1. Ise Shrine in Kyoto, Japan. The shrine is rebuilt every twenty years according to an ancient Shinto tradition. (Public domain photo)
Present Debate
While examining the history of modern preservation practices, one notices how these have evolved from individual initiatives to national legislation, subsequently becoming the basis for international doctrine. The role of international organizations, and particularly of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), has however become increasingly decisive. It has been sustained by the activities of International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and guided by international conventions and recommendations. In terms of theory, the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter) in 1964, started a compendium of international doctrine, which gradually expanded the thinking process. Alternatively, as a legal instrument, the UNESCO 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (the World Heritage Convention) has become crucial. By March 2005, it had been ratified by 181 states—nearly all the countries of the world. More recently, UNESCO has adopted the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003), emerging from the earlier Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity (1997). We should also remember that the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001) was groundbreaking in recognizing the value of all cultures. Through this process, new notions of heritage, such as “cultural landscape” and “intangible heritage,” are rapidly having an impact on national and local policies.

The current debate has raised a number of issues that are significant for the formulation of principles and philosophy for safeguarding heritage resources as well as reviving a new interest in preservation-conservation-restoration theory. At the same time, we should take note that the meanings that we associate even with familiar words can vary from language to language and from country to country. For example, the North American expression “historic preservation” would generally correspond to “conservation of historic buildings” in the United Kingdom and “restoration of monuments” in Latin countries. International documents often use the terms...
"conservation" or "restoration," depending on the emphasis of treatment. For example, the Venice Charter emphasizes that "conservation of monuments" should imply maintenance and appropriate use, while restoration is considered a highly specialized operation, aiming "to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value," respecting original material and authenticity.

The principles emerging from the debate have sometimes been accused of "Euro-centricity," intending that they would be mainly applicable to historic monuments that correspond to those in the Mediterranean region. The 1994 Nara Conference on Authenticity was an attempt to rebalance the debate and take into account the cultural situations outside the Western world. During the conference, there was a hard debate between those who emphasized the importance of "monuments" and those who stressed the qualities of "vernacular built heritage." In fact, the question was raised whether the whole concept of "authenticity" actually existed outside Europe! Special attention was drawn to cultural diversity and the "authenticity of values." Furthermore, in the French language, a fundamental difference was seen between the concepts of "monument" and "monument historique," which are defined by Alois Riegl as "memorial" and "historic building."

Notwithstanding all of these differences in meanings and approaches, the conference was able to draft the Nara Document on Authenticity, which was only finalized after additional efforts by the two rapporteurs, Raymond Lemaire and Herb Stovel. We should remember that Lemaire had been rapporteur of the drafting group that produced the Venice Charter in 1964. In the new document, he stressed material authenticity and the spirit of this Charter. Stovel, on the other hand, represented a younger generation, and gave importance to cultural diversity and the continuity of traditions. Both of these issues were integrated into the Nara Document, which emphasizes the fundamental importance of cultural diversity and "the respect for other cultures and all aspects of their belief systems." The document notes that the judgments of values attributed to heritage may differ from culture to culture, but it also insists that the importance of "credibility and truthfulness of related information sources" be verified in each case. The concept of authenticity thus emerges as a notion related to the credibility and truthfulness of sources of information, which may include a great number of parameters depending on the character and values of the heritage concerned. At the same time, the truthfulness, i.e. "authenticity" and "genuineness", of the sources of information must be verified.
**Restoration Theory**

A line must be drawn between principles or ethics of preservation, on the one hand, and the relevant theory, on the other. International doctrinal documents, such as the Venice Charter or the Nara Document on Authenticity, offer principles, which are often referred to in debates. The *US Secretary of the Interior’s Standards of Preservation* and the Australian *Burra Charter* have comparable sets of principles. However, the theory of restoration or preservation means something different, and should be understood as the description of the methodology of approach to the critical survey and assessment of a heritage, and the step-by-step decisions for its treatment and maintenance.

