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PREFACE

To preserve cultural, natural and historical heritage is the most important topic that states and publics place emphasize on and it is an area which United Nations being in the first place, Europe Union, European Council and their various organizations’ studies are focused on. Damages caused by whether natural disasters or man-made hazards are threatening directly and continuously cultural and historical heritage. Occurrence of irremediable damages is inevitable when existing structural conditions of historical heritage buildings and high risks of disasters are met. Risk is rising when taking into account the transformation of natural events into disasters and their occurrence frequencies are increasing particularly in recent years.

A lot of activities are been realizing such as assessing the seismic risk related to buildings in the scope of cultural and historical heritage and preparing the reinforcement, restoration and restitution projects for sample buildings under the B component of “Istanbul Seismic Risk Mitigation and Emergency Preparedness Project (ISMEP)” which aims to mitigate risks of disasters especially earthquake risk of Istanbul having implemented for six years. In the scope of integrated disaster management principles, we are also carrying out supplementary efforts in collaboration with precious academicians of Yildiz Technical University to support our studies, to build up “Turkey Prevention Regulation” intended to create a common prevention language in studies of cultural and historic al heritage and to contribute international area. We are also pleased to be a part of “Cultural Heritage of Protection in times of Risk; Challenges and Opportunities Conference” which another one of the supplementary collaboration efforts.

We wish that these proceedings formed with the selected beyond valuable studies will light the way for many of studies carried out in the field and contribute to new approaches in the scope of conference which aims to identify all the risks that affect historical and cultural heritage, to share the studies carried out or planned for mitigating their impacts, and to present solution suggestions.

I would like to thank to Yildiz Technical University, ICOMOS-ICORP, ICOMOS TR, Ritsumeikan University Disaster Management Center, all board members, and academicians.

Kazım Gökhan ELGIN
Istanbul Project Coordination Unit Director
PREFACE

Even though the cause of climate change is an ongoing discussion topic, it is the fact that scientists in the field of climatology agree on global climate change continuum. Scientific studies show that natural disasters will increase in the next 20 – 40 years. Advanced climate models do not provide good news about our climate in the future. It is estimated increasing of global surface temperatures will continue in the 21st century. According to this prospect dramatic change in the global level such hydrological cycle change, land and sea ice melting, snow and ice area contraction, sea level rise, climate zones change and increase of epidemic diseases and pests depending on high temperatures that will significantly affect human life, socioeconomic sectors, and ecological systems is estimated. In the meantime it should be noted that the effects of climate change due to global warming may show spatial and temporal differences in the future as in past and present. The future predictions are increasing of natural disasters such hurricanes, floods and their impacts in some parts of the world. On the other hand long-term severe events such as droughts and desertification in some regions are expected to be more effective.

In addition, the effort to access to energy and food brought the international conflicts, tension and wars shows that unfortunately will be continue. Although disaster is defined as natural based event in the dictionary local conflicts and wars and terrorist attacks that are considered as unpredictable and harmless events to society and humans should be added to disaster concept. Obviously human beings and natural life will be affected primarily from this natural and manmade “disaster” s in present and future. Today, human beings who died, injured, from time to time forced to relocation and lost their habitats, unfortunately is the main part of breaking news in mass communication instruments.

Both natural and manmade disasters obviously cause great losses to tangible or intangible cultural heritage beside to “life”. Different damages and injures emerged depending on the type of disasters unfortunately affect also all types of cultural heritage. Results of disasters to tangible heritage present their selves as destruction by fire or being submerged and results of disasters to intangible heritage present their selves as disappearance of people who shaped it or differentiation of identity or misidentification. The sequence of losses, restorations and repair made in a hurry and negligently may continue. Even the reason of earthquake or another disaster caused the injury to human beings could be assigned to historical system as a cultural identity sometimes. In this context, to be prepared before any disaster in today’s world as the undisputed priority of human well must include human presence in this planet and its continuity and cultural heritage elements as base of future creations. The concept of preparedness mention in previous sentence includes all issues regarding both before and after natural or manmade disasters. Management of these mentioned risks requires understanding continuity of cultural heritage and its diversity besides local and international differences.

This symposium organized by Yildiz Technical University, ICOMOS – ICORP International Committee of Risk Preparedness, Istanbul Governorship Special Provincial Administration Istanbul Project Coordination Unit (IPKB) and Ristumeiken University Disaster Management Center aims to share, discuss and contribute to solutions improved and applied against natural and manmade disasters affected cultural heritage. Outstanding efforts of the organizing committee for this purpose since the beginning and devotion all the team of scientific committee and the advisory board and selected high quality abstracts formed proceedings book of the symposium. We all wish to share this scientific reference to be valuable for future studies on protection of cultural heritage and all its values, to associate with new ideas and original approaches.

Wish the future without disasters

Prof. Dr. Can Ş. Binan

Head of Yildiz Technical University Faculty of Architecture, Restoration Department
PREFACE

Cultural heritage; an irreplaceable resource of humanity is increasingly at risk from various natural and human-induced hazards. While on one hand, climate change is exposing cultural heritage in ecologically sensitive mountainous and coastal regions to an alarming increase in the frequency and intensity of hydro-meteorological hazards, the increased pressure of development and urbanization are threatening the historic urban landscapes and associated cultural traditions that have evolved over generations and making these increasingly vulnerable to natural hazards such as earthquakes and floods. To add to these threats, conflicts arising from armed aggression and civic unrest have caused insurmountable harm to cultural heritage as is shown by recent incidents in Mali, Syria, Egypt and Libya.

In the light of these challenges, it is very timely and pertinent that the conference ‘Cultural Heritage Protection in Times of Risk: Challenges and Opportunities’ is being organized in Istanbul by Yildiz Technical University and ICOMOS-ICORP; the International Scientific Committee on Risk Preparedness from 15 to 17 November 2012.

I take this opportunity to thank Dr. Zeynep Gul Unal, Professor, Department of Architecture at Yildiz Technical University and Expert Member of ICOMOS-ICORP for her conviction, energy and leadership that has made this event a reality. I also extend thanks to her colleagues and students at the university as well as all the partners for their untiring efforts in realizing this important initiative. Thanks are also due to all the Scientific Committee members from ICOMOS-ICORP, who reviewed the papers and to all those who presented these, thereby ensuring that deliberations during the symposium are of highest professional standards.

