

Part II

The Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage

It was argued in Part I of this thesis that Cesare Brandi's theory of restoration (discussed in Chapter 1.4) forms the theoretical basis of tangible heritage preservation (discussed in Chapters 1.2 and 1.3 – and which is not inconsistent with the approach to restoration discussed in Chapter 1.1). Part II of this thesis discusses recent developments in the international heritage scene – now a global phenomenon. A 'new' vision of heritage is shown to have emerged in recent years – led (in terms of its formal recognition) principally by UNESCO.

The importance of inclusivity characterises this anthropocentric and values-oriented approach to heritage. This is shown to have had a decisive influence on concepts such as, 'authenticity' which, in recent times, has emphasised the importance of the *process* of restoration (not just the remains of the material past). With respect to this, it is argued that these developments are levering ideas about heritage out of an essentially materials-led paradigm (based on the 'scientific' archaeo-museological / fine arts model, discussed in Part I) into a new dynamic paradigm, which seeks to harness the complex nature of the world's cultural inheritance. The thesis considers how this has begun to broaden the concept of 'heritage' (in all its manifestations) in the West – and how this, in turn, impacts upon the field of conservation.

Part II comprises two chapters, as follows: Chapter 2.1: 'Heritage – beyond the material dimension' and Chapter 2.2: 'Authenticity'.

2.1. Heritage – beyond the material dimension

This chapter examines recent developments in global heritage preservation theory which have extended the concept of ‘heritage’ – beyond the materials of fabrication, throwing into question Brandi’s methodological approach to restoration as the basis of international professionalisation. It is revealed how the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) has been central to these developments. Its influence on the development of tangible heritage preservation over the past thirty years is acknowledged and discussed.

However, an assessment of more recent UNESCO documents is used to bring to light how our approach to heritage has changed in recent times – from a formerly materials-centred approach to the past – to a more people-centred one. In this connection, among the more notable developments discussed has been the emergence of the concept of intangible heritage – which has become central to global heritage concerns. This chapter considers how ‘intangible heritage’ has become formally recognised by UNESCO, establishing this as the overarching paradigm through which all heritages are understood – indicating the acceptance of wider concepts of heritage, leading to greater inclusion and closer synthesis between the tangible (discussed in Part I of this thesis) and intangible heritages (the basis of Part II).

Chapter 2.1 consists of the following sub-sections whose headings reflect the key documents published in recent times: 2.1.1: ‘UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972 (World Heritage Convention)’; 2.1.2: ‘Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore, 1989’; 2.1.3: ‘Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation: on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore, Smithsonian Institution, 1999’; 2.1.4: ‘Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage, Getty Conservation Institute, 2002’; and 2.1.5: ‘UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003’.

2.1.1: UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972 (World Heritage Convention)

Prior to investigating developments with respect to intangible heritage it is first

necessary to mention the wider political developments which have been influential in cultivating (in a formal sense) our collective understanding of heritage throughout Europe, and indeed, throughout the West. Ever since the *UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (also known as the World Heritage Convention) held in Paris in 1972,¹ UNESCO has played a leading role in the development of heritage preservation in its international contexts. Its vision is based around a State-managed approach to preservation (hence reflecting a ‘top-down’ developmental strategy). The main focus is the protection of tangible heritage (which may also be referred to as ‘cultural heritage’ and/or ‘cultural property’).

The Convention provided a definition of cultural heritage in the following terms, under article one:

For the purpose of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “cultural heritage”:

Monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science.

Groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science.

Sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of

¹ *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (The World Heritage Convention), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), adopted by the General Conference, Paris, 1972. Available from: http://whc.unesco.org/world_he.htm [Accessed 15th February 2005].

view.²

Under article four it states the following:

Each State Party to the Convention recognises that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural [and natural] heritage [referred to in article one above] and situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State.³

In order to achieve this it identifies the responsibilities of nation states in helping:

(c) to develop scientific and technical studies and research and to work out such operating methods as will make the State capable of counteracting the dangers that threaten its cultural [or natural] heritage.

(d) to take the appropriate legal, scientific, technical, administrative and financial measures necessary for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of this heritage; and

(e) to foster the establishment or development of national or regional centres for training in the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural [and natural] heritage and to encourage scientific research in this field.⁴

Clearly then, the World Heritage Convention stressed the importance of the *materiality* of the past (i.e. the ‘tangible heritage’). Due to its emphasis on preserving tangible heritage, the Convention recommended that education be based essentially on scientific research and development which is related to the various agencies of the State and State-affiliated heritage organisations – i.e. the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors. Importantly, the primary values associated with the

² *World Heritage Convention*, 1972.

³ *World Heritage Convention*, 1972.

⁴ *World Heritage Convention*, 1972.

tangible heritage are limited to ‘history’, ‘art’ or ‘science’.

This limitation, however, is not unproblematic in the sense that ‘history’, ‘art’ or ‘science’ do not necessarily include relative social and cultural values embedded, for example, in customs, rituals and/or religions (except in so far as they may be understood in scientific terms). These ‘wider’ cultural aspects, this thesis argues, sustain diverse motives for preserving the past which frequently lie beyond the materials of fabrication (and the prevailing research methodologies supported by the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors). This may have a great bearing on how the materials are preserved; from the point of view of materials and techniques used, the extent of intervention and those that undertake the work – and, of course, where the objects are ultimately housed. Moreover, the Convention also recommended *universalisation* (in terms of values) of the most important heritage which is indicative of a tendency to homogenise diverse conceptions which may be culturally (or even locally / regionally) specific.

Crucially, what the 1972 Convention did not do at that time was to make any specifications regarding the nature of the work involved in preservation and how such activity might reflect diverse cultural values and aspirations such as, those that may be manifested in, for example, historical arts and crafts practices which often reflect distinctive cultural, regional and/or group identities. Related to this, although the primary interest of the Convention concerned the protection of tangible heritage, it also raised awareness of the idea of including folklore within its overall framework. This was considered during the drafting of the Convention under the sub-category ‘Recommendations’.⁵

The ideas expressed in the Recommendation originated in Marrakech, Morocco; they related to concerns regarding the performers at Jeema’ el Fna Square – whose

⁵ J. Blake, ‘Safeguarding Traditional Culture and Folklore – Existing International Law and Future Developments’, in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999. Available from: <http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/blake.htm> [Accessed on 15th February 2005]. Full text available from: <http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/index.htm>

existence was threatened by city development.⁶ The Marrakech residents in fighting for its protection and winning their case demonstrated the need for action on an international level for the protection of such cultural spaces and for popular and traditional forms of expression.⁷ According to the UNESCO Director-General:

UNESCO's renown is largely based on the admirable action it has carried out concerning the tangible heritage. The General Conference's adoption of the World Heritage Convention, in 1972, was not only a political and legal landmark; it was also a major conceptual innovation. For the first time, cultural and natural heritage were associated to one another within one legal framework.⁸

The main reasons why concerns now subsequently emerged regarding the safeguarding of the intangible heritage are largely related to the processes of globalisation and the social, cultural, economic, political and technological transformations associated therewith. The impact of industrialised culture (essentially occidental) purveyed through the mass media today poses a particular threat to the continued existence of the intangible heritages of humanity, as Kirkinen notes:

More recently, economic globalization and the rapid progress of communication techniques have accelerated the growing uniformity of cultures around the world. Thus, it has become a matter of urgency to preserve the traditional and popular cultures specific to each community if we want to perpetuate the cultural diversity of the world.⁹

⁶ In fact, ideas about the intangible heritage (although not hitherto formally recognised as such) are apparent in the writings of English historian Thomas Carlyle which inspired John Ruskin and William Morris to found the SPAB and the Arts and Crafts Movement in the United Kingdom. This is discussed in Section 3.1.1: 'The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) and the Arts and Crafts Movement'.

⁷ 'UNESCO to protect Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity', UNESCO Office of Public Information (OPI). Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2000/00-48e.shtml> [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

⁸ K. Matsuura, speaking at the 'First Meeting of the Jury named to select Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage', June, 2000, UNESCO Office of Public Information (OPI). Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2000/00-60e.shtml> [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

⁹ H. Kirkinen, 'Problems of Traditional Culture and Folklore in Europe', in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage,

Matsuura has also expressed similar concerns regarding globalisation and the subsequent tendency towards cultural homogenisation:

As fundamental questions are being asked regarding the future of cultural diversity in view of the effects of globalisation, we can but note that intangible heritage is the most vulnerable aspect of the cultural identity of the peoples of the world. It is therefore UNESCO's duty to draw the attention of public opinion to the importance of this heritage and to encourage Member States to make its inventory, protect and revitalise it.

10

Issues concerning the world's cultural diversity are thus central to the safeguarding of the intangible heritage. The international conference: *Globalisation and Intangible Cultural Heritage*, held in Tokyo, Japan in 2004 in association with UNESCO discussed in some detail issues concerning globalisation and its effects on intangible heritage and has gone some way to formalising an approach to it.¹¹

At the time of the 1972 Convention, the Recommendation, which suggested the potential for a more people-centred approach to the past, was considered *in tandem with* the main issues of the Convention (i.e. the preservation of tangible heritage). However, this approach to heritage was clearly problematical, as Blake has noted:

The 1972 Recommendation, developed alongside the WHC [World Heritage Convention], creates a two-tiered approach to protection... Central to this Convention is the characterisation of its subject as a "universal heritage" deserving of international protection... It is difficult to see, however, how folklore could be included within the existing definitional terms and provisions of this Convention, which assume that

Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999. Available from:
<http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/kirkenen.htm> [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

¹⁰ K. Matsuura, speaking at the 'First Meeting of the Jury named to select Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage', June, 2000. Available from:

<http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2000/00-60e.shtml> [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

¹¹ *Globalisation and Intangible Cultural Heritage: Opportunities, Threats and Challenges*, UNESCO, held in association with the United Nations University, August 2004. Available from:
<http://www.unu.edu/globalization/intangible-cultural-heritage/> [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

the subject of protection is a physical entity.¹²

This ‘two-tiered’ approach can then, be understood as reflecting a dualism in thinking about the past – based (on the one hand) on the *physical object of history* and (on the other) the *living subject of history*. This apparent dualism within UNESCO’s administrative apparatus was perhaps one of the main reasons why the Convention did not make any specifications with respect to how the work involved in preserving tangible heritage might reflect and sustain diverse cultural values – which may be an important aspect of ‘intangible heritage’ (suggesting the need for synthesis between the tangible v. intangible domains).

There are a number of international organisations presently looking into these concerns, such as the European Centre for Traditional Culture (ECTC) which is a regional centre for the safeguarding, revitalisation and diffusion of traditional culture and folklore heritage in Europe;¹³ the International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP) is exploring how cultural diversity can be integrated into a common approach to global development – which includes promoting and protecting cultural heritage for social and economic development;¹⁴ the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is an international organisation dedicated to promoting the use and protection of works of the human spirit.¹⁵

UNESCO is, however, perhaps the most influential organisation and, ever since the drafting of 1972 Convention, has continued to play a leading role in international heritage concerns, thus having a significant influence on how heritage is understood in Europe, and throughout the West – particularly in the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors. The International Council of Museums (ICOM) and the European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers’ Organisations (ECCO), for example, play a foremost role with respect to the preservation of tangible heritage.

It took until 1982 for UNESCO to set up a ‘Committee of Experts on the

¹² J. Blake, ‘Safeguarding Traditional Culture and Folklore – Existing International Law and Future Developments’, Smithsonian Institution, 1999 (cited above).

¹³ Information available from: http://www.folkline.hu/index_e.shtml

¹⁴ Information available from: http://206.191.7.19/index_e.shtml

¹⁵ Information available from: <http://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/>

Safeguarding of Folklore’ and created a special ‘Section for the Non-Physical Heritage’. The concerns raised were formally recognised with the *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference in Paris in 1989, discussed in the next section.

2.1.2: Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore, 1989

UNESCO’s 1989 Recommendation was the first formal recognition of intangible heritage¹⁶ - which, by recognising the social, political, economic and cultural importance of folklore, represented a decisive change in thinking about heritage. The concept of intangible heritage, by incorporating the history of people and recognising its importance to contemporary culture, has subsequently become recognised as an integral part of cultural heritage and living culture.

In UNESCO’s 1989 Recommendation, folklore was defined as follows:

Folklore (or traditional and popular culture) is the totality of tradition-based creations of a cultural community, expressed by a group or individuals and recognised as reflecting the expectations of a community in so far as they reflect its cultural and social identity; it’s standards and values are transmitted orally, by imitation or by other means. Its forms are, among others, language, literature, music, dance, games, mythology, rituals, customs, handicrafts, architecture and other arts.¹⁷

According to this definition, ‘folklore’ is understood as *living heritage* – as such, it is not represented solely in the materials it creates but in terms of the peoples who express it. This is an important distinction because it reflects the dualistic nature of heritage preservation in Western culture (suggested above).

It is also important to recognise that, although the 1989 Recommendation identifies so-called ‘living heritage’ and supports its transmission to future generations, it still

¹⁶ *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, UNESCO, adopted by the General Conference, Paris, 1989. Available from:

http://www.unesco.org/culture/laws/paris/html_eng/page1.shtml [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

¹⁷ *Recommendation*, UNESCO, 1989.

tends to focus on the *material outcome* of intangible heritage (which, of course, is not intangible heritage *per se*). This is arguably because it is heavily weighted towards what can be described as a scientific epistemological paradigm which is essentially concerned with collating, documenting, cataloguing and recording, and the creation of national inventories (for example, through museums) with the purpose of forming a typology of folklore – information which may then be made public through ‘scientific’ publications. This would surely only encourage a focus on the *material outcome* of folklore activities rather than the essence of folklore which is represented by the *actions* of people (hence not merely the material outcome of their actions) and the value that they attribute *to* those actions.

In this sense, the Recommendation interprets folklore as a form of expression that materialises in objects when this is only partly the case. Folklore may also be a *way of life* and cannot be fully understood solely in terms of its material expression. To that extent, there is insufficient emphasis placed by the Recommendation on the social context of folklore creation and the knowledge and values that (re-)create and sustain it.

Another important point to make is that there clearly is not enough emphasis on the bearers and transmitters of this knowledge and how this needs to be sustained in living form by passing from one person (generation or group) to another. Blake expressed her concerns in this regard in the following way:

...the heavy emphasis on the needs of the scientific community is a major weakness, the definition is too narrowly focused, and the Recommendation fails to safeguard folklore through the social and economic empowerment of its creators.¹⁸

Moreover, the Recommendation tends to refer to a generic group (or community) rather than an individual bearer which weakens the likelihood of being able to

¹⁸ J. Blake, ‘Safeguarding Traditional Culture and Folklore – Existing International Law and Future Developments’ in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999. Available from: <http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/blake.htm> [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

identify forms of knowledge that may have unique qualities but which may not be represented by a particular group or recognised by a particular community. Nonetheless, the emphasis on the bearers and transmitters of intangible heritage, suggested here, indicates the need for a ‘bottom-up’ approach to its promotion – which contrasts with the existing ‘top-down’ approach represented by the domination of the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors in the preservation of tangible heritage. Most relevant to this still (and to this thesis) is the fact that the Recommendation identifies certain forms of *knowledge* as a prospective characteristic of living ‘intangible’ heritage.

Since the initial conception of living heritage at the World Heritage Convention (1972) and its subsequent formal recognition in 1989 (in terms of folklore at least), UNESCO has implemented the *Living Human Treasures* programme (1994) and the *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity* programme (1997/8). The ‘Living Human Treasures’ programme defines living human treasures as:

...persons who possess a very high degree of knowledge and skills required for performing or creating specific elements of the intangible cultural heritage that the Member States have selected as a testimony to their living cultural traditions and to the creative genius of groups, communities and individuals present in their territory.¹⁹

This definition aims to encourage Member States to create national systems that give official recognition to knowledgeable tradition bearers and practitioners (such as, traditional artists and craftspeople) in order to encourage them to transmit their knowledge and skills – related to the various aspects of intangible heritage – to younger generations.²⁰ In other words, *knowledge of how* – which, in its cultural manifestation, may also be described as the ‘tacit dimension’ (discussed in Part I).

