as part of the pre-industrial, pre-scientific and pre-mechanical heritage.

This remains true to this day, as Peter Venning has explained:

> The Society [SPAB] makes no pretence of being academic. Indeed the very concept is almost pejorative to some activists because an overly-scholarly approach has been known to propel the unwary down the slippery slope of 'restoration'. The essence of the Society is practical

38 '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]. The Lethaby Scholarship was introduced in 1930 in memory of Professor W. R. Lethaby. The Scholarship aims to cultivate a deep understanding of historical structures and appreciation of the traditional building crafts.

39 J. Ruskin cited by Paul Philippot 'Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines, I', in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price (*et al*) The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996 (p.269).

repair, based on handed-down knowledge and experience.[40]

The continuing work of the SPAB is then, based on a continuity of handed-down knowledge based around traditional craft practices – in other words, the SPAB philosophy advocates (and sustains) a historiography of *practice*. As such, the traditional arts and crafts have intrinsic value to heritage itself; which has subsequently become known as intangible heritage. Therefore, it can further be argued that this view of the past sought to synthesise the tangible and the intangible heritages which had become disrupted by the progressive tide of modernity and the subsequent emergence of modern historical consciousness (the basis of which is the Western 'scientific' epistemological tradition). This tension in history is apparent in the original text (still used today) of the Manifesto of the SPAB when Morris used phrases like 'escape the reproach of our learning' and criticised any attempts to 'stay the hand at an arbitrary point' undertaken by those who were 'deaf to the claims of poetry and history in the highest sense of the words'.[41]

Surely then, the Ruskin-Morris-Webb-Lethaby philosophy was the antithesis of the scientific ideal of metaphysical neutrality propounded by Benedetto Croce and forming the basis of Cesare Brandi's theory of restoration which has dominated the post-WWII period throughout the West – especially in the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors? The ascendancy of scientific conservation and restoration during this period (represented by the so-called 'paradigm shift') has, therefore, arguably had the effect of overwhelming Ruskinian ideology rather than upholding it. This view was expressed by Summerson in the following terms:

> John Ruskin, William Morris, Philip Webb, and W.R. Lethaby all held
> very nearly if not absolutely identical views on the subject of the

---

[40] P. Venning, '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 (p.281).

[41] W. Morris, 'Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB). Available from: http://www.marxists.org/archive/morris/works/1877/spabman.html [Accessed on 23rd August 2005]. The author believes that in this Morris is essentially criticising the cultural phenomena whereby 'knowledge' (in the sense of scientific knowledge about the past) superseded 'thought' (feelings or 'intangibles' inherited from the past) which was arguably the ultimate achievement of the Enlightenment 'closure' suggested by Ruskin earlier in this section. This limiting of consciousness forms the basis of the final conclusion to this thesis.

preservation of ancient buildings. Ruskin announced his views in 1849; Lethaby died in 1931. So I think we may say that for about eighty years a distinct philosophy of preservation was upheld. … Not merely the act of conservation but the art of conservation became an aspect of [their] philosophy. As participants in and critics of the preservation movement of today we must, I think, regard this philosophy as something belonging irrevocably to the past. Even if, in part, we subscribe to the same principles we do so for different reasons. I think it must be said that we have not the same passionate, almost religious, reverence for the ancient; we have a much wider and more exact knowledge of the past and we study it as doctors rather than as lovers.[42]

Does this then, also represent the loss of intangible heritage – and authenticity as an aspect of intangible heritage?[43]

Obviously, a central requirement in preserving the meaning-conferring qualities of any historical document is the processes employed in interventive treatment. Importantly, *Ruskin disapproved of any intervention that put the appearance of the building at odds with its structure and substance* which, for him, was unethical – this was the basis of his philosophy of strictly honest repair. For example, Ruskin expressed his view of casting (or machine-work) which replaced the work of hand in the following terms:

There are two reasons, both weighty, against the substitution of cast or machine work for that of the hand: one, that all cast and machine work is bad, as work; the other, that it is dishonest. …Its dishonesty, however, which, to my mind, is of the grossest kind, is, I think, a sufficient reason

---

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

[43] With respect to this, see for example, the recent publication *From William Morris: Building Conservation and the Arts and Crafts Cult of Authenticity, 1877-1939*, edited by C. Miele, Yale University Press, 2005 which shows the affiliation between the SPAB and the Arts and Crafts Movement and argues that this synthesis (as the title of the book suggests) was a 'modern cult of authenticity'. Although not formally recognised in their time, the author would extend this hypothesis to include intangible heritage as an (inseparable) aspect of authenticity which is consistent with recent developments on the international heritage scene – led in particular by UNESCO.

to determine absolute and unconditional rejection of it.[44]

In fact, Ruskin apparently abhorred any form of imitation with the intention to deceive; with respect to imitations of marble on wood he expressed the following:

> There is not a meaner occupation for the human mind than the imitations of the stains and striae of marble on wood. …the grainer must think of what he is doing; and veritable attention and care, and occasionally considerable skill, are consumed in the doing of a more absolute nothing than I can name in any other department of painful idleness. I know not anything so humiliating as to see a human being, with arms and limbs complete, and apparently a head, and assuredly a soul, yet into the hands of which when you have put a brush and a pallet, it cannot do anything with them but imitate a piece of wood.[45]

This demonstrates unequivocally that Ruskin's view of the use of technology (including materials) was one which respected material substance and process and not merely superficial appearance.[46] Ruskin's influence became apparent when criticisms of the restoration work at Tewkesbury Abbey by the SPAB were quoted in the Times:

> Now there is one thing in the present incomplete state of the work, which had never been intended by Sir Gilbert Scott to remain as it was. He [Ruskin] alluded to the temporary screen between nave and choir, made

---

[44] J. Ruskin, *Selections from the Writings of John Ruskin*, Smith Elder and Co., London, 1865 (p.240).

[45] J. Ruskin, *Selections from the Writings of John Ruskin*, 1865 (p.248).

