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Abstract

A select group of countries now have guidelines to underpin approaches to conserving and managing cultural heritage resources. The monuments and sites oriented Venice Charter of 1964 has been superseded by new charters and documents and rethinking in the late 1980s and early 1990s on different values systems. In an international perspective the adoption of three cultural landscape categories for World Heritage recognition in 1992 was a major milestone reflective of this philosophical shift in attitude. Additionally there are available international conventions and guidelines laying down best practice by organisations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS. Inevitably in looking at international standards, often based on western conservation canons, the fundamental question arises: ‘whose values are we addressing and whose heritage is it?’ Whilst acknowledging the importance of establishing professional standards of practice for protection of the world’s cultural heritage, it is imperative that universality of practice and adoption of standards do not overwhelm local values. Charters and conventions aim to assist in defining the critical notion of significance which must address intangible values as well as the tangible. Here integrity of heritage places and their continuing authenticity are fundamental concerns, particularly as the notion of heritage embraces traditional communities and everyday places as well as national icons. This paper reviews the history of current interest in cultural heritage protection and the various charters available to assess significance and to offer comment on them with reference to the need in university courses to teach the imperative of understanding regional values and applications and whose values we are trying to protect through the process of heritage management. Examples are drawn from the author’s academic and professional experience in southeast Asia.
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Introduction

Post-1945 overview: internationalism and globalised cultural heritage initiatives

A momentous social advance of the post-World War II era has been concern for the world’s cultural heritage with associated efforts to mobilise professional global agencies and
initiatives to protect it. Initially with the advent in 1964 of The Venice Charter\(^1\) heritage was seen to reside predominantly and physically in great monuments and sites—and substantively monuments and sites of the Classical (Old) World—as works of art. The UNESCO World Heritage Convention of 1972 firmly placed cultural heritage (and natural heritage) conservation on the world stage, and certainly early inscriptions on the World Heritage List focused on famous monuments and sites, sometimes referred to as the separate dots on a map syndrome (Taylor and Altenburg, 2006). As the management of cultural heritage resources developed professionally and philosophically a challenge emerged in the late 1980s/early 1990s to the 1960s and 1970s concept of heritage focusing on noble monuments and archaeological locations, famous architectural ensembles, or historic sites with connections to the rich and famous. Here was the inception of an enlarged value system embracing such issues as cultural landscapes and settings, living history and heritage, intangible values, vernacular heritage, and community involvement. It was the beginning of the shift from concentrating wholly on what Engelhardt (2007) pithily calls the three ‘Ps’ of Princes, Priests, and Politicians to include PEOPLE.
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**Figure 1 Place identity and its components adapted from Relph (1976)**

Critical to this view of cultural heritage was and remains an appreciation of the inter-relationships through time between people, events, and places involving not only tangible values but associated intangible cultural heritage values. Intangible Cultural Heritage is ‘the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith—that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage’ (UNESCO 2003). Here heritage is inextricably linked to notions of identity and continuity, to private and public memories, to sense of place (*genius loci*). **Identity** as Relph (1979) posits is a key word, crucial to sense of place where the tangible (physical features and functions) and intangible (meaning or symbols) coalesce (see Figure 1). Notions of intangible cultural heritage have increasingly suffused the thinking of international organisations involved in setting standards for a shifting global approach to cultural heritage protection.

The growth of global thinking and practice in cultural heritage management emerged from the twentieth century modernist movement—modernism—originating as a Western
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\(^1\) ICOMOS International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites
cultural phenomenon. Modernism started in the late nineteenth century in various arts such as poetry, architecture, painting and continued to influence twentieth century ideas (Bullock and Stallybrass, eds.,1977). It invoked a break with tradition to create new forms as, for example, in architecture and planning. It was a rationalist view of an ideal world that could be applied universally. It informed the cultural globalisation movement paralleling economic globalisation (Logan 2001). Coincidental has been mounting concern that the thrust of global thinking has the potential to overwhelm non-Western local and regional traditional cultures; commensurate with this is ‘a considerable body of literature over the past 10 years [that] has criticised cultural globalisation’ (Taylor, 2004).

