

pca

european journal of
postclassicalarchaeologies

volume 9/2019

SAP Società Archeologica s.r.l.

Mantova 2019

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 Louisville)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Paul Arthur (Università del Salento)

Margarita Díaz-Andreu (ICREA - Universitat de Barcelona)

José M. Martín Civantos (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 Lawit (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), 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 "European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies" as full title.

Cover image: statue of Mont'e Prama (from F. Pinna with modifications).

"Post-Classical Archaeologies" is indexed in Scopus. It was approved on 2015-05-13 according to ERIH PLUS criteria for inclusion and indexed in Carhus+2018. 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

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 - PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH IN ARCHAEOLOGY. LEGAL ISSUES AND GOOD PRACTICES	
A. Olivier Socialising heritage: polity and praxis	9
G. Tully Skills, ethics and approaches: an introduction to 'the basics' of participatory archaeology	35
A. Castillo Mena Participative processes in cultural heritage management. Methodology and critical results based on experiences within the Spanish World Heritage context	61
B. Wilkins A theory of change and evaluative framework for measuring the social impact of public participation in archaeology	77
G.P. Brogiolo, A. Chavarría Arnau Archaeology for local communities in Northern Italy: experiences of participatory research in an adverse legal framework	101
F. Pinna Archeologia e costruzione partecipata dell'identità locale: percorsi di archeologia di comunità in Sardegna	123
S. Thomas Doing public participatory archaeology with "difficult" conflict heritage: experiences from Finnish Lapland and the Scottish Highlands	147
F. Benetti, C.P. Santacroce In the public interest? Archaeological research, permits and public participation in Italy	169
K. Möller Will they or won't they? German heritage laws, public participation and the Faro Convention	199
R. Karl Authorities and subjects? The legal framework for public participation in Austrian archaeology	219

M. Rizner Participatory research in archaeology in Croatia: between law and practice 257

L. Delgado Anés, J.M. Martín Civantos The legal framework of cultural landscapes in Andalusia (Spain): limits and possibilities of public participation from an archaeological perspective 269

K.A. Pyburn Archaeology by, for, and about the public 291

BEYOND THE THEME

E. Zanini Trama e ordito di un territorio: un esperimento tra (micro) *Big History* e archeologia pubblica a Vignale di Maremma (Toscana) 303

C. Citter From roads to mobility. A theoretical framework and a case study to investigate the medieval connections network 325

F. Sogliani, D. Roubis The discovery of the monastic settlement of Jure Vetere (S. Giovanni in Fiore, Calabria, Italy): a multidisciplinary project of landscape archaeology 343

RETROSPECT

T. O’Keeffe The archaeology of Ireland’s long middle ages: retrospective and prospective 365

PROJECT

L. Band CITIZAN 2015-2018 and 2019-2021, a community archaeology project past and future: successes, challenges, potential solutions 399

REVIEWS

S. Rippon, *Kingdom, Civitas, and County. The Evolution of Territorial Identity in the English Landscape* - by **G.P. Brogiolo**

W. Scheidel, *The Science of Roman History: Biology, Climate, and the Future of the Past* - by **M. Fecchio**

A. Izdebski, M. Mulryan, *Environment and Society in the Long Late Antiquity* - by **M. Rottoli**

M. Marinato, *Alimentazione, salute e mobilità della popolazione in Italia settentrionale tra IV e VIII secolo. Approcci bioarcheologici* - by **P.M. De Marchi**

V. Amorós Ruiz, *El Tolmo de Minateda en la Alta Edad Media. Cerámica y Contexto* - by **J. Sarabia**

B. Lefebvre, *La formation d’un tissu urbain à Tours. De l’amphithéâtre antique au quartier canonial* - by **M.-A. Causarano**

A. Chavarría Arnau, M.-A. Causarano (eds), *La memoria culturale dell’Oltresarca trentino. Paesaggi, persone e storie di pietre* - by **V. Higgins**

Adrian Olivier*

Socialising heritage: polity and praxis

In most countries the social values of heritage have always existed alongside the more instrumental values of identification, regulation, and protection. Likewise, social objectives have been explicit features of international instruments (conventions, recommendations, declarations) since at least 1945. However, these have been difficult to operationalise in practice, and attention has generally focussed on the more technical aspects of heritage management. Only in recent years have serious and realistic steps been taken to translate these aspirations into a meaningful reality. However, despite many advances, some very serious challenges and obstacles remain that must to be overcome if heritage is to be the vehicle that can successfully deliver the socially cohesive objectives that have been claimed for the subject.

Keywords: conventions, heritage and social values, community engagement, public benefit

Nella maggior parte dei paesi il valore sociale del patrimonio è sempre stato preso in considerazione accanto ad altri valori strumentali per la sua identificazione, regolamentazione e tutela. Obiettivi sociali sono stati anche esplicitamente citati negli strumenti internazionali (convenzioni, raccomandazioni, dichiarazioni) almeno dal 1945. Tuttavia, tutto ciò è stato difficilmente messo in pratica e l'attenzione si è generalmente focalizzata sugli aspetti più tecnici della gestione del patrimonio. Solo di recente sono stati compiuti dei significativi passi avanti per tradurre queste aspirazioni in realtà. Nonostante i progressi, molti e seri ostacoli rimangono da superare, se il patrimonio culturale deve essere lo strumento per raggiungere obiettivi di coesione sociale che gli si vuole attribuire.

Parole chiave: convenzioni, patrimonio culturale e valori sociali, coinvolgimento della comunità, interesse pubblico

1. Introduction: heritage protection and social purpose - twin approaches

Since their inception heritage laws and associated instruments – whether enacted in a national or an international context – have invariably focussed on the protection of selected elements of the cultural heritage. This was evident as early as the 17th century in Sweden with

* Secretary General of ICAHM-ICOMOS, adrian.olivier@btinternet.com.

a royal proclamation of 1666 which declared all objects from antiquity to be the property of the Crown and which protected ancient monuments and sites from treasure hunters and unthinking acts of vandalism (Lingdén 2018). More generally, interest in heritage protection throughout Europe was triggered in the 19th century, at a time of increasing scientific curiosity and enlightenment, by discoveries resulting from agricultural intensification, accelerating industrial development, and a growth in cultural tourism (Thurley 2013, pp. 5-23).

In Britain, the nascent conservation movement came into being in the 1860s and 1870s with the creation of a number of campaigning organisations including the Commons Preservation Society (1865) and William Morris' Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (1877). Attempts to formulate legislation to protect cultural heritage culminated in the Ancient Monuments Protection Act in 1882, the appointment of Pitt Rivers as the first Inspector of Ancient Monuments in the same year, and the Ancient Monuments Act in 1900 which strengthened both the degree of protection that could be afforded to monuments and the nature and scope of what could be protected.

During the same period Octavia Hill, HD Rawnsley, and Robert Hunter – three Christian-socialist reformers concerned with issues of social welfare and education founded the National Trust in 1896 - initially as a pressure group to preserve ancient rights of access to the countryside (Murphy 2006). In 1907 the National Trust Act gave state recognition to the Trust and empowered it to hold land inalienably. In 1927 the Trust was granted the ability to take into its care historic houses rather than just land and in 1945 the establishment of the national Land Fund enabled the Trust to purchase large tracts of land on behalf of the people of Britain as a reward for their efforts during the two World Wars (Waterson 1999). The Trust's initial focus therefore was on providing public access to the countryside as part of a social programme of mass education. Since then it has developed strong interests in the protection, conservation, and interpretation of historic buildings, country houses, historic gardens, landscapes, ancient monuments, archaeology and industrial sites, and the coastline (<https://www.national-trust.org.uk/our-cause>). However, although the responsibilities of the National Trust include 'preservation' and 'protection' in its widest sense, its functions are not regulatory (Thurley 2013, p. 63). The National Trust has never lost sight of its founders' campaigning and social purpose, and today remains true to their principles of social inclusion and engagement: 'the preservation for the benefit of the nation of lands and tenements (including buildings) of beauty or historic interest and as re-

gards lands for the preservation (so far as practicable) of their natural aspect features and animal and plant life' – the words of the Act succinctly summarised by the Trust's strap line: 'for ever – for everyone'.

