

# EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN HERITAGE CONSERVATION

## MİRASIN KORUNMASINDA EĞİTİM VE ÖĞRETİM

### Makale Bilgisi | Article Info

Başvuru: 03 Haziran 2022	Received: June 03, 2022
Hakem Değerlendirmesi: 30 Haziran 2022	Peer Review: June 30, 2022
Kabul: 22 Temmuz 2022	Accepted: July 22, 2022

DOI : 10.22520/tubaked2022.25.005

**Jukka JOKILEHTO\***

### ABSTRACT

This article has been prepared by the invitation of the ICOMOS Turkey Education Committee to share the author's personal experiences in education and training. Here, a significant emphasis is placed on the author's experience at ICCROM from 1971 to 1998. There are several reasons for this. The Second World War provided an important additional input to international developments in education and training, and ICCROM became a focal point in the process. The ICCROM was created by UNESCO to not only advise on conservation principles and approaches, but also – and perhaps more specifically – to advise on the development of international educational models in the conservation of different types of heritage resources. In this paper, the historical development of educational activities in the field of cultural heritage is analyzed with a comprehensive and detailed approach based on the author's personal experience, under the titles of 'Bases in ICCROM', 'Contribution to the Educational Guide', 'World Heritage Consulting'. It is hoped that it will shed light on the future. Recognition of heritage requires awareness, knowledge and hard work, so collaboration with building owners is needed as well as with managers and experts. In order to secure sustainable management for their heritage, it is necessary to understand what a 'heritage community' expects.

**Keywords:** ICCROM, education and training, architectural conservation, Educational Guide, World Heritage consultancy, ICOMOS CIF.

\* Prof. Dr., University of Nova Gorica- jointly with IUAV, Venedik.  
e-posta: nurdan.kuban[at]kocaeli.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-6687-7663



## ÖZET

Bu makale, ICOMOS Türkiye Eğitim Komitesi'nin davetiyle, yazarın eğitim ve öğretimdeki kişisel deneyimlerini paylaşmak üzere hazırlanmıştır. Burada, yazarın 1971'den 1998'e kadar ICCROM'da edindiği deneyime önemli bir vurgu yapılmaktadır. Bunun birkaç nedeni bulunmaktadır. İkinci Dünya Savaşı, eğitim ve öğretimde uluslararası gelişmelere önemli bir ek girdi sağlamış ve bu süreçte ICCROM bir odak noktası haline gelmiştir. ICCROM, yalnızca koruma ilkeleri ve yaklaşımları konusunda tavsiyelerde bulunmanın ötesinde, aynı zamanda -ve belki de daha belirgin biçimde- farklı türdeki miras kaynaklarının korunmasında uluslararası eğitim modellerinin geliştirilmesi konusunda danışmanlık yapması amacıyla UNESCO tarafından oluşturulmuştur. Bu bildiri 'ICCROM'daki dayanaklar', 'Eğitim Rehberi'ne Katkı', 'Dünya Mirası Danışmanlığı' başlıkları altında, kültürel miras alanındaki eğitim faaliyetlerinin tarihsel gelişimi, yazarın kişisel deneyimine dayalı kapsamlı ve ayrıntılı bir yaklaşımla analiz edilmekte ve bu çalışmanın kültürel mirasın korunması için geleceğe ışık tutması ümit edilmektedir. Mirasın tanınması farkındalık, bilgi ve çok çalışmayı gerektirdiğinden, yöneticiler ve uzmanlar kadar bina sahipleri ile de işbirliğine gereksinim duyulur. Mirasları için sürdürülebilir yönetimi güvence altına alabilmek adına, bir "miras topluluğu"nun ne beklediğinin anlaşılması gerekir..

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** ICCROM, eğitim ve öğretim, mimari koruma, Eğitim Rehberi, Dünya Mirası danışmanlığı, ICOMOS CIF.

Sir Bernard Melchior Feilden (1919-2008), a distinguished conservation architect in the UK, responds to the question: What is an historic building?

*Briefly, an historic building is one that gives us a sense of wonder and makes us want to know more about the people and culture that produced it. It has architectural, aesthetic, historic, documentary, archaeological, economic, social, and even political and spiritual or symbolic values; but the first impact is always emotional, for it is a symbol of our cultural identity and continuity – a part of our heritage. If it has survived the hazards of 100 years of usefulness, it has a good claim to being called historic.* (Feilden 1982:1)

Consequently, he claims, the aim of conservation is to prolong the life of what is recognised as heritage. Bernard also prepared the first draft for the Guidelines on Education and Training in the Conservation of Monuments, Ensembles and Sites (ICOMOS-CIF), adopted by the ICOMOS General Assembly in Colombo in 1993.