National legal frameworks for the protection of cultural heritage emerged in the nineteenth century. The League of Nations established after World War I, saw its work continued and developed in 1945 when the United Nations was formed; in 1926 the International Museums Office (IMO) had been established in Paris with the aim of promoting the activities of the museums and public collections of every country by organising joint work and research. The IMO organised a number of key events that set the scene for the development of an international movement for cultural heritage conservation. Notable was the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Athens 1931, from which came the Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments (the Athens Charter). It stands as the first truly international statement on general principles and doctrines relating to the protection of historic monuments. As a result the League of Nations established an International Commission on Historic Monuments to deal with conservation education, legal and technical issues, and documentation.

In early 1945 the Charter of the United Nations was drafted followed by the creation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO] in November 1945. The Constitution of UNESCO [November 1946] mandates the Organisation to ensure the conservation and protection of the world’s inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science (UNESCO 2007). Here was established the firming of globalised thinking on cultural heritage protection in the modernist tradition of ‘ideas and practices that could be applied around the world regardless of differences in local cultures’ (Logan op. cit.).

In the early UNESCO years, various missions were organised to advise Member States on the conservation of heritage sites. Later these developed into international campaigns, of which the first was launched in 1959 on the Temples of Abu Simbel, Egypt, threatened by the construction of the Aswan Dam. Among its early tasks, UNESCO also collaborated in the organisation of meetings of experts in the preservation of heritage resources. These included a conference on the preservation of monuments held in Venice in 1964, which adopted the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, (the Venice Charter).

In 1972 at a UN conference on the human environment in Stockholm, it was recommended that a UNESCO convention on World Heritage should be adopted, resulting in The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (16 November 1972). Generally known as The World Heritage Convention, it has achieved a great deal during its existence. ‘Today, it is among the foremost international tools of conservation, and certainly among the best known’ (Bandarin 2007:18). In 1992 the World Heritage Centre was established and is the focal point and coordinator within UNESCO for all matters related to World Heritage including: management of the Convention; organising annual World Heritage Committee meetings; providing advice to States Parties in the
preparation of nominations; coordinating the reporting on the condition of sites and the emergency action undertaken when a site is threatened. The Centre also organises technical seminars and workshops; updates the World Heritage List and database; develops teaching materials to raise awareness among young people of the need for heritage preservation; and keeps the public informed of World Heritage issues. Its global initiatives are assisted by various regional offices throughout the world and increasingly attention has been given to regional cultures and needs (see http://whc.unesco.org/en/134). UNESCO was instrumental in setting up key international organisations—ICOMOS, ICCROM, and IUCN—that have become official advisory bodies to the World Heritage Centre (UNESCO 2007, op. cit.).

ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), a non-governmental organisation with headquarters in Paris, was established in 1965. It is dedicated to the conservation of the world’s historic monuments and sites, and provides a forum for professional dialogue and a vehicle for the collection, evaluation and dissemination of information on conservation principles, techniques and policies. It also advises UNESCO on World Heritage cultural matters. ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) based in Rome was established in 1956 by UNESCO. It has a worldwide mandate to promote the conservation of all types of cultural heritage, movable and immovable, with the aim of improving the quality of conservation practices and raising awareness about the importance of preserving cultural heritage through training, cooperation, research, information and awareness. IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) advises on natural heritage matters.

Protecting whose values? Imperialism or relativism

Laying down global frameworks for protecting cultural heritage underpinned by methodical approaches to identification and assessment of heritage resources, analysis of significance, and evaluation of proposals has led to an internationally accepted modus operandi. It represents a modern bureaucratic system where heritage resources are itemised through categories and entered in registers and lists. Whilst we need to apply such tools anchored in a systematic and demonstrable way of working, they, and associated charters, do show their Western cultural origins (Byrne 1991), and, one may add, Western values, although these may well be values shared by other cultures. Nevertheless, the question is how far such universal approaches based on Western methodologies and thinking adequately address regional cultural values and differences across the world?

