

pca

european journal of
postclassicalarchaeologies

volume 6/2016

SAP Società Archeologica s.r.l.

Mantova 2016



EDITORS

Gian Pietro Brogiolo (chief editor)

Alexandra Chavarría (executive editor)

ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Carver (University of York)

Matthew H. Johnson (Northwestern University of Chicago)

Giuliano Volpe (Università degli Studi di Foggia)

Marco Valenti (Università degli Studi di Siena)

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Francesca Benetti

LANGUAGE EDITOR

Rebecca Devlin (University of Florida)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Gilberto Artioli (Università degli Studi di Padova)

Andrea Breda (Soprintendenza BB.AA. della Lombardia)

Margarita Diaz-Andreu (ICREA - Universitat de Barcelona)

José M. Martín Cívantos (Universidad de Granada)

Girolamo Fiorentino (Università del Salento)

Caterina Giostra (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore di Milano)

Susanne Hakenbeck (University of Cambridge)

Vasco La Salvia (Università degli Studi G. D'Annunzio di Chieti e Pescara)

Bastien Lefebvre (Université Toulouse - Jean Jaurès)

Alberto León (Universidad de Córdoba)

Tamara Lewit (Trinity College - University of Melbourne)

Federico Marazzi (Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa di Napoli)

Dieter Quast (Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz)

Andrew Reynolds (University College London)

Mauro Rottoli (Laboratorio di archeobiologia dei Musei Civici di Como)

Colin Rynne (University College Cork)

Post-Classical Archaeologies (PCA) is an independent, international, peer-reviewed journal devoted to the communication of post-classical research. PCA publishes a variety of manuscript types, including original research, discussions and review articles. Topics of interest include all subjects that relate to the science and practice of archaeology, particularly multidisciplinary research which use specialist methodologies, such as zooarchaeology, paleobotany, archaeometallurgy, archaeometry, spatial analysis, as well as other experimental methodologies applied to the archaeology of post-classical Europe.

Submission of a manuscript implies that the work has not been published before, that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere and that it has been approved by all co-authors. Each author must clear reproduction rights for any photos or illustration, credited to a third party that he wishes to use (including content found on the Internet). For more information about **ethics** (including plagiarism) and copyright practices and guidelines please visit the web site www.postclassical.it.

PCA is published once a year in May, starting in 2011. Manuscripts should be submitted to editor@postclassical.it in accordance to the guidelines for contributors in the webpage <http://www.postclassical.it>

Post-Classical Archaeologies's manuscript **review process** is rigorous and is intended to identify the strengths and weaknesses in each submitted manuscript, to determine which manuscripts are suitable for publication, and to work with the authors to improve their manuscript prior to publication.

This journal has the option to publish in **open access**. For information please visit the web site www.postclassical.it

How to **quote**: please use "PCA" as abbreviation and "Post-Classical Archaeologies" as full title.

Cover image: courtesy of Schaffhausen, Stadtbibliothek (Switzerland), Gen. 8, f. 271v – Klosterneuburger Evangelienwerk, retrieved from www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/sbs/0008/271v/0/Sequence-1030

"Post-Classical Archaeologies" was approved on 2015-05-13 according to ERIH PLUS criteria for inclusion. Classified A by ANVUR (Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del sistema Universitario e della Ricerca).

DESIGN

Paolo Vedovetto

PUBLISHER

SAP Società Archeologica s.r.l.
Strada Fienili 39/a, 46020 Quingentole, Mantova
www.archeologica.it

PRINTED BY

Tecnografica Rossi, Via I maggio, Sandrigo (VI)

Authorised by Mantua court no. 4/2011 of April 8, 2011

For subscription and all other information visit the web site www.postclassical.it

CONTENTS PAGES

EDITORIAL

5

RESEARCH - RECYCLING AND REUSE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

R. Fleming The ritual recycling of Roman building material in late 4th- and early 5th-century Britain

7

S. Paynter, C. Jackson Re-used Roman rubbish: a thousand years of recycling glass

31

A. Sebastiani Glass and metal production at Alberese. The workshops at the manufacturing district of Spolverino

53

F.-D. Deltenre, L. Orlandi «Rien ne se perd, rien ne se crée, tout se transforme». Transformation and manufacturing in the Late Roman *villa* of Aiano-Torraccia di Chiusi (5th-7th cent. AD)

71

S. Bertoldi Santa Cristina in Caio (Buonconvento, Si): productive reuse during the Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages

91

C. Fernández-Ochoa, F. Gil Sendino, J. Salido La actividad metalúrgica en el yacimiento Veranes (Gijón, España): de la villa romana al asentamiento tardoantiguo y altomedieval

109

BEYOND THE THEME

F. Curta Postcards from Maurilia, or the historiography of the dark-age cities of Byzantium

141

M. Asolati Trasparenze ponderali: contrappesi monetali di vetro nell'Anatolia bizantina

163

DOSSIER - WORLD HERITAGE AND THE PUBLIC

- M. Díaz-Andreu** Introduction to the Dossier "World Heritage and the Public" 189
- M. Díaz-Andreu** Social values and the participation of local communities in World Heritage: a dream too far? 193
- Q. Gao** Social values and archaeological heritage: an ethnographic study of the Daming Palace archaeological site (China) 213
- G. Alexopoulos, K. Fouseki** Gender exclusion and local values versus universal cultural heritage significance: the Avaton debate on the monastic community of Mount Athos 235
- T.S. Guttormsen, J. Taylor, G. Swensen** Heritage values conceptualised as heritage routes. Visions and challenges towards public diversity 255
- M. Maluck** Spatial planning as a way to stakeholder involvement in cultural heritage management. Examples from Northern Europe 273
- D. Rodwell** Community values vs World Heritage values: bridging the gap 295
- G.P. Brogiolo** The UNESCO network "The Longobards in Italy. The Places of Power (568-774 A.D.)" and the Brescia case 317

RETROSPECT

- N.I. Platonova** Problems of early medieval Slavonic Archaeology in Russia (a view from St. Petersburg) 333

PROJECT

- M. Valenti** "We invest in Public Archaeology". The Poggibonsi Archaeodrome project: an alliance between people, Municipality and University 417

REVIEWS

- G. Chouquer**, *Les parcellaires médiévaux en Émilie et en Romagne. Centuriations et trames coaxiales. Morphologie et droit agraires* - by **C. Citter** 431
- A. Vigil-Escalera Guirado**, *Los primeros paisajes altomedievales en el interior de Hispania. Registros campesinos del siglo quinto d.C.* - by **T. Lewit**
- M. Díaz-Andreu, A. Pastor Pérez, A. Ruiz Martínez** (eds), *Arqueología y comunidad. El valor social del Patrimonio Arqueológico en el Siglo XXI* - by **M. del Carmen Rojo Ariza**

EDITORIAL

The sixth issue of PCA presents the material from two conferences held in different European countries last year.

