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Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions

Edited by Ken Taylor, Archer St Clair and Nora J. Mitchell

Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions brings together a collection of papers presented at ‘Cultural Landscapes: Preservation Challenges in the 21st Century’, an international conference held at Rutgers University, New Jersey, in October 2012. The conference was ‘an official UNESCO World Heritage 40th Anniversary event’—to mark forty years since the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention). The conference was also an opportunity to recognise twenty years since the World Heritage Committee’s 1992 introduction of ‘cultural landscapes’ as a new kind of cultural property on the World Heritage List, in addition to the approval of the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in November 2011. The editors have selected 21 papers from the conference for publication on a wide range of topics, including; the World Heritage application of cultural landscapes, community stewardship in landscapes, new approaches for considering landscapes and heritage, the challenges that surface when heritage is managed beyond isolated features, and how issues such as climate change affect the futures of cultural landscapes.

While this publication is certainly a ‘one-stop-shop’ for all things ‘cultural landscape’, and a showcase of the scholarship of the international authors well-known for their cultural landscape-related work, many of the papers selected present arguments and material that has already been widely circulated. Those who are well-read on the topics of cultural landscapes might want to skim the first half of the publication. Yet readers should ensure that they get right to the end, as I found some fresh and inspiring papers tucked away in the final chapters – Mirzoshoh Akobirov’s chapter on the ‘Gardens of Jafr (Rasht Valley Tajikistan) as a Model of Sustaining Cultural Landscapes for Future Generations’ was a particular stand out. I also recommend doing a ‘Rutgers cultural landscape’ search on YouTube, where you will find videos of many of the papers presented at the conference recorded by the good people at Rutgers University.

For a publication that was produced in conjunction with the 40 year anniversary of the existence of World Heritage I was surprised to find that there was not more discussion which returned to 1972 and focussed on how the concept of cultural landscapes was being used in relation to heritage management in the twenty years leading up to 1992. There was scope for more of a longitudinal study of the evolution of the cultural landscape concept in terms of an interrogation of its usage within heritage management. While the first chapters in the collection do touch on the World Heritage Convention era, with Christina Cameron’s chapter...
providing a useful historical overview, the discussion is essentially there to set the scene for the focus on the 1992 formal recognition of cultural landscapes by the World Heritage Committee. Yet if you look up the scholarship of many of the well-known authors in this publication – the Robert Melnick’s, the Brenda Barrett’s, the Ken Taylor’s, the Jane Lennon’s – you will see that all of them were engaging with, and publishing on, cultural landscape ideas prior to 1992. For example, Ken Taylor’s 1988 Master of Landscape Architecture thesis from the University of Melbourne was on ‘Cultural Landscapes: Meanings and Heritage Values’, and Jane Lennon’s scholarship from the late 1970s and early 1980s, including her work on the use of historical source material in understanding environmental change in Gippsland, Victoria, demonstrates an active Australian engagement. In fact, a glimpse into the early efforts of some of Australia’s cultural landscape pioneers reveals a sophisticated understanding of cultural landscapes, which included consideration of cultural landscapes as a process, as nature and culture together, and which promoted cultural landscapes in relation to the heritage of the everyday. These pioneers, many of whom were also founding members of Australia ICOMOS and responsible for the development of The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter), thought carefully about the guidance they developed for heritage management in Australia. The 1979 Australia ICOMOS guidelines for the conservation – not preservation – of places of cultural significance followed a broad meaning of ‘conservation’ that took into account both tangible and intangible values (Lennon 2005: 62). Thus owing to the Burra Charter, Australia’s experimentation with cultural landscapes conservation in the 1980s had the ability to comfortably move away from a ‘monumental’ vision of heritage that corresponded to western aesthetic canons associated with preserving historic fabric, and to encourage a more interdisciplinary approach. In the foreword to the proceedings of a 1988 Australia ICOMOS conference on cultural landscapes, John Mulvaney noted:

The outstanding feature of this meeting has been its stress upon the need to bring a diversity of disciplines to bear on any true assessment of a cultural landscape. This is a heartening revisionism. A decade and more ago, apologists for conservation too often highlighted their particular interest to the neglect of other disciplines… Speaking generally, while buildings and architectural interests predominated at Beechworth, they are conspicuous by their absence here. (Mulvaney 1989: 2)

Mulvaney’s words were further emphasised by Sandy Blair and Marilyn Truscott (1989) representing the Australian Heritage Commission, who promoted that there was a need to develop mechanisms for the identification and assessment of cultural landscapes alongside other places of cultural significance such as buildings and sites. Hence, to begin Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions at 1992 – is to ignore much of the seminal groundwork that went into the thinking and development of World Heritage cultural landscapes, while at the same time, simplifying and overstating the significance of 1992.

