

le champ⁵, et traiter les objets qui le peuplent de façon *distinctive*, chaque type en fonction de sa nature propre. Sinon l'hésitation entre le concept de *patrimoine* et celui d'*environnement* mènera à une confusion globale faite de *négligence du patrimoine* et de *gel de l'environnement*.

Devant la crèche de Jésus, Gaspard roi de Meroé a une étonnante révélation. Elle nous commande de nous faire, dit Michel Tournier, « semblable à ceux que nous aimons, de parler leur langue, de les *respecter*, mot qui signifie originellement *regarder deux fois* »; ce qui implique bien de *regarder notre regard*...

Ainsi découvrons nous l'*authenticité* des êtres et des choses, et la façon de les *traiter* pour ce qu'ils sont, et non pour leur en imposer. « *C'est ainsi qu'a lieu l'élévation du plaisir* », ajoute l'auteur, *et ce plaisir « a nom amour »*.

⁵ Cf. Jacques ATTALI, « Les Trois mondes » (Fayard, 1981). Cet économiste distingue les mêmes phases en économie.

MICHEL PARENT

DOCTRINE FOR THE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION OF MONUMENTS AND SITES

GENERAL REPORT

I - THE NEED FOR THEORY AND DOCTRINE

A - THEORY AND PRATICE

Under its Statutes ICOMOS must imperatively concern itself with “*principles, techniques and policies* for the conservation, protection, rehabilitation and enhancement of monuments, groups of buildings and sites” (III.5.(b)).

The objection that the building heritage can be handled only as a series of individual cases — which is the kind of objection fairly generally raised to any theoretical approach — is directly contradicted by the experience offered by history.

It may very well be that the building heritage is composed of such widely differing elements that any hasty generalizing must be treated with a salutary suspicion. But notwithstanding the diversity of cultural backgrounds and of the situations encountered it is unquestionable that, for example, over the whole of 19th century Europe one specific way of handling that heritage remained predominant, albeit within a broad margin of variation. And it is no less unquestionable that this approach was essentially bound up with dominant trends in thought and, to a certain extent, with the technical means then common to all.

It is true that the disapproval with which this type of approach has gradually come to be regarded in the 20th century would appear to imply a calling in question of the very principle of making practice conform to a systematic theory.

In reality the combating of 19th century restoration doctrine and its replacement by the code of good conduct contained in the Venice Charter required almost as much theoretical and practical justification as its initial establishment; the Charter, while not seeking to be as eternal as the buildings themselves, was nevertheless, in 1964, the response to a demand from the whole community of professional people concerned.

In this preamble on questions of method we would like to start by pointing out that our exploration of the subject on the level of theory, far from leaving no room for examining individual situations and cases, is on the contrary designed to give these significance and to offer justification for a relative diversity of attitudes within the coherent system it is attempted to achieve.

B - ANALOGY WITH MEDICINE

Though there is increasing use of the exact or natural sciences it is not merely a matter of establishing a "science of the building heritage" by straightforward application of such sciences to a given area.

Nor is it purely a question of a different variety of "medicine" designed to keep buildings standing as long as possible as though they were patients to be saved from lying in bed.

Such a purpose must be combined with others — with purposes depending on such subjective criteria as those of artistic appreciation and such relative criteria as those of the historian.

Moreover, the works which are to be the vehicle for the achievement of such purposes were built to serve uses which in some cases have continued or developed and in others have disappeared, and whose preservation — whether relatively easy or relatively difficult to ensure — is a responsibility whose acceptance must be weighed against other requirements of the individual or the community.

C - NO FUTURE WITHOUT A PAST

In reality, ideas on what we are agreed to call the legacy of the past belong to the sphere of research into the future. What is involved is not merely the future of that legacy but our own future as well. The more the natural and human sciences progress, the more they convince us that man, though a biological entity, is also fundamentally a product of his own culture. The risks to be taken, and the preservation of his own future, can be faced only with a knowledge of his past. It is for science to reveal the different particles of that past, in the fibres of his being, in the traces

left by his environment and in the depths of his memory, and it is for basic theoretical research to bring out their significance after first preserving their authenticity.

It is true that beyond the past that has thus been brought to light, as beyond the problem that has been elucidated, new mysteries will constantly be emerging, and it is obvious that acquired knowledge cannot replace consciousness. But we are coming to understand better and better that it is his cultural status that determines man's destiny.

It is the content of the past which provides that on which the imagination feeds. But the first prerequisite for the expression of our liberty is to recognize each part of that content for what it is and to mistrust hybrids. In our disciplines as in all others, though truths are only relative there are lies which are certainties.

It is in this sense, without nostalgia but with confidence in our future notwithstanding our many disappointments, that there is "no future without a past".

In circumstances as we know them, the search for a free, just and peaceful future for man is the more difficult in that science, education, information and the further development of cultural identities, which are laid down among the very purposes of UNESCO as contributions to peace, cannot but help to provide food for situations of conflict.

Thus, while it is essential for the heritage handed down from the past to be the subject of theoretical study, that study itself must be undertaken with prudence and restraint.

II - THE SUBJECT OF OUR RESEARCH

A - THE STAGES OF OUR EXPLORATION OF THE SUBJECT

We possess, as we have said, an experience deriving from history — the history of the formation of the heritage and subsequently the history of its conservation and restoration. Neither of these is the same as the history of art. If the lessons to be learned from both on the level of doctrine are to be found expressed in the Venice Charter, it is absolutely essential to begin by studying:

- a) The implications, for the future of the architecture of the past, of our manner of seeing it and of seeing it as a heritage;
- b) The implications for that heritage of its architectural character;
- c) Having once made clear the nature of the historical experience

which has given us our Charter, we must do our best to test the latter against the most representative testimonies to the different ways of acting in practice. Among these testimonies the papers to be presented at this symposium deservedly occupy a privileged position. But obviously the content of these papers on what is known as "the doctrine of the conservation and restoration of historical monuments and sites" is in no way a study confined to the matter of choosing how to look after the heritage, but is intended by their authors to cover all aspects of the unsolved problems connected with that heritage. This is which justifies the very broad approach adopted in our introductory remarks.

d) For convenience we will distinguish three fields of study emerging from the analysis of our historical experience, i.e.:

1) *The extent of the area covered by the heritage*, including what it is today agreed to call its "new dimensions".

2) The compiling of *documentary records* or, more generally, of information serving the needs of the heritage without reference to which — to quote the Charter — it is "conjectural" to speak of authenticity.

3) The fundamental problem of exactly what work is to be done on a building requiring it: is it to be mere conservation or restoration, reconstruction, conjectural or otherwise, or even renovation, as these terms are defined in the various glossaries?

B - THE USE TO BE MADE OF OUR FINDINGS

Although the title of our symposium refers only to "historical monuments and sites", it will emerge both from the contents of individual reports and in subsequent chapters of the present one that the important problems raised by "groups of buildings" as defined in our Statutes and as dealt with in the UNESCO Warsaw-Nairobi Recommendation of 1975 cannot be evaded either.

III - THE PROBLEM OF THE WAY WE LOOK AT THINGS

A - CASPAR...

Caspar, the black king of Meroë, the first of the Magi, remarks, looking at Biltine, his blond Phoenician slave: "I had not ceased to look at her and to observe the changes in the way I saw her".

This quotation from a recent French novel by Michel Tournier entitled *Caspar Melchior et Balthazar* may help us to determine the nature of the

visual relationship entertained by each of us with other beings and with things, particularly works of art and whatever is to form our individual heritage; their strangeness first of all disconcerts and fascinates, and they then become so familiar as to take a sort of ambivalent possession of us.

We must briefly consider:

i) The significance of that strangeness in a work of art which gradually gives way to familiarity, and which is particularly important in the case of an architectural work which is to become part of the heritage.

ii) Our ability to see our own eyes alter their vision of things without there being any change in the things themselves.

iii) Our ability to observe intrinsic change in a work.

iv) The significance of this taking of possession, which in the highest sense is the process of its inclusion in the heritage, and which involves the dual — and conflicting — obligation to preserve and to transform the thing possessed.