The state apparatus for the protection of the heritage in Britain also evolved over the same period (Thurley 2013). Legal and administrative mechanisms to inventorise, regulate, and protect historic buildings and monuments were deployed by the Office of Works (implementing the Ancient Monuments Act for Historic Buildings and Monuments), the Royal Commissions on the Ancient and Historical Monuments (separately of Scotland, England, and Wales), and latterly by various ministerial departments and non-departmental public bodies. Similar moves to identify and protect monuments of course also took place in many European countries during the late 19th and early 20th centuries (cf. this volume: Benetti, Santacroce, Delgado, Civantos, Karl, Möller, Rizner for summaries of developments respectively in Italy, Spain, Austria, Germany and Croatia).

In Britain therefore, there has always been a twin-track approach to heritage protection and preservation. The socially inclusive objectives established by the reforming Founders of the National Trust – which remain at the heart of its operations today – and the legal and administrative measures and instruments developed and implemented by government and its various agencies.

A similar twin track approach to heritage occurred in the United States of America. The 1906 Antiquities Act is the foundation of the legal preservation and protection of America's archaeological sites and codified state control over archaeological resources (Sonderland 2012, p. 38). Alongside this, USA National Park Organic Act (1916) established a governmental agency to manage and conserve the nation's scenery, wildlife and natural environment for the public and for posterity. This echoed Britain's National Trust Act and was as much about setting out philosophical objectives as about the actual management of the (heritage) resource (Sonderland 2012, p. 38). Implementation of the National Park Act today has extended well beyond the care of individual places to include many other initiatives which combine to deliver wide-ranging educational and recreational outputs which incorporate diverse narratives of the past and can support real social outcomes (Sonderland 2012, p. 53). From beginnings in the 19th and 20th centuries, to this day, approaches to cultural heritage in the UK and the USA at least have always comprised two main strands: inventorisation, regulation, and protection of cultural heritage on the one hand, and on the other hand the deployment of cultural heritage as a social good that supports broader social outcomes.

2. Doorways to democracy: social objectives

During the middle years of the 20th century, national heritage legislation in European countries evolved in direct response to the widespread destruction (especially of historic town centres) during the Second World War. The creation in 1945 of UNESCO signalled a collective international desire to counter the nationalist imperatives that had led to world-wide conflict in first half of the 20th century, and to build international collaboration through education, science, and culture as a means of underpinning universal respect for justice, the rule of law, and for human rights and fundamental freedoms (Hall 2011, p. 2). However, the significance of a human rights based approach to the preservation and protection of tangible cultural heritage may lie more in its conceptual and rhetorical, rather than its legal, value (O'Keefe 2013, p. 87). This humanist focus on using culture (and heritage) as a way to realise universal principles to cement and safeguard greater international unity was further emphasised by the founding principles of the Council of Europe in 1949. These specifically identified the need to safeguard and ensure access to a common (European) cultural heritage (Pickard 2002, p. 11). This concept was reinforced by the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict which stated that 'damage to cultural property belonging to any people whatsoever means damage to the cultural heritage of mankind' (UNESCO 1954).

Since this time, there has been a proliferation of international instruments (conventions, recommendations, declarations) which have been adopted with varying degrees of success by individual states, and the provisions of which have been translated to a greater or lesser extent into national legislation examples of which are set out in other papers in this volume. Generally, these all incorporate (in principle at least) the concept of a common (universal) heritage and, alongside the need for heritage protection and regulation, a consideration of the social values of heritage. Characteristically each instrument articulates the value of heritage as a common good and the need to safeguard this from destruction and/or dispersal on behalf of society, and each sets out - in their different spheres - the actions needed to safeguard those elements of heritage that are identified and selected as having particular significance.

Practical consideration of the full range of social values of heritage, however, only emerged towards the end of the 20th century when the concept that heritage conservation is an integral part of civil society began to be explored in more detail (Avrami, Mason, de la Torre 2000, p. 1). At this time, concerns about the inherent tension between the protection of individual cultural rights and the collective cultural rights of groups focussed

attention not just on the relationship between culture and human rights but also on the role of community in defining heritage. This concept of cultural rights was the philosophical cornerstone of approaches to managing culture and heritage in the aftermath of the Second World War, and although it was embedded in almost all subsequent international heritage instruments, specific measures to protect and conserve elements of heritage only emerged on the international stage some time later.

In 1972 the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO 1972) stated explicitly that 'the deterioration or disappearance at any time of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all nations' (Dingli 2006, p. 223). This concept of a universal cultural heritage was then deployed to justify the need to identify and select natural and cultural heritage sites of 'outstanding universal value' and to develop measures to share responsibility among the international community to conserve and preserve them for future generations. Although the concept of a shared global responsibility to protect universal cultural heritage is relatively simple, in practice, operationalisation by individual states is not without national and local tensions (Omland 2006, pp. 244-245). Like other instruments of the period, the World Heritage Convention actively encourages democratisation of cultural heritage at a global level but without explicitly linking protection measures to human rights. Nevertheless, the concept of World Heritage continues to evolve as practice evolves, and the latest iteration of the Operational Guidelines reflects growing concerns for example with the role of minority groups and emphasises the increasing importance of incorporating social (and political) values in the implementation of the convention (Labadi 2010, p. 67). So much so that, today, many regard the 'soft power' of the UN social and cultural programmes (including the World Heritage Convention) as the best way of delivering the global humanist objectives of peace, international cooperation, and cultural respect (Long, Labadi 2010, pp. 5-6).

In 1979 the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance – the Burra Charter (further developed and revised in 2013) adopted a more directly values-led approach to conservation and heritage management (Australia ICOMOS 2013). This grew out of the explicit need to adapt European cultural heritage instruments to a country where the understanding of significance – and therefore related heritage management practice – often used different perspectives and assumptions to those then current in Europe (Clark 2005, p. 318). The original Burra Charter adapted the principles of the Venice Charter to the Australian *locus* by focussing on place rather than individual buildings and sites. It put cultural significance at the heart of decision-making and set

out the practical steps necessary to use significance to underpin policy and management frameworks (Clark 2005). Later revisions broadened the definition of significance to include social values and multiple values, and the key principles and approaches of the Burra Charter have now gained widespread currency, and indeed have been adopted and incorporated into many subsequent cultural heritage conventions and other instruments (international and national) worldwide.

Article 2 of the 1990 ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage - the Lausanne Charter (ICOMOS 1990) calls for active participation by the general public as part of the development of wider policies for the protection of the archaeological heritage (although the Charter focuses mainly on the provision of information to the public as a component of integrated protection). Importantly, Article 6 also emphasises the need actively to seek and encourage local commitment and participation as a means of promoting the maintenance of the archaeological heritage. This imperative therefore recognised not only the role of communities in safeguarding cultural heritage, but also, and perhaps more importantly, the need to operationalise public (and community) responsibilities in this sphere by ensuring that individual members of society can feel that they are participating actively in defining the national vision rather than simply being recipients of it (Stanley 2006, p. 81).

3. Pathways to protection: expert approaches

Despite the underpinning philosophical and social objectives of most international heritage instruments during the second half of the 20th century, implementation was generally directed at the practical measures necessary to identify, protect, regulate, and manage heritage and only rarely was any meaningful practical weight given to its social purpose. Attention was therefore focussed more on technical, scientific, legal, and administrative aspects of heritage related to specific topics (e.g. archaeology, architecture, landscape) and/or specific policy areas (e.g. spatial planning, regional development etc).