I also found the automatic connection that is made between cultural landscapes and historic urban landscapes frustrating. As I have already stressed, this publication contains the scholarship of many of the key international thinkers on landscape-related topics. And while Mechtild Rössler quickly addresses the confusion that is sometimes apparent between people’s considerations of cultural landscapes and historic urban landscapes, Ron Van Oers and Ken Taylor missed a key opportunity to really delve into explaining the relationship between the two ideas. The cultural landscape content of the paper, addresses the connection between the two concepts simply by explaining that historic urban landscapes or HUL is ‘an approach that relates closely to the cultural landscape concept and cities may therefore be understood as a type of cultural landscape’ (Van Oers & Taylor 2015: 201).

Nevertheless, there are many positives about this collection of papers, with a significant acknowledgement throughout being the recognition that cultural landscapes and historic urban landscapes are about management processes and governance systems – just as much as the protection of fabric of the past. The editors do well at promoting the case of cultural landscapes as being about a processual conservation more so than protectionist preservation, and this is a point taken on by many of the authors (although also made by Australians over 25 years ago). Susan Denyer’s chapter makes the significant contribution that World Heritage
inscription is not enough on its own anymore. She suggests that inscription can be the catalyst that is needed to raise awareness of the issues, yet this awareness needs to be harnessed and translated into systems for management. Denyer’s scholarship is built upon by Leticia Leitão and Tim Badman who draw attention to the current destabilising questioning around cultural landscapes in terms of the natural and cultural criteria of World Heritage. The authors point out the continued separation between cultural and natural criteria – despite their organisation into one central list of ten selection criteria for Outstanding Universal Value.

*Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* is a publication that presents the status quo of cultural landscapes. It is a useful collection of the key cultural landscape debates of the 1990s and 2000s for students of cultural landscapes, presenting a wide spectrum of information in one place. Yet it is hoped that future collections of papers on cultural landscapes and historic urban landscapes will continue to build on the new directions more so than repackaging the debates of the past.

Paulette Wallace
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This is a handsomely produced collection of 33 chapters by different authors reflecting on the historical development and current state of industrial heritage conservation. The contributions are divided into six parts, covering: Values and meaning; Understanding the evidence; Realising the potential; Sharing and enjoying; Teaching and learning; and an overview of TICCIH. The International Committee for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage (TICCIH) was formally established in 1977, and recognised by ICOMOS in 2000 as the independent expert committee on industrial heritage. This led to TICCIH being identified as a special advisor to ICOMOS on heritage industrial sites for World Heritage purposes. TICCIH’s *Nizhny Tagil Charter for Industrial Heritage* (2003) is featured as an appendix to the book, but the more recent joint ICOMOS-TICCIH *Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures and Landscape (the Dublin Principles)* (2011), are only mentioned in passing. While basically being a shorter
version of the Nizhny Tagil Charter, the Dublin Principles represent a merging of TICCIH’s focus on industrial heritage and ICOMOS’s focus on broader heritage conservation practice, and a discussion of the different purposes of the two documents would have been useful. Stuart Smith’s chapter indicates the hope that the Dublin Principles will become more widely accepted by national governments, and this is demonstrated by the Japanese government’s recent adoption of them as the principles underpinning its management of a World Heritage nomination for industrial sites in that country.

The key challenge of industrial heritage conservation is flagged in the Introduction by James Douet and in the first chapter by Sir Neil Cossons. Both Douet and Cossans detail the challenge of re-purposing, re-tooling or adapting industrial sites for contemporary uses, so as to make their conservation economically viable, while at the same time retaining the evidential values of their industrial use and associations that gives them meaning and heritage value. Cossons argues for the better articulation of the values of industrial sites in ways that would resonate with the public, rather than formulating grandiloquent arguments understandable only by the conservation professional elite. Without the wider understanding and valuing of the importance and meaning of industrial sites, Cossons fears that they can be interpreted as simply ‘assets-in-waiting, ready to be adapted to another perhaps quite alien purpose unconnected with, or quite alien to, their history’. Cossons outlines some of the history of adaptive re-use illustrating this issue. Part of this problem is the separation of the industrial building, often architecturally interesting and aesthetically attractive, from its industrial uses, memories and associations. Another aspect of the problem, to this reviewer at least, is the trend to gentrify and beautify redundant industrial buildings and landscapes, further eroding any association that the new, clean, adapted solution might have with what was usually a gritty and un-aesthetic historical industrial reality. The questions of authenticity and integrity become very relevant when looking at many of the adaptive re-uses of industrial sites driven by architectural, urban planning and landscaping ‘improvement’ objectives. It is interesting, for example, that the four fundamental principles characterising the approach to the renowned Emsher Park redevelopment of the industrial landscapes of Germany’s Ruhr Valley, listed by Cossons and much-emulated by urban designers, do not include the conservation of heritage values.

