

# Reconstructing Europe: The Need for Guidelines

JOHN BOLD

*Reader in Architecture, University of Westminster*

ROBERT PICKARD

*Professor Emeritus in Built Environment and Heritage Conservation,  
Northumbria University*

In a contemporary climate in which reconstruction in a historicist style is regarded negatively by heritage specialists as inauthentic, there is a need for better guidance and greater clarity about what reconstruction connotes, when it is admissible to carry it out in a style or form reflecting so far as possible what has been lost, how it should be done, and what authenticity actually means. In this paper, we review the current situation and existing charters and terminology, and suggest ways forward. Experience within the Council of Europe has shown that reconstruction after the wars in the former Yugoslavia will take place whether or not it is approved by the international heritage community. Guidelines are needed and we suggest in an Appendix the form which these might take.

**KEYWORDS** Built heritage, heritage values, charters, reconstruction, authenticity

## Introduction

The issue of how to reconstruct the built fabric of towns and cities, whether individual buildings, ensembles, or entire districts, has been a major concern for all who have suffered war or natural disaster throughout recorded history. Debates have tended to polarize around two alternatives: building anew in a contemporary style, signifying a new beginning; or rebuilding in a historicist style, signifying continuity and supporting ideas of national or community identity. In view of the fact that the question of how to reconstruct has long been a matter of concern to architects, planners, politicians, and indeed society as a whole, the absence of dedicated international guidelines is notable. The need to address this absence has become pressing in the countries of the former Yugoslavia following the devastating wars of the 1990s when historic buildings were specifically targeted, and in countries which have suffered accidental, devastating disaster through earthquakes and floods. It is the question of reconstruction after war which is specifically addressed in this paper.

In a heritage climate in which historicist reconstruction is frowned upon by heritage specialists as inauthentic, there is a need for better guidance and greater clarity about what reconstruction connotes, when it is admissible to carry it out in a style and form reflecting as far as possible what has been lost, how it should be done, and indeed, what authenticity actually means in theory and practice — wherein does it reside? The very positive response of Ministries of Culture in South-East Europe to pan-European political and procedural guidance on built heritage has been very clearly demonstrated through their acceptance of Council of Europe conventions, recommendations, and guidance documents, as well as through their continuing support of the joint European Commission/Council of Europe heritage rehabilitation programmes in South-East Europe. Reconstruction has been touched upon in several Council of Europe, International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and other international documents, but it has not been the subject of dedicated guidelines or recommendations to which politicians and practitioners can easily refer. So each individual case has to be re-argued within the countries from variously located first principles, with variously understood terminology (for a list of relevant charters and conventions, see Appendix 1).

In this paper we review the current situation, outlining what has been done before and reviewing existing charters, recommendations, and terminology, consider the various approaches to reconstruction, consider the criteria and procedures, and suggest guidelines (Appendix 2) for heritage and other professional practitioners, decision makers, and society as a whole. In a climate in which access to cultural heritage is seen as a function of human rights, decision makers must heed the voices of individuals and communities: ‘everyone, alone or collectively, has the right to benefit from the cultural heritage and to contribute towards its enrichment; everyone, alone or collectively, has the responsibility to respect the cultural heritage of others as much as their own heritage’.<sup>1</sup> In an important report for the Human Rights Council of the United Nations,<sup>2</sup> Farida Shaheed recommended, *inter alia*:

concerned communities and relevant individuals should be consulted and invited to actively participate in the whole process of identification, selection, classification, interpretation, preservation/safeguard, stewardship and development of cultural heritage; states should take measures to encourage professionals working in the field of cultural heritage to adopt a human rights-based approach and to develop rules and guidelines in this respect; professionals working in the field of cultural heritage and cultural institutions [...] should build stronger relationships with the communities and peoples whose cultural heritage they are the repositories of [...]

There is more to this than questions of mere fabric — what does that fabric signify and what, if destroyed, did it once embody? As Michael Petzet has noted in his introduction to the ICOMOS publication on *International Charters for Conservation and Restoration*:

in the evaluation of a monument not only the oft-evoked historic fabric but also additional factors ranging from authentic form to authentic spirit play a role [...] In conjunction with the deep-felt human concern that arises over rebuilding after catastrophes, there is also always the additional issue of the perceptible presence of the past at the monument site, an issue that involves more than extant or lost historic fabric.<sup>4</sup>

Embodied meanings prompt considerations of notions of authenticity (see below) and public trust. Commenting on the proposed reconstruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas, destroyed in 2002, Philippe de Montebello, then the Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, referred to this as potentially the ‘further desecration of a ruined site [...] an egregious betrayal of authenticity [...] the loss of which] will have betrayed public trust’.<sup>5</sup> The more the public is involved in the decision-making process, the more that trust in process and outcome must be engendered and maintained.

## Background

Reconstruction today is taking place in a climate which is very different from that which pertained after World Wars I and II,<sup>6</sup> although the feelings which pertained after the two wars were not identical, which underlines the need to consider specific circumstances and guard against making generalized responses. For Tony Judt, ‘after 1918 the mood of exhaustion was accompanied by a widespread desire to recapture, somehow, the certainties and the security of the pre-war years. No such nostalgia could be found in Europe following the end of the Second World War’.<sup>7</sup> This is broadly but not uniformly accurate with respect to reconstruction. After World War II, reconstruction of bombed towns and cities throughout Europe often was seen as an opportunity to build a new environment for a new world, an urban renewal overcoming the errors, excesses, and horrors of the past in the creation of a modern, rational environment. But even then, in some circumstances, for example Warsaw, the rebuilding of the city, for political and social reasons also incorporated the reconstruction of older monuments in the centre as symbols of identity and continuity, albeit with the new functions required in the provision of a living and liveable modern city.

Esther Charlesworth has referred to the two major alternative approaches to reconstruction as transformative (Rotterdam and Coventry) and facsimile (Warsaw and Dresden).<sup>8</sup> There are numerous examples of both, and there are also examples of compromise positions in which both approaches have been used, together with many examples noted by Gilles Plum in post-World War II France of rebuilding in a local style, not replicating the past but restoring a harmony believed to have been lost through the introduction of discordant elements.<sup>9</sup> He identifies a range of responses in which the architects of reconstruction adapted modernity to the realities of society, urban culture, economy, and materials. Architecture, he points out, is not free expression, still less is it conceptual.<sup>10</sup> The extent to which architects determine outcomes has been demonstrated by Wim Denslagen in his review of approaches to reconstruction in post-World War I Belgium where, notwithstanding the views of Modernists, regionalism prevailed: ‘this did not mean wanting to regain what had been there before, so much as building what they thought *should* have been there [...] an architecture that was supposedly typical of the local, traditional style of construction’.<sup>11</sup> In reconstructing the monuments of the past it is often necessary to decide which part of that past should be recreated. At Santa Chiara, Naples, for example — part of a monumental complex bombed in 1943 — it was the original fourteenth-century gothic church which was reinstated ten years later, as a memorial and symbol of peace, rather than the baroque with which it had been overlaid in the seventeenth century.