¹⁹ *Living Human Treasures*, UNESCO, 1994. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=2243&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

²⁰ Guidelines for the establishment of National ‘Living Human Treasures’ Systems have subsequently been published by UNESCO and are available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/file_download.php/1422690320114549c199903cf8ba93f9Guidelines_lht.pdf

The ‘Proclamation of Masterpieces’ is an international distinction which was inspired by the *List of the World Heritage Convention*. It sets out, also through a list system, a programme to create an internationally recognised distinction which celebrates the bearers and transmitters of intangible heritage with due regard to their safeguarding and continuity. The Proclamation awards for two types of intangible cultural heritage: forms of popular and traditional cultural expressions and cultural spaces.²¹

These two programmes have been of great importance to the formation of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2003) which is stated in the ‘Proclamation of Masterpieces’ document in the following terms:

The first Proclamation held in May 2001 at UNESCO Headquarters stressed the urgent need of protecting and safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage. The 19 Masterpieces proclaimed by Director General Koichiro Matsuura, were chosen because they represented outstanding values from a historical, artistic and ethnological point of view and because of their importance for the cultural identity of the tradition bearer communities. For the first time ever, the Proclamation provided a means of exhibiting examples of the diversity throughout the world of intangible cultural heritage. During the 2nd Proclamation, held in November 2003, a further 28 Masterpieces were proclaimed, thus enriching the list with as many new and remarkable cultural expressions and spaces. The 2nd Proclamation coincided with the adoption, by UNESCO Member States, of the Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, representing the outcome of endeavours and reflections led by UNESCO for over twenty years.²²

The 2003 Convention is discussed later in this chapter (Section 2.1.5) but what is

²¹ *Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, UNESCO, 1998. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=2226&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

²² *Proclamation of Masterpieces*, UNESCO, 1998.

important to note here is that it is surely evident that cultural diversity *cannot* be assured solely by preserving vestiges of the past. Consideration must also be given to the recognition, safeguarding and promotion of the intangible heritage which, in the widest sense, may be understood as a form of ‘meta-cultural’ production – i.e. it is *not* scientifically reductive in character.

In this respect, Matsuura explains how intangible heritage is:

...a melting-pot for creative expression and a driving force for living cultures. Intangible heritage embodies an infinity of expressions bearing on the profound values of the life of a people and of a community: oral traditions, traditional knowledge, know-how in the creation of material cultures, values systems, representational art, languages.²³

In safeguarding intangible heritage, UNESCO has recognised the need to bring some form of protection to forms of culture that, by their very nature, are fragile and at great risk – particularly through their exposure to social, political, economic and technological forces, together with the influence of mass culture and modern lifestyles effected by globalisation. To that extent, Matsuura believes that:

...this [the safeguarding of intangible heritage] is an urgent task because threats weighing on intangible heritage are immense. In many parts of the world, a great number of these expressions have either entirely disappeared or are on the verge of extinction due to the processes of globalisation and the impact of new mass cultures. Unfortunately, intangible heritage is in this way becoming ever more marginalised, although it is the mainstay of the identity of all peoples [and] ...the speed of changes in the contemporary world makes me fear that unless we act rapidly, diversity, one of the world’s essential and vital treasures, might

²³ K. Matsuura, speaking at the ‘First Meeting of the Jury named to select Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage’, June, 2000 in *UNESCO to protect Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*, UNESCO Office of Public Information (OPI). Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2000/00-48e.shtml> [Accessed on 13th October 2003]

be lost forever more.²⁴

In addition to UNESCO's *Living Human Treasures* and its *Proclamation of Masterpieces* programmes, there have concurrently been other significant international developments such as, the Washington International Conference in June 1999 – the significance of which was expressed by Bouchenaki, as follows:

After 1989, several regional assessments on the impact of this Recommendation have been made. They culminated in the Washington International Conference in June 1999 organised jointly by UNESCO and the Smithsonian Institution. The Conference underlined the necessity to place an emphasis on tradition-bearers rather than scholars.²⁵

Some of the main points raised at the Washington Conference are discussed in the next section.

2.1.3: Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation: on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore, Smithsonian Institution, 1999

The 1999 Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference set out to assess the implementation of the 1989 *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore* – ten years on. To this end, various perspectives on the Recommendation were brought together from about the world based essentially around discussions about the ways in which the Recommendation might develop in the future so that its purpose (i.e. the safeguarding of traditional culture and folklore) might be achieved. The Conference included essays by cultural workers and other experts, including members of traditional communities; accounts of eight regional seminars held to evaluate the state of traditional cultures and UNESCO's role in safeguarding them; and essays on the legal questions that affect traditional cultures including for

²⁴ K. Matsuura in 'Towards a Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage', Press Release No. 2003-15, UNESCOPRESS, February 2003. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=9712&URL_DO=DO_PRINTPAGE&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed on 13th October 2003].

²⁵ 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).

example, intellectual-property issues. This section examines the various perspectives.

McCann, in his introduction, highlighted the deleterious effects of: ‘...the culture of the economy and technology that dominates the globe. [And that]: ...maintaining secrecy of traditions and of particular sources of information where necessary...’²⁶ With respect to sustaining intangible heritage, he expressed the importance of knowledge-transfer and how ‘knowledge-bearers’ should be better integrated into education:

In education, creators and perpetuators of folklore should be included in all aspects of curriculum development and teaching, not merely relegated to the role of providers of cultural materials to be structured, presented, and interpreted by others [i.e. by ‘non-participating’ observers].²⁷

In this statement McCann also brings to light the disjuncture between the careers of those involved in preserving tangible heritage and the bearers of intangible heritage – embodying the object v. subject dichotomy described in this thesis. He explained how terminology can perpetuate this and how this can be reflected in institutionalised administrations:

Principal among the questioned terms is “intangible cultural heritage” itself. To be sure, the term makes sense within the administrative logic of UNESCO, where it is theoretically equal and opposite of “tangible cultural heritage.” [With respect to this, he emphasised that]: The term “intangible” also encourages the use of models for understanding and action drawn from policies that address “tangible” heritage, thus

²⁶ A. McCann, (*et. al*), ‘*The 1989 Recommendation Ten Years on: Towards a Critical Analysis*’, in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment of the 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, Centre for Folk-life and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, 1999 – ‘Introduction’. Available from: <http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/mccann.htm> [Accessed on 15th October 2003]. Full text available from: <http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/Unesco/index.htm>. Such insularity is essentially a defensive mechanism against the threat of exploitation from ‘outsiders’ – i.e. by ‘non-participants’. It is important to stress here that this is not just a problem of Westernisation (as some of the delegates at the Conference expressed) but it has also evidently been a problem *within* Western culture. This is explored more fully in Part III of the thesis.

²⁷ A. McCann, (*et. al*), ‘Introduction’, the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

reinforcing the notion of folklore as items rather than as social activity.²⁸

In 1994, UNESCO issued a 'Questionnaire on the Application of the Recommendation' to Member States in order to ascertain the impact of the Recommendation and gather information about the policies and practices in those nations. Kurin's report offered a summary of the responses to that questionnaire and drew on social science literature in order to present the 'modernisation hypothesis'. Kurin explained this in the following way:

Other patterns in the responses to the questionnaire can be sought by using two competing hypotheses suggested by social science literature. The first of these, here called "the modernization hypothesis," would predict that more modernized nations have less folklore and traditional culture. Folklore and traditional culture, associated with a pre-modern era, would exist on the margins of society, in un-modernized, isolated pockets of the society. This form of culture would be devalued and discarded. Its knowledge would be replaced by a formal education system, its means of social communication replaced by the mass media. In such societies, folklore and traditional culture would not be seen as valuable; there would be little in the way of societal protections and no or few policies for their enhancement.

By way of contrast, folklore and traditional culture would be stronger in less modernized nations. This form of culture would be more central than marginal, a force in people's lives, a fact of everyday existence. It would be recognized in custom and law, valued, and protected. Thus, according to this hypothesis, more modernized nations would indicate less elaboration in institutions, laws, training, programs, and public awareness of traditional culture and folklore in their questionnaire responses, while less modernized nations would be much more positive.²⁹

²⁸ A. McCann, (*et. al*), 'Introduction', the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

²⁹ R. Kurin, 'The UNESCO Questionnaire on the Application of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore: Preliminary Results', the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999. The 'modernisation hypothesis' brings to mind the situation in the United Kingdom with respect to the role of the traditional arts and craft in the context of the

Puwainchir warned against the inadvertent objectification and exploitation of culture in the following terms:

Local cultures should not be turned into objects of folklore, of marketing, and of commerce, nor should the only places for old cultures be repositories in museums or descriptions in books. And we must avoid being represented only in monuments. No, we are a culture that is alive.³⁰

Implicit in this are the deadening effects of museums which is related to the academic tradition of textual representation. Importantly, he recognises that intangible heritage is *living heritage*.

Not unrelated to this, Puri used a citation from Langford in order to highlight the harmful effects of ‘Westernisation’ that occurred to the indigenous cultures of Australia:

From our point of view, we say – you have come as invaders, you have tried to destroy our culture, you have built your fortunes upon the lands and bodies of our people, and now... want a share in picking out the bones of what you regard as a dead past. We say it is our past, our culture and heritage and forms part of our present life. As such it is ours to share on our terms.³¹

It is obvious that these authors do not see their past in materials alone. To this extent, Puri also criticised current legislation (based on Western law):

conservation profession and the difficulty of knowledge-transfer – discussed in Chapter 1.3: ‘Professionalisation in the United Kingdom’.

³⁰ M. Puwainchir, ‘The Globalization of Interculturality’, the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

³¹ R. Langford, ‘Our Heritage – Your Playground’ (1983), cited in K. Puri, ‘Protection of Traditional Culture and Folklore’, the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999. Related to this (and worth noting here), Krishna Menon highlights the problematical differences between European and Indian visions of heritage; see A. Krishna Menon, ‘Conservation in India – a search for direction’, in *Research, Abstracts and Texts: Conservation in India*, 2002. Available from: <http://www.architecture.net/+subject-listing/000058.shtml> [Accessed on 14th December 2004].

...the focus of cultural heritage laws is on tangible material, such as objects, sites, and areas. Intangible materials, such as stories, dreaming tracks, and songs, are not protected. Secondly, the focus is on historical and scientific value rather than cultural and spiritual value. Thirdly, *past heritage is considered more important to protect than living heritage [my italics]*.³²

This brings to mind the limiting nature of the positivistic approach to historiography that dominates Western institutions and which sees only the past as historical while ‘forgetting’ the historicity of the present. It also (arguably) reveals the limiting nature of scientific epistemology – based on methodological (*and* metaphysical) reduction. It is perhaps worth noting here that such intangibles as fairytales, myths, stories and songs, are well-documented in Western culture (and arguably forms an innermost part of it).

In conclusion Puri argued:

In most parts of the world, there are no specific laws to protect traditional knowledge and expressions of indigenous culture. Consequently, almost all Indigenous communities have been forced to become secretive and, where possible, to turn to traditional customary laws to safeguard their culture and knowledge from indiscriminate exploitation and subjugation by the dominant Western culture. It is strongly recommended that UNESCO should rally behind Indigenous peoples of the world by adopting a common approach so that their special needs could be represented at domestic, regional, and international levels.³³

Prott expressed how heritage preservation is essentially about a civilisation’s *connectedness* to its past: ‘Current anthropological studies emphasize that it is *social process* that needs to be preserved, rather than merely the items produced, to ensure

³² K. Puri, ‘Protection of Traditional Culture and Folklore’, the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

³³ K. Puri, ‘Protection of Traditional Culture and Folklore’, the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

the continued creation of these valued products' [*my italics*].³⁴ In this, Prott recognises that 'heritage' (in all its manifestations) *should* be understood as a form of meta-cultural production. In relation to this, he acknowledged the traditional arts and crafts as central mediators of intangible heritage and, in so being, recognised their 'connectedness' to the tangible heritage. As such, under the heading: 'Traditional Skills Related to Tangible Cultural Heritage', Prott identified the following:

Objective: to maintain stock of skills for restoration, maintenance, and replacement of tangible heritage created by traditional skills.

Needs: to ensure the handing on of skills and the survival of tools and raw materials.

Means: support of senior craftsmen to ensure survival; training schemes to ensure passing on; "living cultural treasures" program; mandatory use in government-owned properties; education programs to enhance appreciation.³⁵

There are two important points to make here: on the one hand, is the importance conferred upon the history of *practice* and, on the other, *its* importance to tangible heritage. In other words, it can be argued that *one sustains the other* in what might be described as a symbiotic relationship (and perhaps an implicit reference to authenticity). This might also, in some respects, be understood as a 'resistance' to the outward effects of the so-called 'modern historical consciousness' (discussed in Chapter 1.4, above).

Not unrelated to this, Prott acknowledged the difficulty in safeguarding the 'social process' in the following terms:

Preserving the social processes which have produced folklore and traditional knowledge is much more difficult than just recording them or

³⁴ L. Prott, 'Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies', the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

³⁵ L. Prott, 'Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies', the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

preserving the results in a museum. For example, where traditional skills are handed down from elderly persons with a lifetime of expertise, with decades of experience in increasing cultural knowledge, and with primary responsibility for their transmission to the next generation, respect for the aged is a very important aspect of that transmission.³⁶

Finally, Bradford pointed out that the 1989 Recommendation called for: ‘...the international scientific community to adopt a code of ethics to ensure a proper approach to and respect for traditional cultures’³⁷ – reinforcing the hypothesis documented by this thesis that the objectifying and universalising tendencies of scientific epistemology contribute to the problem of global cultural homogenisation. The references to ‘ethics’ also suggests the need for what might be described as a moral epistemology.

As part of these wider international concerns the Getty Conservation Institute took a lead in the assessment of *values* relating to cultural heritage which began in 1995 and materialised with the publication of *Economics and Heritage Conservation* in 1999.³⁸ A second research report, *Values and Heritage Conservation*, which developed upon the earlier report, was published in 2000.³⁹ Each of these publications recognised the need for a broader concept of heritage. A third report was published in 2002 which discussed these issues in greater detail – some of which are examined in the next section.

2.1.4: Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage, Getty Conservation Institute, 2002

The publication of *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage* (in 2002) represented

³⁶ L. Prott, ‘Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies’, the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

³⁷ S. Bradford, ‘Global Steps to Local Empowerment in the Next Millennium’, the Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference, 1999.

³⁸ *Economics and Heritage Conservation*, edited by R. Mandy, The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1999. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/econrpt.pdf [Accessed on 15th May 2006].

³⁹ *Values and Heritage Conservation*, Research Report, edited by E. Avrami (*et al*), The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2000. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/valuesrpt.pdf

the culmination of research led by the Getty which began in 1995.⁴⁰ In the introduction to the Report it is recognised that the value that is attributed to cultural heritage has always been the reason underlying its preservation. Accordingly: ‘It is self-evident that no society makes an effort to conserve what it does not value’.⁴¹ In relation to this, the research at the Getty Conservation Institute highlighted:

...the lack of recognised and widely accepted methodologies for the assessment of cultural values. [The publication of the Report in 2002 thus]: ...starts to address these issues by focusing on methods of identifying, articulating, and establishing cultural significance. [Cultural significance is determined by]: ...the aggregate of values attributed to it.⁴²

Recognising that the significance of cultural heritage is determined by the multiplicity of values that culture attributes to it, the Report highlighted the insular nature of the heritage field and how it must undergo a process of transformation to be more reflective of diverse stakeholder interests:

Until recent times, the heritage field was relatively isolated, composed of small groups of specialists and experts. These groups determined what constituted “heritage” and how it should be conserved. The “right to decide” of these specialists was validated by authorities who funded their work. In recent decades, the concept of what is heritage has evolved and expanded and new groups have joined the specialists in its identification. These groups of citizens, of professionals from other fields, and of representatives of special interests arrive in the heritage field with their own criteria and opinions – their own “values” – which often differ from our own as heritage specialists. The stakeholders of social values are usually members of the public who have not traditionally participated in our work or had their opinions taken into consideration. This

⁴⁰ *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, edited by M. de la Torre (*et al*), The Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2002. Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

⁴¹ M. de la Torre (*et al*), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Getty, 2002 (pp.3-4).