The volume opens with some of the papers presented at The British School at Rome (April 2014) at a conference on The Recycling and Reuse of Materials during the Early Middle Ages. The meeting – organised by Alessandro Sebastiani (who has collaborated as guest editor for this section), Elena Chirico and Matteo Colombini – dealt mainly with productive structures related to the transformation of glass and metal in Italy (papers by Alessandro Sebastiani, Stefano Bertoldi, François-Dominique Deltenre and Lucia Orlandi). Other international experts have agreed to add their contributions to the subject: Robin Fleming on the reuse of construction material in early medieval graves, Sarah Paynter and Caroline Jackson offering a synthesis on the reuse of glass, and the team of Carmen Fernández-Ochoa in Spain presenting the early medieval productive structures at the villa of Veranes (Gijón). Two papers by Florin Curta and Michele Asolati, dealing with exchange in the Byzantine Mediterranean, have been published in the Varia section.

After the catastrophe of World War II, many international institutions were founded: the United Nations, UNESCO, the European Community. All these organizations are today immersed in a transitional phase in the systemic crisis which affects the entire Western world, a crisis to which the nihilist and relativist positions have contributed and which has (rightly) delegitimated the imperialism on which the West had built its dominant position. In this crisis, the recovery of shared historical memories is increasingly revealed as a central element in the defence of a rational world, which, although it may have abandoned the utopias of the 1900s, at least safeguards the principles of freedom and the pluralism of values. Today, there is wide debate, even among archaeologists, over how to present cultural heritage in a globalized society while nevertheless pre-

serving its multiple identities and cultures. The discussion of these matters was the purpose of the papers dedicated to the World Heritage List. This collection, guest edited by Margarita Díaz-Andreu, results from a workshop of the EU-project JPI–JHEP Heritage Values Network (H@V) held at the University of Barcelona in February 2015. The main question, summarized in the title of the paper by Díaz-Andreu, is whether the inclusion of social values and local communities in the management of cultural heritage is an impossible dream. Is it a utopian vision, typical of the historical processes which gave birth to the international organizations and their initiatives to hold back the spectre of a World War III? In many of these contributions, the watchwords still conform to this direction: the participation and involvement of stakeholders in the hope that local communities will be led to a positive valuation of assets and their public use.

The different directions of the debate move between the two poles of economic management and cultural enrichment of local communities. Too often, it is difficult to find a balance between touristic exploitation and a useful cultural proposal for local communities, as happened in the telling example of the Daming Palace in China, developed by Qian Gao, winner of the 2016 PCA young researcher award.

Direct involvement is often difficult in a globalized and multicultural society that has lost its historical roots. Most of the contributions consider that a proper balance can be found between global strategies promoted by UNESCO, based on the decalogue of general principles under which to file an application for protected sites, and the feeling and evaluation expressed by the local community (the focus of Torgrim Sneve Guttorsen, Joel Taylor, Grete Swensen on Heritage Routes and Matthias Maluck and Gian Pietro Brogiolo on organizational proposals in the interventions).

Also related to the subject of cultural heritage and the public is the project section of this issue, a homage the Poggibonsi Archeodromo. A project developed in recent years by the team of Marco Valenti (University of Siena), this is a unique living archaeological park recreated from archaeological evidence, presenting the life of an early medieval village, an initiative that clearly demonstrates the social and economic benefits of good practices in public archaeology in Italy.

Finally, the retrospect section, which addresses the history of early medieval archaeology in different European countries, is this year devoted to the fascinating recent history of early medieval Archaeology in Russia, with an extensive study by Nadezhda Platonova (St Peterburg).

Community values vs World Heritage values: bridging the gap

DENNIS RODWELL

Greenside Park, St Boswells, Melrose, Roxburghshire
TD6 0AH, United Kingdom.
dennis@dennisrodwell.co.uk

The traditional approach to the definition of heritage values is essentially top-down, derivative of an ethos best suited to museological curatorship. Tensions exist especially in historic cities inscribed on the World Heritage List, where there is a tendency for established communities to be perceived as a threat to their authenticity, not as one of a site's fundamental and indispensable features and safeguards. This paper questions how a normative approach to *outstanding universal value* can be synthesised with core community values alongside UNESCO's overarching mission, and proposes essential redefinitions of both *heritage* and *values* as the precursor to 'bridging the gap'.

Keywords: authenticity, community, historic cities, UNESCO's global mission, values

Il tradizionale approccio alla definizione dei valori del patrimonio è essenzialmente top-down, derivante da etiche che meglio si adattano alla curatela museale. Esistono tuttavia delle tensioni, specialmente nelle città storiche inserite nel Patrimonio dell'Umanità, in cui si registra la tendenza a percepire le comunità locali più come una minaccia alla loro autenticità che come una caratteristica essenziale e indispensabile alla tutela dei siti. Il contributo analizza come un approccio normativo all'outstanding universal value può essere sintetizzato con i valori delle comunità e con la missione dell'UNESCO e propone un'essenziale ridefinizione dei concetti di "patrimonio" e "valore" come premessa per una mediazione.