A fundamental reference for the theory of restoration was published by Cesare Brandi in 1963. In his work, Brandi distinguished between the common understanding of “restoration” as “any intervention that permits a product of human activity to recover its function,” and the restoration of works of art, which he defines as “...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". Brandi’s name is well known outside Italy, but little other than his theory of restoration has been translated. His other works, however, are essential for understanding his thought and his definition of the work of art. Paul Philippot, the former director of ICCROM, has translated a fundamental book by Brandi, *Le Due Vie* (“the two paths”), into French. Without going into more depth here, we still want to emphasize that Brandi’s concept of art is in the human mind, and therefore, a work of art cannot be conceptualized in the same way as other types of existing physical reality.

In his lectures at ICCROM in the 1970s, Philippot often emphasized restoration as a fundamentally cultural problem. Restoration and preservation of cultural heritage should thus be understood as a form of culture—another aspect of modernity of our time. It is based on values generated by us, values that can be quite different from those in the traditional society. Today, we are experiencing the phenomenon of globalization, but we are concurrently aware of the conflicts between modern societies and communities that have retained their traditional beliefs and ways of life. These differences can be seen in various realms, such as religion and family life. In such situations, the question can be raised whether the international principles of preservation and the theory of restoration can be applicable and, if not, what is the alternative.

Taking into account the notion of cultural diversity as declared by UNESCO, we should respect the values and the specificities of culture and heritage in different contexts.
Following Brandi's definition, restoration is a process in which the first phase consists of the 'recognition' of the heritage and understanding what it signifies. It is only then that an intervention can be contemplated. Recognition is a fundamental part of the process, because this is the basis that will guide one's critical judgment of the necessary analysis and treatments that should follow. It is not by accident that Brandi's theory has been called in Italian "restauro critico" or restoration based on critical judgment.

"Restoration" ("conservation," "reservation") can thus be defined as a cultural approach to our inherited environment and understood as a methodology based on critical judgment of the qualities and the identification of the significance and associated values of a heritage resource. The principles indicated in restoration charters can be kept in mind as a general guidance. However, the process must necessarily be based on a critical judgment. Therefore, restoration cannot be a template distinguished from miles away. It must take into account the specificity of each heritage as a resource reflecting the cultural and historical context where it was created and with which it associates. David Lowenthal has spoken about the past as "a foreign country". One should approach any heritage with the same critical mind, in such a way that the methodology is not dependent on the "nationality" or the age of the heritage.

Since the 1994 Nara Conference on Authenticity, there has been on-going debate about the applicability of restoration principles in different cultures. It is obvious that no principles should be applied without a critical recognition and assessment of the character and significance of a particular heritage. Such a notion has been recognized by Seung-Jin Chung of Korea, who has claimed that East Asian societies are determined in relation to the spiritual and naturalistic sensibilities of their culture and that such ideas are more appropriate than the approaches ("mainly aesthetically oriented") developed in Western countries (Figure 1). Following from the previous and also referring to the Nara Document, one can obviously conclude that each heritage needs to be based on the knowledge and understanding of its qualities and attributed values. The differences and similarities of our cultures can be discussed at length. In this discussion, we can also refer to the on-going international debate and research on new types of heritage. Each culture has its own spirituality, relationship with nature and environment, and aesthetic appreciation.

**Heritage Values**

The World Heritage Convention has been remarkably successful in encouraging the various states to iden
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representation of the World Heritage List in relation to three frameworks: 1) typological framework of heritage categories, 2) chronological-regional framework, and 3) thematic framework. Of these, the thematic framework is the key for the identification of the universal value of a particular site, and it lists the following main themes: expressions of society, creative responses and continuity, spiritual responses, utilizing natural resources, movement of peoples, and developing technologies.

This is an open framework which can be edited and provided detailed sub-categories if necessary. Once a potential heritage resource has been identified, the relevant themes should be determined. Subsequently, for the World Heritage purposes, it will be necessary to make a comparative study of the relative significance of the site seen in its chronological and cultural-regional contexts. Such studies are increasingly important not only to inscribe something on the UNESCO List, but also to define appropriate strategies for the national territory.