B - STRANGENESS AND FAMILIARITY OF THE WORK

The strangeness of the work for the person who looks at it derives from its difference and its remoteness.

The works of the past are foreign to us insofar as what remains of them is the reflection of techniques, methods of portrayal and hidden meanings which differ from those we encounter in our contemporary daily practice.

Conversely, the works of civilizations different from any of our own are in a sense "historical" for us insofar as their remoteness from our own environment involves, as does that of the works of our own past,

i) an enigma and the need to solve it;

ii) rarity, notwithstanding the existence of a certain number of similar works;

iii) an emotional shock, which nevertheless does not exhaust our capacity for different emotions as these works gradually come to form a part of our individual sentient universe.

C - CHANGES IN OUR WAY OF LOOKING

It is for those who can claim intimate acquaintance and are on what I might presume to call "speaking terms" with art and with the cultural heritage to analyse the significance of the gradual change in our way of seeing a work which is "foreign" in that it is different, or remote from us in time or space.

Let us similarly consider the people of a given culture in the process of development; for example, the Europeans of the past two centuries. Let

us take a look at the way they have themselves perceived the works of a given distant period or country: though they may claim that there has been no change in their impression in the course of their lifetime or from one generation to the next, it is quite certain that a difference has actually occurred.

This can be proved to them by the enormous amount they have said and written on art since Diderot. But a yet much clearer proof is provided by the changes in their attitude towards the care of the works of their own past and of other civilizations.

This changing attitude is to be seen:

- i) In the extent of the area considered to be covered by their heritage;
- ii) In the manner in which that heritage is preserved or neglected, maintained as a coherent whole or broken up, left incomplete or incompleting, and in the imagination or circumspection with which any necessary additions are treated; the manner, too, in which a surviving use is perpetuated or, where it has disappeared, a substitute use is introduced after the appropriate changes have been made, or, alternatively, the architecture changes have been made, or, alternatively, the architecture is made a part of the heritage as something specifically to be looked at.

In short, it is our way of looking at its contents which has created the heritage, at least on the level of its significance and of our own intentions.

In this sense, we are responsible for the existence not only of the heritage of which we ourselves become aware and which we treat in accordance with our own way of seeing it, but also of those works which were already part of that heritage at a time when it was looked at differently and have already been cared for as that different way of looking demanded.

D - INTRINSIC CHANGES IN A WORK AS WE OBSERVE IT

But in reality, whereas when we observe gradual alterations in our picture of a familiar face, we distinguish the change due to habit from the change due to age, in the case of the heritage, and by reason of its longevity, it is usual for these two phenomena to exist concurrently and to influence each other. Hence here — and particularly in architecture — we have the fundamental problem not merely of the way a work is looked at but of the way its ageing process is looked at.

Though it cannot be equated to a living organism, it is clear that an architectural work will intrinsically age, since it is made of materials which are not perfectly stable and stands on ground which is not stable either. Organically it is dependent on mechanical structures which could themselves

be stable only if the work were disturbed neither by environmental factors nor by the instability of its own materials or of its soil.

Over and above such spontaneous and intrinsic ageing, allowance must be made for the effects of harm resulting from deliberate destructive action on the part of man, which, in addition to causing direct damage, diminishes the resistance of the work to gradual wear. Further, we unfortunately know that the physical environment and the soil, as well as causing gradual damage, may themselves directly cause violent accidents as radical as those deliberately brought about by man.

All these signs of ageing, or sudden aggressive phenomena, affect the appearance, the status and sometimes even the survival of a work. Where the combined effects of the change in our way of looking at a work and of its actual ageing lead to the likelihood of its disappearance, we must, according to circumstances, either resign ourselves to the loss of a part of our heritage (perhaps even rejoicing at the fact) or else look after it as the contemporary attitude to ownership of that heritage demands.

It will suffice to take a work to pieces in imagination to see that any process of decay is made up of a series of irreparable partial losses. Whether suitably "doctored" or whether replaced, a decayed fragment will never be intrinsically the same as before. In absolute terms, the original substance of each individual component of the heritage is necessarily going to suffer erosion.

The decay may also spread to other areas than that of the fragment initially attacked. Hence there exists a whole set of problems connected with the need to choose between the progressive destruction of the original substance of a work and its alteration through replacement or through treatment of one of its portions in order to preserve the rest. When anything is to be done to a building it will always be necessary to choose between a certain past and a certain future for that building. Our way of looking at the heritage will determine the kind of future it is to have and for how long. Before asserting that for ourselves there is "no future without a past", we may observe that there can be no awareness of the past as embodied in the heritage without provision for its future, and for a future not so very different from its past.

The analogy with living organisms must not be pursued too far, and we may find cases in which the ageing has nothing to do with the longevity of the building. Thus a carved feature may have "aged" in the past but show no sign of recent decay. Conversely, a feature which has long remained intact may be suddenly affected by a rapid decaying process.

In ordinary cases where a given piece of sculpture suffers from wear

which does not affect the building as a whole, it is obvious that the conservation questions to be solved are essentially bound up with the way we look at the piece of work involved. We read in it the message of the artist who made it, but also the traces left by time, and we thus become aware of the reality of the time which has made it different from what it was.

This awareness of the presence of an incorporeal time within the work is more convincing to our conscious sensibility as a means of dating the work than any specific data supported by historical evidence. What matters is the way we superimpose our picture of the work in its present state on our imaginary picture of the work as it originally was. Sometimes we possess drawings or photographs of a work which time has more or less spared; but this phenomenon of our awareness of the time embodied in the work is independent of such external proofs. The imaginary comparison with our present picture of the work is feasible even where the original appearance of the building is hypothetical owing to the alterations made since it began to age externally.

E - OWNERSHIP OF THE HERITAGE

While the heritage itself is at the mercy of changing ways of looking at it, the practical procedures by which a community deals with threatened or actual decay will inevitably depend on that community's legal status and on its ideological approach, even if the latter is only implicit.

Hence it is impossible in any exploration of the problem of the heritage to avoid taking a look at the legal and ideological background to the modern conception of what the heritage is.

In 1825, when the modern concept of the "building heritage" was on the eve of its worldwide development, Victor Hugo wrote:

"There are two things to a monument, its use and its beauty. Its use belongs to its owner, its beauty to everyone. To destroy it is therefore to overstep a right. Your field is forcibly bought from you to make a square, your house to make a poorhouse, and your monument will be bought in the same way".

We should point out that before the existence of the nation as an institution a value as "testimonies to rights" had been conferred not only on objects but also on buildings; this had been done for religious reasons or for their "sacred" character all over the world, by civil society in the cities of Italy, Flanders and elsewhere, and by the monarchy in France,

Spain or Russia. Possessions invested with such importance needed, further, to be rare, precious, beautiful and capable of lasting eternally.

The emergence of nationalities, in the 19th century, coinciding with that of the historical sciences and the development of archaeology and the history of art, helped to place the heritage on its modern pedestal of legitimacy. It is in the name of the nation that the laws providing for the protection of the heritage refer at once to art and to history.

The French Revolution had planned to make such a community that of the nation itself; the Convention had in fact declared: "Each citizen is no more than the trustee of a possession for which the great family of the Nation is entitled to render him accountable".

No national community, whatever the period at which it may publicly have assumed ownership of the heritage of the past, is any more neutral than the French community at the time of the Revolution. However positive a thing may have been the emergence of the scientific study of history, such science is no more neutral, ideologically, than history as conceived of in the 19th century, deeply imbued as it was with the concept of the national and with belief in science itself.

In the event, the content of the heritage was determined, and work on it was begun, with constant and very substantial guidance from a past history viewed retrospectively in the light of criteria which gave precedence to whatever appeared to support the nation-state ideologies and the bourgeois and science-oriented conceptions of the age. Today we are able, in our knowledge of the diversity of the national situations obtaining in one country and another — the influence of which on the treatment of national heritages was far greater than that of the nature of each heritage — to observe the relative universality of the 19th century approach.

