

DAVID LOWENTHAL

DILEMMAS OF PRESERVATION

Every aspect of our heritage seems more dramatically altered and drastically threatened today than ever before. More of prehistory may have been destroyed in the past generation than was previously known to exist. "The tempo of destruction is currently so great", warns Karl Meyer, "that by the end of the century most important archaeological sites may well be plundered or paved over"¹. No less than archaeological sites, historic buildings and traditional landscapes are victims of modern technological change.

Such destruction is not uniquely modern, to be sure. Surveying Derbyshire's antiquities in 1848, Thomas Bateman noted their "rapid disappearance and exhaustion [owing to] agricultural improvements, and the ill conducted pillage of idle curiosity"². Public interest threatened the survival of British ancient monuments as long as a century ago. "The very fact that attention is drawn to them makes them increasingly the prey of the ignorant sightseer on the one hand or the needy owner of the soil on the other"³.

Yet the pace of destruction has unquestionably accelerated in our own day. Giant machinery can now transform a city or a landscape almost in the twinkling of an eye; where damage might formerly have been halted before too much harm was done, today trees are felled, hedgerows uprooted, buildings wholly demolished before a protest can be lodged. Deep ploughing

¹ Karl Meyer, *The Plundered Past: The Traffic in Art Treasures* (London, Hamish Hamilton, 1974), p. xv.

² Thomas Bateman, *Vestiges of the Antiquities of Derbyshire* (1848), quoted in Joan Evans, *A History of the Society of Antiquaries* (Oxford, University Press, 1956), p. 286.

³ Review of *Archaeologica; or Miscellaneous Tracts relating to Antiquity* (Society of Antiquaries of London, Vols. 45-46), in *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 154, 1881, pp. 101-21, ref. on pp. 120-21.

obliterates visual evidence of settlement patterns that had survived two millennia of previous grazing and cultivation. Farmers, sand and gravel contractors, and developers make increasing inroads against surviving landscapes. Modern weapons annihilate terrain and vegetation as well as man-made structures. Industrial pollution erodes ancient masterpieces from the Acropolis to "The Last Supper", which can perhaps now be salvaged only by depriving Athens and Milan of both automobiles and industry.

Technology is the past's major enemy, but other agencies add to the toll of destruction. Patriots who eradicate what they regard as relics of and monuments to a depraved or unhappy era often uproot the entire heritage in their iconoclastic fervor. Zeal for knowledge may destroy the past in the course of studying it, as archaeological excavation still unhappily demonstrates. The most ancient living tree ever found — a bristlecone pine 4,900 years old — was cut down to determine its age. The crowned mummified head of Otokar II of Czechoslovakia rapidly disintegrated when his 13th century tomb was re-opened in Prague's St. Vitus Cathedral in 1977. "That's the trouble with old mysteries, they can't stand touching", commented an observer. "For 700 years Otokar lay there in peace, while the Czechs wondered what had happened to him, and now he has gone"⁴.

Mass tourism has intensified the impact of theft and erosion at historic sites. Visitors to Stratford no longer take home slivers of Anne Hathaway's supposed chair, nor do visitors to Salisbury Plains hire hammers at Amesbury to chip keepsakes from Stonehenge. But these improvements in decorum are minor compared with modern losses. The press of visitors has destroyed the turf around the sarsens at Stonehenge. Human breath promoted micro-organic decay that forced the closure of the cave paintings at Lascaux. Sightseers at Canterbury and other cathedrals wear down old floors, render inscriptions illegible, and pilfer fittings⁵. High prices for antiquities have promoted illicit trade and devastated ancient sites; entire Mayan temples in Central America are broken up for clandestine export.

But protecting historic sites and artifacts may equally doom them beyond recognition. Modern fire and safety regulations in adapted historic buildings, for example, require insulation and escape routes so expensive or unsightly that, architects warn, they "could spell the end of Georgian and Victorian domestic architecture as we know it"⁶.

Outright destruction is not the only force that profoundly alters our surroundings; so does the decay of artifacts of all kinds — houses, clothes, books, toys, furniture, crockery. Far more plentiful than ever before, such things also expire at a pace our ancestors never witnessed. When raw materials were expensive and labour comparatively cheap, objects of use were made to last. Household artifacts were often passed on to the next generation. Today, by contrast, we replace rather than conserve and repair. Who now protects fabrics with dust covers? How many of us turn cuffs and collars or darn socks? Manufacturing makes it cheaper to replace aggregates than to fit new parts into old structures; and as profits depend on continuing sales, fashion persuades us that still serviceable older possessions are obsolete.

Thus we live in circumstances previous generations would have found extraordinary: most of the things we wear, use, and see around us are shorter-lived than ourselves. And because our own longevity has increased, along with our tendency to move from place to place, the environments and artifacts that surround us in later life are seldom those we grew up with.