There is nowadays a much greater acceptance of the idea of a built heritage, freighted with meanings and resonance for the population, for which there is a common responsibility: the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society<sup>12</sup> has been fundamental in underlining and promoting this notion. In this current climate, it is apparent in some of the countries of the former Yugoslavia that even though there continues to be the desire to redevelop in a contemporary, international, vernacular style, signifying a new start, with the contemporary international materials of steel, glass, and PVC, great emphasis also is placed on the reconstruction of buildings which are considered to be emblematic of identity or religious faith, also serving to demonstrate that deliberate destruction as an act of war should not be allowed to prevail. Historicist reconstruction is designed to send a message of continuity, a return to normal after exceptional events, together with the assertion of national cultural identity: an encouragement of those dispersed by war to return home. In Bosnia and Herzegovina it has been calculated that 3,226 listed buildings were destroyed or damaged in the wars of the 1990s.<sup>13</sup> Here the reconstructions of the Town Hall in Sarajevo and the Aladza Mosque at Foca (Figures 1 and 2)<sup>14</sup> — one of more than twenty to be destroyed in the town as part of a deliberate ‘policy of erasure’<sup>15</sup> — are being carried out currently with these sentiments of continuity and identity in mind. Public opinion on these sentiments was tested in a survey of residents carried out in Stolac, Bosnia and Herzegovina, following the beginning of their return in 1998 to a town from which they had been driven five years before. Results confirmed their strong identification with the built heritage and their desire to see it reinstated after catastrophic destruction:



FIGURE 1 Town Hall, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

*Photograph by Frantisek Zvardon, 2008. © Council of Europe*



FIGURE 2 Aladza Mosque, Foca, Bosnia and Herzegovina, before destruction in 1992.  
© Commission to Preserve National Monuments, Bosnia and Herzegovina

the intangible expression of the heritage takes precedence when its material factors have been destroyed. The heirs to the heritage do not regard it as lost by virtue of its mere physical destruction, and they see its reconstruction as the essential bestowal of form on the intangible content that it retains.<sup>16</sup>

In Kosovo, ‘art and architecture have become proxies through which ideological, ethnic and nationalist conflicts have been fought out [...] A mosque or a church is no longer a place of worship, but a token of the presence of a community marked for erasure’.<sup>17</sup> The repair or reconstruction of the 200 mosques damaged or destroyed in 1998–99, representing one-third of the overall total, has raised serious questions about how to restore and how far the intentions of the funding bodies may be regulated. The Saudi Joint Committee for the Relief of Kosovo and Chechnya — ‘the largest and most prominent Arab aid organization in Kosovo’ — favours the austere architecture and decoration of Wahhabi Islam over the richly decorated interiors of the Balkans.<sup>18</sup> Great emphasis has been placed also in Kosovo on the reconstruction or instauration (restoration after decay, lapse, or dilapidation) of many deliberately targeted, traditional Kosovo Albanian tower houses — *kullas* — of which 90 per cent were destroyed or damaged in the attack on the Muslim heritage.<sup>19</sup> For reasons of cultural affirmation, the *kulla* form also has been used in the construction of wholly new buildings, sometimes in new contexts (Figures 3 and 4). As Michael Petzet has noted:



FIGURE 3 Kulla of Ali Bajraktarit, Vranoc, Kosovo, before reconstruction.

© Ministry of Culture, Youth, and Sports, Kosovo



FIGURE 4 Kulla of Ali Bajraktarit, Vranoc, Kosovo, after reconstruction.

© Ministry of Culture, Youth, and Sports, Kosovo

the rebuilding of totally or partly destroyed historic buildings, in particular of monumental buildings which visually embodied the history of a city or nation, can be an act of political self-assertion [...] It is sometimes astonishing how structures that are rebuilt [...] close the gap rendered by the catastrophe and are perceived as historic documents despite the irreplaceable loss of original fabric.<sup>20</sup>

The sense of fractured visual embodiment and the political self-assertion of reinstatement lies behind the reconstruction of the fourteenth-century House of the Blackheads in Riga, a building erected for a mercantile guild which was bombed during World War II, its remains destroyed, and the square on which it stood enlarged during the following Soviet period. The reconstruction of the building in modern materials, reviving the spirit of independent place, was completed in 2000 in time for the celebration of the 800th anniversary of the city (Figure 5). This endeavour was justified in the Riga Charter on Authenticity and Historical Reconstruction (2000) which acknowledged: ‘replication of cultural heritage is in general a misrepresentation of evidence of the past [...] but that in exceptional circumstances, reconstruction of cultural heritage, lost through disaster [...] may be acceptable, when the monument concerned has outstanding artistic, symbolic or environmental [...] significance for regional history and cultures’.<sup>21</sup>

Visual embodiment and political self-assertion are even more clearly apparent in the account of Adolf Ciborowski (Chief Architect of Warsaw 1956–64) on the post-war return of the Varsovians whose ‘common longing for a city which no longer existed’ stimulated reconstruction as ‘a spontaneous protest against the dark forces which had tried to wipe out our capital’.<sup>22</sup> This was a highly edited, politicised reconstruction, not a literal restoration of what had existed before, in which choices were made about which periods of Warsaw’s long history carried the appropriate resonance for reconstruction.<sup>23</sup> Reconstruction here, as in Berlin, ‘like all action, entails selective remembrance and selective forgetting’.<sup>24</sup> Only thirty-four of the officially-listed 957 monuments in Warsaw survived the systematic razing of the city by the Nazis in which 250,000 people died,<sup>25</sup> an extreme example of the deliberate



FIGURE 5 House of the Blackheads, Riga, Latvia.

© Nicola Bailey, 2013

and systematic destruction of monuments throughout the whole country.<sup>26</sup> This was an early example of urbicide — the intentional planned destruction and disintegration of an entire way of life in the city — later identified by Andrew Herscher in Kosovo<sup>27</sup> and by Milan Prodanovic in the siege and assault on Sarajevo and the bombardment of Dubrovnik in the 1990s as crimes against humanity.<sup>28</sup> Recognizing that twentieth-century architecture ‘became, more and more, a weapon of war rather than something that gets in the way of its smooth conduct’, Bevan has proposed the addition of a new, specific crime of ‘cultural genocide’ to the 1948 United Nations Genocide Convention: ‘at least in circumstances where it is intrinsically linked to mass murder’.<sup>29</sup> It is noteworthy that the Dayton General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1995) includes, as Annex 8, ‘Agreement on Commission to Preserve National Monuments’. This, for Amra Hadzimuhamedovic, was the first

time in the modern history of humanity that heritage had been identified as crucial to the establishment of a sustainable peace.<sup>30</sup> The reconstruction of destroyed historic monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina is specifically allowed in the national legislation and rehabilitation includes: ‘the reconstruction of a national monument on the same site, in the same form, of the same dimensions and using the same or same type of materials as were used prior to its destruction, using the same building techniques wherever possible’.<sup>31</sup> National monuments also have been accorded particular weight in Kosovo where the ‘Ahtisaari Plan’ on the settlement of the political status of the territory acknowledged the need for the protection and promotion of religious and cultural sites, particularly those of the Serbian Orthodox Church, some of which had been attacked in riots in 2004, establishing ‘protective zones’ around more than forty key sites.<sup>32</sup>

## Definitions

A great deal of work has already been done on the compilation and analysis of cultural heritage charters by Dorothy Bell, Michael Petzet, and Robert Pickard.<sup>33</sup> Bell is particularly useful in the present context since the author reviews the charters in order to extract themes and definitions. She defines reconstruction as ‘returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state’.<sup>34</sup> It is appropriate only when:

a site is incomplete and reconstruction is necessary for its survival; it reveals the cultural significance of the place as a whole; it is not conjectural; it does not constitute the majority of the fabric; it is identifiable on close inspection as new work; it avoids generalised representations of typical features.<sup>35</sup>

In the special case of monuments destroyed by war:<sup>36</sup>

special care should be taken that the historic development up to the present time can be traced [...] the complete reconstruction of severely damaged monuments must be regarded as an exceptional circumstance which is justified only for special reasons [...] Such a reconstruction must be based on reliable documentation of its condition before destruction.<sup>37</sup>

All charters, the author notes:

are unanimous in their refusal to consider conjectural reconstruction or re-creation as an acceptable action within the terms of conservation, except for the Washington Charter [for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas, 1987] which merely discourages alterations which have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance.<sup>38</sup>

Petzet offers a definition of reconstruction:

the re-establishment of structures that have been destroyed by accident, by natural catastrophes such as an earthquake, or by events of war; in connection with monuments and sites in general to the re-establishment of a lost original on the basis of pictorial, written or material evidence. The copy or replica, in contrast to the reconstruction, duplicates an original that still exists.