The concept of cultural imperialism—imposition of a foreign viewpoint or culture over another country—emerged in the 1960s. Terms such as first world (developed) and third world (developing) may be seen by some observers as representative of an imperial attitude. Edward Said in discussion of the way British writers have historically seen “abroad” or the exotic other out there as strange, “ours” to control, posits that this imperial manner of thinking became ‘a main element in the consolidated vision, or departmental cultural view, of the globe’ (Said 1994:74). Said proposes the notion of a social and political ‘centre and a series of overseas territories connected to it at the periphery’ (ibid). Such critiques gel with the alternative notion of cultural relativism acknowledging cultural diversity and attempts to understand and judge the behaviour of another culture in terms of its standards rather than one's own. (Eller, 2009).

Can the globalised tenets of cultural heritage management processes of the twentieth century be seen as a reflection of a culturally imperial view? Or alternatively are they part of a
systematic approach to guide protection processes capable of being sensitively adjusted to reflect differing cultural contexts?

In considering such matters there is a fundamental question: ‘Whose values and whose heritage are we addressing?’ This can be tendentious. In the context, for example, of the World Heritage (WH) Convention’s threshold of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)\(^2\) for a property to be listed we may have to reconcile international and local values which can be in contestation: what is valued locally may not be appreciated internationally and vice versa. A recent Chinese perspective (Qian 2007) discussing heritage as a global industry reflects that ‘the application of Eurocentric heritage philosophy and approaches is problematic. As a consequence, the need for formalising approaches ... appropriate to various cultural contexts is becoming increasingly acute.’ Thus, for guidance in establishing OUV, the WH Convention lists applicable assessment criteria, specifies that properties must meet conditions of authenticity expressed through a variety of attributes, and must meet conditions of integrity. It also requires comparison with similar properties regionally and internationally to inform commentary on the level of representativeness of a type of nominated property and how/why the property stands out. In this way the Convention does have positive universal application if applied with sensitivity to the plurality of cultural contexts: a topic to which I return later. Implicit also in this process is ensuring that the human rights of local people are not overwhelmed by a competing discourse of international practice.

The globalising practice tendency of international organisations such as UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICOM, and ICCROM is compelling. Whilst they lay ‘down international standards for professional practice —“world best practice”—in the cultural heritage field as well as influencing thinking in those fields in less direct ways’ they can be said ‘to be imposing a common stamp on culture across the world and their policies creating a logic of global cultural uniformity [by seeking] to impose standards of “good behaviour” onto Member States and other states’ (Logan op.cit). A cogent alternative view is acknowledgement of the fact that they have established a shared way of working that is apparent and understandable, is replicable so that its validity is testable, and one that allows comparative evaluation of findings and management recommendations. One may also add that these methods must then be applied in ways that are appropriate to the country and culture in which you are working, i.e. adapting them to be sympathetic to specific cultural contexts. To effect this also needs national and local laws to be in place to ensure international practice is statutorily grounded.