⁴² M. de la Torre (*et al*), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Getty, 2002 (pp.3-4).

democratisation is a positive development in our field and bears witness to the importance of heritage in today's society.⁴³

The heritage field thus recognises that heritage belongs to *all* members of any civilisation. However, the view that new groups 'arrive' with their own opinions into the world of conservation is potentially misleading; in fact, it can be argued that the opposite is the case in the sense that conservation (a relatively new discipline) 'arrived' into existing domains and through the processes of methodological reduction 'separated' the material heritage from such groups (see Chapter 1.4). It is surely for this reason that concerns have grown over different stakeholder participation? As a result of this, the introduction to the Report concluded by recognising that:

Conservation professionals are faced with two particular challenges arising out of these social and political contexts: challenges of power sharing and challenges of collaboration. Broader participation poses a challenge to the roles and responsibilities of conservation professionals: some suggest that bringing conservation policies and decisions in line with democratic values would undermine the authority of conservation professionals and would even amount to an abdication of professional responsibility. In other words, democratisation of conservation decision making could contradict the professional devotion to conservation...⁴⁴

This suggests that conservation professionals (who are a *very* small minority) are not themselves part of any social and political context. A conservation profession (and indeed heritage institutions) that does not reflect the interests of respective stakeholders in a democratic way could be perceived as autocratic which could in turn lead to concerns regarding the ethics of the profession on a more ideological level. In connection with this, Mason recognised that:

...the conservation field, at present, is not very proficient at gauging all the values of heritage. [As such]: ...heritage conservation is best

⁴³ M. de la Torre (*et al*), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Getty, 2002 (pp.3-4).

⁴⁴ M. de la Torre (*et al*), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Getty, 2002 (pp.3-4).

understood as a socio-cultural activity, not simply a technical practice. Traditional modes of assessing “significance” rely heavily on historical, art historical, and archaeological notions held by professionals... The values of heritage are not simply “found” and fixed and unchanging, as was traditionally theorised in the conservation field. Values are produced out of the interaction of an artefact and its contexts; *they don’t emanate from the artefact itself*. For conservation professionals, this requires some substantial rethinking of the kinds of research and knowledge that are needed to support conservation [*my italics*].⁴⁵

Accordingly, values are not inherent qualities of objects; they are attributes of knowing subjects. Alois Riegl was one of the first to identify how the actions taken in the preservation of tangible heritage actually reflected the values that were attributed to it. His paper ‘The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and its Development’ influenced the way Cesare Brandi (for example) attributed value to fine arts heritage (nominally relating to paintings, sculpture and archaeological heritage).⁴⁶

However (to recapitulate), in Brandian theory the primary value domains are ‘reduced’ to the ‘aesthetic’ and the ‘historical’; while ‘age-value’ and/or ‘use-value’ tends to be denied or relegated in importance. This is perhaps attributable to the scientific basis of his approach and the way that Western aesthetics ‘closes’ the work of art which is based on the concept of an eternal presence. This methodological approach (examined in Part I) arguably creates the impression that such values *are* inherent qualities of objects which can have the effect of debarring alternative reasons for its preservation. And slowing down the rate at which materials deteriorate (the basis of scientific conservation) necessarily causes ‘newness-value’ to emerge, denying future generations of the acquired aesthetic of ‘age-value’ (which has been described in Rieglian terms as an expression of the cult of ‘newness-value’).

⁴⁵ R. Mason, ‘Assessing Values in Conservation Planning’, in *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Getty, 2002 (p.5). *Note: see the table ‘How values relating to tangible heritage have changed throughout the twentieth-century’ (p.15) – the title is self-explanatory.

⁴⁶ A. Riegl, ‘The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and its Development’, in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by N. Stanley Price (*et al*), The Getty Conservation Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1996 (p.96)

The need to broaden conservation's conception of heritage has also been identified by Mason:

Conservation professionals have traditionally been very skilled in looking at certain contexts of heritage – relating to physical deterioration, environmental conditions, and other physical factors; or to art historical narratives and aesthetic canons – and have developed methodologies and tools for analysing these contexts. But an understanding of heritage values in the fullest sense requires that conservation professionals cast a wider net and consider more and different contexts of conservation – economic, cultural, and political.⁴⁷

In order to achieve greater harmony with respective stakeholder groups the Report recognised the requirement of: ‘...identifying the stakeholder groups and employing methods designed to reach and hear them in light of their particular character and capacity is required of any methodology for heritage value assessment’.⁴⁸ The Report recommended research in the social sciences as an important way to achieve this.

However, this would mean that assessments of values would remain in the hands of research scholars and not necessarily in the hands of bearers. It is important for conservation professionals to realise that in considering other value-domains, for example those relating to intangible heritage, that these are *expressed values* – in that they are embodied in people that bear and express them through their actions. As such, it is erroneous to believe that they can be rationally delineated by one person and then applied arbitrarily by another (i.e. non-bearer; the so-called ‘non-participant’). This conception is nonsensical and necessarily in-authentic in terms of *expression*.

Throsby, speaking from an economic perspective, referred to the importance of cultural diversity in the following manner:

Just as biodiversity is seen as significant in the natural world, so also is

⁴⁷ R. Mason, ‘Assessing Values in Conservation Planning’, Getty, 2002 (p.15).

⁴⁸ R. Mason, ‘Assessing Values in Conservation Planning’, Getty, 2002 (p.17).

cultural diversity important in maintaining cultural systems. The diversity of ideas, beliefs, traditions, and values yields a flow of cultural services that is quite distinct from the services provided by the individual components. Indeed, diversity could be seen as one of the most important attributes of cultural capital in the large, because it has the capacity to yield new capital formation. For example, to the extent that creative works are inspired by the existing stock of cultural resources will lead to the creation of more varied and more culturally valuable artistic works in the future. Thus, assessment of specific investment projects should pay attention, in terms of this principle, to the contribution to cultural diversity that the project is likely to make.⁴⁹

The mention of cultural diversity touches on ideas that are presently being developed relating to the intangible heritage (and the notion of ‘heritage’, in the widest sense, as a form of meta-cultural production). However, the use of terms such as ‘cultural capital’ typifies an essentially economic view-point; the over-emphasis on which can have the effect of heritage (and related intangibles) being understood as resources to be commercially exploited, thus leading to a tendency towards commoditisation (which, in turn, could be detrimental to its authentic living vitality).

In connection with this, Mason acknowledged that:

A broad distinction is often made between economic and cultural values as the two primary meta-categories of heritage value. This distinction has served as a starting point for the research undertaken by the Getty Conservation Institute on values-related issues most relevant to conservation.⁵⁰

This again is a limitation. The prominence of economic values (alongside cultural values) is certainly linked to the economic factors relating to the running of the Getty Conservation Institute; in particular, the ongoing costs relating to the preservation of

⁴⁹ D. Throsby, ‘Cultural Capital and Sustainability Concepts in the Economics of Cultural Heritage’, Getty, 2002 (pp.109-110).

⁵⁰ R. Mason, ‘Assessing Values in Conservation Planning’, Getty, 2002 (p.10).

its heritage collections and the (likely) extra costs relating to greater stakeholder engagement. The Report thus reflects an institutional perspective and how this institution (the Getty) is attempting to overcome questions that have been raised relating to its obligations towards, and subsequent engagement with, culture itself.

Also in connection with cultural diversity Mason acknowledged that:

Craft-or work-related values are often very important aspects of heritage. A building embodies the methods used to design and make it, and the values relating to the process of making and building are often separate from (or lost among) more static historical or aesthetic values.⁵¹

This is an important point because it highlights the limitations of aesthetic and historical values from the perspective of the traditional arts and crafts. Mason here also touches upon intangible heritage (as manifested in traditional forms of knowledge and practices) but in an *implicit* way. Indeed, the process of restoration (in the *adding to* sense) can be seen to sustain cultural diversity by keeping alive many traditional practices and related ways of life and forms of knowledge that may be culturally-specific, regionally-specific, group-specific and/or individually-unique. For instance, stone masonry is a thousand-year tradition throughout Europe. The monuments survive because the knowledge survives; if it does not, the monuments are *ipso facto* lost. Hence, in this wider sense, there is a symbiotic relationship between the tangible and intangible heritages based around knowledge (and is therefore epistemological).

This relationship does not necessarily apply in America – for obvious reasons. This may be the reason why intangible heritage (as understood by UNESCO) has not been considered at all in the Getty Report. However, there are other forms of intangible heritages, such as those associated with Native Americans, or ‘Cowboys’, which may be considered relevant to Americans. The narrowness of aesthetic and/or historical values is, nonetheless, made clear. It is surely ironic then, that they should form the basis of professional conservation throughout Europe.

⁵¹ R. Mason, ‘Assessing Values in Conservation Planning’, Getty, 2002 (p.11).

In connection with this, it is essential that the field recognises in considering other values – particularly intangible heritage (as defined by UNESCO) – that this is *expressed through the actions of people*. As such, it is erroneous to believe that intangible heritage (which may have centuries-old lineage) can be rationally delineated by one person and then applied arbitrarily by another (i.e. non-bearer). This would necessarily lead to *in-authentic* expression. And although the Getty Report generally reflects the wider paradigmatic movements in global heritage concerns (spearheaded by UNESCO), the fact that economic and cultural values served as a starting point for the research undertaken is (arguably) a reflection of the Report's institutional perspective. To that extent, the Report, by being essentially framed around the responsibility the Getty has for a collection of cultural objects, failed to draw enough attention to the private sector or to the attention of private ownership at all and is consequently likely to be of primary benefit only to heritage institutions and organisations.

Indeed, in relation to this, it might also be argued that the Report reflects a 'top-down' approach to dealing with these wider issues – which is revealed in its emphasis on conservation management and planning and the political and economic factors related to this. As a result, the conservator has a position of authority over the kinds of decisions that may be necessary with regard to wider stakeholder issues. This authority is, of course, outside of their present 'jurisdiction' and does still tend to leave decision-making in the hands of scholars rather than (for instance) bearers of intangible heritage – whose complex values and aspirations may not be easily communicated to someone else.

In this sense, the Report might be described as essentially reflecting how the Getty Conservation Institute is attempting to overcome questions that have been raised relating to its obligations towards, and subsequent engagement with, culture itself. It is then, what might be called a *post-collection perspective* in the sense that this perspective can be understood as largely existing because of the processes of methodological reduction that have already taken place (which enabled the accumulation of the collection in the first place). Accepting this, it might also be referred to as a *post-reductionist* perspective, suggesting that the need for 're-

engagement' with culture (i.e. through acknowledging relative stakeholder perspectives) is an inevitable outcome of such methodological reduction.

And although the Report shows that the concept of heritage has broadened, unlike the 1999 Smithsonian-UNESCO Conference (which focuses directly on the intangible heritage), it does not really examine in any detail how this might translate into the restoration process itself. This is an important omission because the physical characteristics of any historical document are (it can be argued) determined by the processes of restoration. In order to illustrate this point, if we accept the premise that the material (i.e. the tangible object) is a starting point for consideration of values, then those values must be sustained by the continued existence of the material – when that material is no longer in existence, it cannot be valued. The materials and techniques used in restoration (if the heritage is understood in this way) *because* they sustain the object as a physical entity must, therefore, also contribute to the ways in which heritage may be understood, such as, the aesthetic, spiritual, social, historical, symbolic aspects and so on.

Therefore, in order to enhance the mediation of such 'intangibles' they surely ought to be taken into account in the *process* of restoration? And because they tend to be manifested in 'life-worldly' systems of practice (in Husserlian terms), this raises the question as to whether they can 'authentically' be expressed in a (so-called) *post-reductionist* context. In other words, if restoration is undertaken within narrow value-domains (typically the 'aesthetic' and the 'historical') then such practice is (arguably) not consistent with the wider movements presented in the Report.

It is important to stress here that safeguarding intangible heritage concerns sustaining 'life-worldly' systems which may have a centuries-old lineage. It refers to *living history* and the complex systems of knowing and practice and meanings which exist in a 'pre-institutionally-rationalised' state (i.e. the 'natural attitude' in Husserlian terms). It is not possible to proscribe intangible heritage within a series of 'value' categories – this is a major limitation of the Getty's general approach. Intangible heritage must be understood on its own terms for its own intrinsic qualities to heritage in a holistic way. To that extent, the Report does not really consider intangible heritage in any meaningful way, nor does it consider how the practice of

restoration may be an important aspect of this; something which this thesis is interested in, and something which UNESCO has become more greatly involved with – as discussed in the next section.

2.1.5: UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003

UNESCO's 2003 Convention⁵² outlined considerations for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage – a phenomenon which has become vital to cultural diversity and sustainable development – in the following terms:

The importance of the intangible cultural heritage as a mainspring of cultural diversity and a guarantee of sustainable development, as underscored in the UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore of 1989, in the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity of 2001, and in the Istanbul Declaration of 2002 adopted by the Third Round Table of Ministers of Culture.⁵³

In connection with this, the Convention recognised the relatedness between the tangible v. intangible heritages which is stated among the Considerations in the following terms: '*Considering: the deep-seated interdependence between the intangible cultural heritage and the tangible cultural [and natural] heritage*'.⁵⁴ The use of the term 'interdependence' signifies that by the time of the 2003 Convention the competing claims of the tangible v. intangible heritages were finally being considered in symbiotic unity. The Convention also recognised: 'The invaluable role of the intangible cultural heritage as a factor in bringing human beings closer together and ensuring exchange and understanding among them...'⁵⁵ This reinforces the idea of a collective and unified cultural heritage which embodies both the living

⁵² *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].

⁵³ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), October 2003. Available from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf> [Accessed on 15th February 2004]

⁵⁴ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003.

⁵⁵ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003.

and the material vestiges of history.

In relation to this, the Convention also recognised that:

...communities, in particular indigenous communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals, play an important role in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and re-creation of the intangible cultural heritage, thus helping to enrich cultural diversity and human creativity.⁵⁶

The ‘Purposes of the Convention’ are stated (under article one) in the following terms:

- (a) to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage;
- (b) to ensure respect for the intangible cultural heritage of the communities, groups and individuals concerned;
- (c) to raise awareness at the local, national and international levels of the importance of the intangible cultural heritage, and of ensuring mutual appreciation thereof;
- (d) to provide for international cooperation and assistance.⁵⁷

Accordingly, intangible heritage should be internationally recognised and supported. To that end, the Convention defines cultural heritage under ‘Definitions’ (article two) in the following terms:

The “intangible cultural heritage” means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts, and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to

⁵⁶ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003.

⁵⁷ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003.

generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.⁵⁸

What is important to make clear here is this: intangible heritage should not be solely understood in terms of the materials (i.e. tangible heritage) it produces but also in terms of the ‘life-worldly’ systems that lie beneath it and continue to nourish and give it vitality. This means the practices, representations, knowledge and skills, and the values, rituals, beliefs related to this *as well as* the material this produces and sustains through restoration / repair / maintenance, such as instruments, objects, artefacts and so on. Intangible heritage is also understood to be responsive to its environment – so it is not fixed but dynamic. Therefore, context is important and the rights of people to maintain their way of life and their sense of connectedness to the past and to the physical present are central to its safeguarding. This can be described as an ‘organic’ conception of ‘heritage’ – representing an ecology of human life – that links the past to the present which is central to the concept of sustainable development.

According to UNESCO, the ‘intangible cultural heritage’ (as defined above) is manifested inter alia in the following domains:

- (a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of intangible cultural heritage;
- (b) performing arts;
- (c) social practices, rituals and festive events;
- (d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe
- (e) traditional craftsmanship⁵⁹

⁵⁸ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003.

⁵⁹ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003.

Traditional craftsmanship (for example) is identified as a central constituent of intangible heritage. So it is important to recognise that traditional craftsmanship refers to the use of traditional technology – and, by extension, traditional materials. These are typically natural materials because modern ‘synthetics’, by virtue of their lack of historicity, are not traditional and thus neither are the techniques employed in their use; hence, traditional craftsmanship needs safeguarding:

“Safeguarding” means measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalisation of the various aspects of such heritage.⁶⁰

Some of the key recommendations for safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage, as stated in the Convention, include the establishment of policies and management strategies, competent bodies that can promote identification and research, legal, financial and administrative measures. In addition to this, fostering awareness through education and training with recognition for its enhancement – in particular non-formal means of transmitting knowledge designated as intangible cultural heritage.