[46] In studying the hundreds of letters and documents held in the SPAB archives I have not found a single example of restoration (in the repair or *adding to* sense) that was based on superficial appearance alone and did not respect consistency in terms of material substance and process. Every restoration that Morris and Company undertook – from the replacement of stained glass windows to interior decoration and refurbishment were all undertaken with traditional materials (always natural) and hand-crafted techniques. It may be said, of course, that modern synthetic materials were not available in their time but a more recent example of their philosophy is represented by the restoration of Kelmscott Manor – the former home of William Morris. With the exception of consolidating water-damaged exterior sills (with synthetic fillers) all of the repair work (which was extensive) was carried out in a 'like-with-like' manner – see for example, D. Insall, '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%20manor%20the%20home%20of%20william%20morris%22 [Accessed on 30th September 2003].

of deal, though painted to resemble stone. It was a skam and for that reason and for no other it seemed unworthy of its position in so noble a building as Tewkesbury Abbey.[47]

This 'ethical' understanding appears to be the antithesis of the kind of so-called 'neutral' restoration carried out today in the name of scientific conservation.[48] In spite of this, the literature that has built up in recent times within the discipline of scientific conservation has tended to foster the Ruskinian conception of heritage preservation (i.e. 'conservation') as the profession seeks (through its ethical strictures) to detach itself from its craft-based origins (i.e. the 'paradigm shift'). This conception is typically set against Eugene Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc – who has tended to become synonymous with 'restoration' and thus presented in an unfavourable (and therefore unethical) light in contemporary discourse.[49]

This overly simplistic distinction between what it means to 'conserve' and to 'restore' relates, of course, to Ruskin's public criticisms of Viollet-le-Duc over historical authenticity and the design and alterations and repairs to architecture. However, this historical argument is a complex one, and present understanding within conservation (which is largely based on art-historical studies) does not sufficiently take account of the fact that the issues between Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc did not only relate to the extent of or the stylistic qualities of the interventions. In fact, Ruskin and his supporters were *no less* concerned with the kinds of processes used which *de facto* determine the nature of the historical document itself – the preservation of the symbolic meaning of which was surely their entire *raison d'être*.

---

[47] 'The Restoration of Tewkesbury Abbey', letter to the Times, 6th September 1890 – available from the SPAB archives.
[48] This was discussed in Part I of this thesis. It should be stressed here that different heritage domains have different ideas about restoration. For instance, there may be health and safety issues with architectural restorations which would not necessarily apply to much moveable heritage such as, archaeological relics and/or paintings. And when the object does not have to perform a particular physical function; either by design (like a painting or sculpture) or because it is in a museum where its 'use-value' may only be a secondary consideration. There are of course grey areas in (for example) furniture and decorative arts – especially when the original maker's intention is taken into account.
[49] It is perhaps worth noting here then, that Viollet-le-Duc, according to Sir John Summerson, was one of the most 'supremely eminent theorists of the history of European architecture'. It is surely inappropriate that students of conservation today should consider Viollet-le-Duc in a less-fitting light (as admittedly I once did).

With respect to process then, Viollet-le-Duc was an advocate of the use of the newly available materials of industrial production. These materials and techniques he believed would extend the life of the building because they were superior to those used in the past. To Viollet-le-Duc, it was illogical to repair or reconstruct a building with a method of known defaults and failures when more refined and better methods were available:

> There is another overriding condition that must always be kept in mind in restoration work. It is this: both the methods and the materials of construction employed by the restorer must always be of superior quality.[50]

However, for Ruskin and his supporters the historical record of the building was destroyed in the process, as Demel explains:

> Viollet-le-Duc's insertion of new material suddenly blurred the distinction between what had previously existed and what was new construction. Because the old no longer existed upon its own accord, its meaning had been altered and it could no longer be understood within its own historic moment. The existing building now relied upon a newly inserted member for its existence. By relying upon the new, its perceived meaning had been changed forever. This reliance of the old upon the new could not be tolerated by the preservation movement. The historic environment needed to be valued on its own accord, unreliant upon anything else for its existence or validation. In Ruskin's terms, nothing was allowed to intervene in the understanding of the historic object. As a work of the past, it should not be altered or improved upon by a contemporary hand. In the work of Viollet-le-Duc, the new was a perceived threat to the existence of the old.[51]

---

[50] E. Viollet-le-Duc, 'The Foundations of Architecture: Selections from the Dictionnaire Raisonne, 1868', cited in S. Demel, *Architectural Additions*, MA Thesis, 1997. Available from: http://www.demel.net/th-ch1.html [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

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

The buildings thus had to be recognised (and arguably maintained) on their own accord with reference to their own specific history. Ruskin believed new architectural construction should be produced only from materials which will gain the beauty of age through weathering and the passage of time. Otherwise the building would eventually become meaningless and symbolically depleted – ultimately putting to an end the meaning-conferring qualities of the historical document itself. One could argue then, that Viollet-le-Duc's work is a clear indication of the difference between the pre-industrial, historically-transcendent craft-based perspective, and that of the (so-called) 'Mechanical Age' – which Ruskin reviled.

Viollet-le-Duc's preference for modern materials and techniques has been explained as the outcome of his views of history and his (questionable) understanding of progress. With respect to this, Martin Bressani's interpretation in 'Notes on Viollet-le-Duc's Philosophy of History: Dialectics and Technology'[52] uses Classical mythology (namely Doxius and Epergos) in order to explain the dialectical forces of tradition and renewal which represent the fundamental duality of the world. Viollet-le-Duc is entirely on the side of modern technological culture (or the 'Mechanical Age' in Carlylian terms) which he sees as humankind's emancipation from nature through scientific / technological inventiveness – understood as progress.

Epergos is the active principle of renovation – and thus represents scientific knowledge, while Doxius is the passive imagination – representing the past, or tradition. Epergos is the active imagination, representing the will to transform and improve. For Viollet-le-Duc the source of all Western progress is the Greek intellect (i.e. scientific knowledge). Thus Epergos and Doxius also symbolise the reaction of science against tradition (based on incremental 'pre-scientific' knowledge). The Doxius / Epergos paradox can thus be understood as a dialectic between pre-and post-Enlightenment philosophical positions which can be seen to be connected to the hermeneutical transformation of preceding centuries (discussed earlier) – which, this thesis argues, was linked to the European Church Reforms.[53]

---

[52] 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.
[53] These ideas will be revisited in the final conclusion to the thesis.