Obviously there is a connection between the determination of what constitutes the heritage and the way the heritage is looked after. We may say that initially the idea was — to quote Ludovic Vitet, the first Inspector General of Historical Monuments — to restore "their form, colour, and, in short, their original life" to the Middle Ages, through the medium of their architecture and with the aid of the imagination. Up to the end of the 19th century the most ambitious of the princely residences were invaded by a sort of distant descendant of the Carolingian mythology, not to speak of the ancestral pagan mythologies which invaded castles and opera-houses alike, to the point where the restored imperial governments, in France as in Germany, were obsessed by the phenomenon.

Meanwhile at the other extreme rationalism was producing a very different dream of its own, exemplified for the world in the work of Viollet-

le-Duc. Viollet-le-Duc's system was initially suggested by the structural logic of the ecclesiastical buildings of the Middle Ages and took its inspiration from the "Histoire Naturelle" of the organicist and creationist Cuvier: the whole was confidently reconstructed from the past as in palaeontology, and exact models of types and of "ideal" buildings were devised to serve as patterns to be imitated by real buildings born, instead, of the accidents and cross-breeds of history.

IV - SPECIFIC NATURE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE

A - PERCEPTION, SETTING, ENVIRONMENT

An architectural work can generally be fairly clearly identified as the volume materially delineated by its walls. It circumscribes one or more internal spaces subtly related to one another by virtue of their interdependence or mutual autonomy; they may be roofed or unroofed.

At the same time any piece of architecture except for dwellings in converted caves) is primarily something visible from outside, and in this sense any historic building is inseparable from the environment in which it is seen.

Hence, as something designed, architecture is inseparable from its context. The building affects the visual arrangement of its context, often doing so only through the historical process by which, for example, an ecclesiastical building will be responsible for the arrangement of the houses surrounding it or the houses bordering a rampart will owe their alignment to the latter.

The very nature of architecture conflicts with the concept of the heritage as something to be equated with a collection of objects; yet the national heritages of the 19th century were initially approached in this very manner.

The close connection between the building and its surroundings raises the still more fundamental question of the ambiguous nature of a heritage perceived either, as we have assumed so far, as something initially strange (like the blonde slave Biltine for Caspar of Meroë), or else as a familiar work reflecting the observer's own identity.

In reality at the outset a familiar work does not involve the specific mental reaction which determines the present-day concept of the heritage.

The familiar piece of work which serves in everyday life is preserved and looked after because it cannot be done without. If some external factor

endangers or destroys it, it becomes precious by virtue of the realization of its absence. Hence it acquires a formal entity peculiar to itself owing to its supposed or actual loss and by a kind of phenomenon of distance.

Thus in the course of the 19th century, and still more since the beginning of the 20th, the familiar environment peculiar to each of the majority of human communities has been thoroughly disrupted and replaced by something unusual and "foreign" on its own soil; this has been due to the impact of industry in the highly developed countries, to colonization in the others, to the destructive power of war, to the development of communications, to the invasion of housing by cosmopolitan technologies and, simultaneously, to pauperization of vast areas in the world.

There has hence emerged a new way of looking at the familiar environment and observing its momentary strangeness before re-admitting it to one's inner consciousness, the tranquillity of which has just been violated.

The present ever more insistent demand for the preservation of each community and of its identity by the preservation of its centuries-old environment is something relatively new, and it has given the 20th century an extremely lively perception of its native heritage which is quite different from the 19th century concept. However, deliberate destruction of the traditional environment is still so frequent that there is every reason to believe that the process is far from having been fully effective everywhere.

The change is of universal importance for both theory and doctrine.

It has been responsible not only for pushing back the frontiers of the building heritage itself but also for making a big public issue of a question which had long remained marginal for society (provided the "national" heritage itself was not in danger).

It is the fact that architecture is intrinsically inseparable from its environment that has given it the role of catalyst for that collective identity which is continuing progressively to expand the field covered by the heritage.

Where a village church was classed as a historical monument in the 19th century, this was not done because of its osmosis with the local culture and the landscape immediately surrounding it, but on the contrary for its typological and non-local value as something representative of a distant age and of a whole series of similar works to be found scattered here and there.

Its revelation was brought about by a scholar who may have been an agnostic and not by a peasant who went there to pray.

This also explains why, particularly in France up to 1943, the legislator had not thought of doing anything about the surroundings of historic buildings except for "clearing away obstructions", and why "protection"

was frequently fractional and confined, for example, to the apse or bell-tower of a church or to one arm of its transept.

There is a further point. When, in Renaissance Italy, and subsequently in the rest of Europe, archaeological finds were dug out of the ground, they were distinguished from their surroundings as things specifically intended to be looked at; but though they had concretely marked with their "Romanness" the spot where they had been found, they remained, as exemplary things, foreign to that spot. Such objects were not the expression of a general environment but models which that environment was to be made to resemble if it was to be acknowledged as possessing a value.

This new and increasingly common manner of influencing the environment with the aid of patterns extraneous to it (in space and time) is a more general if less visible phenomenon in Italy than elsewhere, in that in Italy the Roman influence had never ceased. It is a country in which we find overabundance of ancient models and of new works deriving from them, as well as possessing actual consanguinity with them — not to say osmosis — via the Middle Ages.

Nevertheless it can be seen from the skilful and unusual "telescoping" that has been done in the Baths of Diocletian or in the "grafting" done by Michelangelo at Santa Maria degli Angeli in Rome how supremely an age whose basis of reference consisted in the ideals and vocabulary of antiquity was able to treat the works of antiquity with irreverence.

B - TWO TYPES OF SPATIAL ORGANIZATION

Anything subsequently built anywhere in the world in accordance with the principles laid down in Alberti's *Dere aedificatoria*¹ was to owe something to the following ideas:

1) Organized space forms the matrix of the town as an organized community entity.

2) The town — or at least whatever portion of it is to be built — is an irreducible whole.

3) "Natural beauty" is to be equated to the "intrinsic beauty" of a visually satisfying arrangement of space.

4) The building resembles a living organism not by virtue of any

¹ François CHOAY in « La règle et le modèle » (Seuil 1981) writes that it is a « texte instaurateur » (institution text).

capacity to develop, move or undergo unexpected changes in form but in its organic structure and its planned provision for the future.

Whether we are dealing with an individual building or with a group of urban buildings, and whether with classical architecture or with baroque, any architectural design in the West will be the embodiment of these laws and time will be unable to do anything but what they involve.

This leaves us face to face with several problems peculiar to such buildings or groups of buildings when we are called on to concern ourselves with their future once they have become part of the heritage and are suffering either from decay or from never having been completed.

1) In the future, too, the functions of urban space will remain linked with those of the community. The survival of architecture involves the survival of the functions of the buildings. However "decorative" it may appear, the role of architecture is so decisive that it gives a permanent status to urban functions even where these have been altered. For example, if a palace becomes a museum, does its cultural function not owe to its architecture something of the force of its attraction for the public?

2) Symmetrical or repetitive buildings follow laws of their own which involve rejection of any heterogeneous additions. Even where time or accident has intervened it is possible to deduce what the complete building was like.

The three levels at which a building can be "read": proportions, surfaces (solid or void) and overall decorative scheme, will provide further indications.

3) However tentacular a design may have become in its effect on the town or even on the countryside, the future of both will be conditioned by the laws governing the original design, which will have "frozen" the buildings and their setting for the future. And there is no other choice than to adapt that future to their requirements if the whole place is not to lose its unity, decay or perish.

This means that any new work based at any level (urban planning, architecture or decoration) on some other system for the organizing of space which it is sought to introduce into the existent architectural group will be rejected by the latter. Thus a classical or baroque church will not easily tolerate furniture or decoration other than that designed with it and for it.

Medieval urban groups of buildings, on the contrary, have generally developed to suit the successive requirements which have emerged in the course of their history and the natural restrictions imposed by the site, and not as through they were some ideal living organism with its various forms, tissues and organs all carefully harmonized. The medieval building, and particularly the ecclesiastical building, several times rebuilt and with each

age making use in its new design of the remains of previous work, carries its own history within itself. Where a building of a given period has survived, it can always be seen to have been completed in the course of several later periods. Doubtless each age had its own idea of what the completed building was to be; but the arrangement of the forms was so conceived that each feature remained sufficiently independent not to dictate a given formal development to the features adjoining it. The future was thus always free to go on re-inventing.