It is, therefore, crucial to understand the different ways in which such knowledge manifests itself; for instance, it may be represented in individuals and/or communities and/or groups. Therefore, for such knowledge to be recognised for its intangible qualities this does not necessarily have to represent the values and aspirations of a particular community or group but may also be valued on its own terms in individuals *because* it is exceptional and/or incomparable in a historical sense (this tends to recall the issues around traditional craft competence discussed in Part I). Understanding the ways in which knowledge is transferred (i.e. education and training) from one bearer to another is a central aim in safeguarding intangible heritage.

⁶⁰ *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, UNESCO, 2003.

It is possible to get some measure of the relationship between the tangible and intangible heritages by making a comparison between UNESCO's *World Heritage List*⁶¹ (which lists tangible heritage) and their *World Map of the Oral and Intangible Heritages of Humanity*⁶² (which lists intangible heritage). What is important to note from this observation is that Europe has *by far* the most tangible heritage listed, with comparatively little intangible heritage listed. This suggests that there is a lack of formal synthesis between the tangible and intangible heritages which arguably attests to their present disjuncture throughout Europe (and indeed the West in general). It also reveals the Euro-centric (or ethno-centric) leaning of UNESCO.

The *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* was adopted in October 2003 by UNESCO's General Conference. Forty-seven countries have ratified the Convention which came into force on 20th April 2006 – sixteen European countries ratified (notably not including the United Kingdom).⁶³ By establishing the 2003 Convention, UNESCO recognised that the values manifested in cultural diversity are central to sustainable development within the international heritage community. Accordingly, it is considered that *intangible heritage provides the overarching paradigm through which all heritages are understood*, as Bouchenaki argues:

The success of the [2003] Convention is also explained by the fact that for all cultures, tangible and intangible heritage are closely interrelated. Cultural heritage operates in a synchronized relationship involving society (that is, systems of interactions connecting people), norms and values (that is, ideas and belief systems that define relative importance). Heritage objects are the tangible evidence of underlying norms and values. Thus, they establish a symbiotic relationship between tangible and intangible. The intangible heritage must be seen as a broader

⁶¹ *World Heritage List*, UNESCO. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/map> [Accessed on 12th February 2006].

⁶² *World Map of the Oral and Intangible Heritages of Humanity*, UNESCO. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/intangible-heritage/index.htm> [Accessed on 12th February 2006].

⁶³ According to Smith, the United Kingdom was one of the countries that actively opposed the development of the 2003 Convention; see L. Smith's, *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, 2006 (in press at time of writing) (p.134).

framework within which tangible heritage takes on its shape and significance.⁶⁴

However, despite all this, the understanding of intangible heritage is still grossly underdeveloped in the West – as the comparison between the world heritage maps above suggest. This discrepancy between the tangible and intangible heritages was recently acknowledged by Brugman in the following terms:

...there is much intangible heritage in Europe to which not as much attention has been given so far as to the built heritage. Traditional knowledge and skills used in construction might indeed [in agreement with author] be one of the manifestations of such European heritage. [However]: ...the 2003 Convention covers these areas, but puts the accent on the importance of the intangible heritage itself, rather than on their possible associated value to monuments.⁶⁵

How then, might ‘their possible associated value to monuments’ (and indeed other tangible heritage) and this apparent fracture between the tangible and intangible heritages become reconciled? This possibility is central to this thesis and will be considered in subsequent chapters.

Finally, the definitions provided by UNESCO describe the *nature* of intangible heritage and how and where it might be found, but there is currently no definition which *embraces* the concept. Therefore, in order to make the concept more comprehensible, it may be understood (in broad terms), as follows: *intangible*

⁶⁴ 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).

⁶⁵ F. Brugman (f.brugman@unesco.org) 14th November 2005. RE: *Intangible heritage preservation*, e-mail to F. Hassard (f.hassard@tiscali.co.uk) – responding on behalf of Mr Reiks Smeets, chief of the Intangible Heritage Section of UNESCO. Similar developments have occurred with respect to the (so-called) moveable heritage; see for example, Lucie Donkin’s (unpublished) report in association with the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, Rome (ICCROM), *Crafts and Conservation: Synthesis Report for ICCROM*, ICCROM e-doc 2004/02 Version 1.0, written in June 2001 and released in February, 2004. Available from: http://www.iccrom.org/eng/02info_en/02_04pdf_pubs_en/ICCROM_doc02_CraftsandConservation.pdf [Accessed on 5th July 2005]. Among the outstanding training centres noted in the report is West Dean College, England, founded by Edward James in 1964 as a centre for ‘preserving and teaching the arts’ (p.17). The report is indicative of the general trend in recognising the role of the traditional arts and crafts as an aspect of living ‘intangible’ heritage but the notion of tangible / intangible synthesis is not developed.

heritage may be defined by the values that are attributed to a historicity of understanding as represented by the activities of people in the present.

The next chapter considers how these developments have influenced the concept of authenticity and how this in turn has impacted upon the practice of restoration.

2.2. Authenticity

This chapter discusses how the concept of authenticity has been transformed in recent times – moving from an emphasis on materials and form (i.e. the tangible) to *process* (i.e. by incorporating the intangible), thereby having an important effect on the practice of restoration. It is argued that this relates to the movement towards synthesis between the tangible and intangible heritages (discussed above) and that this changes the cultural function of restoration.

The chapter begins by considering how the term ‘authenticity’ was first introduced to the international heritage community by the *Venice Charter* (1964) but that it has taken subsequent decades to understand more fully the complexity of this concept. With respect to this, it is shown how the Nara Conference on Authenticity in 1994, by questioning the epistemological basis of cultural heritage preservation, marked a significant development in this process; thus moving the concept of the ‘authentic’ from what is described as a ‘modern’ Eurocentric understanding to a ‘post-modern’ plural position. The thesis argues that the scientific / technical and the political-institutional sectors (such as museums and universities) are at the centre of this epistemic tension in history.

The thesis also suggests that this epistemological shift (which is essentially a hermeneutical shift) represents a theoretical distinction between ‘scientific’ and ‘pre-scientific’ understandings of the past and that this has a long history in European thought which is attributed to the emergence of scientific methods of verification (which can be traced back to the European Church Reforms). It is further argued that this was central to the issues that emerged in the C19th. in the United Kingdom concerning the restoration of architectural heritage. And it is suggested that this period in many ways anticipated the post-modern concept of ‘heritage’ – which seeks to synthesise this tangible v. intangible dilemma through the concept of authentic process.

The thesis goes on to suggest that in the post-Nara period ‘authenticity’ should endeavour to take into consideration the *process* of restoration as a form of expression inherited from the past and not solely be limited to that which is strictly

necessary for the preservation of material substance and the restoration of visual form. Finally, the movement from materials and from to *process* is traced through its manifestation in various influential declarations, charters and conferences which are reviewed with respect to the materials and techniques of restoration – a determining factor of ‘authentic restoration’.

Chapter 2.2 consists of the following sub-sections: 2.2.1: ‘Authenticity – a brief history’; 2.2.2: ‘The Nara Conference on Authenticity, 1994’; and 2.2.3: ‘Authentic Restoration – from material and form to *process*’. This is followed by 2.2.4: ‘Conclusion to Part II’.

2.2.1: Authenticity – a brief history

The concept of authenticity – as introduced by the *Venice Charter* in 1964 – concerned the preservation of historic monuments; as stated in the preamble in the following terms:

Imbued with the message from the past, the historic monuments of generations of people remain to the present day as living witnesses of their age-old traditions. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity.⁶⁶

‘In the full richness of their authenticity’ has become somewhat of a conservation slogan ever since. However, at the time of this statement, the complexity of the term ‘authentic’ was under-discussed, necessitating a more complete understanding. In this connection, according to the *Venice Charter*, restoration aims to: ‘...preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument and is based on respect for original material and authentic documents’.⁶⁷ The emphasis on aesthetic and historical value owes a great deal to Cesare Brandi’s *Theory of Restoration* (discussed in Chapter 1.4) first published in 1963 – only one year before the *Venice*

⁶⁶ *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*: ‘The Venice Charter’, held at the 2nd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), Venice, 1964. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/docs/venice_charter.html [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

⁶⁷ *The Venice Charter*, Article 9 ‘Restoration’, ICOMOS, 1964.

Charter.⁶⁸

It is perhaps worth noting then, that in relation to these primary value-domains (and with respect to restoration), whereas Brandi uses the term ‘visual oneness’ to refer to the re-integration of losses in the restoration of paintings, in architecture this is generally referred to as *anastylosis* – i.e. the realisation of ‘visual form’.⁶⁹ The principle remains the same; the basis of which is an intentionally abstract and superficial approach to restoration (or reintegration) of missing elements which suspends the existing object in time and denies the meaningful attributes of the traditional arts and crafts (which, according to Philippot, are considered fraudulent). This is the (so-called) ‘synchronic’ (i.e. static) approach to tangible heritage preservation (discussed in Part I).

In contrast to this (and perhaps even because this ‘static’ approach has dominated the Western world for much of the last century) the international heritage community recognised the need to challenge conventional thinking in the conservation field and debate ways and means of broadening its horizons in order to bring better respect for cultural and heritage diversity to conservation practice. A more ‘dynamic’ approach to restoration, which aims to incorporate intangible heritage, has subsequently become central to the concept of authenticity.

The UNESCO World Heritage Committee, in recognising the relationship between the concept of authenticity and dynamic cultural values, included the ‘test of authenticity’ in its ‘Operational Guidelines’ in the late 1970’s. Discussion relating to this throughout the 1980’s reached a point of turning at the World Heritage Convention in Santa Fe (1992), whereupon:

⁶⁸ In addition to this, Paul Philippot and Harold Plenderleith, both formerly of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, Rome (ICCROM), took part in the drafting of the *Venice Charter* – demonstrating the link between archaeological conservation (through Plenderleith) and fine arts preservation theory (through Philippot).

⁶⁹ *Anastylosis* is an archaeological term referring to a restoration technique (based on visual unity) which reinstates as much original elements as possible. It is also sometimes used for broken pottery and other small objects. The missing areas are in-filled in an abstract way purely to link the existing fragments. The Greek architect Nikolas Balanos in 1902 used *anastylosis* in order to restore a collapsed portion of the Parthenon, restore the Erechtheion, and rebuild the Nike Temple a second time.

The experts urged the abandonment of a basically monumental vision of cultural heritage in favour of a more anthropological and global conception. The obvious bias which can be observed in examining the World Heritage List in favour of societies with a monumental culture was severely criticised. [In addition to this]: ...the absence of cultural expressions of living, traditional cultures on the World Heritage List was stated.⁷⁰

For this reason:

...it appears to be urgent to re-examine conservation philosophy in view of the progress made in the knowledge and perception of other cultures and conservation standards of the global community during the 1990's and in the conservation needs of the 21st century.⁷¹

This was undertaken in Nara, Japan in 1994, discussed next.

2.2.2: The Nara Conference on Authenticity, 1994

The Nara Conference on Authenticity in 1994 (which set out to meet the recommendations of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee) culminated in the *Nara Document on Authenticity* published by UNESCO in the same year⁷² - three decades on from the groundbreaking *Venice Charter*.⁷³ It was a turning point in questioning the epistemological basis of cultural heritage preservation; for instance, in the proceedings to the Conference, Larsen made the following assessment: 'The Nara Document reflects the fact that international preservation doctrine has moved from a Eurocentric approach to a post-modern position characterised by recognition of cultural relativism'.⁷⁴ This is reflected in the broadening of values and (most

⁷⁰ B. von Droste and U. Bertilsson, 'Authenticity and World Heritage', in *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995 (p.6).

⁷¹ B. von Droste and U. Bertilsson, 'Authenticity and World Heritage', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.14).

⁷² *Proceedings of the Nara Conference on Authenticity*, edited by K. Larsen, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, 1995.

⁷³ Herb Stovel provides a synopsis of events leading up to the Nara Conference in the Foreword to the proceedings: 'Working Towards the Nara Document', 1995.

⁷⁴ K. Larsen, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.xiii preface).

relevant to authenticity) consideration for the intangible heritage.

It is surely true that the Eurocentric (or ethno-centric) approach was material-centred in its emphasis on the ‘aesthetic’ and the ‘historical’ value of tangible heritage. However, the globalisation of heritage concerns can be seen to have had the effect of cultivating a ‘world view’ which respects cultural diversity and dispels with ethno-centrism. This may indeed, then, be understood as Larsen claims, as a new post-modern perspective which reveals the limitations of the ‘modern’ Eurocentric view and perhaps indicates that any form of ethno-centrism is potentially problematical in a multifaceted and dynamic scene. A ‘new discourse on heritage’ is thus unfolding.⁷⁵

Jokilehto similarly acknowledged the limitations of the Eurocentric approach while at the same time referring to the cultural dimension in the following terms:

In relation to a work of art, there is a habit of speaking particularly about two issues, i.e. its ‘form’ and ‘material’, or its artistic and historical dimensions. Such a definition has also conditioned the debate about restoration. It may, however, produce limitations especially when the discussion is taken into broader contexts. Therefore, a third dimension is gaining importance – a dimension that would take into account the aspect of cultural diversity, and that is the cultural dimension.⁷⁶

There are problems with this view though; for instance, by referring to the ‘cultural dimension’ in this way – i.e. as a ‘third’ dimension to be taken into account – implies that the prevailing dimension exists outside of culture itself and that the (so-called) ‘cultural dimension’ can be somehow apprehended and then included into the fray. The fact that the very concept of culture incorporates the entire constellation of cultural values and perspectives surely makes this perspective untenable. Nobody and no institution or organisation exists outside of culture.

Notwithstanding, it may be that some influential perspectives about ‘heritage’ (such

⁷⁵ *Conserving Culture: A New Discourse on Heritage*, edited by M. Hufford, University of Illinois Press, 1994.

⁷⁶ J. Jokilehto, ‘Authenticity: A General Framework for the Concept’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.19).

as the reductionist approach propounded by Brandi) have precluded the possibility of valuing others, but this does not preclude them from culture itself; it merely means that they may no longer be considered adequate. Indeed, it could be argued that the viewpoint expressed by Jokilehto reflects a *post-reductionist* perspective in the sense that he identifies, from a point of limitation (i.e. reduced perspective), the movement towards expansion (i.e. inclusion) by awareness of cultural diversity (i.e. the so-called ‘third dimension’). It thus starts from a perspective that is already grounded historically in its own ideology rather than starting afresh and being truly open and inclusive – not unlike the perspective suggested of the Getty Conservation Institute (and perhaps the institutional sector in general) in the preceding chapter (Section 2.1.4).

Nonetheless, with regard to this, Jokilehto acknowledged how the (so-called) ‘post-reductionist’ perspective (seen, for example, in museums and/or galleries) can subvert cultural continuity in the following way:

Ever since art has become a collectors’ item, the question of cultural continuity has been given less attention, and the unique, artistic quality of the object has gained a major emphasis. The accent is thus given to the ‘exhibition value’ of the object.⁷⁷

The emphasis on exhibition value would explain why aesthetic values (in particular) are important in such contexts – and perhaps also why Cesare Brandi’s superficial approach to restoration prevails therein. Interestingly, Jokilehto made a distinction between ‘values’ and ‘authenticity’:

The work of art or monument needs to be recognised in its context, and the relevant values defined as a basis for treatment. *Authenticity cannot be added to an object; it can only be revealed in so far as it exists.* Values instead, are subject to cultural and educational processes, and

⁷⁷ J. Jokilehto, ‘Authenticity: A General Framework for the Concept’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.28).

may change over time [*my italics*].⁷⁸

Unfortunately, this understanding of authenticity (which dominates the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors throughout the West) precludes intangible heritage as an aspect of authenticity which is (arguably) not consistent with recent developments with respect to the synthesis of the tangible v. intangible heritages.

It is perhaps worth reiterating here then, that it is *not possible* to rationalise intangible heritage into particular ‘value-domains’ which contradict the very concept of intangible heritage. Jokilehto’s confusion over this can, however, be explained in rational terms: intangible heritage is essentially an *ontological* category – embodying the (often centuries-old) religious, ritualistic, artistic and spiritual feelings of particular people, their knowledge, practices, groups, communities and/or ways of life – or even entire civilisations. It is about *being in* the world. Any attempt to rationalise this into particular ‘value-categories’ does not follow because this would reflect not *being in* the world but *knowing a limited amount about those that are in the world*. The process of rationalisation is *epistemological* in character (essentially based on the Western intellectual tradition) and thus presents this impossibility.