The culture-nature dilemma

As I have discussed elsewhere (Taylor 2009) a cogent example of divergent western and eastern views is that of the concept of nature. Until the late 1980s there was some tension between cultural and natural heritage conservation. Culture and nature were uneasy, sometimes suspicious, companions. Reflective of this, cultural and natural criteria for assessment of properties of OUV for World Heritage nomination and listing were separate until 2005 when they were sensibly combined into one set of ten criteria in Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2008, op.cit para. 77). The separation was originally based on a hegemony of Western values where cultural heritage resided mainly in great monuments and sites and natural heritage in scientific ideas of nature and wilderness as something separate from people. The latter was an ideal
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\(^2\) ‘cultural [and/or natural] significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity’ (UNESCO 2008, para 49)
espoused particularly in the USA. Said labels it the ‘Puritan errand into the wilderness’ (op.cit. 63). A recent American PBS television program shown in Australia ‘The National Parks. America’s Best Idea’ eulogised the grandness of American wilderness and nature virtually as a national symbol and exemplar reflective of Roderick Nash’s (1967) critical analysis of the American concept of wilderness. Nash (ibid) posits its adoption was grounded in the idea of something distinctively American and superior to anything in the Old World: the sublime versus the antique. He refers to the wilderness idea as critical to a unique American white identity (my bold) mimetic of what Said (op.cit., 67), in reference to a British text on Africa, calls ‘politicized [and] ideologically saturated’. Therefore we may ask what of the identity and history of occupation of US national park areas by native Americans before being ousted and their cultural landscape turned into someone else’s ‘wilderness’? That page of history is fuzzy in the heroic wilderness narrative, being as opaque as it was in the environmental ethics debate on natural values during the 1970s and 1980s, in particular that of whether nature has instrumental value or intrinsic value. Feng Han’s (2006) discussion on these values is instructive: instrumental value is assigned because of the usefulness of something; in contrast intrinsic value relates to values of things as ends in themselves. A further complication is the question of the origin of intrinsic value. Is it subjective, created by human thought and value systems. Alternatively is it objective where value is endemic in its own right, simply waiting to be recognised objectively as the deep ecology movement stridently claimed? Is nature valued as purely an object without any human interest or spiritual attachment? Where do traditional owners and societies with their knowledge systems fit into this (imperial core?) image of nature?

Examination of the World Heritage List for Asian countries shows some properties included under natural criteria where local community associations with these places are omitted, or worse, obliterated. In contrast to this approach ought to be recognition of the value systems that traditional communities associate deeply with so-called natural areas as part of their cultural beliefs. Added to this is the fact that many traditional communities live in or visit these places as part of their life systems and have done so for millennia, prompting the question of what do we mean by nature? Is it the 1960s American model enshrined in the Wilderness Act with its connections to Protestant Christian, colonial, and post-colonial cultural associations from the English speaking Western world? Or ought it to be the concept of nature and culture not as opposites, but where nature is part of the human condition? In this connection is J.B. Jackson’s (1984, 156)) view that landscape ‘is never simply a natural space, a feature of the natural environment . . . every landscape is the place where we establish our own human organization of space and time’.

Jackson’s aphorism has particular import in Asia where links between culture and nature are traditional. People are part of nature within a humanistic philosophy of the world. Here is an holistic approach to the human-nature relationship as opposed to the idea of human detachment from nature. In this vein in March 2004, the Natchitoches Declaration on Heritage Landscapes was adopted at an ICOMOS International Symposium. This declaration focuses on cultural landscapes in terms of the ‘interaction of people and nature over time’ stressing the culture-nature link. Of note in this culture-nature and tangible-intangible relationships is the mounting appreciation of links between cultural and biological diversity and traditional sustainable land-use. A landmark UNESCO-IUCN international symposium in 2005 explored the culture/nature diversity links; in an eloquent paper Lhakpa N Sherpa (2005) shows how beyul, the cultural phenomenon of sacred hidden valleys in the Nepalese Himalaya, traditionally support biodiversity conservation. But he also shows how western
influenced initiatives are targeting beyul for establishing protected areas without proper recognition of the symbiotic relationship between local communities and environmental conservation: the message is modern development, education, globalisation, and tourism are not supporting traditional stewardship.

In contrast and connecting with Feng Han’s (op. cit.) view is the Thai example of Doi Suthep-Pui National Park, Chiang Mai. Here culture and nature coexist in terms of traditional Hmong communities allowed to remain living in the park and where interpretative presentation acknowledges the immutable relationship between people and nature. This is seen also in the value placed on the temples in the park, as with the venerable Pra That Doi Suthep Temple.