The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites – the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964) provided an international framework for the conservation and restoration of buildings; in particular it stressed the need to respect the contribution of all periods in the restoration of buildings and set out the (then agreed) technical parameters for the restoration and reconstruction of buildings and monuments (Pace 2012, p. 291). In 1969, stimulated by economic growth and the development of towns and cities during the post-war period, the Eu-

ropean Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage – the London Convention (CoE 1969) placed particular emphasis on the importance of material culture recorded as a result of archaeological work.

In 1975 the European Charter of the Architectural Heritage set out the need to integrate conservation in town planning, preserve groups of historic buildings and their environment, and take the heritage into account as a part of economic and social life (CoE 1998, pp. 147-151). The subsequent Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe – the Granada Convention (CoE 1985) gave these principles greater legal force and set out the minimum arrangements needed to protect and conserve architectural heritage. The Granada Convention echoes Article 5 of the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964) by identifying some associated social values such as the need to recognise ‘the use of protected properties in the light of the needs of contemporary life’; and ‘the adaptation when appropriate of old buildings for new uses’ (Article 11). The Convention also promotes the development of ‘public awareness of the value of conserving the architectural heritage, both as an element of cultural identity’ and ‘as a source of inspiration and creativity for present and future generations’ (Article 15). However, despite such ambitious social aspirations, the Granada Convention does not identify any other values to supplement the intrinsic ‘historical’ values with which it is concerned and adopts a fundamentally criteria-led, rather than a values-led, approach.

The European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised) – the Valletta Convention (CoE 1992a) specifically reflected the changing approaches to the management of the archaeological heritage that had developed since the London Convention of 1969 (CoE 1969). The Convention established a body of new basic standards for Europe, to be met by national policies for the protection of archaeological assets as sources of scientific and documentary evidence, in line with the then emerging principles of integrated conservation and focused almost entirely on the scientific and technical values that were matters of professional concern at the time of drafting. The Valletta Convention also highlights the role that archaeology can play as an important source of Europe’s collective memory and like the Granada Convention references the need to develop public awareness and to promote public access (Article 9.i & 9.ii). The explanatory report to the convention also echoes the Lausanne Charter by recognising peoples’ need to access their past and their identity as a fundamental right but then goes on to state that this ‘can only be met by specialists – archaeologists – who can interpret the data and assist the public in gaining access to its heritage’ (CoE 1992b, p. 2). In this way, public (and community) interest in cultural heritage is seen as entirely passive and subject to expert/specialist mediation – a perspective

still current in many quarters, but that today feels increasingly out of step with modern values-based approaches to cultural heritage.

Some of the key successes of the Council of Europe in the heritage field therefore relate mainly to the preservation of sites and monuments and the development of techniques to do this as a framework to mitigate, document, protect and preserve threatened archaeological sites and historical monuments (Pace 2012, p. 281). Today, most states have – to a greater or lesser extent – a functioning legal system for the protection, conservation, and management of the cultural heritage based on intrinsic values (significance, rarity etc). Standards of work (including research) are regulated, are more or less consistent, and are generally high. There has been a real shift from data production to knowledge building – the creation of knowledge about the past (including scientific analysis and publication) has reached unprecedented levels, and the impacts of continuing advances in digital technology and communication on all aspects of archaeological and heritage work will continue to be profound.

Nevertheless, most national heritage policies (and systems) are about the *curation* of the national heritage (Stanley 2006, p. 81). Generally, despite fairly widespread articulation of the importance of social and societal values of heritage in international instruments and other policy documents (e.g. modern principles of conservation: Drury, McPherson 2008; Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter 2013; Avrami, Mason, de la Torre 2000, pp. 3-11), existing protection systems often ignore the non-intrinsic, societal, and personal values that people assign to the heritage and there is evidence that public awareness and (meaningful) interest in protecting the heritage remains consistently at a fairly low level (Schadla-Hall 2004, p. 255; McDonald 2011, pp. 780-781). There is a clear discrepancy between the high-level principles expressed in international instruments and their practical application in real-world situations.

4. Public benefit and changing values - operationalising social heritage

Since 1992, approaches to archaeological heritage management, and heritage management as a whole have continued to develop and evolve as perspectives have broadened. This is reflected by a much more integrative approach to conservation which addresses the whole of the historic environment (archaeology, buildings, and landscapes) as a single entity (Clark 2001) alongside the development of the conservation management plan process which recognises the role of local stakeholders in defining significance, and (in theory at least) incorporates the need to engage stakeholders in management decisions (Clark 2005, pp. 321-323).

At the same time, heritage practice (and management) has become increasingly integrated with other disciplines (natural environment, landscape, spatial planning, social values, tourism, education etc).

That heritage work is of direct and significant public benefit is as evident to most practitioners today as it was in the early 1990s and this has been articulated in different ways for different contexts (e.g. Clark 2006; English Heritage 2007; Little 2012, p. 403; and in the USA, the National Parks Service brochure: *25 Simple things you can do to promote the public benefits of archaeology*). Public benefit is easy to claim, but more difficult to define or demonstrate in practice. The nature of public benefit – how to define, demonstrate, and operationalise it in the context of cultural heritage – has been the subject of much discussion and debate (Little 2002; Clark 2006; Little 2012; Goskar 2012; Willems 2014). Nevertheless, public benefit is too often expressed through a process of top-down, one-way communication where information flows outwards to an audience. It remains difficult for many practitioners to demonstrate the actual and lasting public worth (and value) of what they do in a way that reaches beyond either straightforward communication or the provision of information for essentially passive public education and entertainment. The top-down approaches embodied in many international instruments and other heritage management frameworks of the second half of the 20th century, but still current today, no longer reflect the needs of a modern multi-cultural Europe (Olivier 2014, pp. 13-15; Olivier 2016b).

In the 21st century, growing awareness of the hitherto undreamed of scale and extent of the heritage resource coupled with ever-increasing pressures on that resource, has led to some questioning of existing orthodoxies and approaches (Carman 1996, pp. 7-8; Holtorf 2005, pp. 130-149; Pace 2012, pp. 277-278; Willems 2014). Loss of knowledge resulting from both natural processes and man-made interventions is inevitable and it is impracticable (impossible) to investigate and analyse everything that is at risk. Today there is a growing, but by no means universal, acceptance that not all elements of heritage have the same value and significance (even in strictly academic terms); that not everything can (or should) be protected or conserved (there's simply too much); and that not everything can (or should) be recorded/excavated (there's are insufficient resources).

In an increasingly global, but paradoxically more diverse and multi-cultural society, how much and whose heritage can and should be conserved? With increasing constraints on resources and funding how can we identify what is most valued, what is significant, and what is important (and to whom)? How much heritage capital should be tied up in conservation and protection per se – do we truly understand the relationship between what we value and how we transform it through the heritage processes? What

are the roles of government, the private sector, voluntary bodies, communities, and owners – who should be responsible for (paying for and) protecting and conserving heritage? To what extent do we recognise and understand how society at large values heritage and how do we incorporate other perceptions into professional belief systems? What is the appropriate balance between the role of the heritage professional as ‘expert’ defining heritage values for other people to consume, and as ‘facilitator’ enabling other people’s perceptions of heritage values? In an increasingly dynamic socio-political context, what is the appropriate balance between legislation, regulation, and other mechanisms for protecting and conserving heritage?

All these questions require flexible, pragmatic, and open approaches to the choices that have to be made by those responsible for implementing systems for heritage protection and management (Schutt *et al.* 2015, pp. 16-23; Degraeve 2017). Growing awareness of the necessity for such choices has resulted in a subtle shift away from preservation and mitigation as the primary driver for heritage management to a more proactive approach based on a better articulation of all the different values at play – and an understanding of how different values may be vulnerable to harm and loss in different ways.