In this way our towns have grown up with their irregular shapes born of a "biological" irregularity which is that of life and not of a predetermined existence.

Over the centuries towns have gradually become peopled with permanent architectural works. In the early days these were only the massive and absolutely necessary buildings designed to last eternally: the places of worship, the defence works and the seat of government. They were stone monuments towering above a lower town built of wood.

The coming of classical architecture saw the introduction of new and different rules for the division of space. Whereas the spaces in the classical town cannot accommodate anything foreign to them, unbuilt-on space in a medieval town constantly in the process of further development can perfectly well be used for new urban complexes, particularly if they can provide a setting for major medieval buildings.

This one comparison between the two most important phases in the development of the Western building heritage will suffice to suggest that the treatment given to the various elements of that heritage must vary with their authors' perception of space and the procedure by which it has been occupied.

We may conclude from this that it is inappropriate to propose common criteria for work in different architectural fields, whether restoring an individual building or determining a policy for fitting a modern work into an existent architectural group; it is difficult to imagine that the criteria can be the same for a building or group which has developed in accordance with medieval practice as for a classical or baroque work.

However, in actual fact in the architecture of the Western world these different trends in development are to be found intertwined. It will therefore be necessary to determine which is the dominant one within the area to be dealt with and to adopt the principles corresponding to the one that has been given priority.

C - RECONSTRUCTION INDEFINITELY REPEATED, OR: DOING AWAY WITH TIME

So far we have been looking at architectural works which, though the hazards of history may have brought them together, left them unfinished or caused them to decay, were originally designed and built to be lasting within a society which itself was constantly changing. But in many parts of the world at the present day we find all sorts of "architectural heritages" reflecting the existence of cultural entities whose attitude to time is quite different from ours, and possessed of a capacity for survival quite different from that of the stone architecture of the West.

Japan.

We will take here the most characteristic case, which is that of Japanese sacred architecture and is illustrated by Mr. Kobayashi's report on the great Shinto temple at Ise, to which I would refer you. It emerges from his paper that this wooden temple was built in A.D. 690, rebuilt 19 years later, and then about once in each generation until 1973. Further, it was built alternately on two different sites, so that frequently a building still standing could be exactly copied.

All those who have visited the parks at Nara, Kyoto or Nikko will have seen how carefully any damaged parts of works are replaced; but there are also systematic reconstructions as at Ise.

The Shinto temples have never from the earliest times ceased to be the shrines of a religious cult with which the structure and form of their architecture is closely bound up. If their exact reproduction can be relied on when they are rebuilt, this is because the religious tradition is most strictly preserved and handed down and damage is promptly repaired the moment it becomes visible. This reliability is particularly visible at Ise where the original model as perpetuated may be seen standing.

The unchanging character of a heritage thus faithfully handed down over so many centuries is here nothing to do with the lasting nature of the material. On the contrary, it is obvious that the very fragility of wood in the presence of fire or rot provides one of the reasons for constant reconstruction.

As for the relation between the architecture and its surroundings, this deserves to be discussed at length and to good effect. It belongs to a conception of space as different from that of the Middle Ages as it is from that of Western classicism. Since what we have are areas made sacred by the wisdom of Buddha and not by transcendental deities, nature is concerned as strongly as architecture in the relations with the depths of being. The

alternating of the two sites for the temple at Ise is as significant as is the repetitive character of the building process.

If we are to distinguish the manner in which the word "heritage" can be interpreted — or at least the way in which the modern concept of the building heritage can be understood — in the other major cultural divisions of the world, we must make a study of the specific laws governing relations with space and time in the Islamic, Hindu, Asiatic, African and other worlds, each of which is itself extremely varied.

Egypt: dealing with an archaeological site

Whatever their internal laws for the perception and treatment of space, certain building heritages remain steeped in the civilization that has produced them, while others, notwithstanding the extent of the remains they have left, have lost their political, religious and socio-cultural roots.

We of the present day are not on familiar terms with our environment; the sudden and unusual contemporary interest in it is born of a demand for better knowledge. Environment is something which forms itself in the course of a long history. On the contrary, walls which have been buried and are suddenly unearthed have had no history between the event which destroyed them and their discovery. Excavations in a modern town mean a break in continuity which it would be useless to try to slur over.

When looked at from the point of view of our concept of the heritage, the architecture of ancient Egypt may be said to express a most fortunate alliance between structures and materials possessed of an enormous capacity for lasting, a suitable climate, and a society which embodied in its sacred architecture its desire to perpetuate itself in an unchanging manner.

In the archaeological sites there are varying levels of internal unity to be considered as well as different levels at which the unity of the environment has been broken.

1) A monument dating from antiquity is a straightforward original work which has not been altered in the course of history except that its surface or setting may have been damaged. Let us take, for example, the Pyramids at Gizeh. They have taken complete possession of the place and have given it the character of a purely archaeological landscape with the widest possible unobstructed view, suiting their symbolical significance to a maximum.

2) On a site like that of Karnak the overlapping of successive works provides evidence of the history of the place before it was removed from the path of history itself. Compliance with the Venice Charter requires the

preservation, as part of the heritage, of the additions made centuries ago, which serve to give reality to the role of the place over a long period.

3) Luxor raises a different problem. The temple is right inside the town and has lost its original sacred character; a mosque now stands inside its ruins. The imperatives of more recent history have obliged us to make a choice; it has been decided to reconcile the desire to display the temple as comprehensibly as possible with deference to more recent historical events, which are absolutely in keeping with the Islamic character of the town.

In the last analysis the effect of the environment on the building or of the building on the environment is dependent on two things. One of these is the system of spatial organization adopted by the one and the other; the other is the manner in which the area affected has been treated with the passing of time and the vicissitudes which have preceded its adoption as part of the heritage.

Two types of civilization as close geographically and historically as those of the English-speaking world and of the Mediterranean may have quite different traditions in this sphere. Their differences do not begin with the lawns round Wells Cathedral as opposed to the *parvis* of Notre-Dame; they derive from much earlier differences in approach to the relation between town and country and between city and citizen (customary law as against the written Code).

V - EXTENT OF THE AREA COVERED BY THE HERITAGES: ITS NEW DIMENSIONS

A - GENERAL REMARKS

Where are we to set the limits to the visual setting of a building to be protected as part of the heritage? This will depend not merely on the size of the building and the nature of the setting within which it is seen but also on the actual significance of the architecture in question. Famous examples in Rome or Paris, for instance, may be cited to illustrate how the continuity of an extensive area forming part of the heritage may be injured by buildings put up at some distance, especially in the case of large 20th century buildings. It is a matter of what the eye may embrace simultaneously, and this may be suitably determined by methods involving a combination of photogrammetry and data-processing. It is also a matter of the way space is organized in the light of the use to be made of the site; the internal arrangement will determine the laws according to which the

building or buildings will be perceived from outside. But the place may, alternatively, be designed to remain withdrawn and therefore isolated, as in the case of a charterhouse or a Cistercian abbey in its valley.

It remains that notwithstanding the heterogeneous and uncertain nature of the limits to the size of the individual works of which the heritage is composed, while there are specific laws governing its *usus* and preventing its *abusus*, we still have to determine the extent of the geographical areas affected.

Conservation will remain something purely passive if concrete measures for preserving the heritage are not taken in these areas.

This subject, which here we can only rapidly mention, raises a number of different problems:

a) The problem of *the protection of individual works*. This has already arisen in connection with the protection of the heritage by legal instrument. How do the surveys made by the administration tie up with the inventories made by the specialists bodies? Are they infinitely extensible?

b) The problem of *whole protector areas*. In this case the requirements of life, movement, and change are all brought within the field of the heritage.

c) The question of the extent of the field to be considered also raises the equally topical problem of the introduction of new types of architecture — rural or industrial in addition to ordinary urban architecture — and this is gradually taking us outside the scope of the mere protection of “monuments”. Further, in view of the time that has elapsed since the introduction of the basic legislation protecting historic buildings or monuments we must now ask ourselves how far this applies to works of the 19th and 20th centuries.

B - PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

In a recent study (REVUE DE L'ART N° 49: *Patrimoine Français*) I felt it was a good idea to review the present situation, in France, as regards the application of the legal notion of “historical monument”, designed to cover a “heritage recognized in law” coming under the responsibility of the State and the object of State initiative and the use of public funds. This at present concerns only about 30,000 buildings.

Of the 30,000 only about a third are listed, and of this fraction about a third are the object of work by professionals with the aid of State funds in the course of a ten-year period.

Mr Bernard Kaukas (GB) gives a very different picture of things in

his country. You will be hearing his report, and there should be a thorough discussion on the wisdom — which he strongly questions — of having, since the days of William Morris (1877) individually protected 300,000 separate buildings and created 5,000 Conservation Areas (where the protection afforded is similar to that provided in some respects under the French law on “sites”). Mr Kaukas considers that such strict legal protection, rarely backed up by means for encouraging upkeep and restoration, is in reality highly prejudicial to the British building heritage.

Comparative studies covering a large number of countries have been made in the matter by different international bodies. We trust that ICOMOS will be able to produce an up-to-date and geographically exhaustive document comparing the advantages and drawbacks of restrictive and less restrictive policies in this field in the light of local traditions and the building stocks concerned. It is precisely the resemblance between the building heritages of England and France that gives significance to the difference between those countries' respective practices. Now that the Strasbourg symposium on inventorying has taken place (1980), it would be well if the aforementioned complete study could bring out the connection between inventories and the national building heritages as recognized in law, particularly in countries such as the GFR or GDR where inventories were drawn up by professionals many years ago and have been regularly kept up to date. It should also bring out the character of the different types of architecture progressively included in the “legally recognized” building heritages of the various countries.

C - PROTECTION OF WHOLE AREAS

Mrs Iva Curk (Yugoslavia) tells us of the methods generally adopted in Slovenia for determining the choice of archaeological sites deserving strict protection. We must, in effect, bear in mind that in the case of the archaeological heritage administrative measures must precede identification of what is to be preserved. This situation is far from being confined to underground archaeology alone. When we concern ourselves with the future of an extensive urban or rural “group of buildings”, what has determined our choice is its value as a whole. If we delay taking action until we have carried out a series of exhaustive individual studies and secured the numerous individual measures required as a result, it is obvious that protection and active means for ensuring upkeep and restoration will be forthcoming too late. Hence the system of protecting whole areas provides a valuable means of enabling anticipatory measures to be taken through the creation of what are at once areas for study and danger zones.

The legislation of a great many countries takes its inspiration from this practice.

Important reports have been received from Mr J. M. Glez Valcarcel (Spain) and Mr A. C. da Silva Tellès (Brazil), dealing respectively with contemporary criteria for the defence of the historic town and with systems for preserving historic towns and town-centres. These two contributions closely concern the practical policy for groups of buildings referred to in the UNESCO Warsaw-Nairobi Recommendation (1975), and in the conclusions presented by the recent Cracow symposium (1980), intended as an assessment of the progress achieved as regards the implementation of this Recommendation; it is also referred to in the conclusions of the working group chaired by Professor A. Schmid (Switzerland) on the possibility of drawing up a charter on architectural groups to be appended to the Venice Charter, in many of the studies produced during the Council of Europe's Architectural Heritage Year (1975) and in similar studies dealing with other parts of the world.

This is an absolutely vital question, and, as a prelude to a discussion specifically designed to produce conclusions as to the present state of progress in the matter at the Bari symposium, I will give an account of the most recent contributions — and in particular those contained in the papers submitted to our meeting — in the course of my oral report.

D - NEW DIMENSIONS (OR NEW FIELDS) OF THE BUILDING HERITAGE

Once we broaden our discussion to include the problem of the location of contemporary buildings, we must realize that, though we may appear to be faced merely with the obligation to choose between a restrictive or non-restrictive policy for individual buildings and to choose between various different policies for groups of buildings, the real problem to be faced is the very difficult one of the inclusion of "new dimensions" in the building heritage.

On the one hand the existent legislation applies specifically to historical monuments and archaeological sites; on the other, the available means, however extensive they may one day be in proportion to what they are at present, will always be insufficient for the task of incorporating the "new dimensions" into the existent structures for protecting the heritage.

Mr A. Román (Hungary) proposes, in his report, a clear definition of the "scope and concept of rural monuments in Hungary". This work of his should be compared with the work of the meeting of our International Committee for Vernacular Architecture held in Sofia, which had the merit

of bringing out more clearly than the Plovdiv symposium of 1974 the increasingly visible specific problems of this sphere of action and of its various complementary aspects.

Various countries in Eastern Europe and certain of the Scandinavian countries have achievements to their credit which all the remaining countries in the world would do well to imitate, each with the means appropriate to its circumstances, if we are to preserve for the future what the peculiar genius of each of the agricultural and sheep-rearing civilizations has had to offer. The presence of this part of the heritage, whether as museum exhibits or as a part of the framework of everyday life, raises difficulties both in certain highly industrialized countries and in developing countries where traditional structures remain very much alive in mentalities, customary practice and language, whereas housing has been invaded by cosmopolitan fashion.

Here we are up against the whole problem of the endogenous character of the "suitable technologies", which has emerged very sharply in UNESCO discussions in an African context on the dialogue between civilizations (for example at the institution which has taken root at Gorée [Senegal]).

Mrs C. Rifkind (USA) deals with the industrial heritage and sets out to show the new cultural and tourist trade potentialities of such 19th century industrial towns as Patterson, where the districts visibly dating from the last century which have become dilapidated could take on a new lease of life if they were recognized to form a part of a heritage.

What, finally, is to be the overall approach to the protection of historical monuments? This is the question asked us by Dr. E. Hruska (Czechoslovakia), who stresses the need for an outlook combining the protection of architectural groups with awareness of ecological imperatives.

There exists, in effect, a "human ecology" in the absence of which ecology as such would not make allowance for the human factor.

In this connection the paper by Mr David Lowenthal (USA) clearly brings out the nature of the "preservation dilemma" which we examined earlier on.

Mr Zelenik (Yugoslavia) quotes the example of Stiena (Slovenia) to show how "*historical monuments considered as cultural assets*" are representative of the multiform continuity of the successive "layers" which have given a community and a territory its unity.

Mr Vicente Medel (Mexico) correctly points out the distinction between inventorying for operational purposes and systematic inventorying, the former being a matter of priorities in the face of risks.

Professor H. Widtmann (Austria) makes a useful contribution to the

study of policies for groups of buildings under the Warsaw-Nairobi Recommendation in his paper on the problem of ancient suburbs and their incorporation into the modern town. He draws attention to the possibility of restoring to these areas their character as residential districts and so gives their cultural significance its place in the town's everyday practice and in its life as a whole.

It is on these same lines that Mr D.A. Zivas (Greece) deals with the revitalization of the Plaka in Athens, which is the district near the Acropolis badly disfigured by neglect and main traffic thoroughfares. The principles he lays down and the "strategy" he proposes for solving the problem are absolutely in accordance with the conclusions as to doctrine to be derived from the Warsaw-Nairobi Recommendation and with the conclusions we proposed to the Drafting Committee at the Cracow symposium (15-18 October 1980), which may be consulted likewise.

VI - THE PROBLEMS RELATING TO DOCUMENTATION

As we have already said, the preamble to our Statutes closely associates the idea of *authenticity* of the heritage with that of its richness.

Before we can determine the positive or negative action required for the preservation of that authenticity we obviously need to know what it consists in. By definition, no scientifically compiled inventory would confine itself to a mere recording of the size and shape of premises but would attempt to show the distinctive features of the buildings inventoried. This requirement is more obvious still in the case of the heritage as recognized by law, by very reason of the particular importance of the objects of which it is composed, the dangers to which these are exposed and the skilled work which it will be necessary or desirable to do, precisely in order to preserve them.