Early this year, we lost a great visionary, teacher and professional in the field of heritage conservation; Prof. Herb Stovel. Prof. Stovel pioneered the cause of risk preparedness for cultural heritage and contributed immensely in articulating the approach and philosophy on risk preparedness for cultural heritage besides teaching in many international training courses on the subject. He also authored the first book on the subject ‘Risk Preparedness: A Management Manual for World Cultural Heritage’, which set the stage for many international and national initiatives in this area. Above all, he inspired many heritage professionals who are working to fulfill the task he set about. Therefore it is all the more pertinent to dedicate the proceedings of the symposium to the memory of Herb.

My hope is that these proceedings would go beyond mere intellectual discourse and inform and influence all the stakeholders at institutional as well as individual levels so that we are able to achieve practical results in reducing risks to our priceless cultural assets for the benefit of the present and the future generations.

Rohit Jigyasu

President, ICOMOS-ICORP
UNESCO Chair Professor, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto
PREFACE

Nowadays societies are losing their natural and cultural heritage due to natural as well as human induced disasters. Cultural and natural heritage values form the collective memories of societies and are common values on which all the world has a right. In global world order, destruction of natural and cultural heritage affects the whole world. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to preserve the natural and cultural values. However, with natural disasters or man induced harm due to wars, accidents or unsuitable applications make it difficult to protect and sustain the natural and cultural heritage which stand against time.

To preserve these values which are inherited from the past and to pass them to future generations is possible only through raising generations and professionals with awareness. One of the most important features to provide and accelerate this education and development process is of course sharing experiences. Academics of Yıldız Technical University Faculty of Architecture and members of ICOMOS-ICORP International Council of Monuments and Sites have organized the symposium, “Cultural Heritage in Times of Risk: Challenges and Opportunities” as a way of this sharing. The symposium, supported by Republic of Turkey Istanbul Governorship Special Provincial Administration Istanbul Project Coordination Unit (IPCU), ICOMOS Turkey National Commission and Ritsumeikan University Research Center for Disaster Mitigation of Urban Cultural Heritage, defines the threats that might damage cultural and natural heritage while discussing ways and opportunities for their protection. The studies that will be presented in this symposium aim to share and enhance the international experiences and original ideas, spread knowledge as well as increase awareness. Therefore, it was decided to collect all these studies in a book and publish them.

On behalf of my faculty, I would like to thank Yıldız Technical University Rectorate, ICOMOS International Committee on Risk Preparedness, Istanbul Governorship Special Provincial Administration Istanbul Project Coordination Unit, ICOMOS Turkey National Commission, Ritsumeikan University Research Center for Disaster Mitigation of Urban Cultural Heritage, Organizing Committee, Advisory Committee and Scientific Committee members who devotedly worked for the selection of proceedings, all the researchers and scientists who present their valuable studies and all the supporting corporations for putting their effort in this organization.

Hoping this symposium will increase awareness in preservation of cultural heritage and expand horizons.

Prof. Dr. Murat Soygeniş
Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Architecture Dean
PREFACE

Today, tangible and intangible heritage not only belongs to the societies that they belong to, but they are of supranatural value. Protection and sustainability of cultural and natural heritage, and to carry them onto next generation is the duty of all societies. However, both natural disasters and disasters which are caused by men directly or indirectly make the protection of cultural and natural heritage very difficult or even impossible. Disasters like earthquake, floods and storms which are caused by global climate changes, fires, conflicts, unfortunately give irreplaceable harm to all sorts of cultural heritage.

This symposium has been prepared in the partnership of Yıldız Technical University, ICOMOS-ICORP International Monuments and Sites Council Risk Preparedness Committee and Istanbul Project Coordination Section of Governorship of Istanbul Provincial Administration (IPKB), and with the support of ICOMOS Turkish National Committee and Disaster Management Centre of University of Ritsumeikan, and it aims protection of cultural and natural heritage and disaster risk mitigation at times of risk. Experts, academics and researchers have been gathered together for this symposium with the subject; “Cultural Heritage Protection in Times of Risk: Challenges and Opportunities”, to share their expertise for protection and disaster management at times of risk, to share their experience, and thus increasing awareness. Within this context, papers which have been selected to be presented in the symposium as a result of efforts of the organisation committee, meticulous work of the advisory and science committees, have been collected in this book to spread them to the mass, and to make them permanent, so as to produce solutions for problems, providing ideas for decision makers.

I Present my special thanks and respect to all academics, all individuals and institutions who have offered their support during the organisation of “Cultural Heritage Protection in Times of Risk: Challenges and Opportunities” symposium, on behalf of my university.

Prof. Dr. İsmail YÜKSEK
President of Yıldız Technical University
IN MEMORY OF HERB STOVEL
Herb Stovel
Recalling His Legacy on ICOMOS, Conservation and Disasters Reduction

By Dinu Bumbaru
Founding member, ICOMOS-ICORP
President, ICOMOS Canada
Past Secretary General, ICOMOS

The sudden and saddening departure of Herb Stovel last March left many in ICOMOS and in the field of conservation with a deep sense of lost. For many, he was more than just an outstanding colleague or professor. He was a towering figure in the community of those who care for heritage buildings, sites, towns or landscapes, an inspiring mentor, and a friend who will be long missed.

Herb left a massive legacy which will be surely explored and commented by scholars, students and professionals over the coming decades thus giving a new life to his stimulating presence through his words and ideas. His work on authenticity, World Heritage, the heritage of living territories or the role of communities in conservation will undoubtedly hold a substantial part in these transactions. No less important is his role in bringing professionals and organisations like ICOMOS to pay a greater attention to those natural or human hazards which impose onto heritage the threats of catastrophic loss.