Parole chiave: autenticità, comunità, città storiche, missione dell'UNESCO, valori

1. Introduction

The traditional approach to heritage values is dependent upon definitions that are articulated by specialist academics and their peers without reference to the everyday socio-economic lives of the communities in which they are located. This works well for objects that are placed under curatorial care in museums or secure archaeological sites, where governmental or other organisations and sponsors

assume stakeholder responsibility and relationships with the community are primarily educational.

World Heritage Sites are classified under the 1972 Convention as properties: immovable objects. Cultural sites continue to be regarded by many in the heritage field as *monuments* that are subject to linear processes of technical preservation and historical interpretation (Petzet 2010), rather than dynamic processes that ensure their continued functionality and appreciation over time in their host communities. Today, the quantum as well as typologies of sites that are embraced as World Heritage has expanded far beyond the capacity of a specialist heritage field to act as discrete stakeholders and guardians (Ripp, Rodwell 2015, 2016); definitions as well as practices remain narrow; and tensions exist especially in inhabited towns and quarters of cities. Of singular concern is a tendency for long-established communities to be perceived as a threat to World Heritage Sites, not as one of their fundamental and indispensable features (Labadi 2013). Indeed, examples continue of local communities expropriated and displaced from within the boundaries of sites once they are inscribed on the World Heritage List (see Zamość, Poland, and Xi'an, China, below), ostensibly to protect narrowly interpreted values and authenticity and in manifest contradiction of UNESCO's global mission in pursuit of causes such as human rights, cultural diversity, social cohesion, and sustainable development.

How can a normative approach to *outstanding universal value*, a competitive approach to the nomination process, and state parties' focus on the economic development potential of the World Heritage brand be synthesised with core community values and UNESCO's overarching mission? This paper addresses these questions critically against the backdrop of the author's longstanding practical involvement in the management of historic cities both within and outside the UNESCO brand in parallel with recent academic research, and proposes essential redefinitions of both *heritage* and *values* as the precursor to 'bridging the gap'.

2. Historic cities: World Heritage values vs community values

In an article published in 2012, the author argued that: "A historic city is at one and the same time a physical place and a human space. Its authenticity is a compound of manmade and associated natural elements coupled with a complex mix of human activities" (Rodwell 2012b).

Article 1 of the 1972 UNESCO *World Heritage Convention*, in its definition of "groups of buildings [the category that is generally applied to historic cities]: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because

of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science" (UNESCO 1972a), presents a major challenge to the understanding of historic cities as human spaces. The latest edition of the UNESCO *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, under "groups of urban buildings eligible for inscription on the World Heritage List", provides the sub-category of "historic towns which are still inhabited and which, by their very nature, have developed and will continue to develop under the influence of socio-economic and cultural change, a situation that renders the assessment of their authenticity more difficult and any conservation policy more problematical" (UNESCO 2015, Annex 3, paragraph 14(ii)). This admission highlights the inherent disconnection between historic cities as physical properties whose authenticity requires to be safeguarded and their dynamic functionality, tacitly admits that traditional approaches offer an inadequate response to the real life challenges of identification as well as management, and begs the question of where citizens fit in.

To ignore the social aspect is to deprive a historic city of its *raison d'être*. It changes it from an inhabited, multi-faceted place into one that can take on the aspect of an open air museum, devoid of everyday life.



Fig. 1. Paris, France; the Place des Vosges. Following abandonment of the initial, 1960s to early-1970s museological approach to the *secteur sauvegardé*, the seriously dilapidated Marais quarter rapidly became one of the liveliest parts of the city. The high residential density of this and other quarters in the historic core coupled with rigorous detailed planning policies continues to support artisan craft businesses such as book-binders, cobblers, tailors, and wood-turners. Photographed 1990 (© Dennis Rodwell).



Fig. 2. Plovdiv, Bulgaria. Following the relocation of the majority of its residents to other parts of the city, commencing in the 1950s, town mansions in the Ancient Reserve were restored for a limited number of cultural and educational uses. Detaching this area from the everyday life of the modern city has seriously limited the options for using these monuments, and hence for the investment to restore and use them. Photographed 1985 (© Dennis Rodwell).

Historical examples of this are the museological approach anticipated in the initial, unexecuted *secteur sauvegardé* plan for the Marais quarter of Paris (Rodwell 2007a, pp. 15-18 and 128-131), and the decades-long executed programme for the Ancient Reserve in Plovdiv, Bulgaria (Rodwell 2007a, pp. 19-20). Such museological approaches coincidentally impose fundamental changes on the functional character for which the buildings, courtyards, street and open spaces were initially constructed, which in turn leads to conflicts between the buildings and the new uses to which they are put, and is destructive of their tangible as well as intangible authenticity. It is a vicious circle that has cumulative negative impacts in both physical and human terms. For the Marais quarter of Paris, the initial plan was significantly revised (fig. 1); in the case of Plovdiv, the project of museification has continued unabated (fig. 2).

Zamość (Poland) (fig. 3) and Xi'an (China) are contemporary examples of inscribed cities where the established populations have been considered an embarrassment to the authentic construction and presentation of the World Heritage brand (Rodwell 2010; Feighery 2011); and Sibiu (Romania, nominated but deferred at the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee in 2007) (fig. 4), an exemplar of a city where the needs and continuity of the existing population of the historic core have been prioritised, thereby sustaining its functional as well as physical authenticity (Rodwell 2010).

Good conservation – as the management of continuity rather than contrived change – is a matter of minimum intervention to the fabric of buildings as well as to the uses to which they are put (Australia ICOMOS 2013). Investigation of the traditional functional characteristics of a historic city should therefore be a fundamental part of the urban conservationist's analytical understanding and holistic approach, a quintessential basis for assessments of authenticity and integrity. The unique, place-specific human heritage is as important to residents and interesting to



Fig. 3. Zamość, Poland. Art historians and their peers have continuously opposed the use of the principal market square for outdoor markets — on the premise that they would compromise its architectural character — directing that the shops and workshops in the perimeter arcades, historically serving staples for a local population that is destined to be relocated, should be replaced with outlets selling luxury goods for an incoming gentrified population and tourists. Photographed 1999 (© Dennis Rodwell).