It is to be assumed that such obvious facts deserve to be repeated regardless of whether or not their hearers have heard them before, since generally, and throughout the world, suitable documentation for the management and care of the legally recognized building heritage is very far from having been prepared, preserved, centralized, processed, made available to those who need it and used by them to the extent that would be appropriate and should be possible. It is true that the Venice Charter itself stresses the need for a study based on documentary records as a preliminary to any work that has been decided on. But when an operation has in fact been decided on — or in other words financed — there is frequently such

urgency on the technical, social and administrative levels that the joint effect is a curtailing of the time that can be spent on research, and we therefore feel that regular provision should be made for documentary research on two levels:

1) *There should be systematic research* on the whole of the legally recognized building heritage and particularly on buildings known to be in poor condition or situated in regions where they are exposed to risks. The assembling of documentary material should precede any decision to undertake work and even any probability of such work.

2) *There should be specific research* on any building or part of a building whose condition or status is such that it is not only to be the object of conservation or restoration but is also to be taken into use and may require alteration to suit new requirements.

In reality when these two levels are mentioned one generally thinks mainly of formal (written) records and of informal (visual) ones. But we must express our gratitude to Mr Foramitti (Austria) for reminding us that over and above these sources of data, and in addition to what we can derive from a careful examination of the building to be dealt with, as described and interpreted, we are going to find out a great many of its secrets in the course of the operation itself. Hence we should not confine ourselves to merely collecting sources of data but should establish an actual plan for coordinated information and make provision for the structures this would involve. The discoveries made in the course of the operation may themselves create the need for other research and lead to new ideas and different choices with regard to the nature of the operation.

Mrs Valli (Italy) raises the problem of the proportions of buildings as measured and refers us back to the question of the legitimacy of conjectural restorations, which we shall be dealing with in our next chapter.

Mrs G.M. Vinualès (Argentina) brings up the vital problem of the relation between documents and the evidence encountered in the course of practical operations, and we are happy to agree with her conclusions.

VII - CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

A - LEGITIMATE CASES OF RECONSTRUCTIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES

In our Chapters III and IV ("The Problem of the Way we Look at Things" and "The Specific Nature of the Architectural Heritage") we described at length the development of the ideas and practices which led 19th century Europe to adopt the conception of a "heritage of monuments"

and to prescribe the manner in which that heritage should be cared for, and the subsequent developments which have caused this conception to be called in question.

That the Venice Charter has reversed the initial approach is perfectly clear. But we have also seen that its principal orientations relate to a relatively restricted area which — precisely in the 19th and not in the 20th century — provided the basis for determining what was essentially meant by “historical monument”, namely, a medieval European building.

It would be ethnocentric and voluntarily old-fashioned to hold that the criteria applicable to the Middle Ages and to Europe alone are correct and that those building heritages to which they cannot apply are those of fringe cultures — particularly if this definition is to apply to two-thirds of the world and perhaps to a large part of the history of the West as well.

The case of Japan is most enlightening. Here we have a cultural area in which the exact reproduction of an original work provides the key to permanent preservation of the heritage.

No less enlightening is the frequently quoted case of Warsaw. Here the reconstruction has been considered as something exceptional, deriving from the need for a resurrection of the buildings of the past as the expression of a lively national feeling which had suffered most appallingly.

In reality the “exceptions which prove the rule” are of greater interest for our purpose than the cases which follow recognized normal practice. Warsaw is not an isolated response to an abnormal situation; it is one of a number of cases occurring in situations of varying degrees of gravity which have arisen out of the catastrophes inflicted by world wars on human beings or on architecture.

Nothing equivalent has been done in Coventry, or anywhere west of Dresden; but similar work has been done in Leningrad, and comparable work in Gdansk and Lublin. And as regards individual buildings, who can feel regret at the rebuilding of the Zwinger in Dresden, Pushkin, Pavlovsk and Petrodvorets in the USSR, or Lessay in France?

Hence whether or not such reconstructions are legitimate is primarily a matter of accurate knowledge of the original buildings. The fact that their destruction has been a recent occurrence is frequently a positive factor, but it is not sufficient. The fact that the destruction, as in Warsaw, has been caused specifically by war may provide a moral incitement to reconstruction, but there can be no doubt whatever that, when we are dealing with whole towns, there are often two problems which must be faced.

The first of these is that of the strict accuracy of the records available and the care, skill and sensitivity with which the work is done.

In the absence of exhaustive information one has the choice between abandoning any idea of reconstruction in favour of something entirely new and embarking on the risky enterprise of a pseudo-historic town which will be something illusory and approximate.

Even so, in the case of a medieval building, over and above the “missing links” there is the fact that its history in any case is partly a matter of conjecture. But where, on the contrary, we are dealing with a classical group of buildings, even very slender remains will, with the help of the original drawings and by extrapolation, provide sufficient evidence for an accurate reconstruction.

The second problem is that of the desire one comes up against to take advantage of the disappearance of a town or an individual building in order to put up something better suited to modern requirements in its place.

In the case of single ancient buildings, this is inadmissible; it runs counter to the fundamental concepts of “historical monuments” and of the “building heritage”. But where a very extensive area has been destroyed, can we admit the prohibition of a practice we would agree to within a town which had been preserved? This is a dilemma which is part of the whole problem of urban quarters and architectural groups in general.

B - HISTORY AS THE BUILDING RECOUNTS IT: HOW THE PAST SHOWS THROUGH

Article 11 of the Venice Charter refers directly to the “superimposed work of different periods” and concludes that “the revealing of the underlying state can only be justified in exceptional circumstances and when what is removed is of little interest and the material which is brought to light is of great historical, archaeological or aesthetic value and its state of preservation good enough to justify the action”. But the most general case is dealt with in the Charter by omission: this is the case where restoration is not initially a matter of archaeological curiosity but is primarily warranted by the state of the building. A Romanesque bell-tower which has lost its roof will need a new one: but what sort of new one? The 19th century one shown on a photograph, the 16th century one of which a vague and symbolic idea may be obtained from a surviving distant view, or the original one whose aspect may merely be conjectured from a study of buildings of the same period?

The further we travel in the direction of the authenticity of the original building, the more mistrustful we must be of our record and of the work that is going to be based on it. And what do we find from an examination on the spot? We find that certain structural features in masonry or brickwork call for given types of roofing and that in actual fact the original roofing was not necessarily that intended in the design. The aim when restoring buildings built in several different styles or retaining traces of earlier work which has been partly concealed must be to bring out their character as it emerges from the convergence of several different and simultaneous "readings".

But we have already explained why a strictly designed French classical façade could not easily be made to accommodate earlier Gothic forms which it might be wished to reintroduce. We may conclude from this that the limit beyond which earlier forms may no longer be allowed to "show through" will depend on the nature of the dominant formal type of design. The latter will admit such forms or reject them according to the degree of "resonance" between its own laws and the principle of the maintenance or reappearance of traces of other systems.

Since Cézanne, and more still since cubism, we have learned to accustom our eyes to the ambiguous nature of what they "read" within one and the same picture; the simultaneous portrayal of contradictory appearances has acquired a legitimacy through a unity preserved at once by the notion of the painted surface and by the arrangement of the volumes.

Here as always art has played the part of prophet. Developments in 20th century painting, and the emergence in our universe of kinetic and cinematographic interpretations of visual phenomena have accustomed us to living in an environment whose apparent disorder has a thread of meaning running through it, and that thread is the measurement of time enclosed in space. All the teachings of sociology give us the confirmation that the practices of our time are dominated by the sudden projection of time into space and of history into the environment.

The "archaeologist's eye"

A piece of architecture is looked at "with the archaeologist's eye" each time the attempt is made to travel back along the road which leads from the building as it is to the building as it was. This means travelling in the opposite direction to that of life, but it is necessarily the direction to be adopted by any scientific research forming the essential prelude to the establishment of any abstract system, and reversing the order of cause and

effect. It is by this means that — as in a detective story — the apparent mysteries of a complex present-day reality can be cleared up. Hence it is logical for a "restoration" in keeping with our present cultural context to allow both the previous shapes and the length of time for which they lasted to "show through": its aim must be to show the whole process stage by stage by embodying each stage into the building.