Heritage Diversity
The definition of what is intended by “heritage” has been greatly broadened in the late twentieth century. In addition to the previous categories of historic buildings and historic towns, there is increasing interest in identifying industrial heritage, modern architecture and town planning schemes, and cultural landscapes. While certain regions of the world have preserved a rich heritage of historic structures built in stone and brick, others may have buildings mainly in wood, mud or straw. Here, the question is sometimes less about the preservation of the historicity of materials, and more about the continuity of traditional use of materials and techniques. Therefore, rather than speaking about the authenticity of ancient elements, the emphasis may be in the continuity of genuine traditions and how such continuity can, if at all possible, be guaranteed in the future.

The ICOMOS Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage (adopted in 1999) states:

[Vernacular building] 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 world-wide by the forces of economic, cultural and architectural homogenization. How these forces can be met is a fundamental problem that must be addressed by communities and also by governments, planners, architects, conservationists and by a multidisciplinary group of specialists.
This consideration places the definition of heritage values in a much broader context, including culture itself, such as the intangible heritage, the subject of the 2003 UNESCO Convention. It can be stated that all heritage has an intangible aspect. A work of the imagination by humankind of any era and culture is based on ideas and concepts that have guided material expressions. In a traditional living settlement or cultural landscape, however, we are dealing with values and ways of life that may change over time. In traditional societies, it was common for older generations to instruct the young in order to guarantee continuity. In our increasingly globalizing world, such indoctrination is rare. Nevertheless, even modern preservation policies should pay due attention to increasing awareness and training. In traditional rural settlements, the challenge is to maintain the integrity of the place, particularly in terms of materials and techniques, which in themselves represent traditional continuity. On the other hand, there are plenty of examples in countries with wood construction, including North America and Northern Europe as well as East Asia, where modern design has been well integrated within traditional context. The question is about finding a critical balance.

In Japan and Korea, there has long been legislation encouraging the identification of skilled persons or groups of persons who agree to pass their knowledge and know-how of traditional building crafts to younger generations. Even the Council of Europe has long made efforts to promote training...
of crafts persons. Additionally, the question is about building a market for traditional crafts and making such solutions accepted by modern way of life. Therefore, it is fundamental to improve public awareness of the value and role of traditional crafts and materials as well as to provide constructive examples of suitable solutions.

The Way Forward
We have discussed various issues related to preservation theory and its implementation in the future. In looking forward, the first challenge in this process is raising awareness of the existence of such a theory—defined as a methodology and based on critical judgment—and introducing this into relevant education programs. ICCROM has long been working on developing the application of preservation methodology into training programs. ICOMOS instead has contributed through systems of communication involving professionals. The most recent initiative, in 2005, has been the establishment of an International Committee for Preservation Theory.

We have stressed the notion of cultural diversity and the need to take into account the specificity and values of heritage. We should not forget, however, that it is also necessary to identify common parameters and definitions that can be shared by all. This is particularly important for the credibility of international collaboration and the implementation of such initiatives as the World Heritage List. In this context, for example, the concept of authenticity has been defined in reference to truthfulness of the sources of information, which already states a common reference applicable to other cultures. A shared critical methodology is fundamental, but it should also offer the possibility to take into account the specificities of heritage resources in different cultures and times.

Another challenge is the continuation of surveying of our heritage, both cultural and natural, and the recognition of its significance as a vital component of the culturally and environmentally sustainable development of the world. Furthermore, past responsibility for heritage management was often assumed by a form of public authority. Since the 1980s, however, due to increasing privatization and the expansion of the notion of heritage, problems cannot be faced by a single authority alone. On the contrary, it is the responsibility of the society as a whole. While the role of specialists and experts in the preservation process remains vital, the informed participation of the other stakeholders is imperative. Since the nineteenth century, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have been fundamental promoters of this process, not only in the Western world and other industrialized countries, but also increasingly in the so-called developing world. The participa-
tion of a large number of interest groups and stakeholders can only become meaningful if there are common objectives based on shared values.

Going beyond the mere principles, the scope of preservation theory is to define heritage and the methodology for its preservation and restoration. However, it can only be reached through an appropriate system of negotiation, arbitration and conflict solving, sustained by a fitting legal and administrative framework. Communication is an important tool for preservationists. In fact, preservation is communication, an understanding of and dialogue with the existing built environment, and it means information flows between all stakeholders.
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