Today there is a growing acceptance that in addition to reliance on scientific and evidential heritage values derived from specialist and expert knowledge, there needs to be a greater focus on broader and more inclusive concepts of public value that better articulate the dynamic relationship between desired professional heritage outcomes and public expectations expressed by the social and cultural values of different communities (Lowenthal 2000; Clark 2001 and 2005; Clark, Drury 2001; Accenture 2006; Accenture, National Trust 2006). This requires heritage managers to move away from technical aspects of heritage management and conservation to being able to draw out ‘local skills, knowledge and experience of place rather than dictating what is of cultural significance’ (Lammy 2006, p. 69). Heritage managers must integrate into their work a direct, meaningful, two-way engagement between heritage professionals and public communities at all levels of activity so that public value and public benefit are firmly grounded in a realistic understanding of public attitudes and needs (cf. Lowenthal 2000, pp. 22-23).

5. Shifting sands: social cohesion and integration, diversity and complexity

The Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994) set out the principle that authenticity of a site is rooted in specific social-cultural contexts and values and that these values can be drawn from a variety

of diverse information sources including in addition to intrinsic historical and architectural sources (e.g. form, design, materials, function) a whole range of other factors (e.g. local traditions, location, setting, spirit, and feeling). Most importantly, using this definition, authenticity is regarded as a relative criterion that can change from one culture to another, with the consequence that conservation practice also needs to reflect the cultural values of particular societies. This whole approach builds on the foundations of the Burra Charter and represents a conscious development away from using Eurocentric criteria to assess the state of conservation of sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List. That it took 11 years for the Nara principles to be incorporated into the operational guidelines of the World Heritage Convention suggests that there may have been some resistance in some states to adopting this more flexible, inclusive, and dynamic approach to conservation.

The Helsinki Declaration of 1996 set out a series of principles as common reference points for heritage policies throughout Europe (CoE 2002, pp. 43-49). These identified access to and enjoyment of cultural heritage in its widest sense as factors vital to personal and collective fulfilment (quality of life); to knowledge and understanding of the values inherent in heritage; and for economic potential (for economic regeneration and rural development). The declaration emphasised the positive contribution of cultural heritage to sustainable development and the need for sustainable strategies for cultural tourism and cross sectoral conservation strategies; it also acknowledged the responsibilities of state and public authorities for the protection of cultural heritage, and the need for better promotion of the role of voluntary organisations. This was a significant shift from a conservation-oriented scientific and technological approach to one that explored ways in which culture and heritage could be meaningful and beneficial for the fundamental values of European unification and social progress (Thérond 2009, pp. 9-12). The resulting cross-disciplinary approach would protect cultural diversity by asserting every person's right of access to the cultural heritage of his or her choice (while respecting the rights and freedoms of others), and had the ultimate objective of promoting the concept of a common European heritage.

By the turn of the century, therefore, there was a much greater acceptance that cultural heritage was a key component in forming the multiple identities that shape Europe. This was sign-posted in 2000 by the Council of Europe's Declaration on Cultural Diversity (CoE 2002, pp. 19-21) which identified the richness of European cultural heritage as a product of the history of intercultural exchange, and assigned cultural diversity as a function of cultural mixing. This perspective, coupled with the re-emergence of armed conflict in parts of Europe, stimulated

consideration of the relationship between citizenship, cultural identity, human rights, and core values (Stradling 2009). In particular, how intercultural dialogue could support the broader view of the common heritage of 'values' inherent in the founding principles of the Council of Europe and help to reconcile potential tensions between 'private' interests in heritage and the need to protect and provide access to knowledge and culture to all. This led in turn to a much greater interest in how heritage could support social cohesion by developing new ways to share responsibility for heritage between all the different elements of civil society including those with little or no interest in traditional and technical aspects of heritage (Weber 2001, pp. 5-6).

The Council of Europe then embarked upon a sustained process of change, that promoted not just the principles of integrated heritage conservation and management, but which focused as well on the social and cultural aspects of heritage (Pickard 2002) and the cultural aspects of diversity and citizenship in both national and transnational contexts (Robins 2006). These approaches are reflected to some extent in the European Landscape Convention – the Florence Convention (CoE 2000) but are more particularly embodied in the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society – the Faro Convention (CoE 2005).

The Florence Convention reflects a significant shift from regulation to participation. It emphasises the concept that landscape is an issue that affects the whole population, that its care requires collaboration between individuals and organisations, and that official landscape activities (including policy development and decision-making) should include the participation of civil society (Article 5). A core objective of the convention is to establish procedures for participation by the general public, local, and regional authorities, and other parties, in landscape policy definition and implementation. The convention also focuses on awareness raising (Article 6A) and training and education (Article 6B). A key aspiration of the Florence Convention is to help people identify with the areas and towns where they live and work by giving them a more active role in decision-making. It intends that people should develop greater awareness of their surroundings by exercising greater political influence on those surroundings and that this will reinforce local and regional identity and distinctiveness. The Florence Convention attempts to address how (landscape) heritage can help underpin social identity, but despite much useful work (Conrad *et al.* 2011), building public participation in the way the convention anticipates is still in its formative stages (Goodchild 2007). There remain significant challenges to overcome (Jones, Stenseke 2011, pp. 295-310) before national, regional, and local administrations embed meaningful participation in their standard administrative practice (Olivier 2016a).

The Faro Convention reiterates the positive social ambitions of earlier instruments (above) but goes much further; it fleshes out the aspirations of the Lausanne Charter (in a wider cultural heritage context) by putting people and human values at the centre of an enlarged and cross-disciplinary concept of cultural heritage (Article 1b). It takes an essentially inclusive approach that presents heritage as a resource for human development, the enhancement of cultural diversity, and the promotion of intercultural dialogue. The principle of access to cultural heritage as a fundamental human right provides a theoretically powerful link between heritage practice and social cohesion (as a form of public benefit). This has far reaching implications for heritage management in the wider global context of human rights and democracy although the concept that everyone has a personal right to benefit from, and contribute to, his or her cultural heritage, whilst respecting the cultural heritage of others (Article 4) is not without its challenges. The Faro Convention, like the Florence Convention specifically supports public participation in cultural heritage activities and decision-making (Article 5) and also provides for the development of legal, financial, and professional frameworks for joint actions by public authorities, experts, owners, investors, businesses, non-governmental organisations and civil society and for voluntary initiatives which complement the role of public authorities (Article 12). It moves a long way away from the intrinsic and scientific-led values of the Granada and Valletta conventions and incorporates a broader, self-defining concept of cultural heritage that includes perception of values in a social context (e.g. contribution to quality of life).

The Florence and Faro Conventions together represent a consistent attempt by the Council of Europe to develop formal mechanisms that use cultural heritage as a positive force to enable social cohesion in societies that are intrinsically characterised by ethnic and cultural diversity. Although in some circumstances ethnic and cultural diversity can undermine social cohesion the issue may be less that diversity *per se* poses a threat to social cohesion, but rather how the people who comprise different groups and communities can be motivated to respond to diversity positively either by assimilation of common historical and cultural traditions or by developing mechanisms to sustain multicultural communities. This inclusive approach of the Council of Europe is very much a product of 21st-century sensitivities but comes with inherent tensions especially when the different (and constantly evolving) values of different heritage communities may not coincide – and may even conflict with one another (Stanley 2006, p. 32). The multiple values associated with different aspects of social and ethnic identity, or between different groups having different intellectual and/or economic interests, make such a people-oriented approach very difficult either to instrumentalise through international ad-

ministrative frameworks or to operationalise through national legislation in any practical sense. Positive solutions to these problems require flexible, open approaches based on deep and respectful understanding of different social and cultural values (Stradling, Rowe 2009, pp. 211-213).