According to Viollet-le-Duc then, the sciences: '…are not the result of the labours of our predecessors [they] …make us, in fact, capable of forgetting all that was done before us'.[54] In other words, for Viollet-le-Duc history comes to an end with science.[55] However, there is a problem here in that Viollet-le-Duc relies on his understanding of history for his conception of progress. And, paradoxically, he sees progress in scientific methodology, deriving from antiquity in the Greek intellect – which is necessarily backward-looking. What tends to give the impression of progress is technology, the proliferation of which is synonymous with scientific methodology, but the methodology itself is ancient and by no means progressive.[56]

Nonetheless, Viollet-le-Duc's understanding of the past is similar to the Western 'scientific' conception of heritage – which sees only the past as historical while 'forgetting' the historicity of the present. Therefore (this thesis argues), Viollet-le-Duc's views about 'progress' are consistent with the 'paradigm shift' from craft to science which has occurred in the post-WWII period in the field of conservation. And to that extent, with respect to the practice of restoration, the scientific / technological 'revolution' of the field is entirely Viollet-le-Ducian in character; while its public denunciation of the traditional arts and crafts is by no means Ruskinian. This understanding has become inverted by prevailing discourse within the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors.

This (arguably) lay at the heart of Ruskin's criticisms of Viollet-le-Duc. Surely the Ruskin-Morris-Webb-Lethaby philosophy sought to arrest the sense of rupture with the past – by supporting the traditional arts and crafts and the idea of an historical document (sustained by a process of incremental repair and not suspended in time 'at

---

[54] E. Viollet-le-Duc, *Lectures on Architecture II*, 1872 (p.100), cited in 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 (p.348).

[55] This understanding is consistent with the emergence of the modern historical consciousness at the end of the C18th, following the synthesis of Greek intellect with Christian culture (commonly known as the European Enlightenment) which resulted in a sense of rupture and discontinuity. Perhaps this is also why the historical document is suspended in time in scientific conservation and why concepts such as 'reversibility' have come into existence – reflecting the (so-called) 'time wall' of heritage preservation documented by this thesis.

[56] T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, The University of Chicago Press, 1962 explains how subsequent scientific paradigms can take on the characteristics of earlier 'pre-existing' paradigms. See also, K. Held, '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) for the cultural impact of Hellenism (in particular science) on Christian culture.

an arbitrary point'). Consequently, all interventive work should complement and not parody[57] the existing and respect original creative propriety – this they believed could not be achieved with modern means that put appearance at odds with structure and substance. This was their understanding of authenticity which sought to bring the past into the present which was achieved through authentic processes, thereby also (re-)creating tangible / intangible synthesis; or as the Technical Secretary of SPAB, Douglas Kent, puts it: 'It comes back to our unique philosophical thread, which is to understand the building you are working with and to use like-for-like materials'.[58]

It is for this reason that in furniture and decorative arts (for example) the leading furniture makers abhor the thought of 'non-like' materials and techniques in the restoration of their own work. Martin Grierson, for instance, who trained at Lethaby's Central School of Arts and Crafts, and Alan Peters, who was apprentice to Edward Barnsley (son of Sidney Barnsley), and Humphrey Sladden, who today runs the Edward Barnsley Workshops – all very strongly insist on 'like-with-like' restoration because it sustains integrity and historical authenticity. According to Peters:

> [I] …have a very strong opinion in favour of 'like-with-like' restoration. The knowledge and expertise should be understood as living history. It must be sustained by repair / maintenance / restoration processes. This is Ruskin and Morris's legacy to the Arts and Crafts furniture-making tradition.[59]

In fact, they would each rather remove more material in order to retain homogeneity of substance if this also kept the knowledge and expertise alive. All of them are concerned that this is in danger of being lost nationally through inadequate training

---

[57] SPAB uphold that interventions should seek to 'complement not parody' the existing building. These terms are defined in the Oxford English Dictionary, as follows; Complement – contribute extra or contrasting features to something in such a way as to improve or enhance their qualities; Parody – an imitation of the style or a version of something that falls far short of the real thing. Views expressed by M. Slocombe, 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).

[58] D. Kent, cited in 'A Hard Truth', article by Naomi Marks in *Cornerstone*, The Magazine for the SPAB, Vol. 27, No.4, 2006 (pp.45-46).

[59] A. Peters, *Interview with the author* (by telephone) 5th February 2006.

provision.[60]

In terms of the harmony of the past and the present, the repair programme of the Fisherman's Chapel at St. Brelade in Jersey (essentially an archaeological project) exemplifies the Ruskin-Morris-Webb-Lethaby philosophy, as explained by Burman:

> Analysis, both archaeological and architectural, of the place showed its extraordinary importance as an intact surviving structure of the late 12th or early 13th Century, with extensive remains of mural paintings on the upper parts of the walls and on the vault. However, in the past the building had been both neglected and compromised. The repair programme included not only repair of the roof covering, after due consideration of methods and materials, but also re-plastering the interior walls up to the level of the fresco paintings with good lime render. The final touch was to commission some really excellent new furniture by the Devonshire furniture-maker, working in the Arts & Crafts tradition, Alan Peters. The result has been that the value of the building has been preserved, indeed enhanced; and has also been added to, in an exemplary way.[61]

It can be argued then, that the idea that tangible heritage preservation should be based solely on superficial appearance (as with Brandian theory) and not also substance and process is not altogether consistent with the Ruskin-Morris-Webb-Lethaby philosophy which saw heritage in terms of process too – and it was based on

---

[60] M. Grierson, *Interview with the author* (by telephone), 6th January 2006 and H. Sladden, *Interview with the author*, The Edward Barnsley Workshops, Petersfield, 10th May 2005. It is perhaps important to note here that these makers were not expressing their views on fine art, such as for example, paintings and sculpture.

[61] P. Burman, 'A Question of Ethics', in *The Conservation and Repair of Ecclesiastical Buildings*, 1995. Available from: http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/ethics/ethics.htm [Accessed on 18th April 2004]. There are also some excellent examples of stained-glass windows designed by William Morris himself as part of the 'restoration' of St. Nicholas Church, Halewood, Liverpool. They do of course reflect the 'spirit' of the original building and are made entirely of natural materials and traditional processes. They are said to be the finest remaining examples in the country. For further illustrations of stained glass windows by Morris, see: *Stained Glass of William Morris and His Circle: Text and Illustrations*, edited by A. Sewter, Yale University Press, 1974. Another interesting example is William Morris' (and his circle) decoration of the Oxford Union debating hall; the issues around which are discussed in K. Godwin, 'William Morris' 'New and Lighter Design', in *The Journal of the William Morris Society*, Vol. II, No. 3, 1968. Such artwork would (no doubt) be considered by many as 'conjectural' today, thus (potentially) depriving 'future generations' of such tangible (*and* indeed intangible) heritage.

memory and enhanced meaning and on the living mediation of the past and the present – and surely *not* forgetfulness. Put simply, it was metaphysically productive *not* scientifically reductive. This lies at the heart of the ideological division in the heritage field documented by this thesis. The next section considers how this philosophy mirrors recent developments.