With respect to this, it is important to remember that intangible heritage must be understood in a ‘holistic’ way and that any attempt to rationalise intangible heritage into selected value-domains would necessarily be reductionist and would fail to capture its very essence. This difficulty was reflected in the contrasting approaches taken by (on the one hand) the Smithsonian Institution in 1999 in safeguarding traditional cultures *for their own sake* and the Getty Conservation Institute (on the other), which in 2002, attempted to extrapolate particular universal values relating to its material outcome (discussed above). The alternative, of course, would be to refer to intangible heritage as a specific category (which is happening) but, in a global context, this would surely increase the likelihood of the objectification and control of others by (so-called) ‘non-participating’ observers (who might not take into consideration the intangibility of their own perspective).

⁷⁸ J. Jokilehto, ‘Authenticity: A General Framework for the Concept’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.17).

However, in taking into consideration developments since the UNESCO 1972 Convention, Jokilehto acknowledged the post-modern movement from a *static* to a *dynamic* concept of heritage and how this is connected to the concept of sustainability:

In this broad picture, the only aim can certainly not be the preservation and conservation of monuments as static objects of contemplation; rather the question is about dynamic conservation management of existing renewable and non-renewable resources for the benefit of present and future society. Regarding the built environment, urban and rural historic areas and cultural landscapes in particular, the question is about sustainable human development. The aim is not to freeze change, but to provide a structure for planning and management.⁷⁹

However, the question of who manages remains undecided. Related to this, Jokilehto recognised the connection between authenticity and traditional continuity and how this links directly to the traditional arts and crafts:

Cultural heritage values should be understood in this dynamic context, and therefore also the concept of authenticity seen in relation to traditional continuity, to revival and upkeep of appropriate crafts and skills for the maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing building stock, with due concern for historic areas or structures that respect living authentic traditions.⁸⁰

It is because of this that:

...the definition of the authenticity of historic buildings in view of their consolidation, reinforcement or restoration treatments, should take into account the existing historical equilibrium of structural systems in

⁷⁹ J. Jokilehto, 'Authenticity: A General Framework for the Concept', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.31).

⁸⁰ J. Jokilehto, 'Authenticity: A General Framework for the Concept', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.31).

relation to materials and workmanship.⁸¹

In this sense, authenticity is conceived of by Jokilehto as a *process*. This conception of authenticity in relation to living authentic traditions, as reflected in materials and workmanship, should of course, not be limited to buildings or historic areas but must also incorporate other domains of heritage, such as furniture, decorative art, handicrafts and so on. This is especially the case with respect to the safeguarding of intangible heritage. Clearly, only specialised research can determine the validity of this.

From a Japanese perspective authenticity may *solely* reside in process – the tangible heritage being valued only in so far as it sustains authentic processes. The original material is thus a secondary consideration. In his defensive account, Ito for example, referred to the periodic reconstruction of the Ise Shrine which is recognised in Japan as an appropriate system for sustaining living culture. He associates this with the climatic conditions of Asia by pointing out that earthquakes are a daily occurrence in Japan making rupture and change part of Japanese life and its social and cultural conditions are also different from Europe. Ito stressed that *anastylosis* is a European concept⁸² and sees an appropriate approach to restoration and reconstruction in the following terms:

Of course, we do not intend to dismantle buildings arbitrarily. Far from it, we dismantle only when it is really necessary. Buildings are leaning and twisting, joints are crushed and timbers are partially rotted. In the repair works damaged objects are patched or replaced by new wood of the same species and quality as the original ones. The same carpentry techniques are applied as far as possible. In short, the aim of repair and restoration is to bring the building back to a neat condition again. ...I hope you understand that Japanese people appreciate old but neat state of

⁸¹ J. Jokilehto, 'Authenticity: A General Framework for the Concept', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.29).

⁸² N. Ito, "'Authenticity' Inherent in Cultural Heritage in Asia and Japan', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.42)

buildings.⁸³

In terms of materials and techniques Ito supports a 'like-with-like' approach to restoration which he described in the following terms:

If minute examination is made before replacement, the quantity of replaced parts is minimised, the size, quality and species of new material are the same as the previous ones, the workmanship is the same, and the report is published after the work, the replacement would never violate authenticity. Thus the definition of authenticity should not be strict but should be more flexible and changeable.⁸⁴

Interestingly, from a Chinese perspective, Zhan holds a similar view in that traditional methods and techniques are important when replacements are necessary.⁸⁵ And, according to Cleere, in Vietnam the practice of restoration rejects modern materials and techniques – echoing Japan and China. The Vietnamese are also meticulous when it comes to authenticity.⁸⁶

It is important to note here, when considering these different perspectives, that many traditional buildings in Asia are timber-framed and thus susceptible to rapid deterioration because they are inherently weaker than stone (for example). In addition to this, in tropical climates insect infestation may be an important contributory factor. By contrast, much of the built heritage in Europe (and on UNESCO's World Heritage List) consists primarily of stone (i.e. bricks and mortar) although the increase of air pollution since the 1900's (especially problematical in urban areas) has (no doubt) necessitated the need for their constant renewal and thus a more maintenance-based approach to preservation.

However, in addition to this, according to Nishimura:

⁸³ N. Ito, "'Authenticity' Inherent in Cultural Heritage in Asia and Japan', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.43).

⁸⁴ N. Ito, "'Authenticity' Inherent in Cultural Heritage in Asia and Japan', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.44).

⁸⁵ G. Zhan, 'The Particularity of "Authenticity" in the Conservation of Cultural Property in China', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.323-325).

⁸⁶ H. Cleere, 'The Evaluation of Authenticity in the Context of the World Heritage Convention', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.63).

Most Asian countries acquired their independence from the colonial powers after the Second World War. Since modern countries are relatively young and their national boundaries are more or less artificial, they are seeking their national identity to unify the nation. Therefore, preservation is sometimes regarded as a means to create national identity.⁸⁷

Many believe that this can be achieved by sustaining the traditional arts and crafts which are part of their living history. The practice of preservation, so understood, emphasises the importance of the objects of history on equal terms as the subjects who create and sustain them. The National Trust and English Heritage in the United Kingdom fulfil much the same ‘political’ function – but primarily through the symbolic power of monuments, arguably over and above the people who keep them there. However, recent developments in the United Kingdom suggest that this situation is beginning to change – particularly in architectural preservation – *because* of a more maintenance-based approach adopted in recent years (this is discussed in Chapter 3.1).

Cleere also discussed authenticity of design, materials, workmanship, setting, function and cultural landscapes. His idea of ‘authenticity of workmanship’ is of particular interest to this thesis and was expressed in the following terms:

Authenticity of workmanship is closely bound up with authenticity of materials. Where traditional materials are used in conservation and restoration work it is axiomatic that authentic techniques and tools should be used in working them.⁸⁸

Although Cleere does not dispute the importance of developing new materials and techniques, for him what is critical in achieving authenticity is *the way in which they are used and the person who uses them*. With respect to this, a distinction must be

⁸⁷ Y. Nishimura, ‘Changing Concept of Authenticity’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.182).

⁸⁸ H. Cleere, ‘The Evaluation of Authenticity in the Context of the World Heritage Convention’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.64).

made as to whether the materials and techniques are used purely for *conservation* purposes (i.e. stabilisation and consolidation) or for new work (such as additions / extensions) or for restoration / repair / maintenance or loss compensation (i.e. restoration in the *adding to* sense). Once a decision is made to replace a loss, Cleere's concept of authenticity of workmanship is mobilised – as are the traditional arts and crafts (if the object or building has been traditionally made) and, by extension, intangible heritage (provided *it* has been 'authenticated'). This clearly extends the concept beyond the purely physical / visual dimension in such a way that inevitably draws attention to the *subjects* of history.

What is also important to note here is that conservation and restoration serve different purposes – not just in terms of what is done but also in terms of what they represent symbolically. Whereas conservation essentially aims at maintaining the status quo – through scientific / technical research and development – restoration is bound to the concept of authenticity. It is understood to *enhance meaning* through its association with cultural practices. The use of traditional materials and techniques in restoration (in the *adding to* sense) is central to the cumulative 'historical' authenticity of the object which does not remain fixed but transcends time into the present through its support of living tradition; so conceived, restoration aims at achieving tangible / intangible synthesis in the name of authenticity.

This, of course, is the antithesis of *anastylosis* and is diametrically opposed to the way in which restoration in the name of the conservation profession has developed in Europe over the past decade (discussed in Part I). With respect to this, if we accept the premise that an object is an historical document and that authenticity is understood in terms of *process* (i.e. it can be *added to* the historical document), then it can be argued, that in 'scientific' conservation, as a general rule: the greater the historical value of tangible heritage the greater is the loss of its authenticity in restoration, and the greater is the compromise of the historical document.

Petzet holds a similar view, recognising that the fundamental nature of a work of art lies beyond the materials of fabrication. In this regard, he described the importance of materials, techniques and traditions of practice in the following terms:

The authenticity of a monument depends... not on the material alone, but rather on the authentic form created from a particular material with the help of particular techniques which are based on long traditions.⁸⁹

In understanding authenticity in this way there is the implicit acknowledgement that the materials used in any work of art and for its continued existence (particularly through restoration in the *adding to* sense) should not be considered context-free in their selection and use and should be based on their metaphysical connotations. In connection with this, Petzet criticised the ‘scientific conservation’ that has characterised the post-WWII period for focusing too much on the existing materials of fabrication. He asserted that:

Preservation, even 20th-century preservation with its supposedly purely scientific methods, has always to a certain degree been an “expression of its time”. ...a modern monument cult that is one-sidedly concentrated on the care of “historic fabric” leads in any case to a dead end if the authentic message of the monument is no longer understood.⁹⁰

Now, this so-called ‘dead end’ suggests what might be described as an ‘impasse’. It could be argued that this is the inevitable outcome of modern historical consciousness whose predominating positivist historiography – which ‘sees’ only the past *as* historical – dissolves the sense of continuity with the living present.

In contrast with Petzet, for Mujica the ‘authenticity’ of archaeological sites is not only important for the ‘aesthetic’ and the ‘historical’ values that are being transmitted to future generations, but above all because it is the only way to guarantee the rigour of the scientific information from which archaeologists reconstruct the history of the World’s peoples (on their behalf). Accordingly: ‘...from the archaeological point of view, a site which has lost its authentic nature

⁸⁹ M. Petzet, “‘In the Full Richness of their Authenticity’ – The Test of Authenticity and the New Cult of Monuments’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.87)

⁹⁰ M. Petzet, “‘In the Full Richness of their Authenticity’ – The Test of Authenticity and the New Cult of Monuments’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (pp.92-93)

has lost its value and is of little scientific use'.⁹¹

But this does not necessarily deplete its symbolic power in relation to culture. For instance, much of the world's material heritage is intimately connected to culture and religion which retains its living vitality and therefore cannot be solely considered in terms of the 'scientific' information that might be gleaned from it. It is critical to understand, as Mason explained in the previous chapter, that values are not inherent qualities of physical objects – they are produced out of the interaction of objects and their contexts.⁹² Aesthetic and historic values are considered universal when they are interpreted scientifically because science is a universal practice with a universal language but the complexities of cultural diversity would suggest that such an interpretation does not reflect the feelings of autonomous peoples. Lamei, for instance, criticised the effects that Western archaeology had on the Egyptian heritage in the following terms:

Westernisation occurred during the 19th and 20th - centuries breaking off the link which had continued for about ten centuries... demolishing the aesthetic concepts and values, creating a gulf between man and his society, [by] adapting European theories.⁹³

This reinforces the idea that a disjuncture occurred *within* Western (European) culture which in turn suggests that the Western (essentially reductionist) approach to the preservation of tangible heritage may have contributed (or currently *be* contributing) to the present global problem relating to cultural diversity.⁹⁴ In this sense, it could be argued that the object / subject (tangible / intangible) dualism continues to sustain a kind of paradox *within* the international heritage community.

⁹¹ E. Mujica, 'Authenticity and Heritage Diversity: Archaeological Sites and Cultural Landscapes in the Andean Countries', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.235)

⁹² R. Mason, 'Assessing Values in Conservation Planning', *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles, The J. Paul Getty Trust, 2002 (p.5). Available from: http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf [Accessed on 15th October 2003].

⁹³ S. Lamei, 'Authenticity and the Egyptian Heritage Diversity', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.361)

⁹⁴ In some respects the Lausanne Charter (1990) concedes this; see *The Charter for the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage* ('The Lausanne Charter'), International Committee for the Management of Archaeological Heritage (ICAHM), approved by the 9th General Assembly, Lausanne, 1990. Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/arch_e.pdf [Accessed on 15th January 2005].

As has been intimated by Lamei above, a synthesis between the two domains is surely vital in order to sustain the living connectedness with an otherwise non-living material record of history. It is important to recognise that the sciences represent *one field of knowledge* – they are not the only field – in opposition to the sciences is pre-scientific life and the ordinary performance of life as carried out in the ‘life-world’ (in Husserlian terms).⁹⁵

With this in mind, whereas there may be universal *principles* which underlie our collective responsibility to protect the common heritage of humankind, it is vital to stress that this is *not* the same as universal values. Universal values concern subjects (i.e. people and their enviring influences) and their relatedness to objects. Moreover, universal values are distinguished from authenticity in that the realisation of authenticity (which is not unrelated to values) also necessitates the preservation of the cultural ‘specificity’ of the creative past (i.e. the object) which cannot be achieved to its full potential when the object has become disconnected (either physically or consciously) from the civilisation whence it derived and through which it acquired ‘specific’ meanings.

Not unrelated to this, Tomaszewski proposed the establishment of a working group in order to carry out a comparative study on the relationship between the world’s major religions and conservation.⁹⁶ This seems a reasonable proposition; after all, much of the tangible heritage venerated today was created within a religious cultural subtext. One might then ask, for example, how far has religion shaped the social ordering of knowledge and, by extension, the methodological tools through which authenticity is understood?⁹⁷

With respect to this, one could surely argue that the essentially scientific Western epistemological tradition – which has dominated Western thought for the past quarter of a millennium (emerging historically from theology, and prevailing since the

⁹⁵ This is a reference to S. Luft, ‘Husserl’s Theory of Phenomenological Reduction: Between Life-World and Cartesianism’, in *Research in Phenomenology*, 34 (pp. 198-234), The Netherlands, 2004 (p.201) from Section 1.4.2: ‘Phenomenological reduction’.

⁹⁶ A. Tomaszewski, (an observer at the Nara Conference), *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.254)

⁹⁷ One recalls here how Hegelian mysticism has influenced the Western understanding of art and its subsequent approach to restoration (described in Chapter 1.4: ‘European restoration theory’) which subsequently became the basis of professionalisation (discussed in the preceding chapters).

period of Enlightenment) – is essentially based on Greek philosophy. The Enlightenment’s characteristic exaltation of reason and rationality (the bedrock of science) and the scientific idealism of methodological ‘otherness’ (i.e. objectivity) and the resultant progressive secularisation of Western education, are hardly conducive to understanding Christian cultural heritage (except perhaps in terms of the information the physical material might provide). One could further argue that by adopting essentially Greek methodologies, Enlightenment philosophers effectively ‘by-passed’ 1800 years of the Christian cultural subtext. Is there then, a chasm in Western thought which has been discouraged by the ascendancy of the (so-called) Enlightenment? The Husserlian ‘epoche’ can hardly be considered to be fostering an open and inclusive approach to the past.

Related to this, Lowenthal argues that the interpretation of authenticity has evolved historically from faith to fact – a phenomenon he attributes to scientific methodology in the following terms:

The history of European uses of the term ‘authentic’ underscores the shift from Medieval and early Modern emphasis on authority and revelation to more recent criteria based on material and chronological science – in a phrase, from faith to fact.⁹⁸

He attributes this to:

Renaissance and later science, with critical standards of evidence, transformed scholarly notions of ‘truth’ [Lowenthal adds]: ...this development owed much to the dispersal of printed books. [Therefore]: ...scientific standards of provenance and dating largely supersede revelation and the performative power of relics as criteria of authenticity.⁹⁹

This clearly suggests that we are not interpreting such ‘religious’ heritage in the proper way. This transformation from ‘faith to fact’, suggested by Lowenthal,

⁹⁸ D. Lowenthal, ‘Changing Criteria of Authenticity’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.134).

