POLICIES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE

What are the likely ingredients of a successful policy for the preservation and use of either the built heritage, or the cultural heritage more generally, including settings, landscapes and gardens?

University of York

MA in Conservation Studies

Assessed Essay No.1

Candidate PGST009102842

Exam number 41083

Word count: 4554, excluding title and bibliography

December 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

POLICIES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE

What are the likely ingredients of a successful policy for the preservation and use of either the built heritage, or the cultural heritage more generally, including settings, landscapes and gardens?

1. Introduction

At the commencement of the twenty-first century, attitudes to conservation at local and even at global levels are being documented at a bewildering rate. The pre-occupations of formerly narrow-interest organisations with particular areas of specialisation are being augmented and overlaid with appreciation that conservation is an overall process. Consideration of this process, whether in relation to places of natural or cultural values is now recognised as a reflection of the well-being of humanity. However conservation philosophy (and policy that follows) has been a long-standing consideration of mankind, with legal protection of places of significance far from being a recent phenomenon. Examples are found from at least as far back as two and a half thousand years ago, where a Mesopotamian ruler threatened punishment of hanging to anyone who spoiled the Royal Road of Nineveh.[1]

Closer to current time and location, in Britain the nineteenth-century tenets of John Ruskin (1819-1900) and William Morris (1834-1896) had considerable influence with respect both to appreciation of the value of conserving traditional design, and to conservation generally. The validity of their philosophy was extremely important in a country that had been raging with a previously vigorous and perhaps uncompromising activity of 'restoration'. In 1849 Ruskin's *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* attacked contemporary standards, and his theories contributed to a radical but highly considered stream in architectural thought that was soon to be reflected in the work of many

[1] Bell 1997, pp.1-2.

important architects. Ruskin's 'The Lamp of Memory' contained many powerful concepts, not the least of which is the idea of trusteeship, with managing our heritage, as it belongs not just to us but also to those who preceded us and those who will follow us. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) adopted the *Manifesto* drafted by Morris (with the assistance of George Wardle and Philip Webb) in 1877. One of the foundation documents for the considered philosophical discussion of cultural heritage value and conservation policy, the SPAB *Manifesto* includes:

> *It is for all these buildings, therefore, of all times and styles, that we plead, and call upon those who have to deal with them, to put Protection in the place of Restoration, to stave off decay by daily care, to prop a perilous wall or mend a leaky roof by such means as are obviously meant for support or covering, and show no pretence of other art, and otherwise to resist all tampering with either the fabric or ornament of the building as it stands; ...*

In common with Ruskin, Morris's plea for 'Protection' rather than 'Restoration' was at odds with that occurring at numerous British and European sites, where old was being remanufactured in an attempt to look like new. Their philosophy soon became recognised as a sympathetic and authentic way of maintaining the values inherent in a place of cultural significance. Directly and indirectly both Morris and Ruskin had considerable influence to debate upon fundamental attitudes to conservation and to the development of appropriate philosophy, not only in Britain, but also in Europe and ultimately on a far wider stage.

With events of more recent time, over the past seventy years a series of conventions and documents has been drawn up by the international community to express conservation philosophy and to guide practice. In 1931 the first real attempt to document the common issues of conservation on an international scale came with the drafting of *The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments*. These were conclusions adopted at the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments in Athens.[2]

[2] Bell 1997, p.4 and Burman 2001, p.13 point out that the 1931 *Athens Charter* is not to be confused with the *Athens Charter* of the International Congress of Modern Architecture held in 1933, whose decisions were later edited by Le Corbusier. More detail is found at Jokilehto 1999, pp.284-5.

At the Athens Congress seven main resolutions were made. These were: 1. International organisations for restoration on operational and advisory levels are to be established; 2. Proposed restoration projects are to be subjected to knowledgeable criticism to prevent mistakes which will cause loss of character and historical values to the structures; 3. Problems of preservation of historic sites are to be solved by legislation at national level for all countries; 4. Excavated sites which are not subject to immediate restoration should be reburied for protection; 5. Modern techniques and materials may be used in restoration work; 6. Historical sites are to be given strict custodial protection; and 7. Attention should be given to the protection of areas surrounding historic sites.[3] Although the articles of the *Athens Charter* are now somewhat dated, themes were certainly carried through into later work. In 1932 the Assembly of the League of Nations agreed to communicate the recommendations of the *Athens Charter* to its member states. Next UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) continued its predecessor's role, and from the 1950s onwards passed a series of conventions designed to safeguard a wide range of cultural property. These included archaeological sites, movable works and landscapes, as well as the built environment. UNESCO conventions, as might be usual from the meeting of the governments of nations, are most deeply concerned with property of world-wide significance.