## FOUNDATIONS AT ICCROM

This paper is a reflection of my personal experiences in the training and education of the conservation of the built heritage. Trained as architect in Finland, I was first introduced to conservation theory and methodology at ICCROM, the International Centre for the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, in the 1970s, where I met some of the key persons in this field. An international, intergovernmental organisation, the task of ICCROM was to advise its Member States regarding the conservation of all types of physical heritage, not only architecture but also works art, collections of objects, archives and museums. ICCROM was founded by UNESCO in 1956 and it became active in 1959, when the first Director Harold James Plenderleith (1898–1997) entered the office in Rome. His deputy was Paul Philippot (1925-2016), Belgian art historian, who was already acquainted with the Italian Conservation philosophy. In 1971, Philippot was elected as successor to Plenderleith, remaining in office until 1977, when he in turn was succeeded by Bernard Feilden.

One of the first international training programmes developed by ICCROM was the Architectural Conservation Course (ARC), which was organised starting in 1966 in collaboration with the University of Rome and under the direction of Prof. Guglielmo De Angelis d'Ossat (1907–1992), former Director General of Cultural Heritage in Italy and the Dean of the Faculty of Architecture. I attended the Architectural Conservation Course in 1971. At the end of the course, Philippot

invited me to return as the coordinator of the course. Consequently, I also acted as an assistant to De Angelis d'Ossat. In this position, I was in constant collaboration with Philippot and with De Angelis, both fundamental elements in my educational experience.

If we look at the founding principles that guided the evolution of ICCROM from the 1960s onwards, we can see that the first three directors were essential in this process. Plenderleith, a recognised scientist gave the scientific basis, while Philippot, as an art historian elaborated the humanistic aspects of the recognition and conservation of human cultural expressions – to use the 2005 UNESCO definition. Bernard Feilden was the pragmatic professional who brought us into contact with the physical reality of the world. As an architect, I learnt much from Bernard Feilden who had a good comprehension of architecture not only as an individual building but also as a part of the built environment. Philippot for me became fundamental due his thinking that gave me a new approach that has since guided me in later research and practice.

In 1972, ICCROM collaborated with the USA in the organisation of the North American International Regional Conference at Williamsburg. Here, Philippot spoke of philosophy, criteria and guidelines of historic preservation, stressing the importance of the approach that should start with an inventory and the criteria recognising the creative quality, documentary significance and impact of the object on human consciousness. Even though the theory of conservation remains the same, the criteria of intervention need to be specific to each place, and should focus on the whole of the object, its context, and its history (Philippot 1972). These principles also reflect the thinking of Cesare Brandi (1906-1988), the founding director of the Italian Institute of Restoration (Philippot 2005). In fact, Philippot had already met Brandi in the 1950s when he was in Rome to write a thesis on the policies of the Institute of Restoration. It was also Brandi who proposed Philippot to be invited as humanist to assist the scientist, Plenderleith, at ICCROM.

The conservation approach of ICCROM was not limited to monuments and sites. There were close contacts with urban planners and other professionals involved in the conservation of historic cities, which was then an emerging topic. The Council of Europe organised several expert meetings already in the 1960s, which then resulted in the organisation of the European Architectural Heritage Year in 1975. It is in this spirit that the 1971 Architectural Conservation Course was also involved in an urban conservation project, including an exercise on the analysis of the historic centre of Capua, near Naples. The students, guided by experts, were hosted by the city

for five weeks in a big hotel on the coast, and the results of these analyses were later published by ICCROM. Philippot wrote in the preface to the publication:

*It is now generally recognized that no efficient safeguard of monuments or historic centres can be adequately achieved as long as each building is treated as an isolated object. Fighting natural degradation will have little effect indeed as long as no action is taken at the level of the cause of decay and these are, in the first place, cultural, economic and social. Architectural conservation, therefore, has now to be approached within the larger ambit of town planning; and keeping in mind that all attempts at saving old buildings are bound to remain platonic as long as an adequate social and economical action cannot be undertaken to ensure them a convenient function and significance within the living context of the town. This requires, on the one hand, due acknowledgement of the specific values of the buildings as cultural factors in modern life, which implies a political will to safeguard them, and, on the other hand, a method of study of the urban structure. This method should assess the values of that which should be preserved, in such a way that the archaeological, historical and aesthetic aspects of individual buildings or complexes of buildings are systematically connected with the actual social, cultural and economic life of the town and its region as well as with the planning of their future development (ICCROM 1972).*