The chapters by Helmuth Albrecht, Barry Trinder and Louis Bergeron look at the history, definitions, and professional involvement in, industrial archaeology and heritage, and the cultural impact of industrialisation globally.

In the section on ‘Understanding the Evidence’ a number of industrial archaeology case studies are described (Patrick Martin), approaches to cultural landscape relevant to industrial landscapes discussed (Iain Stuart), techniques for the recording and documentation of physical evidence and industrial processes outlined (Miles Ogelthorpe and Miriam McDonald, and Gustav Rossnes), and the use of industrial archives and photographic evidence discussed (Belem Oviedo Gámez and Jan af Geijerstam). In some chapters too much information is given, in some it is just right, and in others not enough is given, providing more of a sampling than a ‘guide’ to current practice.

In the section on ‘Realising the Potential’, Paul Smith gives a good overview of the development of surveys of French industrial sites, stressing the importance of knowing what you have before deciding what should be protected. Keith Falconer summarises the development of legal controls in Britain, which includes survey work. Massimo Preite describes some of the iconic urban regeneration projects involving industrial sites. He acknowledges that: ‘a successful outcome of ‘conservation by means of adaptation’ is not always achieved’, discussing some of the considerations driving urban renewal, and identifying problems such as the lack of control over second-generation adaptations once the principle of re-use has been established, and that of pressure for the gentrification of adjacent property. Benjamin Fragner continues the presentation of adaptive re-use case studies, pointing out that approaches range from conservation-driven solutions to ‘adaptive miss-use’ entailing the loss of heritage components and values. In many cases towards the latter end of this range, the industrial structures ‘continue to exist as symbolic edifices, as beacons, though the information they convey has been torn from its historical context’.

122 THE FUTURE FOR HERITAGE PRACTICE
Bode Morin looks at the financial incentives operating in the USA. Jaime Migone describes heritage at risk and uses a case study in Chile. Helen Lardner describes the role of conservation plans in industrial site conservation. Mark Watson outlines the practice of assessing embodied energy in adaptive re-use projects. The issues surrounding environmental contamination of industrial landscapes and their treatment is covered by Norbert Tempel, while Masaaki Okada investigates the concepts of the aesthetics of ruins and of industrial sites from a Japanese perspective. A case study of community involvement in the conservation of a small traditional paper making village in Taiwan is presented by Hsiao-Wei Lin, which is an interesting counter-point to the massive industrial complexes discussed in some other papers.

The development of the World Heritage List is described by Peter Stott, and the issue of the appropriateness of existing World Heritage concepts and language to industrial, scientific and technological processes and sites is discussed by Michel Cotte. Stephen Hughes looks at the use of thematic studies of industrial and technological themes and the development of the World Heritage List.

The section on ‘Sharing and Enjoying’ has four papers that describe developments in industrial museums (Massimo Negri), the extent to which industrial and technological collections can be considered complete (Johannes Grosewinkelmann), the conservation of industrial artefacts (Euebi Casanelles and James Douet), and industrial heritage tourism (Wolfgang Ebert). These chapters deal with a number of practical and ethical issues relating to the collection, conservation and display of industrial and technological artefacts, active and static display, and the development of tourism through such projects as the ‘European Route of Industrial Heritage’.

‘Teaching and learning’ presents short articles on the teaching of industrial heritage and industrial archaeology in schools (Gràcia Dorel-Ferré) and universities (Györgyi Németh). In the latter shortcomings are identified in the absence or minimal presentation of architecture or town planning in industrial archaeology courses (given most conservation projects include these), and the absence of study or training in the industrial remains of Eastern Europe or Asia. As an aside, from an Australian perspective, it would be nice to have some industrial heritage training at all! An overview of current developments in distance and on-line learning is provided by Tuija Mikkonen.

The last section looks at TICCIH itself, with an overview of TICCIH’s history and involvement in industrial heritage globally presented by TICCIH’s long-serving Secretary, the late Stuart Smith, and a discussion of the development of what became the Nizhny Tagil Charter by Euebi Casanelles, formerly President of TICCIH for more than a decade.