He goes on to point out that reconstruction ‘is by no means expressly forbidden by the Venice Charter, as is often maintained’, the prohibition being applicable to

archaeological excavations, although he concedes that, in view of the Charter's 'highly restrictive overall attitude to replacements', the authors appear to have been 'very sceptical of reconstruction work', since history is not reversible, and it was the purpose of the Charter to focus on monuments 'in the full richness of their authenticity'.<sup>39</sup>

Authenticity, as Bell observes, 'is not an easy concept'.<sup>40</sup> In the Nara Document on Authenticity (1994) it 'appears as the essential qualifying factor concerning values'. Petzet too refers not just to 'authentic form' and 'authentic spirit' but also to the 'authentic values' of a monument, including 'display value' and 'feeling value'.<sup>41</sup> These are not and cannot be absolute; rather, they are subject to cultural variation and to interpretation. So, if authenticity is rooted in values, this too is capable of a relative reading. For Sharon Zukin, writing on 'authentic urban places', although 'we think authenticity refers to a neighbourhood's innate qualities, it really expresses our own anxieties about how places change'.<sup>42</sup> Ahmed Ouf has discussed the notion of authenticity in the context of new 'heritage development' projects in Dubai and Sharjah in which he shows it to have been secondary to the creation of an enjoyable urban experience, with a sense of place and historical identity.<sup>43</sup> This reading has been significantly questioned by Jivén and Larkham who have argued the need 'to develop more theoretically informed conceptions of sense of place, authenticity and character [...] informed to a much greater extent by the views of the people directly involved'.<sup>44</sup> This suggests an element of mutability, but for Nataliya Dushkina, arguing powerfully and justifiably against the deliberate destruction and reconstruction of historic monuments in contemporary Moscow, authenticity is 'always autonomous, singular, unique and therefore cannot be reproduced or renewed'. She invokes Walter Benjamin: 'The whole sphere of authenticity is outside technical [...] reproducibility'.<sup>45</sup> (In the current Penguin collection of Benjamin's essays, the translation is 'genuineness' rather than 'authenticity', but as noted in the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*: 'The eighteenth-century distinction between *genuine* and *authentic* is not well founded').<sup>46</sup>

In the recently published Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention:

properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural values [...] 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.<sup>47</sup>

The authors are surely right to note that 'attributes such as spirit and feeling do not lend themselves easily to practical applications of the conditions of authenticity, but nevertheless are important indicators of character and sense of place [...]',<sup>48</sup> or as Petzet puts it: 'the perceptible presence of the past at the monument site [is] an issue that involves more than extant or lost historic fabric'.<sup>49</sup> Perhaps alarmed by the potential breadth of their Guidelines, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) authors draw back, although not as far as Benjamin: 'In relation to authenticity, the reconstruction of archaeological remains, or historic buildings or districts is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances.

Reconstruction is acceptable only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture'.<sup>50</sup>

The faith expressed here, and elsewhere in discussions on reconstruction, in the absolute authority of documentation represents a remarkable triumph of hope over the experience of architects and historians. Documentation often offers only a part of a story and it needs to be interpreted, it does not speak for itself and is not absolute, but subject to interpretation of forms and materials and the values which inform our analyses and assessments. All conclusions drawn are ultimately the result of making the best (often contested) guess on the available evidence. This is even more the case in those circumstances such as contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina where reconstruction may be permitted on the basis of limited traditional forms of documentation which may be enhanced by the memories of the community, perhaps stimulated by their own photographs. This is clearly allowable if the major purpose of reconstruction is to enable familiarization and the return of displaced persons — it becomes an alien place if it does not look the same as before, and believing that somewhere looks the same as before is a function of memory as much as of documentation. The 'familiar and cherished local scene' of English planning guidance<sup>51</sup> is a negotiable construct dependent for its recognition and preservation on values and memory. We have, as Adrian Forty has observed, 'an unshakeable confidence in the power of physical objects to preserve memory',<sup>52</sup> and as David Lowenthal has noted, 'beleaguered by loss and change, we keep our bearings only by clinging to remnants of stability'.<sup>53</sup>

Consideration of values inevitably brings us to Alois Riegl and the essay which he wrote in 1903 as a preface to the legislative proposal for the protection of historic monuments in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In his consideration of the meaning of monuments, he noted that 'every work of art is at once and without exception an historical monument' and 'in the strictest sense, no real equivalent can ever be substituted for it'.<sup>54</sup> But, as Kurt Forster has indicated, he argued for the 'historical contingency of all aesthetic values', recognizing that 'contemporary concerns profoundly determine our perception of the past'.<sup>55</sup> The distinction he drew between the apparently irreconcilable 'age-value' and 'historical value' is fundamental to our current concerns: 'The cult of age-value condemns not only every wilful destruction of monuments as a desecration [...] but in principle also every effort at conservation [...] it] stands in ultimate opposition to the preservation of monuments'.<sup>56</sup> But, 'the more faithfully a monument's original state is preserved, the greater its historical value: disfiguration and decay detract from it'.<sup>57</sup> While regarding the values themselves as conflicting, Riegl allowed for the practical preservation of monuments but stopped short of total reconstruction:

the cult of historical value, though granting full documentary significance only to the original state of a monument, is nonetheless willing to concede some values to copies if the originals are irretrievably lost. Such instances stand in irresolvable conflict with age-value only in those cases where copies are made to substitute for an original in all its historical and aesthetic aspects.<sup>58</sup>

It is not clear whether Riegl would have drawn a distinction between deliberate and accidental destruction of a monument and our consequent attitudes towards it;

rather, he seems to yoke them together: ‘Any untimely and deliberate destruction strikes one as arbitrary, be it the result of human or natural force, because of its especial violence’.<sup>59</sup> There is surely an extra moral charge, however, to a destruction which is deliberate, shaping the contemporary concerns through which we perceive the past.

## The need for guidelines

In proposing the development of guidelines there are major caveats. It must be acknowledged that reconstruction raises profound difficulties, both practically and philosophically: whether authenticity can be reproduced or renewed, and whether it is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances and only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation. In practical terms, it is difficult (and arguably dishonest) to replicate the patina of age; we do not always have the appropriate materials or skills; we do not always have sufficient documentation; we do not always propose to use the buildings for their original function, although the regular re-use of historic buildings in normal circumstances is now wholly accepted as preferable to their demolition. Numerous examples also demonstrate that it is often an image as much as a building which is being pursued in reconstruction. Building in a historicist style, for political and social reasons, happened in Munster for example, in a manner loosely related to that which has been destroyed, with the intention of creating a consolatory aesthetic effect and recapturing a spirit of place.<sup>60</sup> In such cases, this may represent a distortion of the past and a misrepresentation of its memory, unless it is labelled as being something else and signposted,<sup>61</sup> but in assigning heritage-value to an object we are arguably giving a licence to historical misrepresentation and privileging present needs over past achievements. As Lowenthal has observed: ‘Heritage diverges from history not in being biased but in its view of bias. Historians aim to reduce bias; heritage sanctions and strengthens it’,<sup>62</sup> and elsewhere has remarked: ‘the worth of heritage is [. . .] gauged not by critical tests but by current potency’.<sup>63</sup>

As Rebecca Solnit has argued, every city contains within itself an eradication of what was there before, with resurrection or reinvention following.<sup>64</sup> This is a process which has the appearance of being subverted by attempts to reconstruct destroyed monuments as they appeared before. To reconstruct in (inevitably inauthentic?) historicist style may be read as an attempt to stop the ineluctable processes of time and decay:

. . . all things have their end:

Churches and cities, which have diseases like to men,  
Must have like death that we have<sup>65</sup>

But the inevitable may be hastened and deliberate destruction of emblematic buildings or historic quarters in order to dominate, terrorize, divide, or eradicate the population<sup>66</sup> is itself a dramatic and destructive intervention in the historical continuum: ‘The first step in liquidating a people [. . .] is to erase its memory. Destroy its books, its culture, its history’.<sup>67</sup> To reconstruct in response to such destruction is to attempt to turn back the clock, re-ordering time and process, countering a physical assault upon a natural evolution with a philosophical assault on notions of time and memory, risking the distortion of both. As Denslagen notes: ‘every reconstruction is a form of

rebellion, a revolt against time'.<sup>68</sup> To reconstruct at all, whether in modern or historicist styles, may amount to the erasing of the past, as W. G. Sebald has seen in Germany:

From the outset, the now legendary and in some respects genuinely admirable reconstruction of the country after the devastation wrought by Germany's wartime enemies, a reconstruction tantamount to a second liquidation in successive phases of the nation's own past history, prohibited any backward view. It did so through the sheer amount of labour required, and the creation of a new, faceless reality, pointing the population exclusively towards the future and enjoining on it silence about the past.<sup>69</sup>

It also may be argued in the case of countries with multi-ethnicities that reconstruction in response to deliberate destruction is itself an aggressive act, manifest not only in the reconstruction in the same place of something that was there before but also in the construction of new buildings in the style of buildings which have suffered deliberate assault. History is written, and memorials erected by the victors. The embodied messages over time may be subject to shifting attitudes and changes in political circumstances. The ideological nature of the Spanish Civil War had an impact upon how both destruction and the consequent rebuilding — mirroring Nationalist values — took place.<sup>70</sup> The Historical Memory Law (2007) in Spain has been implemented precisely to counter the political imbalance of the post-Civil War memorialization created during the Franco dictatorship (1939–75), prescribing the removal of insignia and monuments that refer positively to the military uprising in 1936 which led to the war. In such circumstances, 'whose heritage is it?' becomes a pertinent question, bearing in mind Lowenthal's contention: 'only a heritage that is clearly ours is worth having'.<sup>71</sup> The issue then becomes a matter of determining the extent of 'ours' and considering the notion enshrined in the Faro Convention of a collective responsibility for the maintenance of the heritage of all people as a shared resource: everyone has the right to benefit, and everyone has the responsibility to respect the cultural heritage of others as much as their own heritage. The notion of a common cultural heritage is enshrined in Article 1 of the European Cultural Convention of 1954,<sup>72</sup> but in spirit it goes back to the end of World War II, carrying with it not only the burden of joint responsibility but also the weight of shared guilt about the willed destruction of artefacts whose value we tend to acknowledge only after the damage has been done.<sup>73</sup> We are all in this together, alternately enhanced or diminished. As Lowenthal has noted: 'modern genocide and iconoclasm magnify needs for legacies to outlast ourselves [...] The ruin of Mostar's bridge built to outlast the centuries, or of a minaret's poignant reach towards eternity, truncates our own lives as well'.<sup>74</sup> Following its destruction in 1993, the iconic significance of the sixteenth-century, single-span bridge at Mostar was demonstrated by the emergence of a world-wide 'lost heritage community', 'larger and more widespread than the heritage community that the bridge had enjoyed when it still stood'.<sup>75</sup> Following its reconstruction, the bridge, which is now part of a World Heritage site, stands as a symbol of reconciliation, international cooperation and the co-existence of communities. We might hope that the translation from symbolic meaning to social and political reality is fully effected over the coming years.

The destruction of the bridge at Mostar was a particularly shocking event which, together with the shelling of Dubrovnik, galvanized Western public opinion about the

wars in the former Yugoslavia. But extreme cases make bad law and the case of the bridge is not in itself a necessary and sufficient justification for further guidelines on reconstruction: it is *sui generis*. There are however very large numbers of widespread cases in which reconstruction of less extraordinary buildings and structures is demanded for social, economic, environmental, and political reasons, often as part of a wider development in which reconstruction is just one potential strategy among many. In such circumstances there is a clear need for the development of institutional approaches which can offer guidance at the political and professional levels so that, in a situation which tends to encourage strong feelings and expressions of great certainty, both for and against, a pragmatic, agreed set of principles and procedures may be developed in order to provide a practical starting point for politicians and professionals who are faced with the question of how to build anew. They are, after all, going to have to do it, and they may well want to do so in a manner inimical to current notions of good conservation practice and contrary also to customary good architectural practice which favours building in a contemporary rather than historicist style. Indeed, it may be argued that it is difficult, if not impossible, to create simulacra which appear to be other than products of their own age. That which appears now to be a convincing re-creation of a historic building is unlikely to appear quite so convincing to the next generation which will be more likely to recognize it as a later pastiche.

It must be recognized that decisions to reconstruct are political rather than scientific with all the risks inherent in political subjectivities in decision making, partiality of purpose, and expedience in implementation. In such circumstances of subjectivity, partiality, and expedience, reconstruction may be as much destructive as constructive if it is not subject to non-political guidelines which seek to fix certain key conditions in the planning, consultation process, execution, labelling of what has been done, and communication of intent to the community. This is crucial to the long-term acceptance and understanding of procedures and outcomes since the democratic process is self-evidently underwritten by the will of the people who must be engaged as the ultimate owners of their own collective heritage. Indeed, the collective will of the people may be harnessed as a democratic force which, through a process of publicity, participation, and consensus-building, prompts political action on the heritage which may include reconstruction for such purposes as the restoration of lost appearances, maintaining the spirit of place, commemoration of an event or person, or as a statement of community or national identity.

It is of fundamental importance that we learn from the discussions which have already taken place in order to identify issues and principles on the way to developing guidelines which build upon existing charters and recommendations. Such guidelines must acknowledge political and social imperatives and provide guidance on the acceptable occasions for reconstruction, giving due consideration to embodied meanings and values, and to the technical requirements for implementation. It is important also that reconstruction should not be considered to be solely concerned with the fate of individual monuments or historic zones but contextualized within a larger urban vision.<sup>76</sup> As English Heritage has shown, most people place a high value on the historic environment and its preservation, seeing it as a totality rather than just a series of individual sites: they have a major part to play in caring for it.<sup>77</sup> This is an

occasion to underline the connectivity of all citizens whether lay or professional (including architects, planners, historians, sociologists, and economists), in planning the future shape of the built environment. Reconstruction is not just about buildings but about the values by which we live and how communities may survive and prosper.

## Appendix 1: Relevant charters and conventions

The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments (International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, 1931); The Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (UNESCO, 1954); International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter) (ICOMOS, 1964); Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO, 1977, with relevant revisions in 2005, now 2012); the Burra Charter (The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance) (Australia ICOMOS, 1979, revised 1988 and 1999); Historic Gardens (the Florence Charter) (ICOMOS, 1981); Declaration of Dresden on Reconstruction of Monuments Destroyed by War (ICOMOS, 1982); Charter for the preservation of Quebec's Heritage (Deschambault Declaration) (ICOMOS Canada, 1982); Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment (ICOMOS Canada, 1983); Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (The Granada Convention) (Council of Europe, 1985); Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (the Washington Charter) (ICOMOS, 1987); Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (ICOMOS, 1990); Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value (ICOMOS New Zealand, 1992, revised 2010); The Nara Document on Authenticity (UNESCO, ICCROM, and ICOMOS, 1994); The Declaration of San Antonio (on authenticity and preservation in the Americas) (ICOMOS National Committees of the Americas); The Charter of Krakow: Principles for Conservation and Restoration of Built Heritage (International Conference on Conservation 'Krakow 2000'); The Riga Charter on Authenticity and Historical Reconstruction in Relationship to Cultural Heritage (Regional Conference on Authenticity and Historical Reconstruction in Relationship to Cultural Heritage, initiated by ICCROM, with the Latvian National Commission for UNESCO, State Inspection for Heritage Protection of Latvia, the World Heritage Committee, and the Cultural Capital Foundation of Latvia, 2000); Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China (The Getty Conservation Institute/China ICOMOS, 2002, revised 2004); Principles for the Analysis, Conservation and Structural Restoration of Architectural Heritage (ICOMOS, 2003); Indonesia Charter for Heritage Conservation/Piagam Pelestarian Pusaka Indonesia (ICOMOS Indonesia, 2003); Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (The Faro Convention) (Council of Europe, 2005); Charter on the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (The Ename Charter) (ICOMOS, 2008).

## Appendix 2: Guidelines

The preparation of international Guidelines for Reconstruction will require further detailed consideration and consultation. It could be suggested, however, that they might take a form which begins with a discussion of existing charters, terminology, principles, and concepts, followed by considerations of typology, with a concluding section on procedures.