Despite all the stunning natural beauty, the main reason many visitors . . . is to visit Phra That Doi Suthep Temple. For Thais, this site is a must for the visit, as it is a sacred place to pay homage to the Lord Buddha’s relic, . . . [it is] one of the most holy Buddhist sites in Thailand. (Nantawan Munga and Vital Lieorungruang 2006).

Tourism: positive or negative force

Understandably the application of global initiatives in conservation methodologies and management plans, not least through the World Heritage program, has resulted in raising the professional and political profile of cultural heritage protection worldwide. Accompanying this has been the raising of the profile within signatory countries (States Parties) to the World Heritage Convention of the meaning and values of heritage protection and importance of national policies. Nevertheless the universality of attention to cultural heritage places can be, and is, a double edged sword, not least through impacts of services and infrastructure demands of tourism. The sheer impact of the numbers of people at places like Angkor or Venice or Ayutthaya or Borobudur is overwhelming. It raises the spectre of having to rethink management organisation on numbers of visitors allowed into such places at any one time and how to plan and handle schedules. How long can we tolerate people clambering over archaeological remains at Asian sites? When do we start to control unfettered access into what for a western tourist might seem to be a dead 1000 year archaeological relict as with the temples at Angkor when in fact many are still used every day by local people as part of continuing living history. We would not countenance tourists walking through and over the altar at Notre Dame de Paris cathedral, so why in a Buddhist temple at Angkor?

Nevertheless, tourism and heritage are linked, not least economically for developing countries, begging the question of how places and monuments and objects are presented to tourists. Colonial Williamsburg in the USA is substantially a re-creation popular with tourists, but this does not detract from its potential to inform people on history and develop heritage values. Muang Boran, an artificial historic park in Bangkok developed as a vignette of all aspects of Thai lifestyles and settlements is a theme park, but has the potential to be informative and provoke the imagination. Focusing on Asia as a non-core example, what is needed is a synergy between heritage protection and tourism with improved modes of interpretation and presentation of sites to cater for a range of tourists from the informed to the novice. Management involving locals as well as professionals, and management informed by tourist experience of the site, are critical factors. Equally there is the need for management practices and machinery geared to local conditions and technology. Sullivan (1997) describes such an approach with successful outcomes for conservation management based on workshop discussions involving a range of stakeholders at Yungang Caves in China: managers, local people, visitors, government officials.
It may be that tourism can play a role in protecting heritage values and significance in rural and urban centres—eg Hoi An, Vietnam—where lifestyle, traditions and fabric are supported by tourist spending and, as the ICOMOS Cultural Tourism Charter (2002) recommends, involvement of host and indigenous communities. Conversely, claims for spurious tourist developments based on notions of beautifying a place can be culturally destructive and lead to an impoverished visitor experience. In an ongoing case in the old city area of Rattanakosin, Bangkok, a local government plan first promulgated in 2003 to create a tourist park surrounded by various monuments will involve clearing of traditional shop houses and a local group of people, the Mahakan Fort community. They objected and found support from the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which Thailand joined in 1999, and from local NGOs. This was to no avail; the unnecessary tourist park is to proceed and tourists lose the opportunity to experience a local traditional lifestyle that enriches the experience of Bangkok. It also raises a critical question: how can and should government authorities factor in the need for a comprehensive assessment of the area and its varied heritage resources, including all stakeholder values such as local community values? In Thailand there is a deeply held and rich national consciousness of the country’s vast and varied cultural heritage, but one that is not always appreciated or understood by municipal authorities, including planning departments.