Fig. 4. Sibiu Romania; Piața Mare, the largest of the three main squares in the city centre and its social and cultural hub. An ICOMOS newsletter published in 2009 used such words as “outstanding” and “faultless” to characterize the coherence of the integrated conservation efforts in the city and the resultant “strong sense of integrity” (ICOMOS 2009). Photographed 2007 (© Dennis Rodwell).

visitors as are the architecture of the buildings and landscape of the public spaces (fig. 5). Indeed, cultural tourism is at least as much about the distinctive human culture of a place – embracing the cuisine, festivals and the amalgam of local customs and daily life – as it is about its built heritage.

Curatorial conservation in a historic city has a devastating impact on the understanding and identification of the full range of human, physical and spatial characteristics that distinguish the historic from the modern city, as well as each and every historic city from all others (Rodwell 2011). The move to sanitise the historic districts of cities of their complex inherited mix of human activities in the interests of protecting their monumental heritage has a long history. The sanitisation of historic cities in England commenced in the late-1940s through the 1950s (Stamp 2007) (fig. 6). Residential uses were relocated outside their historic cores. Small independent artisan workshops were reassigned to dedicated industrial zones and often forced to close down: relocation meant that they lost their customer base and could not continue to operate. Especially in the United Kingdom, from the 1960s onwards, independent shops were overtaken by multi-national, chain and franchise stores, and the unique character of any one historic city was lost as they became clones of each other (Stamp 2007).

Additionally, the social mix that is essential to service the life of a historic city has been prejudiced by gentrification, to the point that local residents can often no longer afford to live in their place of birth (Ripp, Rodwell 2015). Further, today's 'gentry' have consumer-led aspirations based on real estate rather than cultural values



Fig. 5. Regensburg, Germany. Inner courtyard in the rehabilitated city centre, complete with children's play area: part of the integrated conservation and regeneration strategy that, sustained since the 1970s, has prioritised small-scale mixed use, including social housing in the historic core, coupled with the establishment of new industries and supporting infrastructure in the expanding modern city (Ripp, Rodwell 2015). Photographed 2011 (© Dennis Rodwell).



Fig. 6. Chester, England. The Rows, photographed by the author's mother, illustrating the rich tapestry of small-scale mixed uses that have typically been sanitised out of towns and cities across the country. Photographed 1932 (The Scaddan Collection © Dennis Rodwell).

that are frequently in opposition to the precepts of good building conservation practice – which prioritises minimum intervention, not transformative renovation (Rodwell 2010). And, as predominantly incomers and often transient, they have no loyalty to place – either inherited or with the view to transmission to future generations (Ripp, Rodwell 2015).

The constituents of heritage that an established community identifies with, the ones that support the global agendas of social cohesion, cultural diversity and sustainable development, reflect a set of values that do not feature in top-down processes of selective and specialist identification dependent on monumentalising heritage. As Felicity Goodey, speaking of the regeneration of Salford, Greater Manchester, has stated: “The unlisted buildings enshrine the human stories, the memories of the community. They are the real heritage. It is they that determine the sense of identity, of place, and of belonging. These are the places where the historic environment is at the heart of sustainable communities” (cited in Rodwell 2014a, p. 14).

3. Common ownership of heritage values in historic cities: the challenge

3.1. Troublesome words and concepts

If we are serious about community engagement in determining, assessing and implementing a values-led approach to heritage management in inhabited historic cities, be they inscribed as World Heritage Sites under the 1972 Convention or recognised more widely as national heritage under Article 5 of that Convention and the parallel 1972 Recommendation (UNESCO 1972b), we have to start by examining key words in the scientific/professional lexicon and interrogating them closely.

Heritage

The concept of immovable *heritage*, as articulated and applied today, is a modern *construct* (Rodwell 2014a). It represents both a linguistic abstraction and a commodification of history into something that is selected for survival, conventionally by specialists, whether as examples of a particular period, style, typology, association, constructional technique, or other. It is conditioned by the assumption that drove post-Second World War reconstruction in Europe, that heritage which is not identified and designated as such is expendable – much as any other object in consumer-disposable societies.

This assumption is in negation of the much broader sense of the French word *patrimoine*, signifying a collective inheritance that is accumulated and passed down from one generation to another and is not exclusive to prescribed cultural values (Rodwell 2015b). This assumption remains in a time warp from the third quarter of the twentieth century, and is incompatible with late-twentieth through twenty-first century agendas of sustainable development, climate change, the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and broad societal agendas.

Vital questions that have to be asked include:

- Whose heritage is it? Does it, for example, only belong intellectually and in custodianship to the specialists who identify and articulate it?
- Whose cultures are represented by that heritage? Are they reduced to the single culture of the dominant elite, or inclusive of the diverse sub-cultures that are the primary societal characteristic of any historic city?
- Whose ownerships and responsibilities are subsumed in that heritage? And if the heritage that is articulated conforms only to an academic or other elite, how can responsibility for it be shared with the community that hosts it?

Values

With urban heritage, comprising as it does inhabited historic towns and cities, we have to broaden our understanding of the spectrum of *values* that are promoted and subsumed (Ripp, Rodwell 2015). Are they, for example, simply historical, artistic or scientific, and intrinsic solely in a cultural sense? Or should they not be more inclusive, incorporating:

- Community (fig. 7) – incorporating sense of place, belonging, and well-being.
- Resource – including material, and encompassing environmental capital/embodied energy.



Fig. 7. Bologna, Italy, famous for the year-round conviviality stimulated by its *portici* (arcades). Community values and housing for the established population dominated the pioneering programmes of urban conservation from the 1960s onwards (Bravo 2009). Photographed 2009 (© Dennis Rodwell)



Fig. 8. Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation. Material resource value and usefulness provided the substantive rationale for the survival of urban heritage in the pre-1990 East European bloc (Rodwell 2007b). These are not values that form an elemental motivation for the conventional ethos of cultural heritage protection. Photographed 1991 (© Dennis Rodwell).