## *Charters and other guiding documents*

### **Terminology**

#### ***Anastylosis***

The Athens Charter identified the need for scrupulous conservation in the case of ruins, taking steps to reinstate any original fragments that may be recovered (through a process of ‘anastylosis’), stating that the use of new materials should be recognizable. Anastylosis (reassembling of existing but dismembered parts) was recognized in Article 15 of the Venice Charter in relation to archaeological sites, also referring to the term ‘reconstruction’ in this context (although not for buildings), which it stated should be ruled out ‘*a priori*’.

#### ***Restoration***

The Venice Charter (Article 9) identifies restoration as ‘a highly specialized operation’, the aim of which ‘is to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument’ and is based on respect for ‘original materials and authentic documents’. It states that the work must not be conjectural and must bear a ‘contemporary stamp’. Restoration is also considered by other charters, notably the New Zealand and Burra Charters, with the latter further identifying that it should reveal culturally significant aspects of the place and is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric. Petzet states that the purpose of restoration is to re-establish values (aesthetic and historical) that are hidden, disfigured, or impaired;<sup>78</sup> the New Zealand Charter states that the process of restoration (based on respect for existing fabric) typically involves reassembly (using existing material) and reinstatement, and may involve the removal of accretions that detract from the cultural heritage value.

#### ***Repristination***

The Venice Charter (Article 11) also requires that the valid contributions of all periods must be respected ‘since unity of style is not the aim of a restoration’. The recommended process therefore may be distinguished from ‘repristination’: restoration to an original state or condition.

#### ***Instauration***

Instauration means to restore after decay, lapse, or dilapidation, or it can be an act of instituting or establishing something. It can be distinguished from restoration in relation to buildings as it really means to renew, as in the example of the building of lost kullas in Kosovo, as wholly new buildings but in the traditional style. While these may be in new contexts, there are recent examples of instauration in the same place, such as the newly constructed Monastery church of Sts Kliment and Panteleion in Ohrid (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), completed in 2002 in a medieval Byzantine style on the site of a tenth-century church which had been demolished and then replaced by Sultan Mehmed’s Mosque, which was itself subsequently demolished (Figure 6). Some remains found after archaeological investigation of the site were incorporated into the new church. There are no clear guidelines on the process of instauration.

#### ***Relocation: Dismantling and rebuilding using the existing building***

The Venice Charter does not mention reconstruction in relation to buildings but there is a notion that a form of reconstruction may be allowable in certain circumstances: ‘the moving of all or part of a monument cannot be allowed except where the safeguarding of that monument demands it or where it is justified by national or international interest of paramount importance’ (Article 7). This is echoed in the Granada Convention, which clarifies the process



FIGURE 6 Monastery Church of Sts. Kliment and Panteleion, Ohrid, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

© *Institute for Protection of Monuments of Culture and Museum, Ohrid*

as ‘dismantling, transfer and reinstatement at a suitable location’ (Article 5). The Appleton Charter states that relocation and dismantling of an existing resource should be employed only as a last resort, if protection cannot be achieved by any other means.

### **Reconstruction**

The Riga Charter defines reconstruction as the ‘evocation, interpretation, restoration or replication of a previous earlier form’, but does not explain these terms. Reconstruction is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material to replace material that has been lost and, on close inspection, it should be identifiable as new work (Burra Charter, Article 20). An explanatory note indicates that new material may include recycled material salvaged from other places, so long as this is not detrimental to any place of cultural significance (this procedure has taken place in China in the restoration and reconstruction of the historic water towns south of the Yangtze River). The China Principles require appropriate documentation including detailed records of the entire reconstruction process which distinguishes reconstructed and existing original parts, with the display of explanatory signage to this effect (Chapter 13).

Reconstruction may be appropriate where a site is incomplete through damage or alteration and reconstruction is necessary for its survival (Burra, Riga Charters); where it recovers the significance of the place (Burra, Riga Charters) including the function, integrity, intangible value, or understanding of a place (New Zealand Charter); if the work is not conjectural but based on precise, complete, and indisputable documentation (Burra, Florence, Appleton, New Zealand, Riga, Krakow Charters; Deschambault Declaration; World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines; China Principles); and where it does not constitute the majority of the fabric (New Zealand, Burra, Krakow Charters). The China Principles further state that

reconstruction of a site is a rare intervention which should be subject to strict controls and special approval. The Indonesia Charter for Heritage Conservation insufficiently describes reconstruction as one ‘action’, among several, for heritage conservation.

### ***Replication***

The replication of a building that duplicates an existing building is an attempt to form an exact copy and therefore constitutes not just the majority of the fabric but the whole fabric, and as such is intrinsically deceptive in intent. However, there may be exceptions for allowing this course of action so long as the replica does not replace the original and is used for interpretation and display or for educational purposes (and is specifically signposted as a replica). The replication of a whole building should not be protected as ‘cultural heritage’, but could be safeguarded for interpretation purposes. Replication also may be considered as a preventative measure to protect an original. Petzet refers to limited examples of such replication, such as the statues on Strasbourg Cathedral (replaced to protect works of art which can no longer be preserved).<sup>79</sup>

### ***Re-creation/historicist or stylistic reconstruction***

There are numerous examples in Russia and elsewhere of recreation in a historicist style, but there is a clear view established in the various charters and guidelines that conjectural work is not an accepted approach, except in the Washington Charter which discourages alterations that have no historical basis but seek to create an earlier appearance. The Charter of Krakow (2000) further states that the reconstruction of entire parts ‘in the style of the building’ should be avoided.

### ***Authenticity***

The Nara Document on Authenticity is conceived in the spirit of the Venice Charter, building on and extending the notion of authenticity beyond the built fabric ‘in response to the expanding scope of cultural heritage concerns and interests in our contemporary world’ (Article 3), while recognizing the importance of cultural diversity and acknowledging that ‘all cultures and societies are rooted in particular forms and means of tangible and intangible expression which constitute their heritage’ (Article 7). No mention was made in the Nara Document of the concept of reconstruction but in its drafting a widening of the range of attributes that are used to assess the authenticity of cultural properties was intended, particularly to enable Japan to legitimise the practice of periodic dismantling, rebuilding, repair, and re-assembly of wooden heritage structures. In this respect, it stated that sources of information for determining authenticity may include ‘form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors’ (Article 13). The Riga Charter reiterated these words with the cautionary view that these attributes must credibly and accurately bear witness to their significance (Article 4). The Riga Charter, which more directly linked the issues of reconstruction and authenticity, noted concern regarding countries which had recently regained their independence, because of the large number of reconstruction proposals planned or realized. It also stated that replication (meaning reconstruction) ‘is in general misrepresentation of evidence of the past’ (meaning that it is not authentic).

Taking the Nara Document as its starting point, the Declaration of San Antonio also sought to identify a number of distinct headings under which authenticity may be considered: cultural identity, history, materials, social value, dynamic and static sites (those which are in use for society and those which are not), stewardship, and economics (tourist revenue cannot be an overriding criterion). It further suggested the need for proofs of authenticity so that indicators may be identified for determination of significant values at the site, providing five examples of possible indicators: reflection of the true value of a site derived from all its

significant history; integrity in terms of its level of completeness; whether the context and/or environment corresponds to the original or other periods of significance; identity in terms of how the local population identify with the site and whose identity it reflects; and the traditional patterns of use and function that have characterized the site.

Since these wider considerations of authenticity have developed, the test of authenticity in the World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines was first re-titled in 2005 as 'Integrity and/or Authenticity'. The guidelines issued in 2012 identify the Nara Document as being the practical basis on which to consider the question of authenticity (para. 79; referring also in Annex 4 to the Declaration of San Antonio and the Riga Charter), going on to state: 'the ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depends on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful. Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage, and their meaning, are the requisite bases for assessing all aspects of authenticity' (para. 80).

### ***Values and embodied meanings***

The Nara Document states that judgements about values concerning cultural properties may differ from culture to culture. There are no fixed criteria; heritage properties have to be considered in relation to their cultural context. The New Zealand Charter considers values in Article 5, stating that it is important to identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others. However, as stated in the Declaration of San Antonio, there may be a need for proofs of authenticity, in turn requiring indicators to be identified for determining all significant values in a particular site. Moreover, as stated in para. 80 of the World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines, understanding value depends on the reliability of information sources.