Overview: charters and principles; authenticity and integrity

ICOMOS (www.international.icomos.org) lists 12 Charters adopted by its General Assembly; 6 Resolutions and Declarations; and 8 Charters adopted by various ICOMOS affiliated countries. The fundamental role of charters is to offer statements or principles and guidelines for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance where conservation is regarded as an integral part of the management of these places. Charters may therefore be seen to have a professional ethics role in guiding the conduct of cultural heritage conservation practice. Fundamental to the process is the notion of significance. It is a difficult word to elucidate readily. A dictionary definition is ‘concealed or real meaning’. But this suggests more ambiguity, because, in heritage management, we are invariably dealing with concealed meanings. These must be unravelled through subjective assessment and analysis of objective data and cultural traditions that govern the way people have done things to shape their surroundings, creating the cultural places and landscapes we attempt to assess. It is essentially a values—human values—based approach.

The Venice Charter of 1964 was the first post-WWII document marking the internationalisation of heritage codes of practice. Its focus is Eurocentric, high art/high aesthetic monuments and buildings from the past, reflecting the somewhat narrow scope of conservation in the 1960s, although it must be acknowledged that the Charter recognises that such monuments reflect age-old traditions and human values. Emphasis is on physical fabric rather than social meanings, but the Venice Charter is the forerunner of other documents and marks an increasing concern for conserving the past for the present and future. The universality of the Venice Charter is no longer a tenable viewpoint. It has increasingly been regarded as outdated in parts of the world—for example Asia, Australia, Canada—outside the old core. Australia’s Burra Charter3 adopted in 1979 (revised 1988, 1999) was the first national charter (and outside the European core) to challenge the validity of the Venice Charter’s narrow edifice construct. Three important aspects of the Burra Charter are: (i) Use
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3 The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (1979, 1988, 1999)
of the term ‘place’ to define cultural heritage resources underpinning the concept of place as a cornerstone of Australian heritage practice. Place means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works and may include components, contents, spaces and views. Critical to this is the notion that place involves human activity and associated cultural traditions that have guided the activity/activities and its/their outcome. The term ‘place’, with associated cultural context and meaning links components together and puts them into context with their cultural and intellectual background of which they are a product.

(ii) Introduction of the tenet of significance and associated values—historic, social, aesthetic, scientific—in heritage assessment with a cogent definition of significance. (iii) Development of conservation management plans. The Burra Charter also saw a move from a main focus on fabric to embrace ideas of spiritual value.

The China Principles were promulgated by China’s State administration for Cultural Heritage ((SACH) in co-operation with the Australian Heritage Commission and the Getty Conservation Institute (California). Taking the Burra Charter approach of identification and conservation of values and American experience to create a set of guidelines for conservation and management of immovable cultural heritage in China, they meet the needs of an Asian culture. Of particular note is that the Chinese document is presented as professional guidelines that sit firmly within the existing framework of laws and regulations relating to the conservation of heritage sites. They provide guidance for conservation practice as well as the main criteria for evaluating results and, like the Burra Charter, place highest priority on assessment of significance. Notably they emphasise the link between conservation, site management and site planning through master plans. Two words expressing inherent fundamental cultural heritage values are ‘authenticity’ and ‘setting’. In particular, authenticity may have different nuances in Asian cultures to Western cultures, hence its notable inclusion in the Chinese Principles. In the glossary, authentic/authenticity literally mean true + fact/real. A synonym for setting is landscape and presumably embraces the notion of cultural landscape reflecting how and why people have shaped their surrounds according to their ideologies (Taylor 2009). Article 24 directs that the setting—reflecting significant events and activities—of a heritage site must be conserved. Here there are comparisons with the Burra Charter, where setting means the area around a place and may include the visual catchment. The import of authenticity connects with the Asian approach to renewal of physical fabric. This is where replacement of fabric is acceptable because the significance of the place resides primarily in its continued spiritual meaning and symbolic value related to everyday use rather than pre-eminence of the fabric itself. It is expressed by Wei and Aass (1989) in the following commentary:

Consequently, in the field of conservation of monuments such as Qufu, the Forbidden City or Cheng De, the allowing of continuous repairs or even rebuilding all respect this concentration on the spirit of the original monument.