The book is a useful contribution to the understanding of the history of industrial heritage conservation and provides some insights into how it is currently practiced. It suffers a bit, however, from its apparently mixed origins. James Douet in his introduction indicates that the book started out as a ‘glossed’ version of TICCIH’s Nizhny Tagil Charter, then morphed into a ‘definitive international guide to contemporary best practices’. The chapters read as a mix between aims – some provide discussion and processes guiding best practice in philosophy and conservation, with case studies of relatively recent conservation projects that illustrate these, while other chapters are more descriptive of past practices without reflecting changing perspectives and the need for new approaches.

The book’s chapters often outline the issues involved in the understanding of industrial heritage values, the conservation of specific sites to protect those values, and the re-use of industrial sites and landscapes, without often addressing the tension identified by Neil Cossons in his lead chapter:

…the world’s post-industrial landscapes are littered with outstanding places that have intrinsic value, in terms of their history and archaeology. This transcends any usefulness that adapting them for new purposes might afford, even supposing that to be possible. Here we need to preserve for history’s sake.

This tension between re-use and conservation is the elephant in the room. It is being aware of the need to protect and conserve industrial heritage, as much as the need to re-use and...
rehabilitate ‘blighted’ industrial buildings and landscapes, that is important in striking a balance between the two, and so preserve at least the key parts of our industrial heritage for present and future generations. The questions, for example, of how to determine which sites are of sufficient importance to warrant the preservation, restoration or reconstruction of industrial sites, rather than adaptation (to use the Burra Charter terms); or incompatible change or use, and how that protection might be funded and managed, are critical in a period when our industrial past is rapidly disappearing. The book outlines both approaches, conservation and urban rehabilitation, but does little to advance a philosophical and practical balancing of the two. This is perhaps the most profitable dialogue that ICOMOS can have with TICCIH over the coming years.

Michael Pearson

Remembering the future: Warlpiri life through the Prism of Drawing


Mervyn Meggitt was one of the first students of anthropology at the University in Sydney. In 1953 and 1954 Meggitt methodically collected drawings from twenty-four Warlpiri men and women at the settlement of Hooker Creek (now known as Lajamanu), on the northern edge of the Tanami Desert. Meggitt was seeking visual distillations of ritual knowledge, yet the Warlpiri respondents transcended the terms of his request and produced a number of art works that astounded Meggitt in their experimental breadth and attention to phenomena beyond the ceremonial domain.

Six decades later these drawings have been re-introduced to the descendants of the (now-deceased) men and women who made them, by the social anthropologist Melinda Hinkson – of the Australian National University’s School of Archaeology and Anthropology, Canberra – who has taken the descendants on a new round of discussions, triggering recollections of earlier times, animating contemporary predicaments and channelling fears and hopes for the future. Remembering the Future explores how these images, and others like it, reflect post-colonial relationships and provide a platform from which to understand other’s experience of place over time. By comparing the 1950s views of Meggitt, by academics and by the makers themselves, with observations held by the maker’s descendants, by community members, and by other academics, Hinkson is able to capture the interface of Warlpiri religious practise and the intercultural complexities of post-colonial settlement life from multiple viewpoints.

Within Remembering the Future, the author has examined Mervyn Meggitt’s unique collection of 169 crayon drawings created by twenty-one Warlpiri men and three Warlpiri women within the years 1953 and 1954. These (mainly crayon) drawings are used by Hinkson to explore the transformations in Warlpiri life following their relocation to the government settlement of Hooker Creek in the Northern Territory.

As introduction, the author prepares the reader for the Warlpiri’s world view by describing Warlpiri iconography, the complex social structure maintained across the Central Desert region, the way ritual knowledge can become ‘restricted’, and how images can retain an intangible cultural connection to the objects depicted. The author’s deep understanding of these complex concepts and her ability to elicit sophisticated levels of meaning through ‘complex memory work’ with her informants is clearly evident. This ‘exploration of drawing’ is structured within six narrative chapters, which are interspersed with four interludes encouraging the reader to gain insight into relevant contextualising themes including comparable works from the 1930s, localised oral histories, observations from the author and an acknowledgement of the anthropologist collector.
Melinda Hinkson has (inevitably) adopted a speculative approach in describing the Meggitt collection, given that the explanations from the makers were not always documented, and that the contemporary analysis provided by Meggitt was largely speculative, and not corroborated by the artists. In contrast, and as a result of the Hinkson investigation, the ‘Warlpiri people have made hundreds of drawings responding to the 1950s drawings’, from which Hinkson is able to elicit meaning directly from the ‘modern’ makers, just as Meggitt attempted to do some eighty years ago. The new drawings, as with the 1950s drawings, depicted concerns ‘about the present, a lack of a communal vision for the future, and an openness to the world and the new’.

This beautifully written, illustrated, and published book provides a major insight into the history, cultural attitudes, and current circumstances of the Warlpiri.

Susan Dale Donaldson and Peter Freeman