3.1.2: Recent developments with respect to intangible heritage

In early 2000 English Heritage was asked by the government to co-ordinate a wide-ranging review of all policies relating to the historic environment. The group was chaired by English Heritage Chairman Sir Neil Cossons who oversaw the work of the review. This culminated in the publication of *Power of Place,* English Heritage, 2000.[62] This publication reflects wider international trends (discussed in Part II, above) and represents an important turning point in thinking about heritage in the United Kingdom in recent times.

The recommendations outline a general shift in emphasis from curative intervention to preventive measures based on a more maintenance-oriented approach which is stated under the section heading '3.2 Action: for the heritage sector'. This movement, which is explained under the heading '2.1 Conservation-led renewal: unlocking the value' is part of a long-term strategy towards sustainable development. The concept of sustainable development is linked to economic and employment factors along with an awareness of maintaining significance and associated values. The emphasis on associated values is stated under the heading '2.4 People and place: reflecting wider values'.

The government's long-term strategy towards sustainable development was outlined in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) publication *The Historic Environment: A Force for the Future*, published a year after *Power of Place* at the end of 2001. It argues that:

> England's historic environment is one of our greatest national resources… [it] is something from which we can learn, something from

---

[62] *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].

which our economy benefits and something which can bring communities together in a shared sense of belonging. With sensitivity and imagination, it can be a stimulus to create new architecture and design, a force for regeneration and a powerful contributor to people's quality of life.[63]

As part of this strategy, *Force for the Future* also recognised the importance of sustaining appropriate skills (i.e. the stock of knowledge) within the sector. In relation to this, Heritage Lottery funded research culminated in the publication, *Sustaining our Living Heritage* in 2002 which highlighted the lack of skills for the maintenance and restoration of historic properties. The opening statement to the report expressed the importance of traditional knowledge in the following terms:

> The United Kingdom's heritage is, in part, the product of generations of skilled labour. …A sustainable future for our landscapes, habitats, buildings and artefacts depends upon the availability of people with a wide range of specialist craft and conservation skills – *skills that are themselves part of our heritage* [*my italics*].[64]

This report is important because it also recognised, at the level of national strategic development, that the traditional arts and crafts are an integral part of our living heritage. They are thus valued *intrinsically* for their contribution to sustaining the historic environment. *Sustaining our Living Heritage*, therefore, represents the 'formal' acknowledgement of the intangible heritage in the United Kingdom. However, it does need reiterating that at the level of policy the United Kingdom *did not* ratify (indeed, it actively opposed) the *UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, 2003.[65]

---

[63] *The Historic Environment: A Force for the Future*, 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].

[64] *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]

[65] *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003. Available from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf [Accessed on 15th February 2004] – discussed in Section 2.1.5.

Notwithstanding, English Heritage, the Building Skills Action Group (BSAG), the Crafts Skills Forum and the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) are actively involved to ensuring appropriate education and training to meeting the skills requirements. The CITB set up a National Heritage Training Group (NHTG) in 2002. Their report, *Traditional Building Craft Skills: Skills Needs Analysis of the Built Heritage Sector in England* was published in 2005.[66] In addition to this, *Maintenance Education and Training for Listed Buildings* submitted by De Montfort Expertise Limited, Leicester, 2003 was another important report relating to the needs of listed buildings throughout the United Kingdom.[67] The Conference on Training in Architectural Conservation (COTAC) is another important contribution to the education and training of traditional skills for the built heritage sector.

Andrew McIntosh, Minister for Media and Heritage, expressed his recognition of the traditional crafts in the following terms:

> I am delighted that English Heritage and CITB-ConstructionSkills together with the NHTG are tackling the problem of skills shortages in traditional building crafts. Without these skills our aspiration to unlock the potential of the historic environment as a powerful social and economic driver will crumble along with our heritage itself. We must ensure that these skills are not lost for future generations.[68]

Conservation-led renewal has, therefore, had the effect of fostering greater awareness of the significance of (so-called) 'living heritage'. Environmental pollution (which has increased substantially during the past century) has undoubtedly contributed to

---

[66] *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]

[67] *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].

[68] A. McIntosh, Minister for Media and Heritage, speaking at the launch of the National Heritage Training Group research 'Building on the Past: Training for the Future', 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].

the need for such an approach and is perhaps more problematic in industrial nations – especially in inner city regions. A philosophy of constant-renewal is surely inevitable in such contexts.

In a publication by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) in connection with their contribution to education and training the following comments were made:

> Traditional heritage skills are at risk of dying out in the UK. Today, there are less than 40,000 craftsmen with the necessary specialist skills to maintain our historic environment, which includes over half a million historic buildings. [Their continued existence]: …have all relied on the expertise of master craftsmen. Peter Murray (architect, Stanton Williams) who worked on the £20million Tower of London project has spoken of the complexities of the project: "Despite this being a largely contemporary project we used traditional materials in some of the landscaping… Craftsmen had to be flown over from Europe to complete the work using traditional skills which have continued to be nurtured in European countries."[69]

In this statement traditional skills and the materials they are associated with are linked in an implicit way to authenticity. Therefore, one can conclude that what stands between the 'authentic' survival of the nation's heritage, our collective sense of place and thus our social and cultural well-being, lies in the hands of a small group of craftspeople. Interestingly, it is well-known amongst experienced art/craft practitioners to attribute the present skills crisis to the demise of the traditional apprenticeship training system during the 1970's. It is then, perhaps worth remembering that much of the built environment and the collections in our national museums and galleries is *de facto* the tangible outcome of apprentice-based training. Indeed, the demise of such knowledge is surely one of the main reasons why we have had to learn to conserve the tangible relics that were created *because* of its existence.

---

[69] '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].