Although the physical form may change, the spirit and purpose of the original is not only preserved as a continuity, but can be enhanced through contributions of succeeding generations.

In recognition of the significance of authenticity in cultural heritage management the drafting by ICOMOS in 1994 of The Nara Document on Authenticity aimed to challenge conventional thinking in conservation. It acknowledges the framework provided by the World Heritage Committee’s desire to apply the test of authenticity for cultural properties proposed for the World Heritage List but in ways that accord full respect to the social and cultural
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4 The Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China (2000)
values of all societies. The Nara Document is a tacit acknowledgement of the plurality of approaches to the issue of authenticity and that it does not reside primarily in Western notions of intact fabric. It is an attempt to explore an ethos that acknowledges local traditions and intangible values. Logan (op.cit.) suggests rightly that the Nara Document was ‘a powerful voice from the periphery, a veritable watershed’. It acknowledges the need to respect cultural diversity and all aspects of belief systems. It proposes that authenticity judgements may be linked to a variety of information sources: form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions and techniques; location and setting; and spirit and feeling. The Document points out that use of these sources permits elaboration of specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of a cultural heritage place. Nevertheless, it has been misused within Asia to suit nationalist ideals (which are just as imperial as earlier Eurocentric or Americanised ones), possibly because of its generalised nature. It made a virtue of being non-specific.

The 2005 UNESCO Bangkok Hoi An Protocols. Professional guidelines for assuring and preserving the authenticity of heritage sites in the context of the cultures of Asia is an innovative statement of the recognition of diverse and enduring cultural identities in Asian countries. The protocols recognise the impact of tourism in Asia and effects on restoration and presentation of heritage places for tourism purposes. Listed is a series of definitions that draw considerably on the Burra Charter. The inclusion of specifics on Asian Issues is welcome, particularly in the mention of Indigenous and minority cultures and the need to find ways of interpreting sites within an appropriate context as a way of engaging visitors. The Protocols are an attempt to ‘underscore the inter-relatedness of practices for the conservation of the physical heritage sites, the intangible heritage and cultural landscapes’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION AND SETTING</th>
<th>FORM AND DESIGN</th>
<th>USE AND FUNCTION</th>
<th>ESSENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Spatial layout</td>
<td>Use(s)</td>
<td>Artistic expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>User(s)</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sense of Place’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental riches</td>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>Changes in use over time</td>
<td>Emotional impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landforms and vistas</td>
<td>Building techniques</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of usage</td>
<td>Religious context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environments</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Impacts of use</td>
<td>Historical associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living elements</td>
<td>Stratigraphy</td>
<td>Use as a response to environment</td>
<td>Sounds, smells and tastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of dependance on locale</td>
<td>Linkages with other properties or sites</td>
<td>Use as a response to historical context</td>
<td>Creative process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Dimensions of Authenticity (Hoi An Protocols, p.10; op cit)*

In reviewing a periphery perspective—eg from Asia—on heritage values, significance, and protection it is instructive to look at the issue through the lens of **authenticity** and **integrity** (characteristics from Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention op cit) where the spirit of place resides as much in the meaning and symbolism of places and their setting—intangible values—as it does in tangible physical fabric. **Authenticity** (para. 80 of the Guidelines) concerns ‘the ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depending on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful.’ We may see authenticity therefore as ability of a place to represent accurately/truly what it purports to be. Figure 2 from the *Hoi An Protocols (op cit)* illustrates the importance of authenticity within an Asian context.
Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the cultural heritage and its attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity, therefore requires assessing the extent to which the property a) includes all elements necessary to express its OUV; b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property’s significance; c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect. In relation to (c) I would add that judgement will be required when the whole might lack sense of integrity yet some parts or remnants possess it. The decision on overall integrity then will depend on how the parts with integrity are able to be read and interpreted to give an overall sense of continuity.