Both the Florence and Faro conventions illustrate how 'cultural heritage' was redefined as part of the project to establish a common European identity which incorporated the concept of 'human rights' into the Council of Europe's heritage work. This recasting of heritage reflects the view that in an increasingly global society (characterised by the globalisation of economy, information, communications, and culture) national differentiation is becoming obsolete and giving way to national interdependence (Karnoouh 2001, p. 32) although countermanding pressures can also be identified (above). This redefinition explicitly socialises heritage as a dynamic construct that incorporates social values and experiences that reflect local as well as national and international perspectives and it signifies an important political step that shifts practice away from traditional concerns of designation and protection.

The perspective of cultural heritage as a shared and universal resource (as exemplified by the World Heritage Convention, the Florence Convention, and the Faro Convention) is, however, somewhat contradictory to the concept of defining identity (whether on global, international, or national stages) on the basis of cultural differences and diversity. Furthermore, the very concept of 'human rights' is a decidedly western product and the international i.e. universal status of human rights should not necessarily be taken for granted (Wagner 2001, p. 14; Lilley, Williams 2005, p. 228). There is a long history of states deploying the World Heritage Convention to advance their own national cultural, social, and environmental credentials (Long, Labadi 2010, p. 6). Any attempts to codify the world view of governments and NGOs in 21st century heritage instruments could therefore be considered as a conscious way for states to overcome this contradiction but in a way that bears little relation to the real world where 'nationalist' perspectives of one sort or another continue to grow and cause problems on the international stage (Karnoouh 2001, pp. 18-19).

In particular, in emergent nations keen to protect elements of cultural heritage that bolster national identity, the long-standing (if rather simplistic) positive link between *identity* and *cultural heritage* is easily eroded by the use of traditionally oriented cultural protection laws (Prott, Redmond-Cooper, Urice 2013). In a world where technology and travel are forcing the exchange and transformation of cultural ideas and values in local and global contexts, the inherent social tensions resulting either from selecting and retaining specific elements of cultural heritage for protection or ignoring, discarding, and even suppressing some elements of cultural her-

itage for political motives can too easily transform a seemingly positive social force into a negative one. Using heritage to define identity (or different identities) may ultimately be counter-productive and possibly futile.

Other tensions may also result from the differences between First and Third World approaches to heritage and the different impacts of poverty on concepts of identity and nationhood. In the Third World, westernised concepts of heritage are generally the preserve of the social elite and may be of little relevance to ordinary people who will explain heritage features with reference to folklore and legend rather than to specific (and scientific) narratives (Chakrabarti 2012). All this emphasises the importance of adopting well-considered values-based approaches in trying to mediate such tensions. Numerous case studies demonstrate that such tensions can be overcome, and that the inclusive approaches of the Florence and Faro Conventions can and do work in practice in specific circumstances (CoE 2009, pp. 141-196; Little 2002; Merriman 2004; Skeates *et al.* 2012) but widespread implementation may require the different actors to focus less on cultural or material identity and more on the expression of sense of place. It is after all a sense of place which helps to define how people feel about their relationship with the physical world and which can bridge the gap between people and heritage. In this way, understanding the social and physical relationships between people and the places they occupy may be the critical factor in giving practical meaning to the social concepts of the Faro Convention.

The deliberate attempt by UNESCO to shift away from a Eurocentric approach to cultural heritage by establishing mechanisms to recognise, protect, and promote the diversity of the world's cultures is also reflected in the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003), which adopts from the outset a more inclusive, reflexive, and collaborative approach to heritage in which heritage depends on the different subjective values of different communities. Nevertheless, this convention too is deployed by states advancing their own cultural agenda – and is subject to similar tensions to those described above (e.g. Askew 2010) with the bottom-up approach to heritage espoused by the convention actually contradicted both by its top-down standard-setting approach typical of all such instruments, and the process of validation that is controlled by national administrations (Bortolotto 2010, p. 98).

6. Convergence and divergence

Despite all these long-standing moves to socialise heritage, until recently the European Union has taken a fairly traditional expert-led ap-

proach to cultural heritage in the context of specific treaty obligations. The Treaty of Lisbon includes provisions to 'safeguard' and 'enhance' cultural heritage' (European Union 2007a), and Article 167.2 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union specifies the need to improve 'the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples and in conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance' (European Union 2012). Article 167.4, however, also identifies the need to respect and promote national and regional cultural heritage diversity as a key factor that contributes to and helps to define a common European heritage. This is reinforced by the European Agenda for Culture (European Union 2007b) which recognised cultural heritage not just as a source of knowledge and identity, but as a 'valuable resource for economic growth, employment and social cohesion' that is also a 'driver for cultural and creative industries' (European Union 2007b, p. 2). This firmly positioned cultural heritage as a shared resource and a 'common good' (cf. Carman 2005, p. 81) and identified in particular the need to improve the evidence base for the analysis of the economic and social impact of cultural heritage. The Agenda recognised the impacts of decreasing public budgets on traditional cultural activities, and emphasised the need to adapt management and practice to involve a broader range of stakeholders through a more integrated and outward facing approach to heritage activities as a focus for participative community interaction and social integration.

The Agenda for Culture established heritage as a priority in the European Union's work plans for culture, and led to an increase in political interest in cultural heritage in the corridors of the European Union. The Namur Declaration of the 6th Conference of Ministers Responsible for Cultural Heritage (CoE 2015), reaffirmed the importance of cultural heritage as a key component in European identity and emphasised the different social values of the cultural heritage. The declaration focused on the need to understand the economic and social impacts of cultural heritage on society including its contribution to quality of life and prosperity (based on the expression of identities and cultural diversity) and also promoted public participation in heritage governance.

This focus was reinforced recently by the European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century (CoE 2017) which extends the inclusive approach to cultural heritage by involving local, regional, national, and European public authorities and also a wide range of stakeholders including professionals, NGOs, the voluntary sector, and civil society. Strategy 21 coalesces around the interaction between three main themes: social; economic and territorial development; and knowledge and education. It identifies the major challenges that these present, and goes

on to make a number of concrete recommendations that take the form of guidance to address these challenges complemented by examples of best practice from all over Europe. The avowed purpose of Strategy 21 is to create synergies between existing instruments, tools, and policies and to improve or complement them on the basis of international and European legal instruments that are in force. Strategy 21 recognises the scale of the challenge of managing cultural heritage with full regard for the principles of democracy and human rights. It repositions cultural heritage policies at the heart of an integrated approach that focuses on the conservation, protection, and promotion of heritage as a shared responsibility 'by society as a whole' (CoE 2017, p. 6) and in this way attempts to bridge the gap between the often unfulfilled societal objectives of relevant international instruments and day-to-day practice. Nevertheless, like other instruments, Strategy 21 remains fairly high-level and still places considerable emphasis on (one-way) 'promotion' of heritage; it does, however, include many useful case studies and examples of good practice, and the proposed (exemplar) actions do focus on responding to public values in a two-way dialogue.

Following publication of Strategy 21, 2018 was celebrated by the European Union as the European Year for Cultural Heritage and this provided a vehicle to showcase in many different national and social contexts the social, economic, cultural, and environmental power and impact of cultural heritage and encourage more people to discover and engage with Europe's cultural heritage, and to reinforce a sense of belonging to a common European space (European Union 2018a). This culminated in the publication of the European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage (European Union 2018b) as a means of ensuring that the momentum created by Strategy 21, and the European Year of Cultural Heritage was not lost. This framework complements the European Union Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022 (European Union 2018c) and both initiatives include important strands related to the contribution of culture and heritage to social cohesion, intercultural dialogue, dialogue with stakeholders, and the need to mobilise stakeholders from civil society to engage with cultural heritage. These social drivers are also exemplified by the Berlin Call to Action (Europa Nostra 2018) which underscores the need for the full involvement and engagement of all relevant public and private stakeholders, including civil society in the development of cultural agenda and policies.