⁹⁹ D. Lowenthal, ‘Changing Criteria of Authenticity’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.127-128)

represents an epistemological shift (and therefore a hermeneutical shift) in human consciousness brought about by the emergence of scientific thought. Choay similarly considered how this extended the notion of authenticity from its legal connotation in the authentication of texts to the authentication of objects identified in the original.¹⁰⁰

Now, this is important with regard to a (so-called) ‘hermeneutical shift’ because the ‘scientific’ authentication of texts can be traced back to Erasmus, a Dutch-Catholic scholar who began the systematic examination of the manuscripts of the New Testament in order to prepare for a new edition and Latin translation. His work, in particular *Textus Receptus*,¹⁰¹ became the basis of most of the scientific study of the Bible during the European Church Reforms. This ‘scientific’ approach to the Bible created the epistemological conditions necessary for a hermeneutic of the natural world (revealed in the rapid development of the natural sciences shortly after the Reformation) and the subsequent ‘scientific’ authentication of objects.

Therefore, whereas the post-Renaissance episteme sees the world as a ‘picture’ to be objectified by interpretation and categorisation the pre-Renaissance (i.e. medieval) consciousness reflects a cosmological episteme which is rooted in values, beliefs and lived out in practice and characteristically artistic and craft-oriented.¹⁰² For example, the C19th. supporters of the Arts and Crafts Movement in England identified with medieval values – manifested in an understanding of the past based on a heightened sense of continuity and morality, cultivating a tendency towards pre-lapsarianism – which was entirely pre-scientific in character. The modern heritage preservation movement (both natural *and* man-made) owes a great deal to this way of thinking (as Chapter 3.1 aims to convey).

In many ways, the ‘paradigm shift’ from craft to science brought about by the professionalisation of conservation replicates this tension. With a history embedded

¹⁰⁰ F. Choay, ‘Seven Propositions on the Concept of Authenticity’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (pp.297-299).

¹⁰¹ *Textus Receptus* (in English: ‘received text’) refers to the first Greek-language text of the New Testament to be printed on a printing press. It was later used as the basis for the translation of the New Testament into English by William Tyndale, for the original Luther Bible, and for most other Reformation-era translations throughout Western and Central Europe. The *Textus Receptus* is classified by scholars as a late Byzantine text.

¹⁰² For an understanding of the role played by museums in this ‘epistemological shift’ see E. Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*, Routledge, 1992.

in Arts and Craft philosophy, no wonder that there have been so many issues in the United Kingdom regarding the processes of professionalisation. Perhaps it is a question of which ‘paradigm’ dominates – which usually depends on how effectively it is administered. The sciences, for example, are typically empowered by their affiliation to the political-institutional sector, which has contributed to the dominance of the scientific epistemological model in Western culture.

In this connection, Bumbaru made the interesting point that:

On the basis of the authority that legislation, knowledge or prestige grants them, scientific or professional groups, have developed a vision of authenticity that often corresponds to certain standards. [In reality, however]: ...citizens from different cultures often share an understanding of authenticity more easily than an architect and an archaeologist... who are separated by professional approaches.¹⁰³

In so being they do not necessarily recognise relative ‘life-worldly’ concerns – i.e. the people who they are there to serve. It would appear that, in the field of heritage, wherever science (as in scientific thinking) prevails authenticity will tend to be determined through the existing material fabric rather than on a purely conceptual basis (which lies beyond the horizons of scientific facts). However, in terms of practice, science is usually dependent on the availability of advanced technologies which tends to be context-specific. Outside of such contexts authenticity may be considered quite differently and usually determined on a *macroscopic* not *microscopic* (or even molecular) level. This way of ‘seeing’ the object can have a substantial bearing on the kinds of materials and techniques used in restoration – both in terms of what is *added to* the object and what may be *removed* as ‘unoriginal’.

This can lead to confusion over how tangible heritage is preserved which is often represented by conflicting views around the term ‘historical document’. For instance, John Ruskin and William Morris advocated the idea of an historical document,

¹⁰³ D. Dinu Bumbaru, ‘Authenticity and Dignity – Heritage and Human Dimension’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.280)

informing their approach to ‘restoration’ based on *incremental repair*. As such, they lambasted those who attempted to restore back to the so-called original in the name of ‘authenticity’ or ‘stylistic unity’ or ‘historical accuracy’. The idea of an historical document (which may also be referred to as an historical palimpsest), however, is not unproblematic. Lowenthal identified this in the following terms: ‘A second *conundrum* concerns how close to the present to allow heritage alterations. At what point in the past... is a building’s valued dynamic history deemed to end?’ [*my italics*].¹⁰⁴

This idea of history coming to an end (arguably the impasse of historicism) also appears to present a ‘conundrum’ in museum-based conservation. For instance, it is often considered that restorations up to about the 1920’s should be retained on the basis of historical relevance. Thereafter, restorations are more likely to be removed on grounds of appropriateness.¹⁰⁵ For instance, Caple, an archaeological conservator, similarly (albeit implicitly) recognised the ‘conundrum’ of what to retain and/or remove from the historical document when he stated that: ‘Any restorations of the nineteenth century or earlier may be of importance’.¹⁰⁶ Why *prior to* the C20th? This implies that there is nothing to be valued in restorations carried out in the twentieth or even twenty-first centuries? Surely, if the object is to retain its authenticity as an historical document (i.e. its historical authenticity) – and its symbolic message enhanced – then *all* restorations should be historically important? Otherwise it *de facto* cannot be an historical document.¹⁰⁷

It is particularly interesting to note, that the early C20th. is the time when scientific conservation-restoration became established in public institutions in the United Kingdom (discussed in Chapter 1.1). It is surely more than a coincidence that this should also be a period of departure in terms of what might no longer be considered relevant and contributing in a meaningful way to the historical document? Perhaps this is part of the endeavour of scientific conservation – i.e. to preclude ‘unwanted

¹⁰⁴ D. Lowenthal, ‘Changing Criteria of Authenticity’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.128)

¹⁰⁵ See, for example, the introduction to A. Oddy, *Restoration: Is it Acceptable?* British Museum Press, 1991.

¹⁰⁶ C. Caple, *Conservation Skills: Judgement, Method and Decision Making*, Routledge, 2000 (p.127).

¹⁰⁷ These issues relating to restoration tend to be discussed around the notion of reversibility, indicating the confusion in the field; see for instance, *Reversibility - Does It Exist?* edited by A. Oddy (*et al*), British Museum Occasional Paper 135, British Museum Press, 1999.

interference' by the liquidation of metaphysics through the prophetic scientific ideal of metaphysical 'neutrality' – truly a 'dead end'?

The question of whether to retain or remove an earlier intervention (so long as there are no obvious serious damaging effects and it is aesthetically acceptable) arises when the focus of historical enquiry is directed solely towards the *objects* of history (i.e. the tangible heritage interpreted as a material record, as evidence, as data etc.) and not the *subjects* of history (i.e. the intangible heritage, the living embodiment of the past) – which is excluded. This apparent 'conundrum' is the inevitable outcome of a positivistic view of historiography (inscribed by the non-participating observer) which, by focusing on materials, does not take into account the historicity of the present reality – as represented in *people* (which is outside of its 'horizon of knowing' and thus *obscure*).

In order to illustrate this, artists and craftspeople who maintain (for example) historic monuments by constantly renewing their fabric – who have done so for centuries – are necessarily the *authors* of the historical document. However, their work becomes valued (in terms of its historical worth) only once it has entered the horizon of the positivist historiography which requires a certain amount of time to lapse. Until then, the 'authors' tend to remain anonymous. Consequently, their work tends not to be historically valued in the present (i.e. when the work is actually done) at all because it must 'emerge' (in Brandian terms) in time before it acquires historical worth. There is no question of seeing the artist or craftsman as embodying this worth. This is (arguably) one of the reasons why the field of scientific conservation does not recognise the intrinsic value of traditional arts and crafts. It is also (no doubt) one of the reasons why there is a major skills crisis across the heritage sector. It is almost certainly why intangible heritage is barely recognised (formally) in Western civilisations.

However, this time-lapse is undefined which means that there can be no absolute and definitive cut-off point (other than around about the 1920's) – which leads to the (so-called) 'conundrum'. It is a fact that all objects exist in the present; they only become 'historical' (i.e. perceived in the past) because the methodological tools used for interpreting them make them such. In other words, valuing tangible heritage

primarily in historical terms will eventually consign it *to* history (hence the impasse of historicism acts rather like a ‘time-wall’).

A positivist historiography (inscribed by non-participating observers) thus results in epistemic tension between the past (as represented in materials) and the present (as represented in people – who participate in history through practice). The present day global dichotomy between the competing claims of the tangible and intangible heritages – both of which come together in restoration under the theory of an authentic *process* – is largely attributable to this epistemic tension in history. The scientific / technical and the political-institutional sectors, such as museums and universities, are at the centre of this tension. The synthesis between the two subject / object domains arguably represents the overcoming of the modern historical consciousness that emerged in Europe at the end of the C18th.

Institutionalised science perpetually abstracts from the ‘world of life’. Museums, for example, are largely an outcome of positivism in historiography, fashioned by the constant separation of objects from subjects, described by Mensch in the following terms: ‘...a scientific methodology is advocated with emphasis on the physical integrity of the object. [And]: ...little attention is paid to the cultural consequences of ‘scientific’ acquisition and exhibition’.¹⁰⁸ Perhaps inevitably then, within museums the hermeneutical function of time becomes distorted. This is a gradual effect and can only be understood *in time* – i.e. historically. This understanding of the past, because it forms the basis of the Western epistemological tradition, is then superimposed upon culture itself – primarily through education – and is thus written *into* the Western psyche. It is surely for this reason that ‘heritage’ is perceived of as a completed development throughout the West, as Philippot has noted:

...the emergence of historical consciousness at the end of the eighteenth century brought an end to the traditional link with the past. Ever since this ‘rupture’ the past has been considered by Western civilisations as a completed development. This new ‘historical distance’ has produced the conditions necessary for a more objective, scientific approach to the past

¹⁰⁸ P. van Mensch, ‘Ethics and Museology’ (Chapter 10), *Towards a methodology of museology*, PhD thesis, University of Zagreb, 1992.

in the form of historical knowledge [i.e. a positivist historiography].¹⁰⁹

How to re-engage with the ‘world of life’ is a dilemma facing Western museums today (and one which will be discussed in Chapter 3.1).

So far as scientific conservation is concerned (which emerged historically from archaeology and museum-laboratories), it is presently believed that a museum conservator, who is about to carry out restoration work on an object, can study the living culture whence the object derived in order to ascertain their values and then express this in the conservation laboratory; as if it was possible to apprehend such values in this unattached way (i.e. in abstract, as a ‘non-participator’). In other words, it infers that values can somehow be plucked out and then glued into place in an authentic way – surely a methodological fallacy. A great deal of heritage in Western museums is misrepresented because of this.

For instance, according to Krestev, the object that is taken in isolation (i.e. out of its cultural context) which has become the object of conservation and the sole bearer of the actual message cannot be understood in its fullest authenticity. Authenticity has to be realised in the context of the overall spatial, socio-cultural constellation of values and meanings – thus within the context of culture itself. As such, he acknowledged that: ‘The overall scope of and content of the object of preservation has been broadened, hence also the aspects of its authenticity’.¹¹⁰

In relation to this, Lowenthal acknowledged that authenticity may be considered differently from the perspective of tradition (or not even considered at all): ‘Whatever the reason an object or a structure, a process or a tradition is deemed transcendent by its inheritors; no general criteria of authenticity need be invoked’.¹¹¹ This is arguably because authenticity is embodied in the tradition-bearers (i.e. the subjects of history) as an expression of the past to which the physical object is connected. A continuum of historical understanding is sustained in a history of

¹⁰⁹ P. Philippot, ‘Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines’, in *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices*, Proceedings of the North American International Regional Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1972, Washington Preservation Press, 1976 (pp.367-374).

¹¹⁰ T. Kreteev, ‘Cultural Diversity and the Concept of Authenticity’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.344)

¹¹¹ D. Lowenthal, ‘Changing Criteria of Authenticity’, *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.133)

practice (i.e. a tradition) and represented by the bearer (in the present) who is *not* abstract but engaged. He/she is thus not merely a ‘non-participating observer’ but is the ‘partaking benefactor’ of *that* tradition of practice; the continuation of which requires appropriate enculturation which must be determined by the existing bearers and transmitters for it to retain its authentic character. In this way knowledge of practice (which is commonly understood as a way of life) sustains a complex system of knowledge, values and beliefs often reflected in a highly aesthetic consciousness.

The continuity of this acts like an historical ‘stream of consciousness’¹¹² – passing understanding from one generation to another; this is what makes it meaningful. This is the essence of intangible heritage. Within this structural system, the concept of authenticity need not be considered at all because it is understood implicitly – as given. Therefore, in order for restoration (particularly in the *adding to* sense) to be considered authentic the object must be taken back to the historical stream of consciousness whence it derived and executed by a living bearer; thereby synthesising the tangible with the intangible. The materials and techniques used represent the materialisation of the act of restoration; in other words, the point in time when the intangible heritage adheres itself to the historical document and thus *becomes* the tangible heritage of the future, ensuring its historical authenticity. Precisely this was achieved (albeit without the appropriate context) with the African totem pole restored at the British Museum and the Mazarin chest at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London – discussed in Part I.

It can be argued that the present intellectual struggle to extend the concept of authenticity in relation to intangible heritage is essentially a reaction against the effects of conservation ethics which have created artificial boundaries across complex realities of meaning. It might also be argued that one of the reasons why this transformation has been instigated by UNESCO is because of the universalising tendencies of the ‘scientific’ approach to the past which tends to erode diverse perspectives of heritage. The restoration process must surely reflect the expression of this complexity if it is to enhance, or at the very least, secure the symbolic meaning of the material and sustain its historical authenticity in the fullest sense of the

¹¹² This concept is derived from Alfred Schutz, *Structures of the Life World*, Heinemann, 1974 and forms an important part of the final conclusion to the thesis.

meaning and prevent the dissolution of its connection with life?

In this connection, Laenen suggests: 'Our challenge is to know how to conserve heritage resources without freezing, i.e. ignoring the evolution that represents development. We do not have the right to disregard evolution; this is contrary to progress'.¹¹³ He sees the continuity of living values to allow for sustainable change and continuous further evolution as central to this achievement:

Sustainable human development, which is the essence in this matter, should be understood first of all as the process of maturation that allows members of society to grow into a full consciousness of social and cultural values. This will keep active the live relationship between society and its heritage.¹¹⁴

To this extent, Laenen also acknowledged the importance of traditions of practice and showed how this is linked to the theory of 'authentic process' developed by this thesis:

The continuity and development of cultural heritage involves non-material aspects that are expressed in a variety of concepts, ideas and principles, in the know-how, the values, processes and approaches, as well as in the material aspects of heritage conservation. Conservation of the remaining physical expressions, and of the continuity of these ideas and processes, are both related through the cultural authenticity of each new interpretation of the same recognised values. Such authenticity will be reflected in the continuation of traditions. Such traditions should be understood as authentic cultural expressions that are based on shared values in a given society. The essence of modern authenticity will be in the continuation of cultural diversity.¹¹⁵

The *Nara Document on Authenticity* was adopted by the *UNESCO Operational*

¹¹³ M. Laenen, 'Authenticity in Relation to Development', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.352)

¹¹⁴ M. Laenen, 'Authenticity in Relation to Development', *Nara Proceedings*, 1995 (p.353-354)

¹¹⁵ M. Laenen, 'Authenticity in Relation to Development', 1995 (p.354-355)

*Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.*¹¹⁶ This Document was drafted by the forty five international participants at the Nara Conference on Authenticity held in 1994. In section II.E of the ‘Operational Guidelines’ UNESCO identifies two key aspects as the criteria for the assessment of heritage for inclusion on the *World Heritage List*. These are considered under the heading ‘Integrity and/or Authenticity’ – these concepts are interchangeable and it is argued both should be considered together in any assessment. However, as a guideline for assessment they are distinguished in that ‘integrity’ is intended to be understood in a holistic sense. This should incorporate such aspects as ‘environment’ and ‘sense of place’ and in addition to this any other aspects which may contribute to a feeling of wholeness in a particular area or site and thus enhance its essential qualities.