Following from the Athens precedent, the Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments met in Venice in May 1964, and approved the *Venice Charter*, an 'International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites'. This charter has been the starting point for many others that have followed, and in 1965 its recommendations led directly to the founding of ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). Since that time, ICOMOS national and specialist committees have gone on to refine and develop the basic principles of the *Venice Charter* in greater depth, sometimes producing further charters with more singular emphasis.

[3] *Athens Charter* notes at http://www.icomos.org/docs/athens_charter.html

With regard to an example from Australia and applicable on a national level, the *Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance 1999* (first drafted in 1979) is a practical non-government developed guide to good conservation activity. It is sensible for a policy document such as a charter to state immediately for whom it is intended, and the places for which its articles are intended to apply. The Burra Charter preamble records:

> *The Charter sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians;* and
>
> *The Charter can be applied to all types of places of cultural significance including natural, indigenous and historic places with cultural values.*

In England, the government-developed *Planning Policy Guidance: Planning And The Historic Environment* document PPG15, records a slightly different 'for whom' emphasis that illustrates how the purpose of a document can affect the resultant emphasis: [4]

> *This guidance is not only for local authorities, but also for other public authorities, property owners, developers, amenity bodies and all members of the public with an interest in the conservation of the historic environment.*

Prior to more detailed discussion, it may be valuable to reflect upon the terminology used in the essay question. The *Burra Charter* has useful definitions that may be considered for key words in this particular essay:

> Cultural significance *means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the* place *itself, its* fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, *records*, related places *and* related objects.[5]

The explanatory notes to the Burra Charter definitions point out that the term *cultural significance* is synonymous with heritage significance and cultural heritage value.

> Conservation *means all the processes of looking after a* place *so as to retain its* cultural significance.[6]
>
> Preservation *means maintaining the* fabric *of a* place *in its existing state and retarding deterioration.*[7]

[4] Department of the Environment, Department of National Heritage, PPG 15. September 1994. Part three of the Introduction.
[5] *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999.* Article 1.2
[6] *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999.* Article 1.4
[7] *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999.* Article 1.6

Burra Charter article 14 makes it clear that *conservation* is not a singular action, but in fact can be any of a number of defined processes:

> Conservation *may, according to circumstance, include the processes of: retention or reintroduction of a* use*; retention of* associations *and* meanings*;* maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation *and* interpretation*; and will commonly include a combination of more than one of these.*

Perhaps surprisingly to some, the explanatory notes to article 14 helpfully point out that there may be circumstances where no action at all is required to achieve *conservation*.

As James Semple Kerr clarifies in his landmark guide to the preparation of conservation plans:

> *Cultural significance is a* ***simple concept****. Its purpose is to help identify and assess the attributes which make a place of value to us and to our society. An understanding of it is therefore basic to any planning process. Once the significance of a place is understood, informed policy decisions can be made which will enable that significance to be retained, revealed or, at least, impaired as little as possible.*[8]

While *cultural significance* can be considered simple, the recent ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter points out that while *cultural significance* is a simple concept, perhaps in contrast:

> *Heritage is a* ***broad concept*** *and includes the natural as well as the cultural environment. It encompasses landscapes, historic places, sites and built environments, as well as biodiversity, collections, past and continuing cultural practices, knowledge and living experiences. It records and expresses the long processes of historic development, forming the essence of diverse national, regional, indigenous and local identities and is an integral part of modern life. It is a dynamic reference point and positive instrument for growth and change. The particular heritage and collective memory of each locality or community is irreplaceable and an important foundation for development, both now and into the future.*[9]

2. Ingredients of a Successful Policy for the Conservation of the Cultural Heritage

It is possible to summarise the 'ingredients' of a successful policy for the conservation of cultural heritage into five major and inter-related aspects as follows, the first three being principally concerned with the '*why, what and how?*'

[8] Kerr, James Semple 1996, cited in Burman, Peter, November 2000.

Ingredient 2.1 To state the factors that make cultural heritage important to society or individuals ('why conserve?')