- Usefulness (fig. 8) – including for adaptive and creative reuse.
- Cultural – in the broad sense: incorporating the memory of a community as a whole as well as its constituent parts; and including all features and aspects that are recognised and appreciated by the inhabiting citizens.

Of these four values, the *heritage construct* only addresses the last; and that, only in small part (fig. 9). The academic attribution of intrinsic values solely to cultural attributes fails to comprehend the quintessential difference between urban heritage and self-sufficient artistic objects such as paintings and sculpture. Historic cities exist to perform a multiplicity of functions in society, from the ceremonial to the domestic; they are not simply objects to be admired, ones that can beneficially be



Fig. 9. Bath, England; Lansdown Crescent. The urban conservation ethos that evolved from the 1960s through the 1970s prioritised the architecture of the facades and the aesthetics of townscape over the functions attributed to buildings and community interests (Buchanan 1968). Photographed 2005 (© Dennis Rodwell).

monumentalised and taken out of use on the premise that function is an extrinsic, not intrinsic, value.

Expert

The concept of *expert* is one that should be treated with caution in the context of historic cities.

- What are the defining criteria and who is elaborating them?
- Are they internal or external to the local community that hosts them?
- Are they concerned with the city as it functions today, or solely with a limited set of characteristics from earlier centuries?
- Do experts employ language that communicates with citizens; or, alternatively, operate using terminology that differentiates them – whether intentionally or accidentally?
- What skills outside their specialism do they have, especially of moderation directed at conflict-avoidance and securing common purpose in host communities (Ripp, Rodwell 2015, 2016)?

Heritage experts are not habituated to processes that extend beyond linear cause and effect models of intervention and communication. Historic cities are complex systems, and a systems approach to their comprehension and management is essential if the diverse actors, age groups and their affiliations are to be engaged with successfully (Capra, Luisi 2014; Ripp, Rodwell 2015, 2016).

Stakeholder

Definitions of *stakeholder* in the context of historic cities are various, from those institutions and individuals who have a dominant political and financial interest in a place, to anyone who has physical or intellectual access to it (Rodwell 2012a). The following prioritisation into three classifications, which challenge much received thinking, is highly relevant¹:

- Primary stakeholders: namely direct users – the local community.
- Secondary: indirect users – incoming traders, consumers and tourists, service providers, and other work-related categories.
- Tertiary: influential – governmental, non-governmental, academia, and outside investors.

Community

What *community* is implied and favoured?

- The community of *experts* who have defined the *heritage* and delimited the *values* attributable to it?
- The local/established/indigenous community? If so, how are the diverse sub-cultures in the community engaged in the definition of both *heritage* and *values*?
- Is a distinction made between academic communities that have predominantly intellectual access, and local communities that have primarily physical access and are often assumed to require to be 'educated' about the *heritage values* of their place?

It is essential to focus on the established communities in historic cities as the primordial intellectual owners and practical custodians of a broad definition of their heritage. To do otherwise is a recipe for conflict as well as for the marginalisation of academically derived heritage values.

Authenticity and Integrity

Notwithstanding the 1994 *Nara Document on Authenticity* (Lemaire, Stovel 1994), how are the concepts of *authenticity* and *integrity* interpreted in relation to inhabited historic cities? Is there still confusion between *original* and *historic* fabric – which may have replaced original fabric at some unknown and unrecorded date in the past; a

¹ Credit for this classification: Tania Ali Soomro, ICOMOS-Pakistan and masters student at the Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation, KU Leuven; presentation at the ICOMOS Theory and Philosophy International Scientific Conference, 'How to Assess Built Heritage?' held in Florence, Italy, March 2015.

characteristic, for example, of all centuries-long programmes of repair and restoration to the masonry of medieval cathedrals across Europe? This author has never seen a comprehensive audit of *original* compared to *historic* fabric on an older structure, and doubts that a scientifically reliable audit could be achieved; quarried stone, after all, is several million years old.

An obsessive emphasis on *authenticity* of purportedly original fabric, in accordance with academic interpretations of the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964), contradicts *integrity* of form and design, spirit and feeling as set out in the Nara Document (Lemaire, Stovel 1994, paragraph 13). Furthermore, *authenticity* and *integrity* in historic cities do not concern only the archaeological minutiae of fabric: above all, they are determined by human occupancy and use and are layered over time.

Barriers – perceptual, economic and political

There are a number of barriers to achieving common ownership of wider values in historic cities, of which the following is a selection:

- Short-termism, whether for intellectual, economic or political reasons.
- The 'Bilbao effect': iconic modern buildings by 'signature architects' who parachute into cities from afar and follow the credo of Mies van der Rohe, one of the modern movement's most influential figures, who conceived each building as an individual object, never as part of the urban fabric (Rykwert 2000, p. 128).
- The 'Dubai effect' of ever-increasingly high-rise buildings – often also the work of 'signature architects'.
- Globalisation and the cloning of cities, in which cities in disparate parts of the world increasingly resemble one another to the prejudice of their individual identity.
- The negative effects of highly selective lists such as the UNESCO World Heritage List which, as above, are increasingly critiqued as a vehicle for displacing established/indigenous populations, in violation of human rights and contravention of the principles of sustainable development.
- Confused messages surrounding the word *contemporary*, whose duality of meaning – occurring at the present time and conforming to modern ideas in style and fashion – has been hijacked in favour of the latter, thereby acting as a recipe for conflict between historic cities and iconic modern buildings.
- Failure to understand that the embodied energy constituted in existing buildings and the infrastructure of cities is part of the solution to

Fig. 10. Turin, Italy; a hurdy-gurdy in front of the royal palace. As Alexander Youngson, Emeritus Professor of Political Economy, University of Edinburgh, wrote: "Tourism is a great modern industry. ... We had lots of those during the Industrial Revolution and we have been cleaning up the mess ever since" (Youngson 1990, pp. 84-85). Photographed 2008 (© Dennis Rodwell).



- carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions and climate change, not the problem².
- The prevalence and dominance by tourism in historic cities, especially those inscribed on the World Heritage List (fig. 10).

4. Common ownership of heritage values in historic cities: the opportunity

4.1. The European context

The specificity of context is especially relevant to the longer-term consideration of urban heritage and historic cities in Europe.