What should be the new aims and responsibilities of universities within the framework of global issues?

A number of points occur to me as central for university research and training centres in cultural heritage:

- Teach and research within the global perspective whilst ensuring that a move to uniformity is challenged, stimulating students to think regionally/locally as well as being aware of global trends and practice. It is critical that local heritage conservation philosophies taking account of traditional knowledge systems and skills are developed and that respect for ethnic groups and minorities and their beliefs and sense of place is fostered. Establish firm theoretical foundations that underpin practice.
- Articulate the Values Based Approach to heritage thinking and practice where not just tangible aspects of What has happened, Where and When are addressed, but Why have things happened and Who has been involved. What are the associated intangible human values.
- Heritage is about PEOPLE and human values and human rights noting therefore that changes over time will occur. Past human values may be different than present-day and we need practitioners and researchers who can accommodate such thinking. We are interested in the present and the living, not just the dead.
- Understanding and empathy with plurality and cultural diversity in recognition of the 2001 UNESCO Declaration on Cultural Diversity must be critical to our thinking and teaching.
- Need to bridge the culture-nature divide with enhanced understanding of how biodiversity and cultural diversity in traditional land-use systems often co-exist.
- Inclusion of courses in cultural landscape study and significance of human layers through time inherent in the cultural landscape construct as a way of seeing and understanding historiographically the human world. This will help foster appreciation of landscape as a document of social history in which human values inhere.
- Appreciate methods of mapping the interaction between places and/or cultural landscapes and people as, for example, through the technique of cultural mapping whereby tangible and intangible elements are identified and documented in order to understand local distinctiveness.
- Education of people capable of capacity building through explicit, jargon-free communication for support for heritage protection with politicians, government agencies, ordinary people, NGOs, media, ie increase awareness.
• Understand how to devise charters that are not simply a set of rules, but documents that embrace spiritual view of what is valuable, capable of expressing historical legibility and conservation of living traditions.
• Understanding how to work with tourist agencies, managers, and promoters to extend understanding of significance of heritage beyond the national and international icons to include vernacular cultural landscapes and local vernacular heritage.
• Be aware of where gaps occur in knowledge and practice as for example UNESCO (2007 op.cit.) suggestions for:
  (i) thematic and geographic gaps for a World Heritage global strategy (human settlements, human interaction; spirituality and creative expression);
  (ii) thematic studies in cultural landscapes to provide frameworks to guide the WH Committee;
  (iii) need to rectify geographically unbalanced representation (out of 66 WH listed cultural landscapes only 24 are outside the Europe/N America region). ICOMOS (2004) identifies areas of human achievement underrepresented on the WH List, eg Buddhist, Hindu, Islamic heritage. ICOMOS (ibid) also stresses that urgent consideration needs to be given to vernacular buildings and settlements, suggesting thematic studies might be conducted. This particularly applies to the Asia-Pacific region, noted by UNESCO as lacking representation thereby not reflecting the region’s cultural diversity. The dilemma here is that countries seem to be attracted to nominating national icons/famous sites because of their international tourism attraction and ignoring the urban vernacular with notable exceptions such as Georgetown, Penang or various heritage areas and trails in Singapore (Taylor 2009a; Yuen 2005).
• Press the message that the vernacular is a significant scholarly and professional area of study and practice where we are dealing with social and political meaning as well as physical form, what Hayden (1995) perceptively calls power of place. Acknowledge and disseminate the fact that the urban vernacular cultural landscape—historic urban areas—are rich resources for public history and public culture and that urban landscape history can be engaged ‘as a unifying framework for urban preservation’ (ibid p.45).
• Last but not least, cultural heritage is above all a multi-disciplinary pursuit, not the domain of narrowly entrenched disciplinary ideas. The whole area of cultural heritage management offers a richly rewarding and challenging opportunity for cross-cultural study and research and bringing better understanding across culturally diverse global regions.
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