There, he played a key role of which one tangible evidence is his Risk Preparedness: A Management Manual for World Cultural Heritage published in 1998 by ICCROM with UNESCO and ICOMOS. That useful manual is somehow the tip of the iceberg of his attention to this subject of many shifting names – risk preparedness, disaster management, disaster reduction, etc. The better understanding and appreciation of Herb’s influence would require some substantial research and – why not? a good old authentic symposium or round table à la Herb to share information and opinion, debate and, mostly, have some good time amongst curious, enthusiastic and dedicated humans beings of diverse backgrounds but sharing a common cause.

In waiting for that symposium – ICORP and the International Committee on Theory perhaps, early moments of Herb’s involvement in the theme of heritage and disasters are worth recalling. In 1990, Herb had just started as coordinator of the Université de Montréal conservation masters programme and was elected Secretary General of ICOMOS with Roland Silva as President. A series of major highly mediatised events like hurricane Hugo (1989) or the First Gulf War (1990) had increased public and institutional awareness for heritage in these circumstances.

One of the most shocking of these events was the bombing of the historic center of Dubrovnik on the 6th December 1991 in the early phases of the collapse and violent implosion of Yugoslavia. The historic center of Dubrovnik had been inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979, the year if suffered a major earthquake which required a decade of painstaking post-earthquake recovery and restoration. In December 1991, this historic city was besieged and UNESCO had sent a diplomatic mission which lived through the mortar shelling. Facing those events, Herb and Leo van Nispen, the Director of the ICOMOS Secretariat, a meeting of UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOM, APT, etc. was convened at ICOMOS to consider common actions. In parallel, UNESCO sent for the first time in an active war zone, an expert mission (Daniel Lefèvre and myself) to document damage and restoration needs. Things were invented as we went in those days.

The 1991 meeting convened by Herb repeated and evolved into the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) with a close ICOMOS-UNESCO cooperation on the issue. The taskforce generated the 5-point Risk Preparedness Scheme – Documentation, Manuals, Teams, Awareness and Funding – and brought ICOMOS to evaluate UNESCO programmes in terms of risk preparedness. This is also the place where the International Committee of the Blue Shield was founded in 1996 by ICOMOS, ICOM, ICA and IFLA with support of UNESCO and ICCROM. It is in that sequence that ICOMOS established ICORP in 1997, as proposed by Leo who was concerned about ICOMOS unbalanced attention for curatorial rather than preventive conservation.
Herb was also one of the key organisers and the rapporteur of the First National Summit on Heritage and Risk Preparedness convened in September 1996 in Québec City at the initiative of ICOMOS Canada. The Summit’s focus was to provide a forum to have the heritage and the disaster management sectors meet for a first time face to face. It succeeded thanks to Herb and to valuable contributions from UNESCO and colleagues from the Netherlands, Japan, Macedonia and the USA. The Canadian Summit provided a much needed model for assessing and improving the institutional framework at the national level for the greater good of heritage and its conservation. It was genuinely rooted in the authentic spirit of ICOMOS as Herb saw it, an initiative to bring diverse viewpoints together along with the full richness of local, national and international experiences to cross borders and bridge gaps between heritage and other sectors of society.

Though it doesn’t entertain the same aura as the Nara Document on authenticity, the «Quebec Declaration on Heritage and Risk Preparedness» drafted by Herb and adopted at the Canadian Summit is nevertheless an important reference as well as a building stone in what ICORP exists to accomplish. It forms an appendix to the Risk Preparedness Manual authored by Herb and helped in the Kobe - Tokyo declaration he wrote from the international symposium commemorating in 1997, the second anniversary of the Great Hanshin Awaji earthquake.

Whether as the Secretary General who engaged ICOMOS in a concerted process that gave birth to ICORP and the Blue Shield or as the convener and rapporteur of ICOMOS Canada’s National Summit, Herb expanded our views of heritage and our commitment to address the conservation challenges it faces. These are part of his legacy and we should take a particular interest and pride in keeping it alive, not as a precious and inaccessible gem but as a venerable tree that shelters people, inspires artists and guides the travelers in a rich landscape or a forest.

As time goes by, the memory of the landmarks initiatives of 15-20 years ago erodes, constantly exposed to a flow of new ideas – some superficial than substantial, all aiming at a better future for heritage. Through ICORP, let’s commit to keeping the inspiring presence and the vast legacy of Herb Stovel, alive and fertile.
My Personal Reminiscences of Herb

By Rohit Jigyasu
UNESCO Chair Professor, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto
President, ICOMOS-ICORP
Interim President, ICOMOS-India

It is indeed challenging to write a piece on someone like Herb; a multifaceted person, a visionary, thinker, mentor, a giant among the giants whose contribution to heritage conservation cannot be summed up in few words. Herb in his illustrious lifetime touched lives of so many people; inspiring them and shaping their outlook towards heritage conservation. I consider myself fortunate to be among those people. There is so much one can write about Herb but for this short piece, I would limit myself to sharing some personal reminiscences of this great personality and briefly articulating his views on risk preparedness for cultural heritage based on my correspondence with him over the years.

Although I had been reading Herb's work since I joined my post graduate studies in conservation, my personal association with him began in 2002, when I joined ICCROM as a visiting fellow for three months. On my first day at ICCROM, I come across this huge bearded guy, whose larger than life persona and deep voice made me feel a bit nervous at the first instance. To my astonishment, I realized that he was well acquainted with my doctoral research that I had just completed and was already waiting for me with some pointed questions during our first meeting itself.

A few days after I had settled at ICCROM, Herb came to me with his famous book “Risk Preparedness: A Management Manual for World Heritage Properties” and asked me to give my comments on how it can be improved. Being a young professional, I was a bit intrigued at the idea of commenting on this pioneering work. After listening to my critical comments, Herb merely smiled rather a bit mischievously and only some days later came back to me with an offer of consultancy to develop the training kit on risk preparedness for cultural heritage, which would help ICCROM in developing courses on the subject. I felt humbled at his offer of my first international consultancy and on thanking him for providing me with this unique opportunity, he simply smiled and said “You do not need to thank me. You should do the same if you find another Rohit on your way.” It was this very opportunity provided by Herb that laid the basis for my later work in this area that continues till date. Such was his conviction in young professionals as he firmly believed that giving opportunities to them would bring in fresh ideas and energy to intellectual and practical pursuits in heritage conservation.