Intangible heritage not only recognises the traditional skills, importantly it also recognises their *intrinsic value* – both with regard to the authentic preservation of the tangible objects of history but also their intrinsic value to culture itself. So understood, they are a living expression of history. In this connection, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC), established in 1999, is the professional body for the United Kingdom representing conservation specialists and historic environment practitioners in the public and private sectors. Bob Kindred MBE is the IHBC representative on the UNESCO UK Culture Committee. The Culture Committee has been in dialogue with UNESCO Headquarters in Paris regarding the implications of the proposed UNESCO Convention on Intangible Heritage. According to Kindred:

> One of the interesting aspects for IHBC is the implication this has for the practical transfer of traditional craft skills from one generation to another. This has particular relevance in relation to the crisis for heritage skills identified by the DCMS in *Force for the Future* and *Sustaining our Living Heritage – Skills and training for the heritage sector* by the Heritage Lottery Fund.[70]

Kindred supports the view that a maintenance-based approach contributes to sustaining the values attributed to the built heritage – and therefore its implicit living vitality and mediation with culture itself. The historic crafts play a vital role. Regular maintenance brings together the traditional crafts in a symbiotic way with the tangible heritage (i.e. the tangible / intangible synthesis). For many, their continued existence provides a living mediation of an otherwise partially muted material past; an understanding which is closely connected to the safeguarding of the intangible heritage. In other words (as this thesis has argued), the materials of history are preserved 'in the full richness of their authenticity' by way of the intangible heritage. This synthesis is realised through authenticity (as process) and restoration (by way of maintenance) which are unifying factors. The coming together of the two domains is central to the concept of sustainability.

---

[70] B. Kindred, '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].

However, the United Kingdom has been slow to establish formal mechanisms in order to recognise and safeguard its intangible heritage – other nations (it would seem) have been more accepting. For example, in France the Minister of Culture elevated some twenty persons to the rank of "Maître d'art" (Master of Crafts) in 1994; by 1999 the figure had reached forty. This programme has been influenced by UNESCO's *Living Human Treasures* system.[71] It recognises outstanding individuals who are known for their skill, knowledge and contribution to the heritage sector. They are the living embodiment of their respective disciplines; they are therefore (arguably) the authentic 'authors' of the historical document; and they are France's unique bearers of intangible heritage.

The French Minister for Culture and Communication, Catherine Trautmann, expressed the importance of intangible heritage to France at the opening of the 3rd International Heritage Exhibition at the Carrousel du Louvre in unmistakeable terms:

> These craftsmen, second to none, whose talents are often anonymous and unsung, deserve to be better known. [For although the heritage]: …is recognised primarily in the form of historic monuments… our country also has a great many highly skilled craftsmen and women, whose expertise is in itself a genuine yet intangible heritage.[72]

This was acknowledged by the Wooden Artefacts Group of the American Institute for Conservation (AIC) following its 'Furniture in France' trip in 2004. The following was expressed by Jean Marie Easter in the final page of the Report:

> The French believe in maintaining craft traditions and have the schools in place to teach the skills. …Traditional techniques are taught and take

---

[71] *Living Human Treasures*, 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] – discussed in Chapter 2.1.

[72] C. Trautmann, 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].

much time to perfect. …This is history that cannot afford to be neglected and not passed down to the next generation. It is part of a cultural heritage that, if lost, cannot be replaced. [And]: I am in awe of the French because this aesthetic for beauty seems to be in their blood…[73]

This is 'tacit knowledge' (as described in this thesis) that can take generations to develop and refine; the phrase 'in their blood' bears out its inexplicable quality. With respect to its safeguarding and transmission, in 1994 a Traditional Crafts Council was created by the French government. Its purpose is to preserve and develop craft skills both in the field of conservation and contemporary creative work by selecting specialist artisans with a view to awarding them the title of "Master Craftsman". Each Master will be given a grant to provide a three year full-time 'one-on-one' training in their workshop to ensure that their knowledge is transferred to the next generation; an award which is clearly distinct from the university-based 'Master of Arts' training.

In relation to this, Etienne Vatelot, a distinguished stringed instrument maker and president of the Cou Neil des M étiers d'Art (French Council of Traditional Crafts) expressed the following:

> The restorations of the pictures of the Louvre and at the Dome des Invalides, the statues in the Tuileries Gardens, the embroideries of the haute couture collections and the stained glass windows of Chartre Cathedral… The work of master craftsmen and women is all around us in our daily lives.[74]

In their workshops the artisans strive to restore, copy, repair or create, and keep alive the expertise doomed, without them, to disappear forever. Although private owners do commission their services, most of these highly skilled craftsmen and women

---

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

[74]   E. Vatelot, 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].

work for local communities or by public commission for museums, the Heritage Department, the French Commission for the Plastic Arts, and similar bodies.

Much of this is, of course, also the case in the United Kingdom with respect to the conservation and restoration of the (so-called) moveable heritage. However, other than these important and comparatively recent developments in architecture, there has to date been less success in raising the profile of the traditional arts and crafts in the United Kingdom in order to ensure the survival of their unique qualities. What is more, organisations such as, the Crafts Council of the United Kingdom promotes the *contemporary crafts*.[75] There is, therefore, no obvious means of representation for the traditional arts and crafts – unlike in France.

In addition to this, the view that conservation ethics have tended to become dogmatised in the United Kingdom is not uncommon. Indeed one could argue that 'minimum-intervention' has become so 'fundamentalised' that it has tended to function in an imperious way, disenfranchising the art/craft sector. For instance, Pierre Raimond, perhaps the greatest living marqueteur, has been criticised in the United Kingdom for not adhering adequately to this dictum; yet surely he should be regarded as an authentic 'author' in terms of his contribution to the historical document and that the work of such a master should be valued from the moment it leaves his hand? Understood as a bearer of intangible heritage, the craftsman need be less concerned about adhering strictly to minimum-intervention. This does *not* mean the acceptability of *in toto* restorations. It *does* mean that the craftsperson's knowledge, when it is called upon, is recognised for its specific cultural and historical worth which is conveyed *through* his/her work.[76]

Nonetheless, it is apparent that the United Kingdom is developing what can be described as a more anthropocentric approach to heritage – based on people and their values. This has largely been augmented by the recognition of the necessity of a

---

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

[76] Taking into consideration the comments made with respect to standards of competence in Section 1.3.4: 'Education and training' and the contemporary understanding of authenticity in relation to intangible heritage, one can't help but feel that the profession of 'scientific' conservation with its (arguably) dogmatic interpretation of ethics has moved away from the very knowledge (and practitioners) it needs most of all.

maintenance-based approach to conservation-restoration (known as conservation-led renewal). And although the United Kingdom is yet to develop formal mechanisms for the safeguarding of its intangible heritage, it is the recognition of the intrinsic value of traditional skills which suggests movement towards synthesis between the tangible and intangible domains. This is consistent with the wider international movements discussed in Part II of this thesis but it is also similar *in its thinking* to the C19th. founding ideologies, discussed above (hence the UK's unique historical trajectory).