The *Burra Charter* has a useful preamble that immediately makes clear to the reader the value of places of cultural significance, in this case of course with particular reference to Australian usage. Burra records under the heading *Why Conserve?*

> *Places of cultural significance enrich people's lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and to lived experiences. They are historical records that are important as tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural significance reflect the diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are and the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape. They are irreplaceable and precious.*
>
> *These places of cultural significance must be conserved for present and future generations.*

One would like to think that this ideal (*must be conserved*) is universally acceptable, although at a governmental level some countries do not promote conservation in any form. However even if a government is unable or unwilling to recognise the importance of cultural significance, a philosophical approach to built cultural heritage can be embraced on a local or a personal level. A conservation policy may be shown by village trade workers in their traditional approach or by a craftsman in skilled application to his work. In certain cultures principles of conservation may be inherent within the individual or society, sometimes demonstrated with ethical or religious teachings upholding moderate, sustainable living. Having considered the question 'why conserve' in the first instance, it is then appropriate to promote the positive aspects of conservation that are apparent from the answer, both in cultural and also possibly in economic and other terms. In the same way that one must seek knowledge of a place to understand its significance, this knowledge should be summarised and made clear for all to consider.

[9] ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter. 8th draft for adoption by ICOMOS at the 12th General Assembly, Mexico, October 1999.

Ingredient 2.2 To define terminology (the 'what')

The identification of values in the *Burra Charter* definition of cultural significance 'aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations', is a beautiful example of appropriate, considered and helpful terminology.[10] The addition of *spiritual* value in the 1999 revision of the *Burra Charter* reflects ongoing development of the document for local usage. This demonstrates that the terminology, the 'what', may differ according to where a policy is intended to be applied. Clear and logical language in a policy (while again promoting the positive aspects of conservation) is essential if a charter or other working document is to become widely used and accepted, rather than one that resides on the book-shelves of government and academic institutions. If documents become too wordy, or bogged down in semantics, it is unlikely that they will be used and embraced by all levels of society. Definitions found in the British Standards Institute BSI 7913:98 *Guide to the Principles of the Conservation of Historic Buildings* reflect their governmental origin, and have been adopted for usage in documents such as the 2000 *Stirling Charter* of Scotland. These BSI definitions include terms such as *Protection – the provision of legal restraints or controls ….* This type of terminology is designed to fit a statutory planning process, and obviously is not appropriate to international conservation practice.

Ingredient 2.3 To summarise agreement on the way places of cultural significance should be conserved (the 'how' - with acceptable approaches)

In capitalist societies there can be a conflict of values between exploitation of a place for monetary gain and other less quantifiable considerations such as cultural heritage value. Thus a society may elect to moderate and control the manner in which individuals or groups treat their common cultural heritage. It follows that a society may express its desire to preserve elements of cultural significance with formal policy, and this agreement may evolve with the society itself. An example of this evolution in relation to a British example is shown in attitudes to great country houses, often demolished in the period immediately following the Second World War, but now accorded greater value.

[10] *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999.* Article 1.2

When does one *Change, Maintain, Preserve, Restore, Reconstruct, Adapt, Add New Work, Interpret*, or combine all these processes? A policy can assist by immediate explanation, for example by stating '*Restoration* is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric'.[11] The 'how' in a conservation policy will deal with the need for knowledge, skills and techniques. Policy will appreciate value without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others. It will consider use (retention of use where possible, or at least a *compatible* use). Appreciation of setting, location, contents and related places must be considered. Finally, the participation of people for whom a place has value will be encouraged.

Ingredient 2.4 To set a code of practice, philosophy, and ethics for conservation

To assist those engaged in conservation, a policy should attempt to define the relative value of conservation where conflicting demands may occur. In some societies with immediate economic need, the focus of these values may be purely financial, in that cultural heritage encourages tourism and monetary return, but ideally they should try to point out a broader range of values. These could be on environmental grounds. In relation to singular materials this position is readily placed before the British public in consideration of the use of cement or lime in masonry, and timber or PVC in joinery.

Almost universally, adaptation of an existing building to a compatible use is a far more efficient use of energy and resources than demolishing it and constructing a new one. With regard to philosophy, a policy can stress the social value of preserving places of cultural significance, along with the benefits of maintaining a rich cultural heritage, local distinctiveness, and national identity. Educationally items of cultural significance can be seen as irreplaceable historical documents enhancing knowledge and understanding of the past. Preserving them allows a better understanding of the present, and informs those of the future.