Overall population numbers in Europe have stabilised following decades of increase, and are predicted to experience demographic variability and decline in several countries – including France and Germany. Additionally, unlike nations and regions in Africa and Asia, an optimum plateau of urbanisation has been reached.

It is estimated that eighty per cent of the buildings that will exist across Europe in 2050 have already been built; concurrently, new construction represents less than a one per cent annual addition to the existing stock. Thus, the key issues for Europe's cities are the repair, maintenance and creative re-use of the broadly defined historic environment:

² See the EFFESUS project (Energy Efficiency for EU Historic Districts' Sustainability). Online in: <http://www.effesus.eu/> (accessed 5 September 2015).

namely, conservation in its widest sense – not a specialist and peripheral activity that is only applied to designated ‘heritage assets’.

The challenge of safeguarding the authenticity and integrity of what exists, be it inscribed on the World Heritage List or not, presents a major opportunity for conservation to break out of its shell and become a mainstream activity – the norm not the exception – in which urban heritage assumes a new and greatly extended role, demanding a commensurately increased skills-base and supporting wider societal agendas. Anticipating this, a key passage in the 1987 *Brundtland Report* reads: “We see ... the possibility for a new era of economic growth, one that must be based on policies that sustain and expand the environmental resource base” (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987, p. 1). The environmental capital invested in urban heritage constitutes a major part of this resource base. The opportunity for moderated definitions of heritage values to achieve broad civil recognition is effectively unlimited, with World Heritage at the apex.

4.2. *Establishing common ownership of heritage and values*

The common ownership of heritage values in historic cities results from a process of moderation of top-down and bottom-up perceptions. The terms *heritage* and *heritage values* are not ones that citizens generally use in their daily lives to describe the things that are important to them in the places where they live, or the daily inter-actions they most prize with their surroundings and fellow-citizens. The *community values* of a place and its academically constructed *heritage values* will have commonalities, but their starting points are disparate and need to be moderated effectively to secure a shared understanding and respect – the prerequisite of common ownership and responsibility. Moderation involves the following:

- Asking different sectors and age groups in any given community what is important to them about their place – children, youths, parents, the retired; and listen.
- Not pre-judging the outcome by using words such as *heritage* and *values*. To many people today, for example, *value* relates primarily to money; this is not a discourse to animate.
- Anticipating that most of the responses will focus on friends, family, community and the familiar. These are the keys to establishing common ground.
- Comprehending that *heritage* as well as *culture*, in the widest sense (but not articulated as such), are an integral part of the everyday social exchanges within a community and valued instinctively as such.

- Not representing top-down and essentially selective understandings until after citizens have represented the values that are foremost to them, using their own vocabulary.
- Building from the bottom up in order to establish the common ground.

Showing respect for the values articulated by the community is an indispensable foundation for soliciting their respect for yours. Soliciting attachment to the *outstanding universal value* of a site before one has comprehended the spectrum of *local values* does not assure a successful communication. Local values interact far more closely to UNESCO's global mission than reductionist outstanding universal values, and interaction between the two is key.

4.3. Focusing on young people and the marginalised

Two target groups, amongst the most populous but least considered at present, are especially important for nurturing common ownership.

First, school children, a sector of the population that has multi-generational extended family relationships and influence, is open-minded, highly creative, *and* the future. Early in 2006 a campaign was launched in the historic centre of Sibiu, Romania, aimed at informing and persuading residents not to use polyvinyl chloride (PVC) as a substitute for the traditional joinery of doors, windows and shutters – a vital issue for the safeguarding of the tangible authenticity of historic buildings as well as for the reduction of fossil-fuel use and carbon emissions. It was a campaign that included engaging with school children through a competition in which they were invited to submit written work, artwork, and performance. The level of involvement and the standard of the entries were such that the mayor hosted a celebratory barbecue in the *Piața Mare* (main square), and himself took part in the cooking. Klaus Johannis, first elected Mayor of Sibiu in 2000, an inspirational figure in the local and national community and, since 2014, President of Romania, spearheaded the anti-PVC campaign, including signing the promotional leaflets and attracting widespread media coverage; as such, the campaign achieved a significant impact (Rodwell 2007, pp. 168-170).

The second target group is a sector of the population that is often regarded as one of the most challenging to access, but equally one of the most important to engage with: youths with poor educational qualifications in post-industrial urban communities where unemployment levels are high and often three- or four-generational, and where the ripple-effect across their communities is potentially significant. An example of this took place in 2006, when a government minister in the United Kingdom Department for Culture Media and Sport solicited a visit



Fig. 11. Lyon, France. Futuristic art work on the blank gable end of an apartment block in one of the social housing districts. Photographed 2008 (© Dennis Rodwell).



Fig. 12. Lyon, France. Art work celebrating the sporting prowess of France's second city, on the blank gable end of an apartment block adjacent to a number of the city's sports facilities. Photographed 2008 (© Dennis Rodwell).

to Liverpool – a city that consistently features at the top of official indices of deprivation (Rodwell 2015a); she requested to see ‘the good, the bad and the ugly’. Part of her programme included a visit to a youth centre in a disadvantaged neighbourhood; in that centre, unemployed youths presented what the city meant to them. The minister was so impressed with the civic pride and articulateness she witnessed that she cancelled parts of the subsequent official programme in the town hall, on the premise that “These are the real people of Liverpool; these are the people I have come to see” (Ripp, Rodwell 2016).

Civic engagement is additionally achieved when, for example, citizens are invited to propose artworks and other enhancements in the public realm, such as in the social housing quarters of Lyon, a city renowned for its ongoing programme of *trompe l'oeil* murals, a creative industry that dates back to the Renaissance (Poirieux 2006) (figs. 11 and 12).

Heritage professionals need to broaden their constituencies and communicate with and harness the enthusiasm of all sections of civil society, including the young and marginalised in addition to their conventional audiences. The results can seriously reshape conceptions

of *heritage* and engage with its multi-faceted potential in contemporary society.