In 1972, it was decided to use the same methodology for the study the historic centre of Tivoli, which was easier to access being close to Rome. Later, I had the opportunity to represent ICCROM in conferences organised during the 1975 European Architectural Heritage Year. These conferences introduced an international picture for the current understanding in the conservation and rehabilitation of historic urban areas, summarised in the Council of Europe recommendations adopted that year. It was also an important reference for the further development of the ICCROM ARC Course. When I was appointed responsible for the ARC course, it was organised on the general university pattern, which meant that the professors normally had weekly lectures for a certain number of weeks. To this were added foreign teachers who were invited according to their availability. The subjects were mixed up and it was not always easy for the participants to concentrate. I discussed this situation with both Philippot and De Angelis d'Ossat and prepared a detailed critical analysis of the contents of the course. Consequently, the subjects were re-organised on the basis of themes starting with the history and theory of conservation and then moving on to practical subjects, urban conservation, and legal frameworks. This approach was accepted by ICCROM for the future.

At the end of the 1972 course, I met the British architect, Dr Derek Linstrum (1925-2009), who had been appointed director of the International Historic Structures Course at the University of York, organised by the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies (IoAAS) and the British Council. This course was conceived as a Master Course over a period of two years. However, during this period, there were short one-week modules open to other professionals. Philippot and Linstrum decided that my attendance to a short course in September 1972 would be an opportunity to strengthen the ties between ICCROM and IoAAS. During this course, I met Bernard Feilden and other British professionals, who were then invited to lecture at ICCROM in Rome. Consequently, this event gave ICCROM the possibility to further broaden the international character of the ARC course. Feilden soon became an important contributor not only to the course but also an advisor to ICCROM. In 1977, he was elected as the third Director of ICCROM.

Derek Linstrum knew that there was relatively little published in English about the history of conservation movement and associated theory. Therefore, he agreed with Bernard Feilden that I should apply for a doctorate at the University of York. This was taken as an ICCROM research project, and I could have free time when required. It was Philippot who proposed the title for my thesis: *A History of Architectural Conservation: The Contribution of English, French, German and Italian Thought towards an International Approach to the Conservation of Cultural Property*. I was registered for the research in 1978 and completed it around 1985. I was able to use ICCROM missions to examine the conservation practices in various countries, as well as also consulting archives in the UK, France, East Germany, Greece, and Italy. Particularly important were the libraries in Rome, including ICCROM's own, but the research also meant acquiring new and still available older publications for a personal library. This research was fundamental to my teaching activities. I was a regular lecturer at York and Derek Linstrum visited ICCROM. Therefore, we had a possibility to continuously monitor the progress of my research. At the same time, I started lecturing on the history of conservation also at ICCROM. This was possible because Prof. Carlo Ceschi who had been teaching it earlier was no more available.

## **INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING GUIDELINES**

In 1974, Philippot published an article in the ICCROM Newsletter on '*A typology of curricula for training of specialists in conservation*'. He noted that even though the importance of heritage conservation is by now recognised, there is still considerable confusion about the roles and qualifications of the different

disciplines. He noted, for example, that architectural training alone would not be sufficient to qualify for the conservation of architectural heritage. There was need for specialization either during or after university studies. The other disciplines that he listed included historians, art historians and archaeologists, as well as foremen, artisans, and conservation scientists, each playing a role in the conservation of specific aspects or specific types of heritage. The responsibilities depended not only on the qualification of the people but also on the recognition of the requirements of heritage (Philippot 1974). At this time, ICCROM organised three regular training programmes: Course on Architectural Conservation in collaboration with the University of Rome, Conservation of Mural Paintings in collaboration with the Italian Institute of Restoration, and Fundamental Principles of Conservation focused on scientific research and analysis, and based on the proposal by Plenderleith.