Although the concept of authenticity incorporates such aspects as, location and setting, spirit and feeling, it also tends to refer to the values that are attributed to the heritage in terms of its physical existence. The ways in which values may be attributed are outlined in Section II.E Point 81:

Judgements about value attributed to cultural heritage, as well as credibility of related information sources, may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. The respect due to all cultures requires that cultural heritage must be considered and judged primarily within the cultural contexts to which it belongs.¹¹⁷

In connection with this, the values which should be considered are elaborated in Section II.E Point 82 in the following terms:

Depending on the type of cultural heritage, and its cultural context, properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural values (as recognised in the nomination criteria proposed)

¹¹⁶ *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), World Heritage Centre, February 2005. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide05-en.pdf> [Accessed on 15th March 2006].

¹¹⁷ *Operational Guidelines*, UNESCO, February 2005.

are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes including: Form and design; Materials and substance; Use and function; Traditions, techniques and management systems; Location and setting; Language and other forms of intangible heritage; Spirit and feeling; [and]: Other internal and external factors.¹¹⁸

Therefore, the view that authenticity cannot be *added to* the historical document (a view which dominates the scientific / technical and political-institutional sectors throughout the West) has been re-appraised. Now, conservation and restoration ‘post-Nara’ can be seen to serve different purposes. Restoration (in the *adding to* sense) has become bound to the concept of authenticity, achieving a synthesis of the tangible / intangible which can now be seen to be vital to sustaining the living connectedness to the material heritage (in preference to what might otherwise be described as a ‘non-living’ tangible record). This understanding is diametrically opposed to the way in which ‘restoration’ in the name of the scientific conservation profession has developed in Europe in recent times (described in Part I of this thesis).

In this connection, it can be argued that scientific conservation, because of the scientific ideal of metaphysical ‘neutrality’ (and its preclusion of the intrinsic value of the traditional arts and crafts) and the way this impacts upon the process of restoration, necessarily signals the ‘end’ of the historical document. And, to this end it also signals the end of an historical process relating to the traditional arts and crafts which were predicated on the notion of sustaining ‘authentic’ qualities and ‘other intangibles’. This has been described as the ‘impasse of historicism’ (the so-called ‘time wall’ of preservation brought about by the emergence of modern historical consciousness) which (arguably) contributed towards the downgrading and subsequent ‘anonymity’ of the historical arts and crafts – whose contribution to the historical document must ‘emerge’ in time before it acquires historical worth. This situation appears to have contributed to the general exclusion (either consciously or literally) of certain kinds of practitioners (nominally associated with traditional arts / crafts practices) from the scientific conservation profession.

¹¹⁸ *Operational Guidelines*, UNESCO, February 2005.

Thus the move towards synthesis between the tangible and intangible heritages, acknowledging the connection between authenticity, values and traditional continuity (especially in materials and workmanship), can be seen as a major achievement of the Nara Conference. The concept of authenticity has subsequently moved from materials and form to *process* – or as Lowenthal puts it [the]: ‘...criteria of authenticity have shifted substantially away from materials to form, and more recently to process and other intangibles’.¹¹⁹ Therefore, the present day global dichotomy between the tangible and intangible heritages can be reconciled in restoration under the theory of an *authentic process*; something which is central to the final conclusion to this thesis.

The next section shows how the movement towards *authentic restoration process* can be seen to be revealed in key heritage documents.

2.2.3: Authentic restoration – from material and form to process

The movement in the concept of authenticity from material and from to *process* can be observed in various declarations, charters and conferences. Some of the most influential documents are included below with particular reference to technology and restoration – a determining factor of authentic process. From this one can observe the emergence of an essentially ‘anthropocentric’ preservation movement, culminating in the formal synthesis of the tangible and intangible domains.

The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments, 1931: ‘The Athens Charter’.

The Athens Charter was the first official and widespread recognition of the place of modern technologies (including materials) in the preservation of tangible heritage – stated under ‘Point IV – Restoration of Monuments’ in the following terms:

The experts heard various communications concerning the use of modern materials for the consolidation of ancient monuments. They approved the judicious use of all the resources at the disposal of modern technique and more especially of reinforced concrete. They specified that this work of

¹¹⁹ D. Lowenthal (lowenthal@lowenthal.free-online.co.uk), 26th November 2005, *RE: Conservation Research*, e-mail to F. Hassard (f.hassard@tiscali.co.uk).

consolidation should whenever possible be concealed in order that the aspect and character of the restored monument may be preserved. They recommend their adoption more particularly in cases where their use makes it possible to avoid the dangers of dismantling and reinstating the portions to be preserved.¹²⁰

What is interesting about this is that modern materials are considered suitable (judiciously) for *consolidation* work only (which is considered under the heading ‘Restoration’) but *not* necessarily for loss-compensation work. This is a critical distinction when considering the authentic nature of the historical document inherited by future generations (i.e. historical authenticity). To that end, it stated also that newly introduced material should be recognisable – which, of course, does not necessarily preclude using ‘like-with-like’ materials and techniques. It should, however, be noted that this Charter was designed for ancient architecture and thus essentially relates to archaeological conservation and restoration. For this reason the primary value domains are aesthetic and historic and scientific.

During the three decades that followed the *Athens Charter* another dimension emerged relating to people and their values and the concept of authenticity – first formally recognised in the *Venice Charter*.

The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964: ‘The Venice Charter’

The *Venice Charter* recognised the need for a more people-centred and, therefore, value-oriented approach to heritage:

Imbued with a message from the past, the historic monuments of generations of people remain to the present day as living witnesses of their age-old traditions. People are becoming more and more conscious of the unity of human values and regard ancient monuments as a common heritage. The common responsibility to safeguard them for

¹²⁰ *The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments*: ‘The Athens Charter’, adopted at the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Athens, 1931. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/athens_charter.html [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

future generations is recognised. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity. It is essential that the principles guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings should be agreed and be laid down on an international basis, with each country being responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions.¹²¹

Important to note here are the phrases: ‘in the full richness of their authenticity’ and ‘common heritage’. The idea of a common heritage is associated with the *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* (The Hague Convention) which entered force in 1956.¹²² The use of the term ‘common’ (which is arguably interchangeable with ‘universal’) signified an internationalised perspective of heritage concerns. However, the problem of perceiving cultural heritage from a cross-cultural perspective (where cultural heritage is perceived as being a ‘common heritage’ for the whole world) can lead to a depreciation of the importance of cultural specificity. It is imperative, therefore, to interpret ‘common heritage’ in the sense that all nations have a *shared responsibility* in protecting the cultural heritage of others and for this reason local culture and traditions must also be taken into account. To that end, the *Venice Charter* not only introduced the concept of authenticity but at the same time identified the importance of culture and traditions.

It states, for example, under the heading ‘Restoration’ in Article 9 that:

The process of restoration is a highly specialised operation. Its aim is to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument and is based on respect for original material and authentic documents. It must stop at the point where conjecture begins, and in this case moreover any extra work which is indispensable must be distinct from the architectural composition and must bear a contemporary stamp. The restoration in any

¹²¹ *The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites: ‘The Venice Charter’*, adopted by the International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Venice, 1964. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/docs/venice_charter.html [Accessed on 15th October 2003]

¹²² *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict: ‘The Hague Convention’*, The Hague (1954) entering force in 1956. Full text available from: <http://www.icomos.org/hague/> [Accessed on 30th September 2005].

case must be preceded and followed by an archaeological and historical study of the monument.¹²³

With respect to materials and techniques, in Article 10 it states:

Where traditional techniques prove inadequate, the *consolidation* of a monument can be achieved by the use of any modern technique for conservation and construction, the efficacy of which has been shown by scientific data and proved by experience [*my italics*].¹²⁴

With respect to loss-compensation (i.e. restoration in the *adding to* sense), in Article 12 it states:

Replacements of missing parts must integrate harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable from the original so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic evidence.¹²⁵

What is significant here is that the primary value-domains (i.e. aesthetic, historic and scientific) are retained. These are the primary values associated with archaeological and fine arts restoration and also the basis upon which Cesare Brandi's *Theory of Restoration* was formulated (discussed in Part I). Interestingly, Paul Philippot (ICCROM) who was a close associate of Brandi, and Harold Plenderleith (also ICCROM) who was a pre-eminent figure in the founding of the modern practice of scientific conservation, both took part in the drafting of the *Venice Charter*. Together they formed a significant triumvirate in shaping the direction the field of tangible heritage preservation took during the second half of the last century; the emphasis on 'evidence' attests to its scientific basis.

The Charter also states under the heading 'Excavations' (which confirms its archaeological orientation) that:

¹²³ *The Venice Charter*, 1964.

¹²⁴ *The Venice Charter*, 1964.

¹²⁵ *The Venice Charter*, 1964.

All reconstruction work should however be ruled out “a priori”. Only anastylosis, that is to say, the reassembling of existing but dismembered parts can be permitted. The material used for integration should always be recognisable and its use should be the least that will ensure the conservation of a monument and the reinstatement of its form.¹²⁶

The emphasis on form only (as opposed to substance and process) is comparable to Brandi’s *visual oneness* which is based on a superficial (i.e. phenomenological) understanding of the object (or monument in this instance); *anastylosis* is born from this view.

It is worth noting here then, that there is no statement that specifies the kinds of materials and techniques that may be used although it does recommend that the newly integrated part/s should ‘integrate harmoniously’ with the whole but not necessarily reflect (for example) original creative architectural propriety. In this sense, it could be argued that the practice of restoration does not necessarily function within the framework of its own culture and traditions (*anastylosis* is intended to be ‘neutral’). However, the introduction of the term ‘authenticity’ is important in this connection, although the way in which authenticity is understood and how this might be sustained over the long-term in restoration – other than *anastylosis* – is not elaborated and tends, therefore, to be restricted to aesthetic and historical values alone. In other words, the complexity of authenticity was poorly understood at the time of the drafting of the *Venice Charter* and the conception that was given was arguably not sustainable.

The Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance, 1979: ‘The Burra Charter’

Some fifteen years after the (significantly influential) *Venice Charter* came the *Burra Charter* which adapted the *Venice Charter* to local conditions which were very different from European ones. It states under the heading ‘Definitions’ in Article 5 that: ‘Conservation of a place should take into consideration all aspects of its cultural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one aspect at the expense of

¹²⁶ *The Venice Charter*, 1964.

others'.¹²⁷

What is important to grasp here is that the idea of 'cultural significance' is related to the aesthetic, historical, scientific *and the social* – to past present and future generations. The Charter defines social value as embracing the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group. Cultural significance is thus manifested in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. As such, places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.

Although this still demonstrates an essentially monumental vision of the past, the idea of cultural significance was a critical development in that the concept of heritage was extended beyond the purely aesthetic (i.e. visual) and historic (i.e. physical) values. By incorporating cultural significance (which is synonymous with cultural values) authenticity subsequently became implicitly linked to present considerations and which may thus be subject to change; for example, as a result of new information or the involvement of diverse stakeholders. In other words, authenticity implies *movement* (i.e. it is 'dynamic') and is not based on fixed (or at least less dynamic) criteria (i.e. 'static'). The *Burra Charter* – which broadened our understanding of inheritance – owes a great deal to the indigenous cultures of Australia.

With reference to knowledge, skills and techniques it upholds that traditional techniques and materials are preferred for the conservation of significant fabric. In some circumstances modern techniques and materials which offer substantial conservation benefits may be appropriate but their use must be supported by firm scientific evidence or by a body of experience.

The Declaration of Oaxaca, 1993

The next significant development in the theory of heritage preservation was the *Declaration of Oaxaca*, adopted at the Seminar on Education, Work and Cultural

¹²⁷ *The Australian ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance: 'The Burra Charter'*, adopted by the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS, 1979. Updated version available from: <http://www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html> [Accessed on 17th May 2006]

Pluralism and convened by UNESCO and the Mexican National Commission for UNESCO, 1993. It states the following:

The globalisation of the economy, the migration of the work force and the evolution in communications have created a worldwide area where trends towards standardisation of values are matched by a vigorous reassertion of national, ethnic, cultural and regional particularities. The reassertion of the diversity of cultural identities and their consolidation are bulwarks against the danger of a technological society, which succumbs because it is powerless to achieve that democracy towards which mankind strives, because it is incapable of creating efficient instruments to attain a pattern of development that places the individual and his values at the centre of its concerns. Identities, in short, that propel history, that are not frozen legacies but living syntheses, perpetually changing, thriving on inner differences, admitting and reworking contributions from outside.¹²⁸

The importance of this Declaration cannot be overstated. By recognising that the standardisation of values (associated with scientific and technological ‘progress’) is detrimental to cultural divergence (personified in living history) the *Declaration of Oaxaca* represents a *massive* change in thinking about heritage. As such, it calls for what is essentially an ecology of human life; which reflects the recent work of UNESCO in relation to the safeguarding of intangible heritage and the general movements towards a (so-called) post-modern conception of heritage – which incorporates pluralism in cultural diversity.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ *The Declaration of Oaxaca*, adopted at the Seminar on Education, Work and Cultural Pluralism, convened by UNESCO and the Mexican National Commission for UNESCO, 1993. Available from: <http://www.icomos.org/unesco/oaxaca.html> [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

¹²⁹ An interesting publication here is *Conserving the Textile Traditions of Oaxaca*, edited by K. Klein, Getty Conservation Institute, 1997. This was a joint project of the Getty Conservation Institute and the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) of Mexico to conserve an important collection of textiles housed in the former 16th. convent of San Domingo church, now the regional museum of Oaxaca, Mexico. The publication includes discussions around the ethical and practical considerations involved in working in Latin America to conserve the materials and practices of living cultures. Importantly, it shows how leading institutions can (potentially) mediate the tangible and intangible heritages.

The Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994

The *Nara Document on Authenticity*¹³⁰ has been discussed in Chapter 2.2 (above) in some detail. Put succinctly, it shows how heritage preservation as an international movement has developed a ‘world view’. The concept of heritage has broadened and moved towards a more pluralistic approach to the past which is acknowledged as embedded in human values and cultural divergence. This has transformed the understanding of authenticity which has moved substantially in recent years from the preservation of historical materials and their visual appearance to the importance of *process* in sustaining ‘the full richness of their authenticity’.

As such, authenticity can be *added* to the historical document by the use of particular materials and techniques and by particular subjects (i.e. bearers of intangible heritage) – thus enhancing its symbolic value on a cultural-level of understanding. This leads towards the idea of authentic restoration process and tangible / intangible synthesis. The Nara Document was a major turning point in shifting the epistemological basis of heritage preservation.

The Declaration of San Antonio, 1996

The *Declaration of San Antonio* was held in 1996 at the InterAmerican Symposium on Authenticity in the Conservation and Management of the Cultural Heritage to discuss the meaning of authenticity. The meeting acknowledged the importance of the earlier *Nara Document on Authenticity*. Similarly, it recognised that *the concept of authenticity is directly related to cultural identity*. To this end, it states that:

The authenticity of our cultural resources lies in the identification, evaluation and interpretation of their true values as perceived by our ancestors in the past and by ourselves now as an evolving and diverse community. As such, the Americas must recognise the values of the majorities and the minorities without imposing a hierarchical predominance of any one culture and its values over those of others. The comprehensive cultural value of our heritage can be understood only

¹³⁰ *The Nara Document on Authenticity* drafted at the Nara Conference on Authenticity in relation to the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, Nara, Japan, 1994. Available from: http://www.international.icomos.org/naradoc_eng.htm [Accessed on 14th May 2004].

through an objective study of history, the material elements inherent in the tangible heritage, and a deep understanding of the intangible traditions associated with the tangible patrimony.¹³¹

Under the heading ‘Authenticity and Materials’, Point 3, it states the following:

The material fabric of a cultural site can be a principal component of its authenticity... Over time, heritage sites have come to possess a testimonial value – which may be aesthetic, historic or otherwise – that is readily evident to most of society. ...*only the historic fabric is authentic, and interpretations achieved through restoration are not*; they can only authentically represent the meaning of a site as understood in a given moment [*my italics*].¹³²

But surely the ‘interpretations achieved’ and the processes used in restoration *must* aim to be authentic in terms of how it relates to cultural identity? Otherwise authenticity would surely diminish? Identified here are once again the primary values ‘aesthetic’ and ‘historic’. By restricting authenticity to historical fabric (i.e. the tangible heritage) means that what may be considered to be authentic must also be historical (i.e. the concept of authenticity is related to time). It is (arguably) because of this that the Declaration makes explicit that restoration cannot be authentic – which is diametrically opposed to the Nara Document (above).