Finally, it is important to bear in mind that intangible heritage is not merely about rejuvenating traditional skills; it is also about valuing certain ways of life in relation to this, and recognising how this can enhance our understanding of heritage. With respect to this, the next section considers how these wider movements have influenced museology in recent times.

3.1.3: Museums and intangible heritage

The trends towards a more people-centred approach to the past (based on cultural values) have done much to change the role of museums in recent years. Ever since the Quebec General Conference in 1992, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) has taken a lead role in:

> Promoting a museological discourse that is inclusive of indigenous and cross cultural concerns being addressed across the world. [Accordingly, part of ICOM's overall strategic objective is the]: Development and promotion of Inclusive Museology.[77]

There is an important point that needs making here; much discussion about intangible heritage led by UNESCO has tended to emphasise indigenous cultures – a conception which may not be suitable for many 'advanced' Western cultures. This is one of the reasons why intangible heritage has been interpreted essentially from an

---

[77]   '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 Patrick Boylan, City University, London, 1998. International Council of Museums (ICOM), 1997. Available from: http://wwwicom.museum/diversity.html [Accessed on 7th February 2005].

epistemological perspective in this thesis (i.e. in terms of knowledge), rather than seeing the past in terms of the 'first people' of a civilisation (which in a technologically-advanced society seems limiting). It is important to recognise, nonetheless, that 'tacit knowledge' (and the value that may be attributed to this) has often been cultivated over long periods of time – even in Western cultures – and that this is why (it can be argued) it should be formally recognised as intangible heritage on its own terms – as the preceding section suggested.

In the United Kingdom, recent publications such as, *Renaissance in the Regions*,[78] *Renaissance museums for changing lives*,[79] and *Too Much Stuff* [80] are part of this overall strategic objective and broad international movement (led by ICOM) towards a more people-centred 'Inclusive Museology'.[81] *Too Much Stuff*, for example, noted that many museum collections are: '…over-large and underused… [and concluded that]: Collections are held not for the benefit of individual institutions, but for the public as a whole'.[82] In connection with this, the consultation paper, *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life*, identified the various challenges and opportunities facing England's museums. For instance, it recognised the *static* nature of museums in the following terms: 'Museums are sometimes perceived to be timeless, standing still on the sidelines of economic, political and social debates'.[83] This perception is not unrelated to the way in which museums interpret the past and manage their collections – and which has subsequently contributed to the feeling that

---

[78] *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].

[79] G. Porter, *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].

[80] *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].

[81] The idea of 'Inclusive Museology' may be understood as an extension of 'New Museology' which emerged in the 1980's. See for example, *The New Museology*, edited by P. Vergo, Reaktion Books, 1989. These ideas were developed further in the 1990's; see for example, P. van Mensch, *Towards a methodology of museology*, PhD thesis, University of Zagreb, 1992 and *Museum Provision and Professionalism*, edited by G. Kavanagh, Routledge, 1994.

[82] *Too Much Stuff*, 2003 (p.14).

[83] *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life*, Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), Museums and Cultural Property Division, 2005 (p.12). Available from: http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/31419198-35C1-4A00-8C12-CB0572EC9B57/0/UnderstandingtheFuture.pdf [Accessed on 30th June 2005].

'within' museums the hermeneutical function of time is distorted.

In relation to this, the report expressed how their function has changed in recent times:

> Most museums were founded with an idea of public benefit. However, public benefit was largely interpreted as arising from the protection and preservation of collections, and the associated knowledge, for current and future generations. The definition of citizenship fitted the values of this time. Today our definition of public benefit and citizenship is different. It is more inclusive and there is a different balance of rights and responsibilities. This changes the museum's relationship with its public.[84]

Prior to this change in perception museums essentially constructed meaning about the past (i.e. in the form of historical knowledge) by collecting, observing and interpreting materials. This thesis argues that this was the basis of a positive (i.e. scientific) historiography which 'sees' objects as evidence about the past and (perhaps) less so as mediators of meaning inherited from the past and sustained in the present. This was a decisive factor in the cultivation of the modern historical consciousness that emerged in Europe at the end of the C18th. – as a product of Enlightenment thought and the basis of the Western epistemological tradition. But it also contributed to the feeling that museums had become centres of neutrality – the basis of scientific methodology – contributing (in turn) to the sense of disconnectedness indicated here. Therefore, museums, by interpreting the past around materials alone, have underestimated (or perhaps not fully understood) the importance of retaining their *connectedness* to the public – which they are there to serve.

The consultation paper acknowledges the importance of museums maintaining a sense of living connectedness in the following terms:

> Collections are at the heart of what museums do, but they need to remain

---

84   *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21ˢᵗ Century Life*, 2005 (pp.11-12).

dynamic resources. They should, and in many cases do, reflect the vitality, the uniqueness and the diversity of contemporary communities and their lives. [And]: It is important to acknowledge the intrinsic value of culture.[85]

In this acknowledgement, there is what might be described as movement back towards culture itself – i.e. the 'world of life' (in Husserlian terms) – representing a kind of *re-engagement*. By recognising the importance of retaining a sense of 'connectedness' to the present and by subsequently changing the relationship of museums with contemporary culture, Inclusive Museology (arguably) has the effect of overcoming the impasses of modern historical consciousness (and the resultant 'time-wall' of preservation). As such, the contemporary museum – the repository where artefacts are housed, organised, interpreted, conserved, restored and displayed in such ways as to confer meaning upon the material world – has become the principle site for renegotiating the relationship of the present with the past.

Inclusive Museology has arisen partly because of the forces of globalisation but also because of the 'world picture' of heritage and the concurrent importance attributed to cultural divergence. This was expressed in the following terms:

> Globalisation has transformed the world in which we all live. It brings new opportunities – electronic information, cultural diversity, ease of travel and relocation – all of which can lead to the dispersal of established communities and traditions. However, its paradoxical effect has been that of creating greater need for local or community roots and values. This enhances the role of museums. By virtue of their public focus and their varied collections, museums have a unique ability to connect the local to the global and can place personal beliefs within more general and universal truths, and historical settings. In these circumstances the role of museums as mediators of knowledge, information and experience becomes more rather than less important.[86]

---

[85] *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life*, 2005 (p.7).
[86] *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life*, 2005 (p.11).