In 1984, proposed by the Polish architect and historian of art and culture, Andrzej Tomaszewski (1934-2010), the ICOMOS Executive Committee accepted the establishment of the International Training Committee (CIF, Comité International de Formation). The chairperson of the Executive Committee asked me as representative of ICCROM whether this proposal would be acceptable to ICCROM considering that one of ICCROM's mandates was indeed education and training. I responded that we welcomed Tomaszewski's initiative, and that the members of CIF representing universities in different countries would provide a network of contacts also useful for ICCROM.

One of the first initiatives of the CIF was to start discussing the proposal of preparing guidelines on education and training. During a CIF meeting in Montreal, in 1989, Feilden was invited to prepare the draft for these guidelines. We can also recall that Tomaszewski was elected Director of ICCROM in 1988, and he asked me to act as the Secretary General of CIF. Thus, I had an active role in the elaboration of the Training Guidelines, contacting ICOMOS committees and ICCROM Council members. The resulting Guidelines on Education and Training in the Conservation of Monuments, Ensembles and Sites, prepared in English and French, was adopted by the ICOMOS General Assembly in Colombo, in 1993. During the same meeting, I was elected the second president for the Training Committee.

In 1992, in the UK, at a Conference on Training in Architectural Conservation, organised by COTAC, Council on Training in Architectural Conservation, there was a discussion on the main profiles and required competences of the different disciplines needed to collaborate in conservation projects. The theme was

presented by Bernard Feilden, based on the draft ICOMOS Training Guidelines. The document proposed Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration in Conservation Projects in the context of the UK. It included not only architects and engineers of different qualifications but also scientists, economists, surveyors, contractors, curators, and administrators. It was noted that Conservation Officers, Curators, Conservators, Surveyors and Architects would need to study the whole range of conservation subjects, while the others, such as building owners and foremen, could select those suiting their specific requirements. The COTAC document was also presented to CIF at the meeting in Colombo, in 1993.

The importance of training of staff and specialists '*at all levels in the field of identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage*' had already been included in the World Heritage Convention. However, it was necessary to clarify the strategic approaches in the different cases. As a representative of ICCROM, I was asked to prepare a draft, which was discussed at ICCROM, ICOMOS and UNESCO, and then presented to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in July 1995. On this basis, the World Heritage Committee discussed the proposed training strategy concerning both cultural and natural heritage and extending to the needs in the different regions. The focus on education and training was later considered in the broader context of capacity building resulting in the adoption of the *World Heritage strategy for capacity building* at the World Heritage Committee meeting in 2011. In 2013, ICOMOS CIF also prepared the '*Principles for Capacity Building through Education and Training in Safeguarding and Integrated Conservation of Cultural Heritage Territorial Conservation Planning*', which specified the needs of different disciplines in terms of education and training in heritage conservation.

The topic of urban and territorial planning had already been part of ICCROM's Architectural Conservation Course, and there had been various field studies, such as the analysis of the historic centre of Capua in 1971, a study of Tivoli in 1972, and the study of Kotor in 1974. The Kotor exercise was possible due to the invitation by Prof. Tomislav Marasović, former student and regular lecturer at ICCROM. In the 1980s, there were several study periods organised in Ferrara with the support of the city architect Carlo Cesari and the Municipality of Ferrara. This also included the study of the cultural landscape of Ferrara that extended to the Adriatic Sea in the east. In 1995, the city of Ferrara was inscribed on the World Heritage List and extended to the cultural landscape of the Po Delta in 1999. In 1993, the opportunity was offered by an ICOMOS evaluation mission by myself to

the Sassi di Matera in southern Italy for the nomination on the UNESCO List. As a result, a series of yearly field workshops were introduced into the ARC programme, allowing the ICCROM ARC course to contribute to the debate on the conservation and rehabilitation of this city.

In 1995, ICCROM invited a number of conservation experts to discuss the Urban Conservation Initiative (UCI), which was proposed as a reference for a new programme in territorial conservation and planning. This initiative was later developed into the programme called ITUC, Integrated Territorial and Urban Conservation (Jokilehto 1999). This initiative was considered necessary taking into account the currently available education and training, already analysed in the 1995 Training Strategy, and the need to further stress the importance of territorial planning. The main goal of ITUC was to establish an international forum with its objectives falling into the following main areas: teaching, research, system of seminars, establishment of an information centre, technical cooperation. There were several expert meetings to discuss the contents and organisation of the programme, including Montreal in 1996, Rome in 1997, Recife in 1998. The first International Training Workshop, ITUC-97, was organised at ICCROM in Rome from February to April in 1997. The ITUC programme was taken over by Herb Stovel after my retirement from ICCROM in 1998.