In fact, it was Herb’s initiative to bring together five young conservation professionals from various countries in South Asia (most of them ICCROM alumni) to set up a unique online forum called ‘SANEYOCOP’ – The South Asian Network for Young Conservation Professionals as an initiative to voice regional concerns and initiatives at the international forum, which was needed in the absence of or ineffective national committees of ICOMOS in most of the countries in the region. In his introductory note to the network, Herb candidly remarked, “For the network to be effective, it must have results oriented objectives...it will never be enough just to feel that you can talk with someone somewhere; there is a need to feel that your efforts will produce some changes, some results somewhere.”

After returning to India, my dialogue with Herb on various issues and perspectives on heritage management specifically risk preparedness continued through series of exchanges over email. He not only questioned existing notions and practices on heritage management but also engaged in an intellectually stimulating debate on new theoretical perspectives and practical ideas on risk preparedness of cultural heritage.

Herb was also an excellent teacher who believed in ‘case based’ learning through use of interactive mediums which included good old transparencies for overhead projection. He shunned power points as cold monologues that discouraged effective engagement of participants. The opportunity of co-teaching with him an ICCROM course on Risk preparedness in Delhi during March 2004 organized to test the training kit helped me immensely in learning these important skills.
My interactions with Herb continued till 2010 with occasional opportunities to meet and work together. I met him for the last time in July 2010 during World Heritage Session in Brasilia, where he provided some very useful suggestions for the future activities of ICOMOS-ICORP and personally put me in touch with representatives from various organizations. Herb also asked me to speak to his students who had joined the committee meeting as interns. He was always so enthusiastic to be in company of his students and looked for opportunities to inspire them through interactions with his former students and colleagues.

I shall conclude this write up by articulating some key points raised by Herb on risk preparedness of cultural heritage that I gathered during my correspondence with him over the years.

According to him, the most important thing that can be done to reduce disaster losses to cultural heritage before they occur is to ensure that there is a protocol in place in any community which defines a strong and authoritative voice for defense of heritage, immediately post disaster. He believed and rightly so that if the place of the heritage voice is not established in the line of command for response to fire or earthquake or whatever, before the disaster occurs, it will be too late to establish this after the fact.

He stated “In many disasters that I have looked at in my professional life, it is the lack of this authority to intervene and evaluate damage in ways which will not threaten life and security but which will respect the capacity of a structure to do its job in future that results in more physical loss than the disaster itself.” He cited the example of Edinburgh, where 11 of the 12 buildings destroyed due to fire were pulled down by the civil authorities because the heritage advocates and professionals who could have stabilised without threat to life or property were not allowed into the discussion. It is important therefore to look at process and to ensure that the preparedness activity examines “line of command” and makes a place for the heritage advocate during response.

This according to him meant planning – but not producing a plan. Herb stressed that management plans have a place and can be very useful, but if not produced in the right conditions (built internally, grassroots up, with stakeholders etc., built with those with implementation responsibility), they go nowhere. The contemporary expectations and challenges comprise of the need to clarify intended focus, the need for proven models and success stories and the need to improve the coherence in overall planning.

According to him, the focus on this area is often unclear due to the lack of agreed definitions of terms such as risk preparedness, disaster preparedness, risk reduction, risk management, disaster mitigation etc. Herb was averse to the use of term disasters in an exclusive manner as these are not normally understood to include the consequences of conflict. Hence this word choice according to him leaves out or sets aside a commitment made in the early 90s in the UNESCO System to stop separating natural disasters from armed conflict results. “The International Committee of the Blue Shield (ICBS) was built around this idea. So he questioned the return to what most people would interpret to signify exclusively the world of natural disasters?”

He further emphasized the need to defend and promote traditional building technologies, focus on psychological impact particularly in recovery and define consolidated principles. Single coordinated international response is still lacking and integrated approaches are difficult to ensure. Information sharing is arduous with no single sources. Additionally there is a proliferation of unconnected and unknown initiatives.

He further stated that since all heritage properties are not homogenously the same, it is not correct to adopt a shared methodology for risk preparedness which would be applicable to all. Architectural monuments and complexes, historic towns and landscapes, archaeological sites are necessarily separate and therefore require differentiating treatment of properties according to their typology but also providing hands-on guidance to processes in a much more down to earth way for each of these typologies.

Herb was a strong advocate of an integrated approach for heritage management. According to him “We need one management plan for a heritage site, which puts together all concerns and suggests how that site may be managed to meet all needs including heritage. We do not need management plans that focus only
on conserving the heritage assuming there are other management plans dealing with transport, housing, food, water etc. The integrated heritage manager promotes a management approach which finds a place for heritage in the big picture, not just promotes a heritage approach which others may adopt or not as they see fit.” Therefore disaster risk management should also be part of this larger picture rather than an exclusive plan in itself.

His last communication to me was dictated to his son from hospital bed in November last year congratulating me for my election to ICOMOS Executive Committee. His last words for me were “I look forward to lots of communication in the immediate future how to best motivate ICOMOS”. Unfortunately that communication could never happen as he never managed to recover from his illness leaving all of us forever. For me it is a great personal loss of a mentor, who is not there physically to guide me. However his words of wisdom will continue to inspire me forever like for many others.
REMEMBERING HERB STOVEL IN NEPAL

By Kai Weise
Architect and UNESCO Consultant on Heritage Management, Kathmandu

In 2003 the seven monument zones of the Kathmandu Valley were inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to uncontrolled urbanization and the loss of historic fabric. The World Heritage Committee requested the Government of Nepal to redefine the monument zone boundaries and establish an Integrated Management Plan. Herb Stovel, the most experienced expert in the field of World Heritage conservation was invited to be the international technical advisor.

Herb was initially hesitant to get involved stating that many an expert had burnt their fingers on Kathmandu. Nevertheless in February 2005 he consented and wrote "I would be happy to take on Kathmandu. I was first there in 1978 and found myself more entranced by the experience of the time than by any place I have been to, before or since. In 1992, my next visit, the transformation was incredible - all downhill. It’s a difficult problem but still worth the effort."