As indicated above, Petzet argues that the concept of authenticity in the evaluation of monuments (as expressed in the Nara Document) was extended from historic fabric to additional factors including 'authentic spirit'; authentic values of a monument can include a 'display value' (purely aesthetically motivated) or a 'feeling value' that may tend towards reconstructions of a particular form or situation.<sup>80</sup> The New Zealand Charter similarly considers that reconstruction is appropriate if it is essential to the function, integrity, intangible value, or understanding of a place, if sufficient physical and documentary evidence exists to minimise conjecture, and if the surviving cultural heritage value is preserved. The Declaration of San Antonio further states that the importance of material fabric must be weighed along with the immaterial distinctive character and components of the site.

The Declaration of San Antonio raises broader issues concerning authenticity and values including embodied meanings derived from the past and historical associations. Regarding 'authenticity and identity' it lies in the 'identification, evaluation and interpretation of their true values as perceived values by our ancestors' and current society as an evolving and diverse community. Second, in relation to 'authenticity and history', the understanding of authenticity requires a complete assessment of the significance of the site by those who are associated with it or who claim it as part of their history and accordingly it is important to understand the origins and evolution of the site (and the values associated with it). In this respect it relates to the issue of cultural diversity (also raised in the Nara Document and the Faro Convention), reflecting on the idea that a site should not be manipulated to enhance the views of certain groups over others but should be a collective responsibility (as also indicated in the Faro Convention). Third, regarding 'authenticity and materials', heritage sites may possess a testimonial value (aesthetic, historic, or otherwise) in that material elements of the tangible heritage can be bearers of information about the past and the identity of people. Fourth, regarding 'authenticity and social value', heritage sites can carry spiritual messages (through customs,

traditions, religious beliefs, land use, etc.) that preserve memory and sustain communal life, linking it to the ancestral past. Moreover, the China Principles allow for reconstruction to be considered when a structure has been destroyed in recent years and the public still has a ‘strong memory and connection’ with it and when heritage sites have a particular commemorative function.

The debate on authenticity has widened the scope of circumstances for when reconstruction may be permitted to include reasons of cultural identity, social and spiritual value, and associated embodied meanings, particularly where there is loss due to human or natural events, but the circumstances require further clarification. Moreover, the right to heritage and the right to take part in decisions regarding its interpretation (as reflected in the Faro Convention of 2005 and the United Nations Report of 2011) mean that professionals working in this specific field should build relationships with concerned communities and individuals so that issues relating to the material fabric are weighed along with immaterial factors and the embodied meanings of a destroyed site. The Ename Charter further indicates that ‘interpretation and presentation should encourage individuals and communities to reflect on their own perceptions of a site and assist them in establishing a meaningful connection to it’ (Principle 1.2).

## Typology

### *Objectives of the intervention*

There are many reasons for intervention and many categories of possible reconstruction.<sup>81</sup> Reconstruction may take the form of an authentic spiritual and ritual repetition, as in the case of dismantling and rebuilding Japanese temples. Reconstruction may be at a holy place to provide religious and architectural continuity, as in the instauration of the church of Sts Kliment and Panteleion in Ohrid. Reconstruction may be for national political or dynastic reasons, such as the reconstruction of the Gyeongbokgung Palace in South Korea which was destroyed during the Japanese occupation of the early twentieth century because of its status as the symbol of national sovereignty and the architecture of the Joseon Dynasty, or the reconstruction of the Mostar Bridge in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a symbol of national identity and unity, peace, and stability following war. Reconstruction may be necessary to restore a unit or space or a historic urban landscape such as the destroyed historic core of Warsaw. Reconstruction may be for archaeological reasons as in the case of the Stoa of Attalos in the ancient agora of Athens, and in Greek and Roman theatres and other places of performance which have been reconstructed from archaeological evidence to serve new functions. Reconstruction may be in memory of people and/or events such as the reconstruction of the Governor’s Palace which had an important role in the former capital of Virginia until 1775, and was the first major building to be reconstructed after the project to ‘restore’ Colonial Williamsburg began in 1927. Reconstruction may be for leisure, consumption, or tourism promotion such as the reconstruction of pre-Hispanic sites in Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, and Bolivia in the 1950s and 1960s to promote tourism while also demonstrating national pride in the pre-Colombian past. Reconstruction may be in modern materials with the intention of presenting the idea of a building, recapturing the spirit of place, as was the case with the House of the Blackheads in Riga. Reconstruction may be for education and research — there are many reconstructions of timber buildings, for example, based upon archaeological evidence, in the USA, Europe, and Japan which exemplify the combined research and popular education roles of reconstructions. Reconstruction also may be achieved through digital or virtual means for the purposes of interpretation. The list is long but not exhaustive.

### *What are the exceptional cases?*

A number of charters and guiding documents specify the exceptional cases for allowing reconstruction to take place. The Declaration of Dresden made an exceptional case for the ‘complete

reconstruction of severely damaged monuments' by war, but also noted that this must be based on reliable documentation of their condition before destruction. The Krakow Charter further stated that reconstruction of an entire building, destroyed by armed conflict or natural disaster, may be acceptable if there are exceptional social or cultural motives that are related to the identity of the entire community. The Riga Charter also stated that exceptional circumstances arising from 'tragic loss through disasters whether of natural or human origin' may pertain when 'the monument concerned has outstanding artistic, symbolic or environmental [...] significance [...] and] provided that appropriate survey and historical documentation is available'. Further provisions included the avoidance of falsification of context or damage to significant historic fabric; and the need for reconstruction to be established through full and open consultation among national and local authorities and the community concerned. The World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines merely state that the reconstruction of archaeological remains or historic buildings or districts is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances, without detailing those circumstances.

### ***Context/wider vision***

Principle 3 of the Ename Charter is relevant to the interpretation and presentation of sites being considered for reconstruction. This principle considers the issue of context and setting, stating that the interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites should relate to their wider social, cultural, historical, and natural contexts and settings, including multi-faceted historical, political, spiritual, and artistic contexts, and consider all aspects of the site's cultural, social, and environmental significance. Interpretation also should take into account all groups that have contributed to the historical and cultural significance of the site; the surrounding landscape, natural environment, and geographical setting; the intangible elements of a site's heritage (local customs, cultural and spiritual traditions, stories, visual arts, etc.); and the cross-cultural significance of the site including the range of perspectives based on scholarly research, ancient records, and living traditions which could be used in interpretive programmes. Issues of context and/or the environment are also raised in the Declaration of San Antonio which identifies 'context' as one of several possible indicators of authenticity — in terms of whether it corresponds to the original or other periods of significance and whether it enhances or diminishes the significance of the site.

### **Procedures**

#### ***Assessment***

The building, site, or ensemble must be clearly identified and its history and evolution (structural, functional, and social) researched, enabling an assessment of significance and possible options.<sup>82</sup> It is important to consider the building or site in its context, rather than seeing it as an isolated phenomenon. The reconstruction may well be part of a wider development plan. The separation of professional responsibilities often militates against the integrated planning which draws on a wide range of specialisms and cuts across narrow departmental and ministerial responsibilities. The range of possible interventions within the proposed development, including reconstruction, should be itemised. This may result in the preparation of various options about which choices will need to be made. The possibility of reconstruction should be considered alongside other strategies which may include a new building or stabilization and preservation as found. The making of choices will require an assessment of the degree of survival of the original fabric, the extent of available documentation, and the preparation of evidence of significance. The latter is particularly complex since there is a range of levels and types: historical, architectural, technological, aesthetic, religious, spiritual, symbolic, physical context, the spirit of place, value to the community, etc. In assessing options for reconstruction,

an assessment of exceptional significance may outweigh the usual requirements for the survival of the major part of the fabric and the fullest documentation. Choices also should be informed by an assessment of the sustainability of the project. This will include the management of the process, the longer term functions and management of the buildings or site after completion, the economic and social benefits, and potential contribution to the wellbeing of the community.