The modern impulse toward preservation is partly a reaction to the increasing evanescence of the things that pass through our lives. We cling all the more to the little that remains familiar in a disposable world. And we compensate for a less well known environment with a heightened interest in its history. Like a newcomer to an old village who self-consciously acquires roots by joining the local historical society, the annual buyer of new clothes and cars becomes nostalgically attached to the articles he discards. After they cease to be useful they are admired because they are old. Such collectibles are precious because they give the objects we once used a genealogy, place them in a temporal context, make up for the longevity we deprived them of by having cast them off so soon. Interest in each aspect of the heritage peaks as it threatens to disappear — steam engines, parish churches, thatched roofs, canals, pottery ovens all mirror an affection for the vanishing past they seldom elicited when still plentiful.

The pace of change increases attachments to scenes recalled from childhood, things that were here before us. Links with the past mitigate the strangeness of ever less familiar surroundings. Dissatisfaction with the present and malaise about the future induce many to look back with nostalgia, to equate what is beautiful and seemly and livable with what is old or past. And the diffusion of history and archaeology makes us aware that the scenes of our past are essential ingredients of our present identity — a country without historic buildings is like a man without a memory.

Tastes for the past have changed no less than the past itself. Greek, Roman and various stages of Gothic tradition have attracted the admiration

⁴ *International Herald Tribune*, January 25, 1977, p. 3.

⁵ *English Cathedrals and Tourism: Problems and Opportunities* (London, English Tourist Board, 1979).

⁶ *The Times* (London), April 8, 1978, p. 15.

of followers from one or another century. Today's concern embraces all past periods, and to earlier aesthetic, scientific, pedagogic, and patriotic reasons for conservation, our generation adds social identity, a growing need for roots and traditions, and the saving of resources.

Appalled by the destruction of the past, we apply greater care and expertise to the preservation of what survives. The technological tools that advance demolition also locate history hitherto hidden from view under the ground, beneath the sea, behind the varnish of a painting. New conservation techniques now mend old materials, fabrics, structures that used to decay beyond hope of repair. To maintain a cathedral is not yet cheap or easy, but scientific renovation is now both less obtrusive and more durable than ever before.

The surviving past looms more prominently also because more and more around us is recognized as old and hence thought worthwhile. Antiques once had to date from another century, but today include items from the 1950s; buildings thought worth saving in Britain, once exclusively pre-Georgian, now stem from epochs as recent as Edwardian; in the United States anything older than fifty years qualifies for historic preservation grants; yesterday's ephemera, once simply junk, are now collectibles with documented lineages; nostalgia, formerly reserved for childhood if not for remote antiquity, now lends last year a golden glow. The officially valued French past now extends from Palaeolithic Lascaux to Le Corbusier. In Britain, the Department of the Environment has doubled the number of listed buildings in a decade, less by discovering previously overlooked older ones than by adding Victorian structures to the earlier list.

Not even this expanded and better protected past satisfies the modern need for historical artifacts, buildings, and landscapes. The novelist Saki once said that "the people of Crete make more history than they can consume locally". That is a rare circumstance; in most countries the demand for history far exceeds the supply. Spurious origins bolster national pride, antiquing has become a widespread pursuit, newly-minted historic villages replicate fond images of the past. Seeing a quaint Mediterranean town, an inquiring visitor is told, "the town *has* no history, Signore; it was built from scratch three years ago entirely for the tourist trade".

The more the past is destroyed or left behind, the more pervasive grows our nostalgia, the more obsessed we become with preservation and reconstruction. "The dual impulse of our age", suggests a fictional conservationist, "is vast devastation coupled with equally vast reconstruction"⁷. In fact as

⁷ David Ely, *Time Out* (London, Secker & Warburg, 1968), p. 101.

well as fiction, preservation can sometimes be achieved only in the context of destruction. At Pompeii instantaneous catastrophe made possible total preservation; the subsequent recovery of the ordinary things of life — hair-pins and ink pots, dice and knucklebones, mirrors and bottles — which no one would otherwise have bothered to save, lends our view of that ancient city a rare immediacy. The dissolution of England's monasteries in the 1530s is another case in point; the king who had destroyed them championed Leland's studies of their literary remains, and their physical ruins were soon venerated as historical monuments. An insurance company "compensated" for demolishing Nashville's Grand Ole Opry House, by using the old bricks and artifacts for a "Little Church of Opryland" in a new amusement park⁸.

Thus the tangible past, increasingly threatened by technology, pollution, greed, neglect, and popularity, has become a battleground of conflicting interests. Survivals from earlier times today occupy our attention as never before.

We face additional problems when we translate our concern for these threats to our heritage into action. The twin impulses of destruction and preservation engender at least four dilemmas; what to save from the past and why; how to use what we save; how to prevent the fake past from inundating the real; and how preservation, laudable in itself, may hinder alternative uses of the past.

What should we save and why? The criteria that mark out buildings, artifacts and landscapes for study and preservation are in constant flux. Structures unworthy of attention ten years ago have since acquired devotees; past architects once derided gain new favour; works formerly thought derivative or trivial acquire value. Every passing generation tends to downgrade the deeds of its immediate forebears, while rehabilitating the reputation of a more remote past.