The desired model profile of participants was presented in the form of a questionnaire, listing the set of competencies as a hypothesis regarding the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required by professionals in the field concerned. The questionnaire was circulated to the experts who had participated in the meetings, as well as to others, including all candidates who applied to the course. The questionnaire was answered by persons from 41 countries, representing urban planners, conservation architects, historians, government officers, and teachers. The needs that were indicated as requiring most attention in the conservation planning of historic urban and rural areas, included: focus on economic variables, focus on urban conservation and the environment, focus on the need to disseminate information, focus on developing countries operating with scarce resources, focus on influencing policy and policy makers, focus on community, and focus on integrated conservation planning and management.

Prof. Silvio Mendes Zancheti, urban planner and economist on sabbatical leave from the University of Pernambuco, Recife, spent this period mainly to use the resources at ICCROM. He became an important collaborator in the development of the ITUC programme. On his return to Brazil, he organised a regional ITUC

programme at the University in Recife, Centro de Estudos Avançados de Conservação Integrada-CECI, first focused on Brazilian city administrators then expanding to the other Latin American countries. The regional programme at CECI was organised in two phases. The first phase consisted of one year of research and on-line consultation. The second phase consisted of a period of one month of survey and planning of an historic urban area, organised in collaboration with the local planning office.

There were several other regional programmes in architectural and/or urban conservation initiated by ICCROM. In particular, one organised jointly with the Maghreb countries, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. This consisted of a number of seminars at ICCROM and in the countries concerned involving local professionals and administrators. The aim was plan for education and training. As a result, a two-year master course was organised in Tunis, in collaboration with Dr Abdelaziz Daoulati, Director of the Tunisian Heritage Authorities. This course was developed in collaboration with ICCROM, and it was open to all Maghreb countries, partly financed by Spanish and French governments. Later it was proposed to be taken over by the University of Tunis, which however was not successful.

## **WORLD HERITAGE CONSULTANCY**

After my retirement from ICCROM at the end of July 1998, the first event was an invitation to China to examine potential World Heritage nomination together with Dr Henry Cleere (1926-2018), ICOMOS, and Dr Guo Zhan, responsible for the preparation of Chinese World Heritage nominations. At the end of 1999, the Secretary General of ICOMOS, Jean-Louis Luxen invited me to join the ICOMOS team on the evaluation of World Heritage nominations. This meant frequent visits to Paris to prepare the draft evaluations of the nominated properties, then discussed by the ICOMOS expert panel. It also meant a number of missions to sites and the attendance of World Heritage meetings. I worked in this position for seven years until 2006. After this experience, I was frequently consulted on World Heritage issues in countries, such as Italy, Iran, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Eritrea, China, Japan, Arab countries.

In various integrated urban conservation projects, I was joint with Carlo Cesari and Azar Soheil. Having already been involved in the evaluation of the historic centre of Baku, in Azerbaijan, I was asked by the administration to form a team for the preparation of an urban conservation plan, which was a World Heritage requirement. Apart from Cesari and Soheil we contacted some other Italian experts, with whom we prepared the plan in 2007-2008.

In 2011, I was invited to Eritrea to lecture, which then resulted in the invitation to be consulted on the World Heritage nomination of Asmara, the capital of the country. The same team of Baku again joined me. In this case, the city of Asmara organised their own office who prepared the plans, based on our instructions. Asmara was mainly built in the 1930s and 1940s, and it was interesting to find an archive with full documentation of all plans and drawings. All the documents of this archive were scanned to be used in the conservation assessment. We also proposed the structure for the management plan but insisted that the preparation of the plan was the task of the local authority. It became part of capacity building. In 2017, Asmara was inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv) as: “Asmara: A Modernist African City”.

The third project in this period was in Iran. The Deputy to the Minister of Culture, Dr Mohammad Hassan Talebian was responsible for conservation, and he invited us to work on the preparation of the conservation plan for the historic city of Shiraz. The idea was that our team would instruct the methodology and monitor the process, while the surveys and mapping would be the responsibility of the local office, placed in Shiraz. This meant continuous communication over Internet complemented by several trips to Iran. The problem here as well as in Eritrea was and still the relative isolation of these countries and the difficulty to have access to resources. In all these cases, the main focus has been education and capacity building.

## CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

The Second World War gave an additional input to an international development in training. In this process, ICCROM became a focal point. It was in fact created by UNESCO not only to advise on conservation principles and approaches, but also, and perhaps even more specifically, on the development of international training models in the conservation of different types of heritage resources. From the 1960s to the 1990s, ICCROM organised the Architectural Conservation Course. To this were added courses on the conservation of mural paintings, courses for curators of museums and collections, as well as conservation of paper jointly with Japan, wooden architecture in collaboration with Norway, modern architecture in collaboration with Finland, etc.

In the local context, it would be possible to know exactly the materials and structures concerned and focus eventual training on relevant guidelines. Instead, when training is undertaken for an international audience, like in the case of ICCROM, the situation is different. Considering that the diversity of heritage is internationally recognised, the question was raised whether or not there should a

different conservation approach to the different types of heritage and different cultural contexts. Indeed, while it is necessary to look at each site in its specificity, the approach to conservation should be based on a clear methodology. Therefore, Paul Philippot considered that there could only be one conservation theory. This means that the basis of the methodological approach to the conservation and restoration of the different types of heritage resources can be based on the same framework while the specificity of each property would require different types of treatment. The fundamental aim of the ICCROM courses was in fact methodological with reference to the internationally adopted guidelines and conservation theory. In the 1972 ICCROM ARC Course, the participants came from several European and Latin American countries, as well as Canada, Ghana, Iran, Japan, Madagascar, Nepal, and Philippines. The building traditions, materials and structural systems varied from country to country, and there were also various issues related to the preparation of the participants. Even in Europe, there were countries, such as Italy, where the historic consciousness based on the concepts on historiography by Benedetto Croce (1866-1952) was guiding the approach. This could be compared to the northern countries where the approach was more pragmatic. Consequently, in the ARC course, the main scope was to focus training on methodology while any specific advice on technical solutions could be offered in discussions. We can distinguish between education, which aims to provide a broad philosophical and methodological approach, and training that aims to offer skills. However, even when dealing with practical exercises, such as the analysis of urban fabric or the preparation of mortar mixes, the scope was to emphasise a critical judgement in the recognition of the work and the required treatment in each case.

Personally, I was one who came from the northern countries, where of course we did study history of art and architecture, but where nevertheless the question of recognising something as heritage was rather limited. At the university, I studied architecture and urban design, and I also had practical experience having worked on the urban master plans of various cities. In Finland, such studies were based on the experience gained in modern architecture. Therefore, in urban planning, the aim was to design the new areas for existing cities taking into account the required functions, the landforms, and the integrity of the overall design. Regarding the existing built areas, the practice was to identify their dates of construction and judge for each area its functional limit when it could be mature for redevelopment. This was normally taken to be between 30 to 50 years. It is interesting that in the 21st century, Helsinki is still demolishing and redesigning existing buildings. Inside the remaining 19th or early 20th century, even though keeping the old elevations the insides often contain new shopping malls.

Even late 20th century buildings are being redeveloped. As a means to reduce carbon emissions in the next few decades, however, Finland's Ministry of the Environment considers that renovation would be much more effective than demolition followed by new building. This will be a crucial argument in the fight against climate change<sup>1</sup>.

My doctoral thesis was written in the 1980s and published in 1999. It focused on the evolution of approaches to the restoration and conservation of historic structures. It was indeed a critical examination of the foundations of modern conservation movement as then expressed in the Venice Charter (1964). The second edition of my book, published in 2018, some thirty years after the thesis. Therefore, it contains the international developments ever since the 1970s and 1980s. It also shows the changes in attitudes, already anticipated in the Nara Document on Authenticity in 1994 and reconfirmed in the international conventions such as those of UNESCO and Council of Europe in 2005. The study shows a learning process that is reflected in the broadening international context. It is accompanied by an increasing number of nominations on the World Heritage List, and it is gradually also taking into account the context as an important reference for the significance of a place recognised as heritage and as vital for its preservation and safeguarding. Indeed, conservation begins to be fully integrated into the overall territorial management of the built and natural environment.

There are two important conditions to be considered when preparing nominations to the World Heritage List. One is the verification of the condition of integrity of the resource, meaning that all the elements that together contribute to the significance of the resource are considered. The other issue concerns the verification of the truthfulness, i.e., authenticity, of these elements in reference to the recognised significance.