In this connection, with respect to *process* the Declaration states that:

...there are important parts of our patrimony that are built of perishable materials that require periodic replacement in accordance with traditional crafts... In these cases, we also assert the validity of using traditional techniques for their repair, especially when those techniques are still in

¹³¹ *The Declaration of San Antonio*, held at the InterAmerican Symposium on Authenticity in the Conservation and Management of the Cultural Heritage in association with ICOMOS National Committees, San Antonio, Texas, United States of America, 1996. Available from: http://www.icomos.org/docs/san_antonio.html [Accessed on 3rd December 2004].

¹³² *The Declaration of San Antonio*, 1996.

use in the region...¹³³

This appears to be more like the Nara Document. However, this conception of authenticity, although recognising the importance of authentic process (which is related to the traditional arts and crafts – otherwise it would sanction any kind of intervention), does so *tentatively*. What is meant by this is that the Declaration does not distinguish them for their intrinsic value *to* heritage, unlike for example, UNESCO's definition of intangible heritage – whereby the traditional arts and crafts are valued on their own terms as the living embodiment of the past and (post-Nara) inextricably bound (by the concept of authentic process) to the tangible heritage.

Although this has been discussed in the previous chapter (Chapter 2.2) it is worth reiterating here. This conception, it can be argued, is attributable to a positivistic historiography (based on material evidence) which involves a process of emergence – a lapse of (unspecified) time – before something that is done by someone in the present can be valued historically (and thus for its intrinsic worth). When sufficient time has passed (and the 'author' of the work is probably dead) this work (which instantaneously has aesthetic value) will *acquire* historical value. It will eventually be considered as an authentic aspect of the 'stratified' historical document – otherwise there would be no authentic historical document. This conception of authenticity demonstrates well the impasses of modern historical consciousness; the so-called 'time-wall' of preservation.

What should be stressed here is that this is *not* the same as the conception of authenticity given in the *Nara Document on Authenticity* which understands authentic process as a valid expression of the past in the *present* because it is related to intangible heritage and embodied in *people*. There is, therefore, no requirement of a time-lapse, and the tangible and intangible are synthesised (necessarily so, not 'tentatively'). The *Declaration of San Antonio*, although acknowledging the importance of the traditional crafts (if they still exist) as an aspect of authenticity, does not synthesise tangible and intangible heritage because it does not 'see' the traditional crafts *as* intangible heritage – and therein lies the problem.

¹³³ *The Declaration of San Antonio*, 1996.

The Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage, 2000

The *Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage* was ratified by the ICOMOS 12th General Assembly, held in Mexico, 2000. It states:

Vernacular building is the traditional and natural way by which communities house themselves. It is a continuing process including necessary changes and continuous adaptation as a response to social and environmental constraints. The survival of this tradition is threatened worldwide by the forces of economic, cultural and architectural homogenisation. [As a result of this]: ...vernacular structures all around the world are extremely vulnerable, facing serious problems of obsolescence, internal equilibrium and integration.¹³⁴

It thus calls for the establishment of principles for the care and protection of the built vernacular heritage. To this end, under the heading 'General Issues', Point 3 it states:

Governments and responsible authorities must recognise the right of all communities to maintain their living traditions, to protect these through all available legislative, administrative and financial means and to hand them down to future generations.¹³⁵

In relation to this, under the heading 'Guidelines in Practice', Point 3 it suggests:

The continuity of traditional building systems and craft skills associated with the vernacular is fundamental for vernacular expression, and essential for the repair and restoration of these structures. Such skills should be retained, recorded and passed on to new generations of craftsmen and builders in education and training.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ *The Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage*, ratified by the ICOMOS 12th General Assembly, held in Mexico, 2000. Available from: <http://www.international.icomos.org/vernac-eng.htm> [Accessed on 22nd January 2005].

¹³⁵ *The Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage*, 2000.

¹³⁶ *The Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage*, 2000.

Under the same heading, Point 4 it argues:

Alterations which legitimately respond to the demands of contemporary use should be effected by the introduction of materials which maintain a consistency of expression, appearance, texture and form throughout the structure and consistency of building materials.¹³⁷

Implicit in this is the notion of a synthesis of tangible and intangible heritage through the idea of an authentic expression. There is no reason whatsoever why the same philosophy should not equally apply to other forms of architectural heritage and, indeed, any aspect of the tangible heritage which relies upon a living tradition of practice in order to sustain it; it is a question of where and how values are attributed and appropriate mechanisms of formal recognition provided. This is precisely the conception of heritage preservation presently being developed by UNESCO and represented in the *Nara Document on Authenticity*.

The Charter of Cracow, 2000

The recent *Charter of Cracow* reflected on the implications of the progressive broadening of the concept of authenticity with consideration for tangible and intangible aspects. In light of needs arising from global awareness of cultural diversity and considering that heritage should today be understood within a pluralistic framework, the Charter set out the objectives of heritage preservation for the new millennium in the following terms:

Under the heading ‘Different kinds of Built Heritage’, Point 7:

The restoration process must guarantee a correct approach to the conservation of the full setting, decoration or sculpture, with respect to traditional building crafts and their necessary integration as a substantial part of the built heritage.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ *The Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage*, 2000.

¹³⁸ *The Charter of Cracow*, drafted at the International Conference on Conservation, Cracow, 2000. Available from: <http://www.tsconts.it/pag5-e.htm> [Accessed on 18th April 2004].

Under the same heading, Point 10 it states:

Conservation / preservation techniques should be strictly tied to interdisciplinary scientific research on materials and technologies used for the construction, repair and / or restoration of the building heritage. The chosen intervention should respect the original function and ensure compatibility with existing materials, structures and architectural values. Any new materials and technologies should be rigorously tested, compared and understood before application. Although the in situ application of new techniques may be relevant to the continued well-being of original fabric, they should be continually monitored in the light of the achieved results, taking into account their behaviour over time and the possibility of eventual reversibility. Particular attention is required to improve our knowledge of traditional materials and techniques, and their appropriate continuation in the context of modern society, *being in themselves important components of cultural heritage* [my italics].¹³⁹

They are also central to historical authenticity; under the heading ‘Definitions’ the following terms are defined thus:

Point C: Authenticity means the sum of substantial, historically ascertained characteristics; from the original up to the current state, as an outcome of the various transformations that have occurred over time.¹⁴⁰

Point F: Restoration is an operation directed on a heritage property, aiming at the conservation of its authenticity and its appropriation by the community.¹⁴¹

The first part of this statement (Point C) clarifies the nature of the historical document which transcends time into the present. The second part of this statement (Point F) ensures that this continuum is sustained into the future and that restoration

¹³⁹ *The Charter of Cracow*, 2000.

¹⁴⁰ *The Charter of Cracow*, 2000.

¹⁴¹ *The Charter of Cracow*, 2000.

is the way by which this is achieved. In other words, restoration is the aspect of conservation that confers meaning upon the historical document itself. This is, therefore, a ‘dynamic’ (not static) conception of preservation which recognises that conservation and restoration serve different purposes – not just in terms of what is done but also in terms of what they represent symbolically.

Conservation essentially aims at maintaining the status quo – through scientific / technical research and development – while restoration is bound to the concept of authenticity. The practice of restoration is, therefore, understood to *enhance meaning* through its association with cultural practices. The use of traditional materials and techniques in restoration (in the *adding to* sense) is central to the ‘stratified’ historical document (and therefore also its historical authenticity) which transcends time by sustaining living traditions. So conceived, restoration aims at achieving tangible / intangible synthesis in the name of authentic process – as does the Nara Document.

The Yamoto Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2004

Cracow was followed two years later by the *Yamoto Declaration* – the necessity for which was acknowledged at the *Istanbul Declaration*, adopted at the Round table of Ministers of Culture organised by Koichiro Matsuura, Director General of UNESCO in Istanbul in September 2002, who stressed that: ‘...an all-encompassing approach to cultural heritage should prevail, which takes into account the dynamic link between the tangible and intangible heritage and their deep interdependence’.¹⁴² The *Yamoto Declaration* extends upon UNESCO’s *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2003)¹⁴³ (discussed in the preceding chapter) and represents the formal synthesis of the tangible v. intangible domains.

Under Point 4 it recognises the intrinsic value of intangible heritage, as follows:

¹⁴² M. Bouchenaki, ‘Views and Visions of the Intangible’, *Museums International* No. 221-222, United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), Blackwell Publishing, 2004 (pp.6-11)

¹⁴³ *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].

...that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is as important as protecting tangible cultural heritage, and that the world community has come to realise that intangible cultural heritage has to be considered and safeguarded in its own right.¹⁴⁴

Under Point 7 it acknowledges the importance of the *Nara Document on Authenticity* and that interpretations of authenticity are culturally-specific (i.e. the antithesis of universality): ‘...the Nara Document marked an epoch in the conservation of heritage, emphasising that interpretations of authenticity and their application should be attempted within the specific cultural context’.¹⁴⁵ With respect to this, under Point 8 the Declaration recognises that: ‘...intangible cultural heritage is constantly re-created, the term ‘authenticity’ as applied to tangible cultural heritage is not relevant when identifying and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage’.¹⁴⁶

The symbiotic relationship between the tangible and intangible domains is recognised (in a collective sense) under Point 9: ‘...the elements of the tangible and intangible heritage of communities and groups are often interdependent’.¹⁴⁷ And finally, the Declaration makes clear under Point 10 that:

...the values associated with monuments and sites are not considered intangible cultural heritage as defined under the 2003 Convention [UNESCO] when they belong to the past and not to *the living heritage of present day communities* [*my italics*]¹⁴⁸

This is a key statement; the phrase: ‘belong to the past and not to the living heritage of [the] present day’ is the culmination of some forty years of evolution – on an international scale. This thesis argues that this understanding represents the overcoming of the impasses of modern historical consciousness (and the resultant

¹⁴⁴ *The Yamato Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage*, 2004, Japan. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/admin/file_download.php/Yamato_Declaration.pdf?URL_ID=23863&filename=10988742599Yamato_Declaration.pdf&filetype=application%2Fpdf&filesize=35645&name=Yamato_Declaration.pdf&location=user-S/ [Accessed on 15th February 2005].

¹⁴⁵ *The Yamato Declaration*, 2004.

¹⁴⁶ *The Yamato Declaration*, 2004.

¹⁴⁷ *The Yamato Declaration*, 2004.

¹⁴⁸ *The Yamato Declaration*, 2004.

‘time wall’ of preservation) that emerged in Europe at the end of the C18th. and (apparently) ‘cut off the traditional link to the past’ – which has dominated the Western ‘world view’ of heritage. It is an understanding which has become a central aspect of sustainable development within the international heritage community.

With respect to this, Bouchenaki – one of the foremost protagonists of developments in recent times through his work at UNESCO – has provided some guidance on what lies ahead:

Taking into account the different needs for conservation of monuments, cities or landscapes on the one hand and for safeguarding and transmission of cultural practices and traditional knowledge on the other hand, it will therefore be necessary to develop a threefold approach which will (i) put tangible heritage into its wider context, (ii) translate intangible heritage into “materiality” and (iii) support practitioners and the transmission of knowledge and skills. ...When artists, craftspeople and other “living libraries” gain official recognition and support, better care can be taken to ensure the transfer of their skills and techniques to others. ...Even if tangible and intangible heritage are very different, they are the two sides of the same coin: both carry meaning and the embedded memory of humanity. Both tangible and intangible heritage rely on each other when it comes to understanding the meaning and importance of each.¹⁴⁹

This synthesis of the tangible and intangible heritages has been described by this thesis as an epistemological (and hermeneutical) shift in understanding heritage and its connection to the present reality. These two dimensions are synthesised in restoration by the concept of authentic process which relates directly to the materials and techniques employed. Traditions of practice are central to this realisation largely because they are understood to create an abridgement between the past and the present. The *Yamato Declaration* represents formally the highest and most complete theoretical development in the contemporary practice of cultural heritage

¹⁴⁹ 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).

preservation worldwide.

2.2.4: Conclusion to Part II

Part II of this thesis discussed recent developments in the international heritage scene with respect (in particular) to the emergence of the concept of the intangible heritage – now a global phenomenon. It considered how this has influenced our understanding of authenticity and how this in turn is linked to wider concerns relating to sustainable development and cultural divergence. It argued that this has levered ideas about ‘heritage’ out of an essentially materials-led paradigm (based on the ‘scientific’ archaeo-museological / fine arts model, discussed in Part I) into a new dynamic ‘anthropocentric’ paradigm which seeks to harness the complex nature of the world’s cultural inheritance. From this part of the study the following ideas have been developed.

Firstly, with respect to the intangible heritage, perhaps what it is most pertinent to recognise is that it is embodied in *people* – i.e. in individuals, groups, communities, regions or entire cultures. Because of this, it tends not to be institutionalised and generally requires a ‘bottom-up’ approach to its protection; through the empowerment of its bearers. Intangible heritage is to be valued because it sustains composite systems of ‘knowing’ (often in terms of what is described as ‘tacit knowledge’) through the continuity of the performance (i.e. practice). The value attributed of this has frequently been shaped around the complex realities of life – extending an understanding of ‘heritage’ beyond the primary value-domains of the ‘aesthetic’ and the ‘historical’ and also beyond the immediate materiality of the past (although this may sustain intangible heritage). Intangible heritage defined in this way is thus *irreducible* and may be described as *pre-scientific* (and thus also *pre-reductionist*) in character.

From the perspective of intangible heritage, what may be considered to be authentic about the past is embodied in the bearers – living in the present. As such, the practice of restoration (especially in the *adding to* sense) is understood in terms of process – as well as materials and form – but it is not limited to material fabric alone. So understood, authenticity can (arguably) be *added to* the historical document because actions are intentionally expressive of *that* practice (i.e. they are meaningful, not

‘neutral’ nor scientific). Consequently, restoration as historically practiced was not limited to superficial appearance alone because the historical document (i.e. tangible heritage) was sustained by (and at the same time sustains) intangible heritage in a symbiotic relationship which (arguably) prevents the symbolic depletion of each paradigmatic domain.

In general terms, a ‘like-with-like’ approach to restoration is favoured because the knowledge necessary is ‘authentic’ in that it is historically continuous with and has been sustained by practice. As such, restoration is less susceptible to fluctuating material innovations and therefore (arguably) less variable in terms of its outcomes (and therefore also less subjective). The continuity of practice is not driven by scientific research and technical development but is understood as ‘traditional’ and affiliated to custom. The role of such knowledge (and related practices) may also be valued both for its cultural specificity and its importance in sustaining cultural diversity within the international heritage community. It inherently conflicts with the processes of professionalisation – which advocate cross-cultural standardisation.

Intangible heritage (as, for example, manifested in the traditional arts and crafts) is essentially *ontological* in character and not *epistemological* (in the scientific epistemological sense). As such, mastery of existing knowledge (i.e. through mastery of the performance) is highly valued – frequently cultivating a heightened aesthetic understanding. It is, therefore, not technical and rational *in its thinking*; although technical knowledge may be useful (and therefore *instrumental* to practice).

Intangible heritage thus resists the processes of ‘naturalisation’ (i.e. sciencing) – which can be seen as engendered in professionalisation, and which (arguably) contributes to the de-sublimation of practice and the resultant loss of aesthetic sensibility (which is replaced by fact-mindedness, technical and rational reasoning and an orientation towards modern technologies). Intangible heritage, therefore, lies beyond the material dimension and outside of the horizons of the prevailing materials-led and positivistic view of historiography. It is not concerned with (for instance) recording and explaining ‘scientifically’ the tangible record of the past but based on the continuity of the past in the form of *practice* into the present – i.e. a historiography of practice.

Heritage preservation understood from the perspective of intangible heritage may, therefore, be described as (theoretically) *diachronic* (i.e. continuous / dynamic / sustainable) and resists the suspension of objects in time (which is 'static' and arguably not sustainable). Accordingly, the safeguarding of the intangible heritage provides an essentially 'living' historiography which is sustained (to a very large degree) by the tangible patrimony evident in the process of restoration. In so being, the tangible and intangible heritages can be synthesised in a theory of authentic restoration process.