In 1978, Herb had made the then fashionable flower-power pilgrimage to Nepal. He probably did not know that at the time the nomination for the Kathmandu Valley was being prepared, leading to the inscription of the seven monument zones as a single World Heritage site in 1979. He probably also did not know how closely he was going to get entwined in the fate of this heritage property.

By the time Herb made his next visit to Kathmandu in November 1992, he was the Secretary-General of ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) and in Patan for the International Wood Committee Symposium. The participants were shocked by the dramatic transformation of the heritage site and their focus and ire came to rest on the Japanese I-Baha-Bahi restoration project. The ongoing reconstruction was considered to be intrusive, drastically affecting the authenticity of the heritage building.

At the next World Heritage Committee session in 1993, Herb directly challenged the Japanese delegation on their methods of intervention. The concerned delegate, Kanefusa Masuda was taken by surprise with no response. Having been put into an awkward position, Masuda in turn challenged Herb to clarify the contrasting perceptions of authenticity, especially between Asia and the West. This was the impetus which led to a conference being organized in 1994 and the drafting of the Nara Document on Authenticity, which transformed the global approach to heritage conservation. At the same time a decade long wrangling commenced to put Kathmandu Valley site on the Danger List.

I had of course heard of Herb long before I got around to meeting him. His name graced a lot of publications, documents and reports. In the email correspondence even before the start of our project, Herb repeatedly mentioned the long list of names of Nepali experts who had been trained at ICCROM. I was not on this list and was challenged to prove myself. I was in Delhi at the end of April 2005 when Herb and Junko Okahashi from the World Heritage Centre were returning from their mission to the Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya. Though I did not have a chance to meet Herb, I was provided with a tremendously positive image of the great mentor.

I met Herb for the first time on 7 August 2005 at the Hotel Annapurna in Kathmandu and coincidentally Rohit Jigyasu was present. At the time Herb was very much involved in critically reviewing the then ongoing preparation of the management plan for Hampi by Nalini Thakur. Herb championed the cause of the new generation of conservation architects such as Rohit who were working on numerous projects without being given the due recognition. Many of these younger conservation architects that I have met throughout the world seemed to have been trained in one way or another by Herb. As an educator, Herb indulged in teaching and guiding the process of negotiating with authorities and stakeholders and formulating plans. I had worked on municipal planning before, but concerning heritage conservation, I was learning at each step.
Kathmandu is probably one of the most complex World Heritage properties, with components scattered over three municipalities and one Village Development Committee. Though Herb saw Kathmandu to be a difficult problem, he was quick at assessing potentials of any given situation and was flexible enough to building on what he found. The Integrated Management Framework document was prepared and adopted by the Cabinet of the Government of Nepal. From being practically kicked off the World Heritage List in 2004, the management system for Kathmandu Valley was considered to be exemplary and the property was taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007.

This was however not the end of Herb’s engagement in Nepal. The very next year Herb was invited as the International Technical Advisor to provide guidance for the preparation of the management plan for Lumbini. A mission was carried out to Lumbini in April 2008 where an interaction program with the local authorities and stakeholders was organized. Herb went to great lengths and beyond the duties of his contract with UNESCO to prepare a comprehensive mission report with clear practicable recommendations. He was greatly hurt when his report was demonized by a local official whose personal interests were probably infringed upon. Herb took great care dealing with the local authorities and his awareness is shown in his comment after our first workshop in Kathmandu in August 2005. “I can say that the DOA liked me and my interventions, they felt that I was listening to them and their concerns, and the workshop while full of contention was successful in launching the project.” His work was greatly appreciated by the then Director General of the Department of Archaeology, Kosh Prasad Acharya.

In February 2009, the “Kathmandu Symposium on Protecting World Cultural Heritage Sites and their Historic Urban Environment from Earthquakes” was held at the Hotel Himalaya. The symposium took place in the very room that the ICOMOS Wood Committee had met in 1992 and ironically both Herb and Masuda were at the symposium together. Herb was one of the early advocates of risk preparedness for cultural heritage, for which he prepared a manual at ICCROM in 1998. Masuda held the UNESCO Chair on Cultural Heritage and Risk Management at Ritsumeikan University in Kyoto. Here the baton was however being passed on to Rohit who had been following up on this task through his work on the 2006 ICCROM document “Integrated Framework for Cultural Heritage Risk Management”.

Herb’s last mission to Nepal was in June 2009 for the preparation of a Japanese funded project for Lumbini and associated historic Buddhist sites in the region. His proposals for the serial nominations linked to Lumbini showed us possibilities that were right in front of our eyes, but that we could not see. During this mission when temperatures soared to over 45 degrees centigrade, Herb complained of an aching back. At the time we had no idea that this was leading to a fateful struggle with his health. Herb passed away on 14 March 2012.

Herb was an imposing man, a learned Sadhu of Heritage Conservation. Herb could get irritated, upset and be very direct with this critic, but his humour and joviality always shone through. His big white moustache and beard hid his mischievous smile. The bushy eyebrows partially covered his twinkling eyes. At a party in 2006, he moved the TV onto the dining table to watch Italy play in the football World Cup. In Lumbini he thoroughly enjoyed sitting under the Kadamba tree just outside the east gate reviewing the day’s events and sharing jokes with some Signature whiskey and roasted soya beans. The last night in Kathmandu he came over to my place. He beamed with joy listening to my wife Abhaya sing “Diamonds and Rust”, which doubtlessly took him back to the memories of the Kathmandu during his first visit in 1978.
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Summary:

The ancient town Dubrovnik with many historical monuments of the 14th and 15th century is inscribed on UNESCO’s list of the World Cultural Heritage. There is a perpetual quest today for «character» of the places and cities, enhanced by mass tourism, where history is becoming more and more abused. Identity becomes fixed, overdetermined, insisting on an essence, a point, and that is why Paris is becoming more Parisian – it is already on its way to becoming hyper-Paris, a polished caricature. A greater focus on the cultural heritage as a resource for societal growth, such as tourism or other aspects of the experience industry, has turned the cultural heritage into process of becoming a commercial product. Developed commercial use of the cultural heritage can mean over-exploitation and wear and tear.