Taking the World Heritage criterion (i), which requires "to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius", it is often used to justify the nomination of outstanding architectural design, such as the Historic Areas of Istanbul and the Old City of Dubrovnik. There are three properties inscribed only on criterion (i), i.e., Taj Mahal, Sydney Opera House, and the Temple of Preah Vihear in Cambodia, which are all individual architectural complexes. To be a masterpiece of human creative genius can be seen as reference to a work of art, which has been discussed by various philosophers. Brandi notes

that the recognition of the aesthetic quality, i.e., the form of the work of art, takes place in the human mind. This recognition, however, can only take place in the presence of the physical material, the matter. The work of art thus consists of the two aspects: the form and the matter. The form is intangible while the matter represents the aging and eventual changes over time, i.e., history. Paul Philippot refers to Brandi's concepts of phenomenology in works art, noting

*Indeed, whatever period the work of art was created in, it gives itself to us hic et nunc, in the absolute present of perception. It lacks reality of its own until it is recognised by a consciousness, and this recognition is not the result of a judgment arising from an analysis, but the identification of a specificity within the perception itself and the point of departure for the historian's study. Thus, if art story is possible, it distinguishes itself from other historical disciplines as, rather than recounting the history of an event in the past, belonging to memory, it intends to create of history a reality that is present in the consciousness. In this sense, it is inseparable from the critique, to the extent that the latter aims to characterise the nature of this particular presence (Philippot 2005: 28).*

Indeed, in the case of a work of art, as is indicated by Brandi himself, 'Restoration consists of the methodological moment in which the work of art is recognized in its physical being and in its dual aesthetic and historical nature, in view of its transmission to the future. Therefore, we are here talking about the integrity of the human creative genius in reference to significance. For Brandi, considering a work of art does not imply the function. Concerning architecture as a special human creation, Brandi states that it has similarity to the creation of a work of art. However, while architecture is not referred to an external object like paintings or sculptures, it has its reference in a pre-conceptual image that the artist creates in his mind: 'Now, when the artist constitutes the object, it is not the external object that he refers to, but the image he has inside himself: and this image is such precisely because it has a cognitive substance that is figurativity, and it is figurativity as its cognitive substance. ('Ora, quando l'artista si costituisce l'oggetto, non è all'oggetto esterno che si riferisce, ma all'immagine che ha dentro di sé: e questa immagine è tale proprio perché ha una sostanza conoscitiva che è figuratività, ed è figuratività in quanto è sostanza conoscitiva.')

Considering the architectural form, it certainly has aesthetic quality and therefore can be recognised as a work of art. However, it is the function that is mostly the reference for the architect designing buildings and settlements. It is in this sense that the World Heritage

<sup>1</sup> Ympäristöministeriö, 2021. *Purkaa vai korjata? Hiilijalanjälkivaikutukset, elinkaarikustannukset ja ohjauskeinot*. Helsinki (Finland's Ministry of Environment: Demolish or repair? Carbon footprint, cost of living and guidance) (Ympäristöministeriö 2021)



criterion (iv) requires for the nominated property: *‘to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history’*. If the question is of an individual complex, such as monastery, bazaar or an industrial complex, the integrity can be mainly referred to the elements that together define its functionality. The functions may not necessarily be limited to physical relations but also symbolic. Furthermore, such complexes are generally always part of a larger built or natural context. In this sense, the ICOMOS Xi’an Declaration (2005) acknowledges the contribution of setting to the significance of heritage monuments and sites (ICOMOS 2005).

During the European Architectural Heritage Year in 1975, the Council of Europe concluded the findings of various conference at the concluding event in Amsterdam, declaring that the integrated urban conservation is of fundamental importance for the future of the architectural heritage, and that it *‘depends largely upon its integration into the context of people’s lives and upon the weight given to it in regional and town planning and development schemes’* (Council of Europe 1975). In the same spirit, the UNESCO Recommendation of 1976 states: *Every historic area and its surroundings should be considered in their totality as a coherent whole whose balance and specific nature depend on the fusion of the parts of which it is composed and which include human activities as much as the buildings, the spatial organization and the surroundings. All valid elements, including human activities, however modest, thus have a significance in relation to the whole which must not be disregarded* (UNESCO 1976).