Saving a "modern" material

Let us complete our exploration of the ambiguous situation in which we are placed by a rather different cultural "shock wave": what does the present-day restorer with his archaeological method of interpretation do when faced with a work already restored and showing the effects of an earlier interpretation? The spire on Rouen Cathedral, built of timber in 1544, was destroyed by lightning in 1822 and rebuilt in cast iron by Alavoine, with corner bell-cotes of iron coated with copper. Cast iron was the medium of expression of the pioneers of the new technique for introducing metal as a building material. The advantage peculiar to cast iron was that it could replace both the timber structure and its covering.

The bold new departure which had consisted in designing, in the early 19th century, a spire belonging, profoundly, to its age, was to be later disavowed by Viollet-le-Duc, who declared: "To form a new art one must have a new civilization, and this was not (then) the case". Today the huge spire with its characteristic green colour has developed cracks and is in danger of collapsing. In France at the suggestion of Mr Y. M. Froidevaux, the *Commission Supérieure* has decided to forestall any accident in the near future by building an internal steel structure which will be plated over with the broken pieces of cast iron which are now no longer self-supporting. Thus the cast iron, originally able to bear its own weight (which explains why Alavoine chose it), is to become purely decorative, in order that a 19th century feature which has become a part of the heritage and a part of the Rouen townscape may retain its present aspect.

In reality if we were true to the spirit of Alavoine and to the whole spirit of architectural design from the very beginnings we would today replace the cast-iron spire (now out of date) with a spire made of duraluminium or titanium and reflecting the heights to which present-day technology is now able to soar. The mid-19th century would, on the contrary, have opted for a traditional spire, which would have been clearly a betrayal of the real spirit of its much-revered Middle Ages. With the arrangement chosen, the cast iron is deliberately given a place in the history

of the heritage, while its intrinsic role — the reason for its use on a stone building — is abandoned. It is certain that if the spire to be restored had been a traditional 19th century one approximately imitating the medieval style, it would not have been kept if it could not have been saved with relative ease. The idea behind the system adopted is that of preserving a concrete testimony to a revolutionary event in recent architectural history, dating from before the birth of restoration theory.

Conclusions regarding the restoration of buildings left unscathed by the 19th century

What conclusion are we to draw from this up-to-date analysis of the concept of the building heritage and of its situation within the cultural context?

1) Obviously, the need for restoration derives primarily from decay and the resultant dangers, and it is quite true that as a general rule it would be preferable to speak of "conservation".

2) The existent material, even if it has decayed, should be retained insofar as it can be consolidated either from the inside or from the outside, and rendered capable of lasting. This is the condition which must be met if it is not merely to be left as a legacy in the formal sense but is also to remain as a testimony to the longevity of the building, and to the lapse of time which separates us from the moment when it was decided to build it, thus transcending our own restricted life-spans and providing a temporal link between generations, and an "authenticity" in the etymological sense of the term as something deriving its power from its own self.

3) To be absolutely strict such authenticity should be able to apply not only to the outside "skins" of the materials but also to the structures and to materials which are in fact concealed from view. One may feel it is a pity to have to use staff when reinstating a Romanesque vault, even if it is coated over and hidden just as stone would have been. But this is very different from using a concrete "clamp" to save the whole of an ancient building, original materials included.

4) Our position in the matter has already been mentioned several times on a more general level: we consider that where a building is complex in character since it belongs to several successive periods each period should be visible simultaneously. We would add here that the deliberate choice of "successive states of authenticity" when restoring will tend to produce a building with an overall appearance which in fact it has never possessed before; it will be a restoration reflecting the specific nature of the cultural function of the building.

The criteria contained in the Venice Charter, the unsolved problems deriving from the latter which we have pointed out, and even our reservations with regard to certain of its conclusions, are at once the reflection of our own culture and a part of it. We must handle these things with the modesty and sagacity in which the 19th century, with its faith in its own infallibility, was entirely lacking. We shall thus, at the same time, by taking care to do nothing irreparable, be playing our part in history in what we know to be a purely relative capacity. If these conditions are met late 20th century science of restoration may be defined as one of the most advanced branches of the scholarship of a civilization which is constantly enriching its future with the aid of its past and is aware of its limitations.

C - OTHER ASPECTS OF RESTORATION: SHOULD WE RESTORE RESTORATIONS?

Few authors of papers have tackled the various unsolved problems relating to conservation and restoration directly and on the level of first principles.

Mrs Franca Valli (Italy) suggests that knowledge of the measurements of buildings will provide the means of reconstructing features which have been dismantled. This is true of classical or baroque buildings, but even here one cannot be absolutely certain; one should rather say such knowledge enables a coherent proposal to be made.

We would like to stress the excellence of the contribution from Messrs. Claude Jaccotet, T.-A. Hermanès, Alfred Wyss and Charles Bonnet, who, in their paper entitled "Architect and restoration craftsman: their mission and mutual cooperation", have placed the various unsolved problems arising in conservation in the contexts of the respective roles of the various professionals concerned — conservationist, archaeologist, restorer of paintings and architect.

These various stages in the preparation and execution of the work may be considered to form a part of the "structural problems", in that they are the prerequisites of satisfactory restoration, and the fixing of the responsibility of each of those concerned so that the tasks are fairly shared out is a necessary condition of the making of provision for all the various factors we have been dealing with.

Restoring restorations

There is one particular problem which has been worrying professionals in France during the past few years, and that is the need to decide whether to remove previous restoration work or to restore it. The various factors

involved are explained and discussed in the journal *Monuments Historiques* (N° 112, 1981, entitled "Un siècle de restauration") and in the proceedings of the symposium on the subject held by ICOMOS France in Toulouse in 1980, which are shortly to be published².

Removing restoration work and baroque additions

During the discussions at the Toulouse symposium the special nature of the theoretical and practical dilemma which the additions made by 19th century restorers had created for their successors emerged most clearly. The latter had come to reject all the additions made since the period when each building had been originally put up and systematically to remove all restoration work so as to get back to what they imagined to be the original state of the work. Subsequently, throughout the first half of the 20th century the same process had gone in a great many countries; the 19th century additions whose value had been disputed were subjected to a critical examination and were then cheerfully dismantled in their turn.

In actual fact the huge rehabilitation programmes of the 19th and early 20th centuries went much further than mere "de-restoration", since, in the name of unity of style and the return to the original state of things, they deprived, for example, a large number of German or Italian buildings of extremely fine baroque additions, which were replaced by conjectural, if not purely invented, "reconstructions" in medieval style. It is true that such baroque additions may have had nothing to do with the original spirit of the buildings concerned, but they nevertheless had added to their grandeur. And it is precisely an awareness of the unfortunate results of such removal of all baroque features which has caused a great many present-day historians to look with circumspection at any proposed restoration work, from the point of view of the actual principle involved.

The removal of baroque features meant a removal of deliberate additions made with no intention of accurate reconstruction of earlier work: whereas the dismantling of 19th century additions generally signified the destruction of unsuccessful attempts at restoring a building to its original condition. Except that sometimes the irrepressible need to "create" when restoring was stronger than all the rest; in such cases are we to conclude that the 19th century addition has become a sort of creation to be preserved for the sake of its originality and, as it were, for its very infidelity?

² Articles by Michel Parent, Léon Pressouyre, Jean Taralon, François Enaud, Yves Boiret, Mme. Labrousse, Marcel Duruat, Braemer, Cazes Hermitte, Georges Costa, Salet, Bruand, Milhaud, and Saint-Aubin, and also by Messrs. Horier, Berger, Robitaille and Margot.