During the last decade, recent redistribution of property, capital investment, new market economy, and tremendous mass tourism flows buoyed up by a wave of political and social transformation in Dubrovnik that have led to the drastic gentrification of the area and greatly exacerbated the situation. Despite the economic activities related to the increase of tourism, the inhabitants tend to abandon the Old City. The vision of Dubrovnik and its future is unfortunately directed towards touristic mega-projects that do not correspond to the sensibility of historic urban context, and furthermore do not reflect the aspirations and the needs of the local community. On the contrary the hyper-production of mass tourism facilities nullifies public spaces and places of the city, thus converting them into commercialized sub-spaces, „touristic spaces”. The urban and collective memory of the city and its inhabitants is evaporating amidst new mass tourism that does not encourage the sustainable development of the local community.

Furthermore, the preferential right of interpretation that was previously the sole domain of public cultural heritage actors is now shared with those within others areas, such as the tourist industry with new valuations of authenticity and idealisation of the concept of heritage. However, discussions of improving the consumer’ nature of tourism rarely include any detailed consideration of improving the nature and behavior of tourists. Still, the effective interpretation can play a critical role in sustainable tourism by educating tourists about the nature of the host region and culture, influencing them of the consequences of their actions, enhancing their experience and encouraging them to engage in sustainable behaviors. Effective interpretation can relieve crowding and congestion, alter behavior, either through information or indirectly through fostering visitor appreciation of a site, and create public support for conservation of built heritage sites through positive visitor experiences. Tourists can play a central role in the creation of more sustainable tourism thus making a substantial contribution to the sustainability of heritage in general. Future strategies for rehabilitation of the city should consider and reflect the local needs and aspirations, while in order to substantially improve heritage’ conservation and management “mindful visitors” should be sustained.

Heritage is not “the beauty of the dead” but the living practices recognized in the image of contemporary reality, that makes of living context a memory world.

Keywords: identity, mass tourism, gentrification, commodification, effective interpretation, sustainable tourist behavior
«Abused» history through stylized images of heritage

We are aware today that heritage is a social construct, and its value is never intrinsic quality but is externally imposed according to culturally and historically specific frameworks (Pendlebury, J. 2009). The meaning of heritage, thus cannot be interpreted as fixed anymore, nor its traditional notions of intrinsic value, and authenticity, can be sustained as the only criteria. Until now, norms that dictated heritage as a very stable term, were notions such as: intrinsic values, authenticity, and «masterpieces». The fact is that behind its traditional philosophical matters of faith, heritage is at its core politicized and contested, and these cultural norms are being replaced today, by openly contentious and fractious cultural politics. With respect to the latter, it has been recently recognized that heritage is essentially a political idea that asserts a public or national interest while sustaining power relations. Nationalism, imperialism, colonialism, cultural elitism, social exclusion based on class and ethnicity, have all exerted strong influences on how heritage is used, defined and managed. Up until recently, heritage has privileged old, grand, prestigious, expert approved sites, buildings and artefacts that sustain traditional narratives of nation, class and science. Therefore, any encouraging attempt to democratise heritage policy would require rejection of these elite cultural narratives while embracing the heritage insights of people, communities and cultures that have traditionally been marginalised in formulating heritage policy.

Additionally, there is a perpetual quest today for «character» of the places and cities, enhanced by mass tourism, where history is becoming more and more abused. Identity becomes fixed, overdetermined, insisting on an essence, a point, and that is why Paris is becoming more Parisian – it is already on its way to becoming hyper-Paris, a polished caricature. The fact is that heritage bends and reshapes the past to a present purpose. It basically mimics history as it sentimentalises, fabricates and distorts historical traces and historical tales, that are open neither to critical analysis nor to comparative scrutiny (Fairclough, and Jameson, 2008).

As much as our contemporary culture is in a process of cultural fusion, our heritage is as well, by being constructed over and over again, with our changing beliefs and values. In this process of cultural fusion, traditions are entirely being „re-invented“ and „history“ is becoming more and more, commodified and misrepresented. All these notions such as a image of the past, museumification of the heritage, domination of experience industry, commodification and simulation of the culture, reflect the contestations and the conflicts of the contemporary society and its culture, whose very foundations obviously have been undermined, since every new time finds its legitimation in what it excludes. All these disputes underline the impossibility of reducing heritage to s simple formula since it is, by its very nature, an unstable and contested idea.

Museimification and identity reconstruction in World Heritage City of Dubrovnik

The ancient town of Dubrovnik with many historical monuments was inscribed on UNESCO’s list of the World Cultural Heritage in 1979 (World Heritage criteria: i, iii, iv). It was damaged in the 1990s by armed conflict during which some 800 buildings within old city received direct hits and several were substantially destroyed, which led to its inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Since 1992 Dubrovnik has been the focus of a major restoration program coordinated by UNESCO, what resulted with city’ removal from the Danger List in 1998.

Figure 1. Perspective view of the Old City of Dubrovnik
After the 1979 earthquake which damaged over 100 monuments in the city and its immediate region, the cultural heritage organizations in Dubrovnik experienced a period of excessive state funding that had a double-sided effect, since it enabled the restoration and conservation of major important historic buildings but also led to the conservation approach where the most important criteria was not the quality of conservation projects but the criteria of quantity that undermined the research part of the conservation process and emphasized *ad hoc* restoration by using reinforced-concrete floor slabs that proved later to be quite inappropriate for the historic urban fabric. The other major problem was the intended use of the restored buildings. The major *ad cathedram* conservation experts were advocating ‘museumification’ of the restored buildings. The conversion of the building ‘into a museum’ resulted with the loss of the building vital functions and instead created a series of isolated buildings that have imposed an unnatural homogeneity on a historic district originally characterized by diversity of expression and functions. Such static representations preserved city spaces (Venice, Florence,Paris) as if they were museum artifacts what is consequently opposed to the very concept of monument as the generating or inhibiting force influencing a city’s structural formation. In these museum cities, the transitions of time and heterogeneity of events and experiences have been reduced to the „uniformity”of visual scenography properly ordered and maintained. This frozen image of a past connected with stylized images and legendary visions has been supported by human need and conviction that through that image we can also preserve our native myths, our quest for origins, as it offers us assurance that we control our patrimony (Boyer, 1994).