What this implies is that the requirement of integrity needs to be referred to the entire city- not only to some section, such as an historic centre, recognised for its particular historic or aesthetic quality. In addition to the recognition of the artistic and architectural qualities of relevant parts, such as those referred to in the WH criterion (i), for the purposes of management, it is necessary to analyse the historical-functional and visual integrity of the entire city within its context. This has already been emphasised in the UNESCO 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL), which emphasises that the approach of integrated urban conservation needs specific tools, including the civic engagement tools, knowledge and planning tools, regulatory systems, financial tools, as well as capacity building, research, and information tools. These tools are associated with the sustainable social and economic development of the historic city, and it is not possible to limit their use to the protected areas only. Consequently, the planning and management of protected areas must necessarily be part of the general

integrated management, which considers the needs of the community in the entire city as well as in the protected areas.

The Japanese Machinami Charter of 2000 well describes the scope of integrated urban conservation. It notes that Machinami, usually translated as ‘Historic Town’, is a Japanese word that includes a nuance of the historic core, in both its tangible and intangible factors, its physical and spiritual aspects, that would be created by a ‘bond of spirits’.

*Conservation of historic towns differs from the conservation of historic monuments, mainly because it is impossible to restrict the object of conservation to the material elements within given limits, as it would be for historic monuments. The continued use of traditional techniques linked to architecture, and daily living within certain standards, are also considered important actions leading directly to conservation. In other words, conservation of traditional houses or structures - as material objects - is an important element in the conservation of historic towns, but not its final purpose. That people should remain living there, that a vibrant life should develop, and that traditions be given new life and revive, is the aim of the conservation of historic towns* (Machinami Charter 2000).

There has been an important development in the conception of heritage from individual monuments to historic sites with special characteristics, and finally to entire cities and cultural landscapes. At the same time the approach to conservation is no longer only reserved for specialists but necessarily involves all the different stakeholders. As a result, conservation of monuments and sites has been integrated as an essential element in the territorial planning and management. As a consequence, there is a need for efficient systems of communication and capacity building. Also training and education have been subject to development. Earlier, conservation was mainly limited to conservators, while today, due to the multidisciplinary nature of heritage conservation, there is need for many types of professions and even the community at large to be involved. Indeed, integrated urban conservation has its scope keeping historic areas alive and in sustainable use. Therefore, recognition of heritage requires awareness and knowledge and much work. It needs collaboration with the administrators and surveyors as well as with building owners. We need to understand what is required from a “heritage community” to be able to guarantee the sustainable management of continuity for their heritage.

## REFERENCES

BRANDI, C. 1992.

*Arcadio o della Scultura; Eliante o dell'Architettura*, Roma, Editori Riuniti, p. 157.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE 1975.

*European Charter of the Architectural Heritage*, adopted by the Council of Europe, October 1975

FEILDEN, B. 1982(2003)

*Conservation of Historic Buildings*, London, Architectural Press - Elsevier.

ICCROM, 1972.

*Il Centro Antico di Capua: Metodi di analisi per la pianificazione architettonica-urbanistica*, (edited by I. Brock, P. Giuliani, C. Moisescu) Marsilio Editore, ICCROM and Faculty of Architecture, University of Rome.

ICOMOS, 2005.

*Xi'an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas*, Xi'an, China.

JOKILEHTO, J. 1999.

*ICCROM Integrated Territorial and Urban Conservation, ITUC, Programme - Phase I (1994 - 1998), Summary Report*, unpublished ICCROM Paper.

MACHINAMI CHARTER 2000.

Machinami Charter, adopted by the Japanese Association for Machinami Conservation and Regeneration, in October 2000. Assented to by ICOMOS Japan National Committee, in December 2000.

PHILIPPOT, P. 1972

'Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices' in *Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1976., North American International Regional Conference*, Williamsburg, USA, September 1972, Washington, Smithsonian Institution Press, pp. 367-390.

PHILIPPOT, P. 1974

'A typology of curricula for training of specialists in conservation', Newsletter 2-5, International Centre for Conservation, July 1974, pp. 2.

PHILIPPOT, P. 2005

'The Phenomenology of Artistic Creation according to Cesare Brandi' in: Cesare Brandi, 2005. *Theory of Restoration*, Istituto Centrale del Restauro, Firenze, Nardini editore, pp. 27-41.

UNESCO 1976.

*Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas*, adopted by the General Conference at its nineteenth session, Nairobi, 26 November 1976.

YMPÄRISTÖMINISTERIÖ, 2021

*Purkaa vai korjata? Hiilijalanjälkivaikutukset, elinkaarikustannukset ja ohjaukskeinot*. Helsinki (Finland's Ministry of Environment: Demolish or repair? Carbon footprint, cost of living and guidance)