### ***Conservation statement/management plan checklist***

In documenting the site and the proposal, the following checklist offers an indication of the extent of potential topics to be covered and the range of expertise required: technical condition, historical background, vulnerability, site significance, original design and evolution, landscape, archaeology, ecology, social aspects, recent works, management of the site and the project, monitoring of works, conservation and management policies, and long-term maintenance plan (see also the China Principles, Chapters 7, 9, and 10).

### ***Consultation and communication***

Consultation with local stakeholders and community and amenity groups is crucial. Development planning, including reconstruction, is not just a task for the professionals involved in the technical aspects. The facilitation of physical and intellectual access by the public to cultural heritage sites, and the vital part played by interpretation and presentation, are fundamental to the Ename Charter on Interpretation, but the desirability of public engagement at the earlier planning and decision-making stages also must be stressed. This is emphasized in the Deschambault Declaration: ‘the public has a legitimate right to participate in any decision in regard to actions to preserve the national heritage’ (Article 7). The views of all potential stakeholders must be canvassed, meetings held, participation encouraged, and options discussed. The creation of a project website will facilitate this process. Procedures must be transparent to ensure the maintenance of public trust, with decisions clearly explained, communicated, documented, and published.

### ***Technical requirements***

Assessment of technical requirements includes the consideration of the extent of survival of fabric, the availability of suitable materials for new work, the availability of expertise, the skills of the potential workforce, and the availability of funding. The assessment of surviving fabric, in certain cases, will be an assessment of original fabric, but in others it may be the assessment of layers of fabric over longer periods of time, revealing a historical development which should be preserved. In the case of humbler types of building it is important to try to preserve the best of what has been done since its original building. The approach should be sustainably and pragmatically driven rather than being driven by the pursuit of a lost ideal. Decisions on the technical approach should consider whether the intention is to produce a reconstruction which looks so far as possible the same as the building which has gone, or whether the reconstruction should be in the spirit of the time, style, and materials of the original, but adapted to contemporary needs. A phased programme of works, with finite components which can be individually signed-off and assessed, is recommended, particularly when funding is spasmodic.

### ***Labelling/identification of new***

Good restoration practice enables new work to be distinguished from the old or original, and it also allows for future reversibility. More extensive reconstruction may not be so legible so a discreet sign on or near the building or site should state the circumstances, extent, and date of the work.

### *Documenting the process and results*

All work on the project must be fully documented (Venice Charter, Article 16). A project monitoring system is required to ensure the maintenance of quality, compliance with national standards, adherence to time, and budget requirements. This will also require the establishment of an expert advisory board responsible for monitoring the project progress and reporting as necessary. Such a board on occasion may have delegated directive powers. When work has been completed, documentation of what has been done, with reasons where appropriate, should be made available on a website as well as deposited with the owners and managers of the building or site, the local planning department, or the local library or archive, as appropriate. A post-implementation review should consider and document the lessons learned during the process of planning and carrying out the works. It also should consider the successes and failures of the intervention, for future reference. This consideration involves a further consultation process to take into account the views of users of the building and other stakeholders. This process should be fully documented as above.

### Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the University of Westminster for its support of an introductory meeting on reconstruction in February 2012, and to the Council of Europe for its support of a working seminar on the subject in Venice in October 2012. We are especially grateful to Mikhael de Thyse and Valerie Bougerolle of the Council of Europe for their support of the project and to Amra Hadzimuhamedovic of the Commission to Preserve National Monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We also wish to thank all others who contributed in person or on paper to the two meetings: David Adams, Martin Cherry, Bujar Demjaha, Jeremy Gould, Tanis Hinchcliffe, David Johnson, Ingrid Karsten, Marieke Kuipers, Peter Larkham, Olivia Munoz-Rojas, Daniele Voldman, and Walter Wulf.

### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Council of Europe, *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* [The Faro Convention] (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2005).
- <sup>2</sup> United Nations, *Second Report of the Independent Expert in the Field of Cultural Rights, A/HRC/17/18, Farida Shabeed* (Human Rights Council, Geneva, 2011). See also subsequent Resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council, *Special Rapporteur in the Field of Cultural Rights, A/HRC/RES/19/6* (Human Rights Council, Geneva, 2012).
- <sup>3</sup> United Nations, *Report*, para. 80, recommendations (c), (f), and (g).
- <sup>4</sup> International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) *International Charters for Conservation and Restoration*, introduction by Michael Petzet (Paris: ICOMOS, 2004), p. 21.
- <sup>5</sup> Philippe de Montebello, 'Art Museums, Inspiring Public Trust', in *Whose Muse? Art Museums and the Public Trust*, ed. by James Cuno (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 151–70 (pp. 152–53).
- <sup>6</sup> Amra Hadzimuhamedovic, 'Integrating the Heritage into Post-War Revival', *Bastina (Heritage)*, The Annual of the Commission to Preserve National Monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, V (2009), 23–63.
- <sup>7</sup> Tony Judt, *A Grand Illusion?* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), p. 27.
- <sup>8</sup> Esther Charlesworth, *Architects without Frontiers* (Oxford: Elsevier, 2006), p. 27.
- <sup>9</sup> Gilles Plum, *L'Architecture de la Reconstruction* (Paris: Nicolas Chaudun, 2011), pp. 44–45, 58–62.
- <sup>10</sup> Plum, pp. 147, 283.
- <sup>11</sup> Wim Denslagen, *Romantic Modernism* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), p. 99.
- <sup>12</sup> Council of Europe, *Framework*.
- <sup>13</sup> Robert Bevan, *The Destruction of Memory* (London: Reaktion, 2006), p. 42.
- <sup>14</sup> Mirzah Foco, 'Rehabilitation of the Aladza Mosque in Foca', *Bastina (Heritage)*, The Annual of the Commission to Preserve National Monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, IV (2008), 73–111.
- <sup>15</sup> Bevan, pp. 42–43.