Furthermore, the question of economic viability proved to be crucial since none of these restored buildings in Dubrovnik could have been sustained as being state-funded institutions without a management plan for additional financial initiatives that would have contributed their own budget. The consequence was the irretrievable loss of the initial regular budget with no additional external funding for the building maintenance, what at the end led to the building deterioration and had evoked again the question of their (repeated) restoration. Such decontextualized approach that has a rigid focus on building fabric and its appearance thus converting them into a fetish, and to the exclusion of other issues, has been characteristic of much modern conservation practice that ignores the inevitable social, cultural and economic consequences that can flow from conservation actions (Pendlebury, p.210-224, 2009).

Additionally, WH listing altered the traditional social context of the city by changing its social, demographic, economic and cultural character while turning it into economic commodity enhanced by the experience industry where the original inhabitants have to bear considerable inconvenience and in some cases to outright drop in their quality of life as the price of international fame and recognition. The popularity of „historic things” inevitably means that they become today, in a consumer society, an opportunity for consumption. The fact is that beyond the facade of the economic boom in WH towns, is the reality of property prices, and vacant and abandoned spaces. Developed commercial use of the cultural heritage can mean over-exploitation and wear and tear while physical regeneration might help processes of social inclusion but, conversely, might actively contribute to reinforcing social exclusion, for example through enabling gentrification. During the last decade, recent redistribution of property, capital investment, new market economy, and tremendous mass tourism flows buoyed up by a wave of political and social transformation in Dubrovnik that have led to the drastic gentrification of the area and greatly exacerbated the situation. Despite the economic activities related to the increase of tourism, the inhabitants tend to abandon the Old City. Additionally, many well-off foreigners have recently bought the properties in the old city thus investing in them, a process that helped the restoration of the urban fabric but consequently led to the gentrification of the area since the real estate prices went enormously high. Traditional houses of the old city are inhabited today by families living on modest income which does not allow repair or upgrading of the fabric. For example, only 800 hundred inhabitans live today in historic city of Dubrovnik in comparison with 3000 people that lived there just ten years ago.

The heritage industry represents today directly or indirectly an increasing percentage of national budgets and revenues. Obviously, for many states, regions and municipalities it represents economic survival and a secure futures and this is why it is now considerable undertaking. Critics of postmodernity often see this economic role of the heritage as a manifestation of late capitalism, a means of providing new, differentiated products for consumers, that reveals the idea of protecting historic buildings as the imposition on society as a whole of the tastes of a very small, elite minority (Pendlebury, 2009). Convinced that its survival depends on the heritage industry, the city' authorities vision of Dubrovnik and its future is...
unfortunately directed towards touristic mega-projects that do not correspond to the sensibility of historic urban context, and furthermore do not reflect the aspirations and the needs of the local community. Quite contrary, this hyper-production of mass tourism facilities nullifies public spaces and places of the city, thus converting them into commercialized sub-spaces, „touristic spaces”. The urban and collective memory of the city and its inhabitants is evaporating amidst new mass tourism that does not encourage the sustainable development of the local community. Public interest and public good is mainly expressed/represented through tourist industry-experience thus linking its heritage and identity to a place, what contributes to fetishisation of the place and space what at the same time contests this heritage. There is a dissonance in the very nature of Dubrovnik’ heritage since it has become more like an economic commodity which is multi-sold and multi-interpreted by tourist and domestic consumers.

Figure 2. Disonance of heritage - tourist cruisers in port of Dubrovnik

Another problem is the actual physical land-use conflict between different users of the space within which historical sites and monuments in the city are located. A more balanced exploitation of heritage resources within the space of the Old City is needed, by expanding the product range in space. Cities like Dubrovnik may be regarded today simultaneously as successful and profitable providers of satisfying heritage experiences, or little more than stage-sets for historic displays and tawdry souvenir shops that demonstrate the primacy of economic exchange. Unfortunately, both perspectives are reducing heritage to a little more than an adjunct to urban tourism and place marketing. The fundamental point is that the most important local heritage producers (measured in terms of number of outlets, customers or sales) in Dubrovnik are not the museums and galleries but the antique, arts and crafts shops, and similar traders of heritage goods and services. Therefore it is evident that the tourism uses of heritage are therefore in many respects more strongly related to other aspects of the tourism package than to other uses of heritage, which presents both opportunities and problems in its management (Smith, 2007).

The arena of heritage meaning is not spatial location, but internal city in which people carry out their everyday lives. This inherent tension between economic exploitation of heritage and its social and political uses, that underlines purposes of heritage today, are defined by the needs and demands of present societies, which are directing evolving concepts of heritage significance, that is more about its meanings than material artefacts. Traditional activities and lifestyles of residents in Dubrovnik serve today to establish social cohesion within a community, along with the values and beliefs from the past, that furthermore legitimize the authority of a nation in a post-conflict period. Dubrovnik is today mainly confirming its uniqueness and distinctiveness through preservation of its built heritage, thus linking its identity to the Place, with a belief that in such way contributes to psychic stability and sense of well-being for the community, though the people and activities in the city rather than buildings within it, are those who contribute to the identity of place. Traditional heritage practice during last decades unfortunately contributed more to create boundaries around this community and isolate it, while trying to confirm city' uniqueness and distinctiveness as a part of social identity process. Dubrovnik is today museum city where social practices and experiences have been reduced to the visual scenography as a marker of collective memory.
Furthermore, interpretation and representation of the heritage nowadays in Dubrovnik evidence the nature of the heritage as a political act and the power relations that it sustains. National identities and narratives are often mostly authenticated through the representations of nation state’ history, traditions and cultural practices. Heritage tourism actually transform places into „performance stages” where nations and communities create and re-create their identities (Graham and Howard, 2008).

**Figure 3.** Traces of residents’life - today’s remnants of urban identity

As contemporary society and culture is transforming under the pace of global change that questions every identity, a strong need for the recollection of this threatened identity is found in the constructive role of historical heritage (Choay, 2001).