4.4. *The continuity of heritage and creativity*

Tensions between *heritage* and *creativity* can be dated to the genesis of the conservation movement at the end of the nineteenth century, the emergence of the modern movement in the beginning of the twentieth, and traced through the interweaving battles, truces and statements of position that have characterised a century of opposing philosophies and practices (Glendinning 2013). That this is a modern and not historical controversy is manifest with reference to the Italian Renaissance.

Leon Battista Alberti (1404-72), the influential Renaissance architect, antiquarian and humanist polymath, was an early proponent of the intrinsic value of historic buildings as a cultural as well as material resource, both as the starting point for their protection and as inspiration for fresh creation (Jokilehto 2004, pp. 26-27). The past and the future were perceived as one creative continuum, not placed into separate compartments that presaged hostility. The eighteenth through nineteenth century neo-Classical, neo-Gothic and Romantic periods in architecture reiterated this avowal of the past-present-future timeline.

We are conditioned today to the notion that heritage is only about the past and has no connection with the *creative industries* – which are themselves delimited as relating only to arts and crafts, design and fashion, film, software and computer games, the performing arts, publishing, television and radio (Rodwell 2014a). This excludes all sections of any community whose creativity lies in wider directions and whose contributions are not accorded equivalent weight. Creativity is applied imagination, imagination is unlimited, and the conditions under which creativity flourishes cannot be circumscribed.

A pre-condition for moderating common ownership of heritage values in a community is to render equal respect to all who are contributing to the continuity of intellectual attainments as well as practical skills, however modest they may appear to be at first (figs. 13 and 14). This constitutes the *anthropological vision*: a dynamic approach to heritage that is focused on processes that safeguard geo-cultural identity and secure its creative continuity in harmony with the evolving aspirations of peoples and communities. It focuses on people as both the custodians and creative vectors of cultural diversity and identity. Instead of *heritage* and *contemporary* being in conflict, *heritage* and *creative industries* are held to be in harmony as part of a cultural continuum, as two sides of the same coin.



Figs. 13 and 14. Ödemiş, Turkey. On the left, a hand-craft metal-worker at his marketplace stall (photographed 2010, © Dennis Rodwell). On the right, a shoe maker at work. Artisan workshops and services are essential to the life of any historic city: their functionality as inhabited places depends on continuity of the craft skills they provide; gentrification as well as tourism contribute to subverting this (photographed 2011, © Dennis Rodwell).

5. Challenges presented by the World Heritage Convention

The normative approach to implementation of the World Heritage Convention, in the essentially competitive atmosphere of the nomination process and the paring down of complex histories to facilitate simplified justifications of *outstanding universal value*, ones that generally accord with narratives of “national construction of the past”, have been well-researched and presented by Labadi (2013). Labadi challenges the discordance between the application of the Convention and other United Nations agendas such as the Millennium Development Goals, and argues that values should be understood as extrinsic and relative, variable over time for multiple perceptual and geographical reasons, and not confined to the dominant professional and Euro-centric approach to universalism, concentrated as it is on monumentalising heritage in European, non-European and post-colonial countries alike. This politicisation of heritage, Labadi argues, allied to insistence on a unified and discrete collective cultural identity, serves equally to foster exclusion of indigenous and marginalised populations.

Labadi posits whether the essence of the heritage construct is to omit those aspects of history that do not conform to a safe, simplistic but coherent presentation of a site, a nation and its peoples. Referring

to the difficulties of accommodating different histories and narratives within the structured advocacy of nomination dossiers, she goes further and cites “the veneer of objectivity that surrounds the work of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Convention”. In her search for a way forward, Labadi promotes the need for participation by local communities to be a *qualifying* criterion for inclusion on the World Heritage List. The central role of state parties, committed to the promotion of simplified narratives and national agendas, generally counters this (Rodwell 2014b).

6. Branding, distinctiveness and identity

One of the ironies of today's *globalisation*, in a competitive world in which each nation and every city aspires to compete in parallel domains with each other, is that sustainable long-term success under globalisation means competitive advantage through distinctiveness, *not* seeking to replicate another city, either in its presentation to a world audience through mass tourism or by monotonising its identity for its citizens to the point where societal agendas of sense of belonging and allegiance to place are undermined.

As the former British diplomat Sir David Hunt wrote: “Never before has the world been so firmly in the grip of an establishment like the present architectural one, the most rigid in the history of art. All modern cities, as they are rebuilt, grow to resemble each other more. Rio and Hong Kong, to take two with rather similar settings, are clothing themselves more and more in the same style; London and Tokyo come closer each year; today a building in Sarajevo or Calcutta or Yokohama would probably share the same idiom” (Hunt 2006, p. 286).

An extreme example of the World Heritage brand becoming subsumed in a contrivance of cloning is Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City, whose incoherent post-inscription waterfront seeks to ape that of the city's twin city of Shanghai, and whose City Council is focused on *grands projets* that have no conceivable need or demand in the local or regional economy of a city whose population has now stabilised after decades of severe decline, and where long-standing, deep-rooted socio-economic problems in the city's established communities have been neglected (Rodwell 2015a) (fig. 15).

There is nothing inevitable about cloning and loss of individuality. It is a choice but not a good one. It highlights the need to focus on factors that sustain the individual characteristics of each and every physical place and human space, which today's normative approach to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention is, however unintentionally, not achieving.



Fig. 15. Liverpool, England: Panorama of the waterfront from the seaward north-west, illustrating the damage inflicted on the historic urban landscape, since inscription as a World Heritage Site in 2004, as the result of a fragmentary approach to heritage designations and incoherent contemporary interventions. Tom Dyckhoff, architecture critic of *The Times*, has described the new Liverpool waterfront as comprising 'frivolous, flash-in-the-pan architecture that could have been built by anyone anywhere'³. The Danish architect Jan Gehl (author of Gehl 2010) has characterised this genre of development as 'bird-shit architecture', dropped randomly from a three-kilometre height⁴. Photographed 2011 (© Dennis Rodwell).