On the world stage, the World Bank's new Environmental and Social Framework (World Bank 2016) sets out the Bank's aspirations for environmental and social sustainability, and includes environmental and social standards for (amongst others) assessment and management of environmental and social risks and impacts, indigenous peoples and tradition-

al local communities; cultural heritage; and stakeholder engagement. These take an integrated and inclusive view of culture and heritage and how these are positioned in societies and communities and recognise that cultural heritage provides continuity in tangible and intangible forms between the past, present, and future. Considerable weight is also given not just to the need to protect cultural heritage from adverse impacts, but also to its role in forming people's cultural identity and the need both to promote meaningful bottom-up consultation with stakeholders regarding cultural heritage and to safeguard its social values. UNESCO of course has long affirmed the important and ubiquitous role of heritage in society. However, whilst development agencies such as the World Bank now incorporate bottom-up programmes of community development and resources management in their activities, there is no genuinely bottom-up identification process in the World Heritage listing procedures; these generally ignore meaningful consideration of the heritage values of local communities (Askew 2010, p. 38).

All these various initiatives combine to give considerable weight (and momentum) to a range of actions that are intended not only to reinforce the positive and cohesive power of cultural heritage, but also to contribute to the delivery of the inclusive values and social cohesion envisaged by the authors of the international instruments discussed above. Nevertheless, despite these important signposts (and many significant achievements), the road ahead remains fraught with potential difficulties. In particular, at the same time that these socially positivist approaches were being formulated, the very significant (and continuing) increase in the flow of economic and political migrants into Europe has thrown our understanding (or lack of understanding) of cultural identity and cultural relationships (in an inter-connected, transnational world) into stark relief. This process is fundamentally recasting the cultural heritage landscape of Europe - including the displacement of the concept of 'community' by other transnational 'social networks and connections' which present some significant political, economic, social, and cultural challenges to the nation state (Robins 2006, pp. 23-29). These developments make the well-intentioned provisions of existing international cultural heritage instruments feel less relevant today than when they were formulated and international and European institutions and (I)NGOs are now struggling to accommodate into their policy and cultural heritage narratives the new perspectives necessitated by this situation. The heritage community must recognise this challenge, and recognise and adapt to the existence of competing cultural heritage frameworks. Rather than looking back for solutions at instruments that were designed in other contexts and which may no longer be adequate to meet today's social imperatives we need to look forward

and develop new ways of thinking and working that respect and support the new national, culture and heritage paradigms.

At the same time, thinking about the very nature and role of culture and heritage in contemporary society is also changing (Sacco 2011). Pierluigi Sacco has identified three main cultural paradigms: Culture 1.0 (pre-industrial) characterised by patronage where culture is a mainly highbrow spiritual activity dominated by expert gatekeepers; Culture 2.0 (industrial) driven by social innovation and technology where culture is commodified for entertainment and profit; and Culture 3.0 (digital networked age) characterised by collective open communities of practice where culture is about collective sense-making and co-creation where the distinction between producers and users is blurred (Sacco 2011, p. 5). Evolution from one paradigm to another is not strictly linear in a chronological sense, and today, all three paradigms can co-exist in different spheres so that, for example, whilst much 21st century cultural practice may coalesce around networking and co-creation, cultural public policy may still be firmly rooted in the expert-dominated Culture 1.0 paradigm (Sacco 2011, p. 6). These cultural paradigms are easily translated into the heritage world: Heritage 1.0 focussed on conservation where preservation is the priority and heritage is consumed by connoisseurs; Heritage 2.0: heritage as entertainment where attracting people to heritage and making a profit is the priority and heritage is consumed by customers; and Heritage 3.0 where heritage is about community and sense making – heritage is made, preserved and enjoyed by the whole community and everyone is involved in the production, circulation, and conservation of heritage.

Within Sacco's general framework, it is clear that the importance of the key elements of the Culture 3.0 and Heritage 3.0 paradigms have long been recognised by the international instruments discussed here, and indeed have long been translated into over-arching policy objectives. However, it is equally clear that it is only in recent years that serious and realistic steps have been taken to turn these aspirations into a meaningful reality, and that despite advances in this sphere, there remain some very serious challenges and obstacles that must be overcome before the heritage world (and wider society) can truly benefit from embracing the ideas inherent in the Heritage 3.0 paradigm.

7. Discussion: changing social expectations

In many parts of the world, the gradual incorporation of new social values into the heritage discourse, is accompanied by an increasing trend towards deregulation coupled with devolution of decision-making to more

local communities. This, combined with reduced capacity in heritage management resulting from the need for financial savings, is reducing the level of conservation and protection available for heritage assets. The challenge today is to explore how heritage management can be combined with effective community and public engagement, in a new matrix that will deliver increased public benefit at the same time as supporting integrated value-led conservation. This requires an evolutionary step-change in heritage practice and management that is able to incorporate alternative public perspectives into 'professional' discourses. This in turn demands a two-way traffic between heritage experts and the public that moves beyond defining the ways in which heritage contributes to society (Little 2012, p. 403) to acquiring a much better understanding of what society wants from its heritage and its heritage practitioners as an essential foundation to building genuine public engagement (c.f. repeated clarion calls for action: Merriman 1989, p. 23; Schadla-Hall 1999, p. 151; Ascherson 2000, p. 4; Schadla-Hall 2004, p. 255; Agendakulturarv 2004; Olivier 2016a and 2016b).

Demonstrating public benefit means more than simply justifying 'scientific' and 'academic' outputs, showing a return (intellectual or fiscal) on investment in heritage works, or sharing results with the public – none of these will ensure lasting public benefit. Delivering true public benefit means taking the natural product of heritage work (knowledge for research) and *transforming* the results into something that is interesting, meaningful, relevant, and above all *useful* to communities and to the public in the context of their daily lives. It means taking public values into account and including public values in decision-making (participation).

Almost all the international instruments described here have in different ways adopted and incorporated at a high level strong 'public' and 'social' values by espousing and promoting social cohesion and public engagement and participation in heritage. However, the driver for this may be overtly political – using a revised concept of heritage to promulgate for example a vision of a shared, democratic, and participatory European heritage that underpins (and justifies?) the political construct of the European Union itself.

Despite their explicit and embedded socio-political aspirations, the evolution of international heritage instruments displays a significant shift from regulation to participation, and from exclusion to inclusion. All recognise the importance of building public awareness of, and engagement with cultural heritage, and more recent instruments make provision for public participation in heritage related activities including in decision-making. There are many examples of good and successful practice in these areas, but success in developing specific mechanisms to turn these aspirations into practice is limited.

There is an inherent tension in all these heritage instruments between the principal that the heritage is a source of collective memory common to all human society (an essentially inclusive concept) and the need to protect that heritage through regulation (an essentially exclusive process). This makes it difficult to reconcile the open, and inclusive engagement with the public about what is significant (or not) on the one hand, with the by and large exclusive, expert-driven process of protection and regulation on the other. This tension runs subliminally through almost all aspects of heritage management today. The momentum of public and community archaeology is growing, but these tensions have yet to be fully resolved because of a reluctance in some quarters to recognize and include the public in heritage discourse (e.g. discussions in Moshenska 2017). Existing approaches to building public awareness are often top-down and take little account of the opinions and desires of other communities with an interest in their heritage and the exclusive nature of the heritage 'expert' role continues to hold sway in many states. Even where the principles of inclusion and participation have been clearly articulated as in the European Charter on Participatory Democracy in Spatial Planning Processes (European Council of Spatial Planners 2016), and the Report on Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage (European Union 2018d) they remain difficult to embed in decision-making.