[11] *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999.* Article 19

Ingredient 2.5 To offer guidelines on courses of action (management)

With regard to management, Article 6 of the Burra Charter and the flowchart at the end of the document (The Burra Charter Process) outlines a three stage process - with a sequence of investigations, decisions and actions: *Understand significance, develop policy, and manage.* The three parts of Article 6 are set out in full as follows:

> *The* cultural significance *of a* place *and other issues affecting its future are best understood by a sequence of collecting and analysing information before making decisions. Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy. (6.1)*
>
> *The policy for managing a* place *must be based on an understanding of its* cultural significance. *(6.2)*
>
> *Policy development should also include consideration of other factors affecting the future of a* place *such as the owner's needs, resources, external constraints and its physical condition. (6.3)*

In the case of the Burra Charter another excellent element of the document that can assist with its application to management is the strata of principles, processes, and practices. Articles in the Conservation Principles section are often further developed in the Conservation Processes and Conservation Practice sections.

As conservationists, we may frequently attempt to clarify the fact that it is important to understand that conserving *places of cultural significance* is an ongoing responsibility, which simply should be integrated with their broader management. And so our own responsibility is to ensure developed conservation strategies are implemented in a management plan.

3. Principles of Good Charters

The common principles of good charters will include minimum intervention in the fabric, reversible intervention, and interpretation to assist in differentiating phases of work (newer from older). Charters are a guide to good practice, but as will be outlined further, need to be reviewed regularly to reflect developing standards of knowledge and practice.

Principle 3.1 Minimum intervention in the fabric

As has been discussed in the introduction, during the nineteenth-century there was great debate about the value of contemporary taste as against that of authenticity in restoration. We recall that the 'Restorers' took the view that an aesthetic and structural consistency was important, a complete even if deceptive whole above all, and they maintained that every place should be reconstructed, re-created or completed in the predominant style. 'Restorers' considered that the value of the new appearance was well worth the distortion and eradication of the visual, emotional, aesthetic, and historical evidence that ageing had produced. The other 'conservative' side had an opposing view (as expounded by Ruskin and others) that the genuine, no matter how battered, original was worth far more than even the most perfect imitation. We now appreciate and understand the value of authenticity in conservation, and the concept of minimum intervention is an accepted principle of a good charter. The *Burra Charter* advocates this very cautious approach to change, with the concept of doing 'as much as necessary to care for the place and to make it useable, but otherwise change it as little as possible so that its cultural significance is retained'.[12] The acronym AMANBALAP is a useful reminder for the basis of this approach. This ideal had been put forward as early as 1873, when a correspondent to *The Builder* wrote 'perhaps the best, and simplest counsel to offer those engaged in a restoration was … to do as little as possible.'[13] The subject of authenticity is still debated at length, and in some cultures there is a concern about processes (which often have a long historical precedent) of regularly replacing fabric of a place.[14]

[12] *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999*. Preamble.
[13] Edmund Sharpe, 'Against restoration', *The Builder*, 23 August 1873, p.672; cited in Bell, 1997, p.3.
[14] One of the documents that approaches this issue is *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, which was produced following an ICOMOS conference held in 1994 at Nara, Japan.

Principle 3.2 Reversible intervention

In accordance with currently accepted conservation philosophy, if alteration is unavoidable then policy should encourage the retention of all the features or elements of the fabric which contribute to a place's significance. Policy should respect the traces of additions, alterations and earlier treatments to the fabric of a place, as these are evidence of its history and use, which may be part of its significance. Policy should also encourage sensitive, compatible and reversible design solutions to any necessary interventions in the fabric, while providing clear paths to allow contemporary design and technological solutions. In this way future conservation actions are not compromised. A conservation policy can also outline how an enhanced knowledge and understanding of the history of a place can be gained over time, and thus reversible interventions can assist future decision making.

Principle 3.3 Interpretation to assist in differentiating phases of work

Continuing with reference to the *Burra Charter*, Article 1.17 records that:

> Interpretation *means all the ways of presenting the* cultural significance *of a* place.

The explanatory notes to the article state that 'Interpretation may be a combination of the treatment of the fabric (e.g. maintenance**,** restoration, reconstruction); the use of and activities at the place; and the use of introduced explanatory material.' Prior to the 1999 revisions to the *Burra Charter* the common understanding of the term *interpretation* in conservation terminology was that it related to introduced graphic or audio-visual explanatory assistance for a visitor to a place of cultural significance. It is a useful point to make that *maintenance*, *restoration*, and *reconstruction* are all interventions in the fabric, and are acts of *interpretation*. Outlining the *interpretation* **process**:

> *The* cultural significance *of many* places *is not readily apparent, and should be explained by* interpretation. *Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment, and be culturally appropriate.*[15]

Interpretation certainly allows a detailed consideration of the factors of honesty and authenticity in conservation, but this issue may be considered at length in another essay!