This captures well the movement of museums out of an essentially static historical paradigm into a new dynamic paradigm; reflecting a new and invigorating museology, which fuses the past, as represented in materials, with the present reality.[87]

Professionalisation within museums is part of this re-orientation, as stated in the consultation paper in the following terms:

> The planned development of the Sector Skills Council for Creative and Cultural Skills provides hope of a more strategic approach to professional career development. The MLA, through Renaissance and through its Workforce Development Strategy, is addressing issues of standards, agendas and priorities for the workforce at the national and regional level. The MA is bringing to light important issues such as low pay in the museums sector. Government, MLA, the MA and the museums sector need to keep these initiatives under review to ensure that there is an effective strategy and delivery framework to understand and fulfil the training needs that museum professionals have during the course of their careers.[88]

The professionalisation of conservation is linked to this wider movement – although its development in recent years and its recent literature evidently sustain the old historical fracture (discussed throughout Part I of this thesis). Nonetheless, the paper highlights that: 'One of the key areas of concern around the current museum workforce is its lack of diversity'.[89] To that end: 'The MA has identified diversity as a key issue, and is making important inroads in training new museum professionals from ethnic minority and under-represented groups'.[90]

However, this is essentially a *quantitative* approach to the problem (not necessarily qualitative). It is, therefore, important to recognise that cultural diversity does not

---

[87] L. Smith's, *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, 2006 (in press at time of writing) illuminates how museums can use their collections in such ways to mediate 'life-worldly' experiences (understood as intangible heritage).

[88] *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21ˢᵗ Century Life*, 2005 (p.25).

[89] *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21ˢᵗ Century Life*, 2005 (p.25).

[90] G. Porter cited in *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21ˢᵗ Century Life*, 2005 (p.26).

solely include people from other ethnic backgrounds. And under-represented groups may in fact come from *within the same culture* (and, therefore, the same ethnic background), such as traditional artists and craftspeople. The conservation profession is arguably an example of how diversity can be *perceived* to be retained by employing people from different ethnic backgrounds but which at the same time precludes diversity inherent in its own culture.[91] The apparent segregation of the traditional arts and crafts (which are arguably the living embodiment of *sub*-cultural diversity) augmented by the (so-called) 'paradigm shift' from craft to science illustrates this. What is significant here is that the mechanisms of professional standardisation are necessarily *contradictory to* the very concept of cultural divergence.

Nonetheless, at least the *idea* of diversity is a positive movement towards a more representative, democratic and thus Inclusive Museology; which was stated in the following terms:

> Government and the sector need to ensure that all sections of the population are better represented on museums' boards. This is essential if these cultural institutions are to have continued relevance and meaningful connections for all citizens in the 21st-century.[92]

The movement towards a more people-centred approach to 'heritage' is revealed in the *Development of the Museum Definition according to ICOM Statutes (1946-2001).*[93] Conservation is not introduced to the Definitions until 1974; it states under Section II:

> A museum is a non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study,

---

[91] Chapter 1.3: 'Professionalisation in the United Kingdom' in many ways captures the loss of diversity (in terms of knowledge and expertise) within the United Kingdom in a *very short* period of time.

[92] *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life*, 2005 (p.27).

[93] *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].

education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment.[94]

Interestingly, 'restoration' is not included in the 1974 Definition which suggests that restoration is not considered part of the function of museums at all. This is important because restoration in many domains of the heritage sector (both moveable and *in situ*) sustains cultural diversity (which is a pre-requisite of intangible heritage – as discussed in Part II above). However, museums *do* contain in-house conservation departments whose work is not limited to conserving alone but which also includes restoration – which is undertaken on a regular basis. In considering the present understanding of authenticity (i.e. relating to materials and process), and how this is bound to intangible heritage (which is a form of 'life-worldly' expression) – can restoration that is carried out *within* museums be considered authentic? And if so, in what way is it authentic?

In fact, intangible heritage tends not to be recognised by museums *per se* except in so far as they may acknowledge its existence from an abstract (i.e. disengaged) perspective – as does the modern practice of scientific conservation. This is clear in the 2001 Definition which states:

> b. In addition to institutions designated as "museums" the following qualify as museums for the purposes of this definition:

> viii. cultural centres and other entities that facilitate the preservation, continuation and management of tangible or intangible heritage resources (living heritage and digital creative activity).[95]

Accordingly, museums are essentially there to *manage* intangible heritage – they are not in any real sense a representation *of* intangible heritage – as defined by UNESCO and understood in relation to authenticity. This is a key distinction which *cannot be overlooked*. The professional practice of conservation is based on an archaeo-museological / fine arts approach to restoration. Therefore, in view of this, can

---

[94] *Development of the Museum Definition according to ICOM Statutes (1946-2001)*, 2001.
[95] *Development of the Museum Definition according to ICOM Statutes (1946-2001)*, 2001.

restoration that is carried out in the name of professional conservation be considered authentic? And: in what way is it authentic?[96]

The *Shanghai Charter*, 2002 was an important impetus for the recognition by museums of intangible heritage, as Bouchenaki noted:

> The Shanghai Charter, adopted at the 7th Asia Pacific Regional Assembly of the International Council of Museums (ICOM) in Shanghai in October 2002, recommends to "establish interdisciplinary and cross-sectorial approaches that bring together movable and immovable, tangible and intangible, natural and cultural heritage" and to "develop documentation tools and standards in establishing holistic museum and heritage practices".[97]

Boylan similarly noted:

> …the 2001 changes in the official ICOM definition of a museum, and the likely new potential role for the museum sector in relation to the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage [not ratified by the UK], means that changes in the ICOM Curricula Guidelines are now needed to refer more explicitly to the need for professional training and career development programmes and qualifications to recognise the significance of the intangible heritage. [To this end]: …all museum training and professional development programmes are recommended to include an understanding of the importance and museum potential of the intangible heritage in their curricula and professional qualifications.[98]

---

[96] Surely restoration that is undertaken in the name of Cesare Brandi (discussed in Chapter 1.4) is that that is *not* authentic?

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

[98] P. Boylan, '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, 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.