- <sup>16</sup> Amra Hadzimuhamedovic (2008) ‘The Meaning of Homeland - Heritage and Uprootedness’, *Forum Bosnae* 44 (2008), Sarajevo, pp. 328–345, ISSN 1512-5122 (C.E.E.O.L. webbase -online archive) <<http://www.ceol.com/asp/issuedetails.aspx?issueid=150cef18-cd26-4b4c-a873-f951f7bafefb&articleid=ado48072-cbe8-4866-b70e-c9275c314c6f#aado48072-cbe8-4866-b70e-c9275c314c6f>> [accessed online 20 August 2013].
- <sup>17</sup> Anne-Françoise Morel, ‘Identity and Conflict: Cultural Heritage, Reconstruction and National Identity in Kosovo’, *Architecture\_Media\_Politics\_Society*, 3.1 (2013), 4 <<http://architectureemps.com>> [accessed 9 May 2013].
- <sup>18</sup> Morel, p. 7.
- <sup>19</sup> Bevan, p. 85.
- <sup>20</sup> ICOMOS, p. 21.
- <sup>21</sup> Riga Charter, The Riga Charter on Authenticity and Historical Reconstruction in Relationship to Cultural Heritage, Article 4 (2000). <[http://www.altes-rathaus-halle.de/dokumente\\_17.asp](http://www.altes-rathaus-halle.de/dokumente_17.asp)> [accessed 18 August 2013].
- <sup>22</sup> Adolf Ciborowski, *Warsaw — A City Destroyed and Rebuilt* (Warsaw: Interpress, 1969), p. 278.
- <sup>23</sup> Charlesworth, p. 27; Jasper Goldman, ‘Warsaw: Reconstruction as Propaganda’, in *The Resilient City*, ed. by Lawrence Vale and Thomas Campanella (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 135–58 (pp. 138–40).
- <sup>24</sup> Brian Ladd, ‘Double Restoration: Rebuilding Berlin after 1945’, in *The Resilient City*, ed. by Lawrence Vale and Thomas Campanella (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 117–34 (p. 131).
- <sup>25</sup> Bevan, p. 97.
- <sup>26</sup> Nicola Lambourne, *War Damage in Western Europe* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001), p. 42.
- <sup>27</sup> Andrew Herscher, ‘Urbicide, Urbanism, and Urban Destruction of Kosovo’, *Theory & Event*, 10.2 (2007) [unpaginated article] <[http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/theory\\_and\\_event/v010/10.2herscher.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2herscher.html)> [accessed 18 August 2013].
- <sup>28</sup> Milan Prodanovic, ‘Urbicide and Chances for the Reconstruction of Balkan Cities’, in *Out of Ground Zero. Case Studies in Urban Reinvention*, ed. by Joan Ockman (Munich: Prestel, 2002), pp. 138–49 (pp. 142–43); Bevan, p. 121; Amra Hadzimuhamedovic, ‘The Heritage in Post-War Peacetime — The Case of Bosnia’, *Bastina (Heritage)*, The Annual of the Commission to Preserve National Monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, IV (2008), 25–72 (p. 37); and Hadzimuhamedovic, ‘Integrating the Heritage’.
- <sup>29</sup> Bevan, p. 210.
- <sup>30</sup> Hadzimuhamedovic, ‘The Heritage in Post-War Peacetime’, p. 31.
- <sup>31</sup> Law on the Protection of Properties Designated as National Monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Article 2 (2001). <[http://kons.gov.ba/main.php?id\\_struct=83&lang=4](http://kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=83&lang=4)> [accessed 18 August 2013].
- <sup>32</sup> Morel, p. 5; United Nations, ‘Report of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Kosovo’s future status’, S/2007/168, (Security Council, Geneva, 2007).
- <sup>33</sup> Dorothy Bell, *The Historic Scotland Guide to International Conservation Charters* (Edinburgh: Historic Scotland, 1997); ICOMOS; Robert Pickard, *European Cultural Heritage (Vol. II), A Review of Policies and Practice* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2002).
- <sup>34</sup> Bell, p. 25.
- <sup>35</sup> Bell, p. 49.
- <sup>36</sup> Declaration of Dresden (1982). <<http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/184-the-declaration-of-dresden>> [accessed 18 August 2013].
- <sup>37</sup> Bell, p. 50.
- <sup>38</sup> Bell, p. 50.
- <sup>39</sup> ICOMOS, p. 19.
- <sup>40</sup> Bell, p. 28.
- <sup>41</sup> ICOMOS, p. 21.
- <sup>42</sup> Sharon Zukin, *Naked City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 220.
- <sup>43</sup> Ahmed M. Salah Ouf, ‘Authenticity and the Sense of Place in Urban Design’, *Journal of Urban Design*, 6.1 (2001), 73–86.
- <sup>44</sup> Gunila Jivén and Peter J. Larkham, ‘Sense of Place, Authenticity and Character: A Commentary’, *Journal of Urban Design*, 8.1 (2003), 67–81 (p. 79).
- <sup>45</sup> Natalia Dushkina, ‘Historical Authenticity’, in *Moscow Heritage at Crisis Point*, ed. by Anna Bronovitskaya, Clementine Cecil, and Edmund Harris (Moscow: MAPS and SAVE Europe’s Heritage, 2009), pp. 214–25 (p. 218); Walter Benjamin, ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’, in *One-way Street and Other Writings* (London: Penguin, 2009 [1936]), p. 232; see also Natalia Dushkina, ‘Historic Reconstruction’, in *Conserving the Authentic: Essays in Honour of Jukka Jokilehto*, ed. by Nicholas Stanley-Price and Joseph King (Rome: ICCROM, 2009), pp. 83–94; Clementine Cecil, ‘We Shall Soon Have the Newest Ancient Heritage in the World’, *The Historic Environment*, 2.1 (2011), 68–102.
- <sup>46</sup> Benjamin, p. 232; Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, 3rd ed. (1972) at p.844, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>47</sup> United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (Paris: World Heritage Centre, 2012).
- <sup>48</sup> UNESCO, paras 79–86.
- <sup>49</sup> ICOMOS, p. 21.
- <sup>50</sup> UNESCO, para. 86.
- <sup>51</sup> Great Britain. Department of the Environment/ Department of National Heritage, *Planning Policy Guidance: Planning and the Historic Environment* (PPG 15) (London: HMSO, 1994), para. 1.1.
- <sup>52</sup> Adrian Forty, *Words and Buildings* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000), p. 215.

- <sup>53</sup> David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (London: Viking, 1997), p. 6.
- <sup>54</sup> Alois Riegl, 'The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and its Origin', in *Monument/Memory and the Mortality of Architecture*, trans. by Kurt W. Forster and Diane Ghirardo, introduction by Kurt Forster, *Oppositions*, 25 (1982 [1903]), 20–51 (p. 22).
- <sup>55</sup> Riegl, p. 15.
- <sup>56</sup> Riegl, p. 32.
- <sup>57</sup> Riegl, p. 34.
- <sup>58</sup> Riegl, p. 37.
- <sup>59</sup> Riegl, p. 35.
- <sup>60</sup> Walter Wulf, 'German Inventory and Heritage — A Fateful Genesis from History, Politics and Science', *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society*, 41 (1997), 45–58 (p. 56).
- <sup>61</sup> Getty Conservation Institute/China ICOMOS, *Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China* (Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2002), Articles 21 and 25.
- <sup>62</sup> David Lowenthal, 'Fabricating Heritage', *History & Memory*, 10.1 (1998), 5–24 (p. 8).
- <sup>63</sup> Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade*, p. 127.
- <sup>64</sup> Rebecca Solnit, 'The Ruins of Memory', in *After the Ruins*, ed. by Mark Klett (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), pp. 18–20.
- <sup>65</sup> John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi* (1623), Act V, Scene iii; <<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:ZweEVKcVTrsj:www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/2232+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=uk>> [accessed 18 August 2013].
- <sup>66</sup> Bevan, p. 8.
- <sup>67</sup> Milan Kundera, *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), p. 159.
- <sup>68</sup> Denslagen, p. 220.
- <sup>69</sup> Winfried G. Sebald, *On the Natural History of Destruction* (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 7.
- <sup>70</sup> Olivia Muñoz-Rojas, *Ashes and Granite* (Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2011), pp. 1–2.
- <sup>71</sup> Lowenthal, 'Fabricating Heritage', p. 18.
- <sup>72</sup> Pickard, p. 11; Council of Europe, *Statute of the Council of Europe*, Article 1a, ETS no. 001, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 1949.
- <sup>73</sup> Lambourne, pp. 194, 210.
- <sup>74</sup> Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade*, p. 7.
- <sup>75</sup> Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper, 'The Social and Spatial Frameworks of Heritage — What is New in the Faro Convention?', in Council of Europe, *Heritage and Beyond* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2009), pp. 69–74 (pp. 73–74); see also Charlesworth, pp. 99–113.
- <sup>76</sup> Jeffrey M. Diefendorf, 'Rebuilding the Cities Destroyed in World War II: Growing Possibilities for Comparative Analysis', paper presented at the Conference of the European Association for Urban History, Prague, on 'Cities and Societies in Comparative Perspective' (2012), p. 10.
- <sup>77</sup> English Heritage, *Power of Place — The Future of the Historic Environment* (London: English Heritage, 2000).
- <sup>78</sup> ICOMOS.
- <sup>79</sup> ICOMOS.
- <sup>80</sup> ICOMOS.
- <sup>81</sup> Nicholas Stanley-Price, 'The Reconstruction of Ruins: Principles and Practice', in *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths*, ed. by Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker (London: Butterworth-Heinemann, Elsevier, 2009), pp. 32–46; *Geschichte der Rekonstruktion — Konstruktion der Geschichte*, ed. by Winfried Nerdinger (München: Prestel Verlag, 2010).
- <sup>82</sup> On significance, see Council of Europe, *Guidance on Heritage Assessment* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2005).

## Notes on contributors

John Bold is Reader in Architecture at the University of Westminster and has worked for several years as a consultant to the Council of Europe in the field of cultural heritage.

Correspondence to: John Bold, The White Lodge, 2 Tollington Place, London N4 3QR. Email: jsbold@hotmail.com

Robert Pickard is Emeritus Professor in Built Environment and Heritage Conservation at Northumbria University and has worked for several years as a consultant to the Council of Europe in the field of cultural heritage.

Correspondence to: Robert Pickard, 1 Crandale Road, Bath BA2 3HX. Email: robpickard@live.co.uk