[15] *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, 1999*. Article 25

4. Areas for Careful Consideration – 'Ifs and Buts'

We are aware that charters may be written so as to be appropriate to a local culture, or they may be drafted for a regional, national or international usage. It should be remembered that a conservation policy (whether natural or cultural) can be one of many national policies (e.g. educational, economic, etc.), each with a very different focus or emphasis. Policy should not be put together or viewed in isolation, and must also be seen in relationship to local, regional, national and, increasingly, international development plans. The UNESCO World Heritage Convention adopted in 1972 for protection of natural and cultural heritage has now come into greater focus.

Consideration 4.1 Integration

In order to avoid possible conflicts policies may be vertically and horizontally integrated in form, and effective conservation policy may include these features. As an example of this integration, and of interest on the international stage, the World Bank (WB) has formulated a draft policy on the 'Management of Physical Cultural Resources'.[16] Specifically, WB has now made it a mandatory requirement that all WB financed projects, which are likely to have an impact on environmental issues, must include an assessment of the likely impact on the physical cultural resources of the place. This will include studies to identify the nature of any physical cultural resources, including cultural landscapes, and then to identify the nature of any impacts that might arise from the implementation of a project. The concept of embedding cultural heritage impact assessment within environmental impact assessment processes is correct and laudable. Many now recognise that it is inappropriate to separate the two forms of resources, or their management, as has often been done in the past. Since WB negotiators typically deal with the most powerful government policy makers in finance and development, the use of the WB voice to spread this message is of great value. There is thus an excellent opportunity for messages on cultural heritage protection to be communicated to the very highest levels of governments around the world.

[16] See http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/essd/essd.nsf/PhysicalCulturalResources/Home for further details.

Consideration 4.2 Local distinctiveness – the examples of Europe and China

The opening for signature of the *Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe* (Council of Europe - Granada Convention, 1985) was a milestone in developing governmental awareness of the importance of cultural heritage in Europe. European states created the means of co-ordinating conservation policies on a European scale, which inevitably entailed exchanging information. This joining of national resolution on a continental scale should not compromise continuing recognition and development of local distinctiveness, rather an awareness of the value of cultural difference may become appreciated and gain further importance. Additionally, non-government organisations are assisting in philosophical and practical areas and giving useful counterpoints to national legislation that may be less broadly based, without compromising local distinctiveness. International charters prepared by non-governmental organisations, such as ICOMOS are increasingly influencing national conservation policies. Their benefit as documents is seen in that they incorporate a wide range of non-political viewpoints and are therefore acceptable to a broader range of governments. Those governments are not generally obliged in a legal sense to implement any of the recommendations of these charters, but they are seen as common sense and their concepts are now beginning to be incorporated into, or referred to in, national conservation polices. The application of the ICOMOS Charter for Underwater Heritage in relation to shipwrecks etc is a good example of this type of document.

Even in somewhat rigid state bureaucracies such as that of China attempts are being made to develop charters of non-political emphasis. A collaborative project between the Chinese National Administration for Cultural Heritage, the Australian Heritage Commission, and the Getty Conservation Institute has been working since 1998, and is aiming to produce a charter to guide heritage conservation practice in China using models similar in nature to the *Burra Charter*. China already has a well-structured and relatively powerful heritage bureaucracy. There are 500,000 recorded heritage sites in China, and approximately 60,000 staff are responsible for conserving these sites. Strong and thorough laws operate to protect the sites that demonstrate the immense depth of culture

and history that characterises Chinese civilisation.[17] The 'China Charter' as developed thus far has a very strong emphasis on the crucial roles of maintenance and management in the long-term conservation of places of significance, with greater emphasis on the management process than is contained in the *Burra Charter*. This is another example of the need for charters to reflect the local situation.