Tourist consumption can illuminate which aspects of history and culture a country highlights in its self-presentation and which it downplays or omits. Presentations of national identity often focus on glorifications of a country's past because the past is a symbolic resource that unites individuals through a shared sense of descent and destiny, providing „evidence” of a country's superiority. Emphasizing heritage in national ideology is especially common in newly established states, such as Croatia, that are striving to acquire legitimacy. Behind this cultural practice hides the idea of a pure, old and authentic culture, which is exotic and strange but at the same time excites admiration and is consumable.

**Figure 4.** War memorial at the entrance to the Old City – Memory place as an example of contested heritage

This is cultural attitude that „museumises” ethnicity and ethnic culture, as Jonathan Friedman called this process. The deeper social and /or political function of „museumising” ethnicity is that it renders ethnicity more difficult to address and to be lived as a social and political practice. Heritage is used here firstly, as a political resource in the creation or support of states at various spatial jurisdictional scales and the legitimation of their governments and governing ideologies, and secondly, as an economic resource supporting economic activities, either directly as an industry in itself or indirectly as a contributor to the locational preferences of other economic activities (Rivera, p.613-634, 2008).

Finally, there are no more obvious markers of memory in a city than its monuments, and no more obvious sites for crises of memory. Memory places that present national identity, occupy public spaces such is the case with contemporary War memorial built close to the Old City walls in Dubrovnik. The War memorial is causing conflicting views and opinions within community, making division between those who are linked to this memory place, and those who are not and reject it as a symbol. This example underlines that Dubrovnik’ heritage illustrates strong links with the nation-state as its definition and management is directed by national government, whose power lies in the images of representation where heritage is used as a socio-political resource.
Conclusion

We are facing today the ongoing growth of tourism that is more and more tied to the transformation of cities, rising economic inequalities, migration, nationalisms and environmental damage. Unfortunately, these contradictions along with many other complexities of tourism are rarely integrated into the planning strategies of governmental and non-governmental agencies that could prevent or moderate the impact of these tendencies (Winter, and Chang, 2009).

It remains a disappointment that, despite the many assurances at countless conferences on the theme of tourism and preservation, there is a lack of commitment by the tourism industry, which by now is the most important branch of industry worldwide.

Another challenge for heritage today is that the preferential right of heritage interpretation that was previously the sole domain of public cultural heritage actors is now shared with the tourist industry with new valuations of authenticity and idealisation of the nostalgic concept of heritage. However, discussions of improving the consumer’ nature of tourism rarely include any detailed consideration of improving the nature and behavior of tourists. Still, the effective interpretation can play a critical role in sustainable tourism by educating tourists about the nature of the host region and culture, informing them of the consequences of their actions, enhancing their experience and encouraging them to engage in sustainable behaviors. Effective interpretation can relieve crowding and congestion, alter behavior, either through information or indirectly through fostering visitor appreciation of a site, and create public support for conservation of built heritage sites through positive visitor experiences (Smith, 2007).

Future strategies for rehabilitation of Dubrovnik should primarily consider and reflect the local needs and aspirations, while simultaneously working on effective heritage interpretation that would sustain its sustainability and alter the negative aspects of mass tourism. There are complex issues that heritage today has to grapple with, such as growth of cultural tourism from the affluent developed world, but also the enormity of threat of climate change and understanding of how traditional buildings behave as environmental systems. Heritage is usually valued for its own sake by society, but changing societal needs require us to explain heritage conservation in terms of improved quality of life for citizens and communities; while sustaining public interest and public good (Cassar, p.3-11, 2009).

Furthermore, a constant tension exists between the demands for bureaucratic consistency and impersonal expertise, on the one hand, and for popular participation and local autonomy on the other, within heritage discourse (Fairclough and Harrison, and Jameson, 2008). On the other hand, in public discourse the scholarly content and meaning of categories (like tradition, cultural heritage, folk culture, etc) disappear, and they are turned into social and cultural concepts of everyday life, and often used or even emphasized in order to support and represent political attitudes, ideologies and intentions (Niedermuller, p.243-253, 1999). One of the crucial questions is what „history“and implicitly, the term „tradition“means for heritage conservation today. When it comes to tradition, the resistance to the loss of historical environment is today becoming more determined as affluence increases and physical change is more rapid, but confusion still exists about how past is perceived and what is the nature of the endless process of environmental change (Warren, 1998). Of course, memory cannot retain everything; if it could, we would be overwhelmed with data. Every thing, every event, every person is „historic“and the attempt to preserve all of the past would be life-denying.

Heritage today means „anything you want“. That is why definitions of heritage value cannot be singular anymore but must allow for plural interpretations and meaning, and conservation as a practice needs to evolve reflexively. The role of conservation needs to be recognized in establishing environmental quality and identity, local distinctiveness and continuity, and as an active part of social processes, including community cohesion and social inclusion (Pendlebury, b.2009). Finally, heritage belongs to the people, not to the owners, though this brings out the question in some heritage circles whether then the people should help the owners pay for its preservation or upkeep. How our heritage will respond to contemporary cultural reconceptualizations is still unclear. Changing concepts of identity, tradition and history, are modifying and altering, the meaning and function of cultural heritage, that has been until now, taken for granted i.e. to save old things has been a «matter of tradition». After all, it would be illusory to insist on a single or unitary
theory, that would define the notion of heritage. Heritage should be reviewed and reconsidered as a social activity, bound up with, and shaped by, myriad social processes. Heritage is not “the beauty of the dead” but the living practices recognized in the image of contemporary reality, that makes of living context a memory world. In our urban environment where everything is commodified and aestheticized, even the world of heritage, should not cultural heritage be a viable form to resist this totally homogenizing space of global multi-nationalism.

It might also be possible to use environment to teach change instead of permanence – how the world constantly shifts in the context of the immediate past; which changes have been valuable, which not; how change can be externally effected; how change out to occur in the future? To retreat to a hopelessly artificial past is unrealistic, but to allow a brutalizing system to dominate and destroy traditional urbanism is irresponsible. As culture becomes global, heritage becomes more important in creating new sense of cultural belonging. Heritage is constructed, and heritage qualities are not essential to certain object, it is we who construct their qualities and these qualities are nothing more than our beliefs and values.
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