This is clearly not the same as embodying it. However, it must be emphasised here that these are recent developments in museology which are yet to reach maturity.[99] As such, it is important for museum professionals and researchers to note that with respect to collecting, recording, and archiving, there is the inherent danger of retarding the living vitality of intangible heritage (how many Hawaiians, for instance, actually wear grass skirts?). It is, therefore, vital to understand that intangible heritage is dynamic not static and that essentially it refers to the value that is attributed to the historicity of understanding as represented by the activities of people in the present – not solely the physical outcome of those activities. Part of this understanding, at least in so far as the traditional arts and crafts are concerned, is specialist knowledge. The context within which this exists is of *great importance*.

For that reason, those that are given the responsibility to collect, record and archive intangible heritage would have to be aware that the information collected would only be a tangible record of intangible heritage – it would not be intangible heritage *in itself*. Museums, for example, through their collections, already provide a tangible record of intangible heritage; the end result has tended to be the historical separation of objects from subjects which has, in many ways, diminished the living vitality of heritage not promoted it – the well noted deadening 'museum effect'. This clearly should not be repeated with respect to the safeguarding of the intangible heritage.

With museums playing a greater role in intangible heritage concerns, it should be emphasised, that the viewpoint of the museum is necessarily *post-reductionist* in the sense that the objects in their collections are already in place *because* they have been abstracted from the 'world of life'. This is because they are valued by them in a *particular* way. In museums the primary value domains are the 'aesthetic' and the 'historical'. This is their starting point when considering intangible heritage in relation to their collections. It is the limiting to these primary value domains (through methodological reductionism) that leads to a view of intangible heritage as if looking

---

99 An important publication in this respect was *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp (*et al*), Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991. However, there is no mention of what was arguably the most significant intangible heritage preservation movement in Western history – the Arts and Crafts Movement in England (discussed at the beginning of this chapter).

from the outside in – as if somehow separated from it – and thus abstract. One could argue that museums, by isolating the 'aesthetic' and the 'historical' have in themselves become the 'isolated intangibles of culture'[100] but on an institutionalised-level which is why they have recognised (perhaps inevitably) the need to 'return' to culture itself – i.e. the 'world of life' – whence they derived. Clearly, there are also particular considerations and constraints which must also be taken into account; the physical structure of a museum is in itself a partition from the everyday 'world of life' in which intangible heritage exists.

Successfully safeguarding intangible heritage will depend upon the methodological approach taken; for example, it may be understood in outstanding individuals or professional or trade groups; this would enable a direct focus on that group or individual. It may, however, be recognised regionally or even nationally; this would perhaps necessitate a broader anthropological approach. Focusing on the needs of culture itself provides an opportunity for museums to properly embrace intangible heritage in order to inspire learning and better understanding of tangible heritage (i.e. their collections). However, great care will have to be taken with respect to successfully safeguarding intangible heritage in order to avoid diminishing its authentic living vitality for the benefit of future generations.

The recent 7th Cambridge Seminar: 'Intangible-Tangible Cultural Heritage: A Sustainable Dichotomy?' held at the University of Cambridge continues the debate between the conflicting claims of the tangible and intangible heritages in the United Kingdom.[101] Notwithstanding, the recent House of Lords report, *Science and Heritage*[102] – which essentially discusses the role of science and technology in heritage (termed, 'heritage science') – demonstrates the dominance of the scientific epistemological model in the United Kingdom and in no sense conveys that the concept of intangible heritage is today understood to be the overarching paradigm

---

[100] 'Isolated intangibles of culture' is a reference to the Ashley-Smith citation made in Section 1.3.4: 'Education and training', as follows: 'The notion that conservation is merely about the physical, means that current conservation chooses to have nothing to do with the isolated intangibles of culture'.

[101] The 7th Cambridge Seminar: 'Intangible-Tangible Cultural Heritage: A Sustainable Dichotomy?' held at the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge, May 2006.

[102] *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.

through which all heritages are perceived. As such, 'heritage science' is an aspect of a far greater whole. It is, therefore, likely to be some time before this 'new' perspective is fully realised in the United Kingdom in keeping with contemporary developments on the international scene.

3.1.4: Conclusion to Part III

Part III of this thesis discussed the United Kingdom's unique historical trajectory with respect to the competing claims of the tangible and intangible heritages – which (it argued) first emerged in the C19th. The concerns about culture and inheritance were closely related to the cultural impact of modernity – especially manifested in the emergence of the (so-called) 'Mechanical Age'. Part III suggested that underlying this was an intellectual transition in Western culture dominated by a new scientific order which emerged in the period of (so-called) Enlightenment; out of which developed a new scientific epistemology.

The thesis argues that this transition – in particular the metaphysically-reductive and objectifying tendencies of scientific thought – lay at the heart of concerns regarding restoration and the Preservation Movement's veneration of the traditional arts and crafts which were understood as the cultural expression of a 'pre-scientific' era. It regarded this as an essentially anthropocentric vision of heritage preservation which was based around an understanding of heritage as a means of meta-cultural production; it was thus dynamic *not* static. Ironically, recent developments in the United Kingdom with respect to traditional skills (necessitated by conservation-led renewal) and the value attributed to this, combined with the re-definition of the role of museums (reflected in Inclusive Museology), suggests that this anthropocentric vision of heritage has recently once more (re-)emerged in the form of a 'post-modern' recovery of the idea of the intangible.

The thesis suggests therefore that the C19th. Heritage Preservation Movement in many ways anticipated recent developments in global heritage preservation theory which now seeks to synthesise the tangible and the intangible – and the past with the present – through the concept of authentic process. This has been spearheaded by UNESCO but this time in a global context. The historical trajectory of the United Kingdom, therefore, provides greater understanding of what has recently become

known as intangible heritage, although to date, understanding such has not been obvious nor has it been formally sanctioned *in* the United Kingdom.

Now, importantly, these recent developments challenge a (so-called) 'authorised' view of heritage which has dominated the post-WWII period through its international administration by the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors – also led historically (and perhaps somewhat ironically) by UNESCO. The recognition of intangible heritage – and authenticity understood as an aspect of this – inevitably raises questions about the authenticity of restoration carried out in museums (and, by extension, the professional practice of conservation). An understanding of the value of intangible heritage must surely be taken into account if the field of conservation is to pass on to future generations, their inheritance 'in the full richness of its authenticity'. The final conclusion to this thesis suggests how this more broadly conceived view of 'heritage' might be embraced and embodied.