Consideration 4.3 A process – assessment and listing

Perhaps the most established method of protecting cultural heritage is to assess those elements that may be considered worthy of protection (this can be achieved by using a set of values to inform a statement of significance), and then to gather them into a list. Lists may have varying legislative and statutory implications. Lists can be used for reference when development is proposed at a place of significance, both in order to identify whether it is protected, and if properly documented, to identify the important values of the place. For countries with large numbers of potentially significant buildings the process of compiling a list is a massive undertaking and must inevitably remain incomplete by the nature of scarce resources, by omission and by the evolving nature of cultural significance. Conservation policy at a government level can include a mechanism of emergency protection for any place omitted by inadvertent lack of assessment, by error, or by an evolved significance that may become apparent with public outcry against development

With regard to listing and to an analysis of places of cultural significance, the final summation should be a statement of significance, perhaps summarising the key aspects of aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value. This aspect of assessment is often critically lacking in countries where elements have been known to be of importance for long periods of time, but where by common acceptance of high value a statement of those cumulative values has not been properly documented.

[17] Sullivan, Sharon, 2001.

Consideration 4.4 The consideration of irresistible forces

Stewart Brand pointed out in a recent book called *How Buildings Learn: What happens after they're built*, 'Buildings keep being pushed around by three irresistible forces - technology, money and fashion.'[18] Moreover, even if a place or landscape of significance remained relatively unscathed by technology, money and fashion, the culture around it would continue to change in additional ways, and of course natural forces would continue their inexorable effect of decay.

Decay is an inevitable consequence of the ageing process on the built environment, however with responsible care and maintenance the 'life' of a place can be prolonged. Conservation policy can encourage regular inspection and maintenance, and where necessary the use of compatible repair techniques. This may also ensure that many traditional craft based skills are not lost. Good stewardship of buildings should be encouraged, especially on environmental grounds, as repairing and adapting an existing building is a more effective use of resources.[19] A conservation policy should also encourage the keeping of detailed records of the building before and after any work done. For complex places these may be an invaluable resource in the future.

5. Conclusions

The major ingredients of a successful conservation policy include stating the factors that make cultural heritage important to society ('why conserve?'), defining terminology (the 'what'), and a summary of the way places of cultural significance should be conserved (the 'how'). A policy should also set a code of practice, philosophy, and ethics for conservation, and offer guidelines on courses of action. Common principles of good charters include minimum intervention in the fabric, reversible intervention, and the use of interpretation to assist in differentiating phases of work. Finally there are a number of 'ifs and buts' to consider in ensuring that a policy is appropriate, including integration, local distinctiveness, listing, and methods of dealing with 'irresistible forces'.

[18] Cited in Burman, Peter, November 2000, p.1.
[19] In England, Stewardship is emphasised in PPG15, Article 1.6.

6. Bibliography

Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) *Manifesto* 1877.

The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments.
Adopted at the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Athens 1931.

Venice Charter. 1964. International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites.
(A charter adopted by the General Assembly of ICOMOS)

Granada Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe The member States of the Council of Europe, (European Treaty Series, No. 121) Granada, 3 October 1985.

Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972
(The UNESCO World Heritage Convention)

1994 The Nara Document on Authenticity (Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention, held at Nara, Japan, from 1-6 November 1994).
(A declaration of an ICOMOS conference)

Burra Charter 1999. The *Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance.*
(A charter adopted by an ICOMOS national committee)

Books
Bell, D 1997, *Historic Scotland guide to international conservation charters*. Historic Scotland, Edinburgh.

Brand, Stewart 1994, How Buildings Learn: what happens after they're built. Viking, London.

Feilden, B M & Jokilehto, J 1993, *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites*. ICCROM, Rome.

Jokilehto, Jukka 1999, *A history of architectural conservation*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.

Kerr, James Semple 1996, *The Conservation Plan: a guide to the preparation of conservation plans for places of European cultural significance.* The National Trust of Australia (NSW), Sydney.

Powys, A R 1929, *Repair of Ancient Buildings*. Dent, London.

Ruskin, John 1849, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. 5th edition 1894. George Allen, London.

Stratton, Michael (Ed) 1997, *Structure and Style: Conserving Twentieth Century Buildings*. E & FN Spon, London.

Papers

Burman, Peter 2001, *What Is Cultural Heritage?* Offprint of pp.11-22 from Baer NS and Snickars F 2001, *Rational Decision-making in the Preservation of Cultural Property*. Dahlem University Press.

Burman, Peter, November 2000, *Analysis: traditional and evolving ways of analysing buildings and places.* MA course notes from the Centre for Conservation, Department of Archaeology, University of York.
http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/arch/gsp/conservation/buildings/analysis

Sullivan, Sharon, *A well-baked Charter*, in 'Historic Environment', the journal of Australia ICOMOS. Vol 15 No 3, 2001 pp11-19.