Restoration of outside surfaces

There have been some recent cases where it has been necessary to choose from among various alternatives for the mere outside appearance of wall-surfaces; these have occurred on the Place Nationale at Montauban and in the courtyard of the Hôtel Clary in Toulouse (known as the "Maison de Pierre" because of its stone façade on the street side). The choice is turning out to be no less difficult to make and to involve no less uncertainty as to principle than in the case of the actual replacement of defective structural materials. Unstuccoed brick? Imitation brick? Stuccoed brick? "Present-day sensitive taste" would appear to be in favour of the original material — in this case brick — left unstuccoed. But on many locations brick rapidly degenerates if it is left bare; the Hôtel de Clary as left us by the 19th century has been painted over with imitation brickwork to hide the original rather decayed surfaces. In Montauban some of the brickwork has been left bare while some of it has had its stucco removed. It is certainly difficult to know how to choose between the return to an original condition which varied from one point to another or of which we are uncertain, the condition of the building as left to us by prudent restorers, and the demands of a "sensitivity" which may be a momentary phase and whose decisions will generally be open to question.

In reality there is no single solution which will suit the whole square in Montauban. The rendering dates from the 18th century, when the whole square was renovated in a baroque style, and forms as well as surfaces were altered. The baroque innovations should be preserved, but this does not mean that where the bricks have recovered their original unstuccoed appearance they should be given a rendering.

In a paper presented to the Paris symposium on restoration in France and the Venice Charter, Mr Bertrand Monnet raised a related problem likewise connected with the outside "skins" of buildings: this was the problem of the "readability" of restorations.

Where restoration is a matter of filling in visible gaps and no conjecture is involved there is no justification for using contrasting material: for an understanding of the message of the past the treatment of the surfaces is as important as the treatment of the forms. French restorers recommend that where walls are to be completed the same kind of stone be used as originally; this will sometimes mean the reopening of quarries and the laying-in of stocks. They advocate the use of a dividing line to separate the original portions from the restored ones, as in the brick fortifications

of the Old City of Warsaw; there is thus no deception and aesthetic requirements are reconciled with truthfulness.

May we claim that this approach has the support of the Bible? In St. Matthew (IX.16) we read: "No one puts a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old garment, for the patch tears away from the garment, and a worse tear is made".

In contrast to this practice — which is commonly adopted in France and in Poland — the supporters of "archaeological restoration" advocate the practice of refraining from filling in missing portions, even by mere surface treatment. For this reason when the temple from Philae was placed on its new site on the Nile the cement portions of some of its columns which had been restored earlier on were not replaced by stone. As it was necessary for reasons of stability to fill in the gaps, the replacements were made smaller than the original portions so as to be distinguished from them by the difference in surface level.

Use and conservation: a further dilemma

Any building or monument will have had an initial use (even if only — as in the case of actual "monuments" — that of embodying and preserving a memory). Obviously where the original use — a religious or residential one, for example — has been maintained, overall conservation is easiest to achieve. But even where a building has preserved its initial function the function itself may undergo change as time goes on. The problem may be solved where the building is adapted, without there being any irreparable changes, to serve a purpose as a part of the heritage, with the addition of new features which are independent and removable; here we may speak of a "forward-looking transparency" comparable with the transparency we have already mentioned which enables the past to "show through". Buildings which have lost their original function have often reappeared as part of the "heritage of knowledge and enjoyment". Already in his day Mérimée found such a role preferable for rare buildings such as the baptistery at Poitiers, where even the alterations required to enable a cultural purpose to be served — in this instance, to enable a museum to be housed — were liable to lead to a perversion of the character of the place.

Yet it is obvious that the best incitement to upkeep is practical use and that the housing of a museum is the function nearest to that of forming part of the heritage.

Museums frequently contain the wreckage of buildings which have been pulled down, and in such cases they testify to scandalous behaviour

at some time in the past. But they are also places of refuge for rare architectural fragments which would inevitably decay irreparably if left standing; they have thus become the "allies" of buildings where once they fed on their neglect. Yet clearly conservation in situ is the basic objective of any conservation policy, and this it is which makes restoration legitimate.

The enormous increase in the size of the heritage necessarily raises in a very pressing manner the problem of its use. This was the subject of a symposium organized by ICOMOS France in 1978³ and held at the Popes' Palace in Avignon, a part of which Mr Jean Sonnier had temporarily transformed into congress premises.

Over and above the need for an appeal to the imagination, successful uses are those which, despite the enormous outward differences, present underlying analogies with the original ones; we might speak here of the permanence of a building's structural function.

For Dr. Jerko Marasović (Yugoslavia) the present-day approach — to quote the title of his paper — "*is based on respect for the architectural heritage*", and this would imply, notwithstanding all the differences, a secret collusion between past and present.

The introduction of modern works into ancient buildings raises a problem similar to that of the introduction of contemporary architecture into ancient groups of buildings and to that of the adaptation of buildings to suit new purposes. For the reasons we have already mentioned, medieval architectural works are able to accommodate the works of the present day, just as they were able to accommodate baroque and to be enriched by it.

VIII - CONCLUSION

"Neither is new wine put into old wineskins; if it is, the skins burst, and the wine is spilt, and the skins are destroyed". This further passage from St. Matthew (IX.17) must be meditated; it would lead us to throw away the "old wineskins".

We must keep them, since it is they which make the good wine; but we must also make new "skins" for the "new wine".

We must not hide from ourselves the fact that with the successful and widespread acceptance of the concept of the architectural heritage we are now living through a new crisis in the matter; the earlier crisis derived

³ Cf. *Les Monuments Historiques de la France*, No. 5, 1978.

from the problem of selection and of false certainties, whereas the present one is one of growing pains and of doubts.

Like the histories of all human things, the history of the heritage is ambiguous, composed of a series of errors and failures leading to a truth of which we cannot be certain — and sometimes to transcendent beauty. It began in an optimistic century which believed it was going to achieve human happiness by travelling straight along the path of progress with history and reason to light it on the way.

The concept of the "heritage" took hold of the architecture then in existence, which so far had been as it were "regulated" by the profits due to imagination and the losses due to destruction, finally achieving "assets" which were admirable.

For nearly two centuries, while imagination has been exhausting itself, society has been "producing" heritage with the works of the past, until it has reached a stage where anything produced by man becomes something to be owned as though inherited, an object of nostalgia, of display in a museum, of preservation by a possible or probable science of conservation.

If we are to deal with the effects of such inevitable inflation we must "reorganize the area" and treat the objects in it individually, each in accordance with its peculiar nature. If we do not, hesitation between the concept of the architectural heritage and the concept of the environment will lead to general confusion deriving from neglect of the heritage and freezing of the environment.

In Michel Tournier's book, Caspar the King of Meroë has an astonishing revelation when he reaches the crib. This revelation enjoins on us, says the author "to resemble those whom we love, to speak their language, and to respect them; and this last word originally meant *to look twice*" In other words, we should *look at the way we look at things*.

In this way will discover the *authenticity* of beings and things and how to treat them as what they are and not to oblige them to be something else. "Thus it is" the author adds, "that pleasure is exalted"; and that pleasure "is known as love".

⁴ Jacques ATTALI, *Les Trois Mondes* (Fayard, 1981). The author distinguishes these same three bases in the area of economics.

HEINZ WOLFF

CHARACTER OF CONSTRUCTIVE ELEMENTS FIT FOR FACADES IN A VERNACULAR ENSEMBLE

In nature the individuals of each kind are only similar to each other never congruent. With pleasure we look at creations that man has formed in the same way. Instead of a boring sequence of one and the same pattern, we would rather see a succession of mere similar ones.

The houses in an old street often show charming variations with always the same materials: the halftimbered wood, the handmoulded tiles etc. This and the wellknown differences in the levels of gutters and ridges as well as in the width of the lots make an individual of each building.

Likewise: a monument looked at from close by does not lose our interest. The eye discovers individuality in every equally planned constructive element: in the slate, the plank, the ironrod. Each one differs in a more or less distinct way in its

1. surface (rough or smoother)
2. contour (irregular or straighter)
3. colour (uniform or changing in itself)
4. proportion or
5. size.

The application of these experiences eases the harmonious filling in of a new facade. Often it will be possible to reuse technically sound parts from old buildings inevitably pulled down. As new materials

a handmoulded brick, which owns nearly all the qualities from point

1 to 5, is better than a mechanically exact formed one,

a plasterwork with slightly undulating surface better than an entirely plain one,

a freestone with the stonecutters script better than a sawn one,

a plate of copper or plumb will 'oxidize' soon, the surface of untouched