International instruments do not usually furnish specific and detailed mechanisms that can directly implement policy as practice. In practice each state implements the principles and policies within the constraints of their own administrative and legal context. The real challenge is how to build mutually advantageous partnerships between heritage practitioners and local communities that will reposition heritage in the public mind as an essential component of quality of life. Where this already happens the benefits are obvious and tangible, but success requires heritage professionals to relinquish their ownership of the past in favour of a broader and genuinely inclusive public ownership that takes proper account of public attitudes and values.

8. Conclusion – new paradigms

The social dimension of heritage has long been acknowledged in international instruments, but limited attention has been paid to how these aspirations can be operationalised and the implementation of these instruments remains rooted in traditional processes and 'expert' approaches to selection and protection. International instruments (to a greater extent) and national heritage regulations (to a lesser extent) provide a more

or less sympathetic framework for interweaving so-called professional (expert) and community (social)'values' into coherent practice. A shift to a much more inclusive social paradigm is required if we are to realise and reap the benefits of the social values of heritage in the context of the global socio-political-economic realities of the 21st century.

Heritage professionals need to be open-minded about how the public (and different communities) value the past, and about their own roles in mediating these values with public communities. In the 21st century world of digital social networks the opinions of experts have been replaced by the aggregated opinion of tens of thousands of consumers. Heritage practitioners at large need to be more respectful of public opinion (and 'public research'), if heritage is to be a successful vehicle that delivers social cohesion. If passive (but extensive) public interest in heritage is to be mobilised into widespread and active engagement, we will need to tap into the 21st century zeitgeist by recognising the role of the public in *defining* cultural heritage (e.g the Know Your Place initiative: <http://www.kypwest.org.uk/>).

The challenge today is to continue to explore and understand the social dimension of heritage in all its multifaceted complexity, and to deploy this understanding in the service of society at large so that the instruments that we already have can attain their true potential. Our heritage forebears – including in the UK the founders of the National Trust (alongside their like-minded contemporaries in other states) – knew only too well how to engage directly with public opinion in the service of high-minded social ideals to deliver actual social benefit. During the second half of the 20th century, the same understanding was, and continues to be deployed by our environmental *confrères* to deliver real social change and social benefit on behalf of the conservation 'movement'. If the cultural heritage community is to achieve similar outcomes, it must paradoxically relearn some of the lessons of the past by confronting and overcoming its general reluctance to engage meaningfully with public concerns of, and interest in, heritage. If society at large is to realise the full social and public benefit of heritage (as envisaged by the authors of so many international instruments and conventions), then we must break down the walls of the intellectual ghetto that we have (almost accidentally) created over the past 70 years by acknowledging the role of the public in creating our collective past and working jointly with the public to care for our cultural heritage in a more sustainable and meaningful way.

References

- ACCENTURE 2006, *Capturing the public value of heritage: looking beyond the numbers*, in CLARK 2006, pp. 19-22.
- ACCENTURE & NATIONAL TRUST 2006, *Demonstrating the Public Value of Heritage*, London.
- AGENDAKULTURARV 2004, *Putting People First: Operation Heritage Policy Statement*, http://agendakulturav.raa.se/opencms/export/agendakulturav/sidor/in_english/in_english.html
- N. ASCHERSON 2000, *Editorial*, "Public Archaeology", 1(1), pp. 1-4.
- M. ASKEW 2010, *The magic list of global status: UNESCO, World Heritage and the agendas of states*, in LABADI, LONG 2010, pp. 19-44.
- E. AVRAMI, R. MASON, M. DE LA TORRE (eds) 2000, *Values and Heritage Conservation*, Los Angeles.
- AUSTRALIA ICOMOS 2013, *The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance 2013*, Australia.
- C. BORTOLOTTO 2010, *Globlising intangible cultural heritage: between international arenas and local appropriations*, in LABADI, LONG 2010, pp. 97-114.
- J. CARMAN 1996, *Valuing Ancient Things: Archaeology and Law*, Leicester.
- J. CARMAN 2005, *Against Cultural Property*, Bath.
- D.K. CHAKRABARTI 2012, *Archaeology and politics in the Third World, with special reference to India*, in SKEATES, McDAVID, CARMAN 2012, pp. 116-132.
- K. CLARK 2001, *From regulation to participation: cultural heritage, sustainable development and citizenship*, in WEBER 2001, pp. 103-112.
- K. CLARK 2005, *The bigger picture: archaeology and values in long-term cultural resource management*, in MATHERS, DARVILL, LITTLE 2005, pp. 317-330.
- K. CLARK 2006, *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage*, Proceedings of the Conference (London, 25-26 January 2006), London.
- K. CLARK, P. DRURY 2001, *From monuments to people, the functions of the cultural heritage in a changing Europe*, in WEBER 2001, pp. 113-117.
- H. CLEERE 1993, *Managing the archaeological heritage*, "Antiquity", 67, pp. 400-402.
- E. CONRAD, L. CASSAR, M. JONES, S. EITER, Z. IZAOVIČOVÁ, Z. BARANKOVÁ, M. CHRISTIE, I. FAZEY 2011, *Rhetoric and reporting of public participation in landscape policy*, "Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning", 13(1), pp. 23-47.
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 1969, *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage*, European Treaty Series 66, Strasbourg, <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/066.htm>
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 1985, *Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe*, European Treaty Series 121, Strasbourg, <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/121.htm>
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 1992a, *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised)*, European Treaty Series 143, Strasbourg, <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/143.htm>
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 1992b, *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised), Explanatory Report*, Strasbourg, <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Reports/Html/143.htm>
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 1998, *Compendium of basic texts of the Council of Europe in the field of cultural heritage*, Strasbourg, CC-PAT (98) 65 Inf.
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 2000, *European Landscape Convention*, European Treaty Series 176, Strasbourg, <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 2002, *European Cultural Heritage (Volume 1) Intergovernmental co-operation: collected texts*, Strasbourg.
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 2005, *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, European Treaty Series 199, Strasbourg, <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/199.htm>
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 2009, *Heritage and Beyond*, Strasbourg, http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/PatrimoineBD_en.pdf

- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 2015, *The Namur Declaration adopted at the sixth ministerial conferences of Ministers responsible for Cultural Heritage Namur 23-4 April 2015*, <https://rm.coe.int/16806a89ae>
- CoE (COUNCIL OF EUROPE) 2017, *European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century*, <https://rm.coe.int/european-heritage-strategy-for-the-21st-century-strategy-21-full-text/16808ae270>
- A. DEGRAEVE (ed) 2017, *Dare to Choose: Making Choices in Archaeological Heritage Management*, Proceedings of the International Conference (Athens, 9-11 March 2017), Namur.
- S.M. DINGLI 2006, *Responsibility towards the heritage on mankind*, in SCARRE, SCARRE 2006, pp. 219-41.
- P. DRURY, A. MCPHERSON 2008, *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*, London.
- ENGLISH HERITAGE 2007, *Valuing Our Heritage: the Case for Future Investment in the Historic Environment*, London.
- EUROPA NOSTRA 2018, *The Berlin Call to Action: Cultural Heritage for the Future of Europe*, <http://www.europanostra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Berlin-Call-Action-Eng.pdf>.
- EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF SPATIAL PLANNERS (ETCP-CEU) 2016, *European Charter on Participatory Democracy in Spatial Planning Processes*, Brussels.
- EUROPEAN UNION 2007a, *Treaty of Lisbon: amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty Establishing the European Community*, "Official Journal of the European Union", 2007/C 306/1.
- EUROPEAN UNION 2007b, *Resolution of the Council of 16 November 2007 on a European Agenda for Culture*, "Official Journal of the European Union", 2007/C 287/01.
- EUROPEAN UNION 2012, *Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union*, "Official Journal of the European Union", 2012/C 346/47.
- EUROPEAN UNION 2018a, *The European Year of Cultural Heritage*, Brussels, https://europa.eu/cultural-heritage/about_en
- EUROPEAN UNION 2018b, *The European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage*, Brussels, <https://ec.europa.eu/culture/sites/culture/files/library/documents/staff-working-document-european-agenda-culture-2018.pdf>
- EUROPEAN UNION 2018c, *Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022*, Brussels, <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-13948-2018-INIT/en/pdf>
- EUROPEAN UNION 2018d, *Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage*, doi:10.2766/984757, Luxembourg.
- P. GOODCHILD 2007, *The skills of training the public for participation in decision-making processes*, in *Proceedings of the fourth meeting of the Council of Europe Workshops for the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention*, "European Spatial Planning & Landscape", 83, pp. 211-217.
- T. GOSKAR 2012, *On Commercial Archaeology and Public Benefit*, <http://pastthinking.com/2012/12/06/on-commercial-archaeology-and-public-benefit> (last accessed 08.09.2015).
- M. HALL 2011, *Introduction*, in M. HALL (ed), *Towards World Heritage: International Origins of the Preservation Movement 1870-1930*, Farnham, pp. 1-19.
- C. HOLTORF 2005, *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: Archaeology as Popular Culture*, Altamira.
- ICOMOS 1964, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964)*, Paris, http://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf
- ICOMOS 1990, *Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage (The Lausanne Charter 1990)*, Paris.
- ICOMOS 1994, *The Nara document on Authenticity*, Paris.
- M. JONES, M. STENSEKE (eds) 2011, *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation*, Amsterdam.
- C. KARNOOUIH 2001, *Europe: common heritage and difference*, in WEBER 2001, pp. 29-52.