7. Conclusion

Synthesising state parties' focus on the economic development potential of the World Heritage brand with core community values and UNESCO's overarching global mission poses a formidable challenge. First, a broader approach is needed to the definition of *heritage*, not as a normative concept that suits simplistic marketing, be it of a nation or a city; rather, one which is founded on a broad comprehension that is recognised and appreciated by its citizens. Second, a broader approach to *values*, acknowledging the twenty-first century's agendas of sustainable development and climate change, and recognising that *heritage values* are not simply the cultural ones identified by an intellectual elite.

The focus of the 1972 Convention on 'properties' poses a challenge for the promotion of a broader understanding of *heritage* and the set of *values*. For it to be fully relevant, however, to the circumstances of a world that has moved on in the four decades since the Convention's adoption, it needs to adapt to the agendas, constraints and opportunities of 2016, including the newly adopted United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. Only then can we begin to bridge the gap between community values and World Heritage values.

³ Speaking in the television programme 'A Year in the Life', broadcast on BBC Two on 19 January 2009, which reported on Liverpool, European Capital of Culture 2008.

⁴ Lecturing to the title 'Cities for People' in Edinburgh, 7 September 2012.

References

- AUSTRALIA ICOMOS 2013, *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMO Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*.
- L. BRAVO 2009, *Area conservation as socialist standard-bearer: a plan for the historical centre of Bologna in 1969*, in M. GLENDINNING (ed), *Mirror of Modernity: The Post-war Revolution in Urban Conservation* (DoCoMoMo E-Proceedings), pp. 44-53. Online in: http://www.docomomo.com/com/e-proceedings2_dec09/Docomomo%20E-proceedings2.pdf (last accessed 5 September 2015).
- C. BUCHANAN & Partners 1968, *Bath: A Study in Conservation*, London.
- F. CAPRA, P.L. LUISI 2014, *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision*, Cambridge.
- W. FEIGHERY 2011, *Contested Heritage in the City of Peace*, "The Historic Environment", 23(1), pp. 38-47.
- J. GEHL 2010, *Cities for People*, Washington.
- M. GLENDINNING 2013, *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation: Antiquity to Modernity*, London.
- D. HUNT 2006, *Memoirs: Military and Diplomatic*, London.
- ICOMOS 1964, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites* (Venice Charter), Paris.
- ICOMOS 2009, *Newsletter C/AV* (International Scientific Committee of Vernacular Architecture), pp. 10-11.
- J. JOKILEHTO 2004, *A History of Architectural Conservation*, Oxford.
- S. LABADI 2013, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*, Lanham.
- R. LEMAIRE, H. STOVEL 1994, *Nara Document on Authenticity*, Nara.
- M. PETZET 2010, *Conservation or Managing Change?*, paper given at the conference "Conservation Turn – Return to Conservation: Challenges and Chances in a Changing World", Prague, 5 to 9 May 2010.
- C. POIRIEUX 2006, *Lyon et ses Murs Peints*, Lyon.
- M. RIPP, D. RODWELL 2015, *The geography of urban heritage*, "The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice", 6(3), pp. 240-276.
- M. RIPP, D. RODWELL 2016, *The governance of urban heritage*, "The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice", 7(1), pp. 81-108.
- D. RODWELL 2007a, *Conservation and Sustainability in Historic Cities*, Oxford.
- D. RODWELL 2007b, *Approaches to urban conservation in Central and Eastern Europe*, "Journal of Architectural Conservation", 9(2), pp. 22-40.
- D. RODWELL 2010, *Comparative approaches to urban conservation in Central and Eastern Europe: Zamość, Poland, and Sibiu, Romania*, "The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice", 1(2), pp. 116-142.
- D. RODWELL 2011, *Ajalooliste Linnade Haldamine* (Managing Historic Cities), "Muinsuskaitseraamat 2010" (National Heritage Yearbook 2010), Tallinn, pp. 107–112. English text online in: <https://independent.academia.edu/DennisRodwell> (last accessed 17 April 2016).
- D. RODWELL 2012a, *The Unesco World Heritage Convention, 1972–2012: Reflections and Directions*, "The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice", 3(1), pp. 64-85.
- D. RODWELL 2012b, *The Social Aspect of Urban Revitalisation*, "Biuletyn Informacyjny", 19(4), p. 27. Online in: http://www.icomos-poland.org/images/Biuletyn%20PKN%20ICOMOS/biuletyn%204_2012_druk.pdf (last accessed 5 September 2015).
- D. RODWELL 2014a, *Heritage as a driver for creative cities*, in D. WIKTOR-MACH, P. RADWAŃSKI (eds), *The Idea of Creative City*, Skopje, pp. 11-26. Online in: <http://eujournal.org/files/journals/1/books/Cracow2013.pdf> (last accessed 5 September 2015).
- D. RODWELL 2014b, *Discordances in the application of the 1972 World Heritage Convention: is it fit for purpose in the 21st century?*, "The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice", 5(3), pp. 300-303.

- D. RODWELL 2015a, *Liverpool: heritage and development – Bridging the gap?*, in H. DEVERMANN, H.A. MIEG (eds), *Industrial Heritage Sites in Transformation: Clash of Discourses*, New York, pp. 29-46.
- D. RODWELL 2015b, *The Limits of Heritage: What Limits?* in K. JAGODZIŃSKA, J. PURCHLA (eds), *The Limits of Heritage: The 2nd Heritage Forum of Central Europe*, Krakow, pp. 25-40.
- J. RYKWERT 2000, *The Seduction of Place: The History and Future of the City*, Oxford.
- G. STAMP 2007, *Britain's Lost Cities*, London.
- UNESCO 1972a, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (the *World Heritage Convention*), Paris.
- UNESCO 1972b, *Recommendation Concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Paris.
- UNESCO 2015, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Paris.
- WORLD COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT 1987, *Our Common Future* (also known as the *Brundtland Report*), Oxford.
- A.J. YOUNGSON 1990, *Cities and civilisation*, in P. HARRISON (ed), *Civilising the City: Quality or Chaos in Historic Towns*, Edinburgh, pp. 83-87.