- S. LABADI 2010, *World Heritage, authenticity and post-authenticity: international and national perspectives*, in LABADI, LONG 2010, pp. 66-84.
- S. LABADI, C. LONG (eds) 2010, *Heritage and Globalisation*, Abingdon.
- D. LAMMY 2006, *Community, identity, and heritage*, in CLARK 2006, pp. 65-69.
- I. LILLEY, M. WILLIAMS 2005, *Archaeological and Indigenous significance: a view from Australia*, in MATHERS, DARVILL, LITTLE 2005, pp. 317-330.
- C. LINGDÉN 2018, *Riksantikvarieämbetets historia*, Swedish National Heritage Board, <https://www.raa.se/om-riksantikvarieambetet/riksantikvarieambetets-historia/> (retrieved 15 January 2019).
- B. LITTLE 2002, *Public Benefits of Archaeology*, Gainesville.
- B. LITTLE 2012, *Public benefits of public archaeology*, in SKEATES, McDAVID, CARMAN 2012, pp. 396-413.
- C. LONG, S. LABADI 2010, *Introduction*, in LABADI, LONG 2010, pp. 1-16.
- D. LOWENTHAL 2000, *Stewarding the past in a perplexing present*, in AVRAMI, MASON, DE LA TORRE 2000, pp. 18-25.
- C. MATHERS, T. DARVILL, B. LITTLE (eds) 2005, *Heritage of Value, Archaeology of Renown*, Gainesville.
- N. MERRIMAN 1989, *Museums and archaeology: the public view*, in E. SOUTHWORTH (ed), *Public Service or Private Indulgence?*, Conference proceedings (Lincoln, 1987), "The Museum Archaeologist", 13, pp. 10-25.
- N. MERRIMAN 2004, *Public Archaeology*, London.
- H. McDONALD 2011, *Understanding the antecedents to public interest and engagement with heritage*, "European Journal of Marketing", 45(5), pp. 780-804.
- G. MOSHENSKA (ed) 2017, *Key concepts in Public Archaeology*, London.
- G. MURPHY 2006, *Founders of the National Trust*, London.
- R. O'KEEFE 2013, *Tangible cultural heritage and international human rights law*, in PROTT, REDMOND-COOPER, URICE 2013, pp. 87-96.
- P.J. O'KEEFE, L.V. PROTT (eds) 2011, *Cultural Heritage Conventions and Other Instruments*, Buih Wells.
- A. OLIVIER 2014, *The Valletta Convention: twenty years after - a convenient time*, in VAN DER HAAS, SCHUT 2014, pp. 11-16.
- A. OLIVIER 2016a, *Challenging attitudes – Delivering public benefit*, in P. FLORJANDWICZ (ed), *The Reality of European Archaeology in the 21st Century*, Brussels, pp. 13-24.
- A. OLIVIER 2016b, *Communities of interest: challenging approaches*, "Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage", 4(1), pp. 7-20.
- A. OMLAND 2006, *The ethics of the World Heritage concept*, in SCARRE, SCARRE 2006, pp. 242-259.
- A. PACE 2012, *From heritage to stewardship: defining the sustainable care of archaeological places*, in SKEATES, McDAVID, CARMAN 2012, pp. 275-295.
- R. PICKARD 2002, *European cultural heritage (Volume II) A review of policies and practice*, Strasbourg.
- L. PROTT, R. REDMOND-COOPER, S. URICE (eds) 2013, *Realising Cultural Heritage Law. Festschrift for Patrick O'Keefe*, Buih Wells.
- K. ROBINS 2006, *The Challenge of Transcultural Diversities: Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity*, Strasbourg.
- P.L. SACCO 2011, *Culture 3.0: A New Perspective for the EU 2014-2020 Structural Funds Programming*, European Expert Network on Culture, <http://archive.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2577.pdf>
- C. SCARRE, G. SCARRE (eds) 2006, *The Ethics of Archaeology*, Cambridge.
- P.A.C. SCHUTT, D. SCHARFF, L.C. DE WIT (eds) 2015, *Setting the Agenda: Giving New Meaning to the European Archaeological Heritage*, Budapest.
- T. SCHADLA-HALL 1999, *Public archaeology*, "European Journal of Archaeology", 2, pp. 147-158.
- T. SCHADLA-HALL 2004, *The comforts of unreason*, in MERRIMAN 2004, pp. 255-271.
- R. SKEATES, C. McDAVID, J. CARMAN (eds) 2012, *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, Oxford.

- L.J. SMITH, E. WATERTON 2012, *Constrained by commonsense: the Authorized Heritage Discourse in contemporary matters*, in SKEATES, McDAVID, CARMAN 2012, pp. 153-171.
- H.A. SONDERLAND 2012, *America's cherished reserves: the enduring significance of the 1916 National Park Organic Act*, in SKEATES, McDAVID, CARMAN 2012, pp. 36-59.
- D. STANLEY 2006, *A Reflection on the Function of Culture in Building Citizenship Capacity*, Strasbourg.
- R. STRADLING 2009, *Introduction: cultural identities, shared values and citizenship*, in STRADLING, ROWE 2009, pp. 13-27.
- R. STRADLING, C. ROWE (eds) 2009, *Handbook on Values for Life in a Democracy*, Strasbourg.
- D. THÉRON 2009, *Benefits and innovations of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, in CoE 2009, pp. 9-12.
- S. THURLEY 2013, *Men from the Ministry: How Britain Saved its Heritage*, London.
- UNESCO 1954, *Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*, Paris, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13637&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- UNESCO 1972, *Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Paris, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13055&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- UNESCO 2003, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- V.M. VAN DER HAAS, P.A.C. SCHUT (eds) 2014, *The Valletta Convention: Twenty Years After – Benefits, Problems, Challenges*, Brussels.
- M. WATERSON 1999, *The National Trust: the First Hundred Years*, London (2nd ed.).
- P. WAGNER 2001, *From monuments to human rights: redefining 'heritage' in the work of the Council of Europe*, in WEBER 2001, pp. 9-27.
- R. WEBER (ed) 2001, *Forward Planning: The Function of Cultural Heritage in a Changing Europe*, Strasbourg.
- W.J.H. WILLEMS 2014, *Malta and its consequences: a mixed blessing*, in VAN DER HAAS, SCHUT 2014, pp. 151-156.
- WORLD BANK 2016, *World Bank Environmental and Social Framework*, Washington DC.