Features considered to be historically significant likewise change over time. Not only do particular figures and events gain fresh stature or fall into disrepute, but entire aspects of the past become newly worth saving or ripe for discard. The homes of presidents and patriots, the sites of national battles and the routes of explorers used to be the most important American monuments; today's preservation priorities are linked with industry and the arts and with ethnic minorities. The antebellum plantation house now gives way as a focus of attention to slave quarters once hidden as shameful,

⁸ Ada Louise Huxtable, *Kicked a Building Lately?* (New York: New York Times/Quadrangle, 1968), p. 259.

just as workaday servants' wings at National Trust houses now attract British visitors whose predecessors had eyes only for the sumptuous and the aristocratic.

Attention has also shifted from things and places of high architectural merit or unique historical consequence to those that have played a part in the lives of ordinary people. The distinction bears on what the geographer Yi-Fu Tuan calls public symbols and fields of care. Public symbols are widely venerated monuments — the Eiffel Tower, Big Ben, Niagara Falls. Fields of care are neighbourhoods whose features matter only to those intimately associated with them, everyday scenes that provide people with a durable sense of place⁹. Historic preservation in this spirit extends to the industrial past, not just to factory buildings but to entire working-class towns. "Our identity lies in this urban industrial past", according to Patrick Mogan, originator of America's first urban historic park, Lowell, Massachusetts. The Lowell revival involves a sense of "collective heritage" for those who lived there, a "confirmation of their past"¹⁰.

Britain's industrial heritage has been markedly neglected despite — or perhaps because of — her primary role in the industrial revolution. Indeed, recent Pennines redevelopment fuelled a desire to *banish* old industrial images; civic leaders who viewed old mills and tenements with disgust and embarrassment felt that progress depended on erasing what was left of the 19th century. But responses to the SATANIC MILLS exhibition recently staged by the Royal Institute of British Architects shows how much these structures meant to the people who lived and worked in them, even when they found life hard and the buildings ugly. Tamara Hareven and Randolph Langenbach cite the visitor who was glad to see that her mill was still there — not wanting to go back to the days of toil as an eleven-year-old after a breakfast of bread and dripping, but feeling that the building's survival provided a physical continuity to match her memory.

The need for familiar landmarks, for being physically in touch with reminders of one's past, now animates many communities to save vernacular structures and humble scenes that would never qualify as outstandingly "aesthetic" or "historical". "The problem for planners and preservationists", as Hareven and Langenbach say, "is how to weld the two aspects

⁹ Yi-Fu Tuan, « Spade and Place: Humanistic Perspective », in *Progress in Geography*, Vol. 6 (London, Edward Arnold, 1974), pp. 212-52.

¹⁰ Quoted in Jane Holtz Kay, « New Birth for Us All », *Nation* (New York), September 17, 1977, pp. 245-57.

of human association, the intimate, and that based on knowledge of art and history, together in the preservation effort"¹¹.

How should we use what we save? The long-term survival of any structure clearly implies a use different from the original one. As things age they become ever less suited to their initial purposes, purposes which time may likewise extinguish or transform. Social and technological change have made the sacrificial altar, the village stocks, the clipper ship wholly obsolete. Many an old jail cannot serve as a prison today, nor can an early zoo be modernized, because ideas about how to treat captive animals and people have changed. Few if any unaltered old houses match modern standards of privacy and sanitation. Any contemporary use requires some adaptation to modern standards of comfort, of social interaction, of technology, of safety, even of decor — adaptations which inevitably violate the historical integrity of what is inherited. Modern alterations that enable a structure to remain occupied and alive are bound to conflicts with the yearning to retain familiar street scenes, landmarks, and other mementos.

Adaptive reuse evokes passionate but quite disparate responses. North Americans take pride in the range of functions places have served: Lafayette Square in Washington, for example, for having been in turn a cherry orchard, the site of Andrew Jackson's raucous inaugural party, a sheep pasture during the First World War. The British, by contrast, often see new use as a sacrilege to old structures; hence Lord Anglesey's plea that redundant churches be left vacant as perpetual reminders of spiritual eternal values¹². Indeed, exemption from local taxes enjoyed by many listed buildings, if vacant, makes less likely their occupancy by new users. Only things kept for use strictly as museum exhibits can keep fidelity to historical structure and appearance.

But both conversion and museumization inevitably pervert the past. Complete preservation means withdrawal from life; it embalms or pickles what is saved. Thoroughgoing reuse invalidates or trivializes surviving elements of the past. Public funding and tax benefits have made historic preservation attractive to American realtors, but the old Home Improvement Company, though now renamed Preservation Specialists, is apt to "restore" as it once "renewed", with little historical understanding and a ruthless disregard for continuity.

¹¹ Tamara Hareven and Randolph Langenbach, « Work space, living space, and historical identity », in David Lowenthal and Marcus Binney, (eds.), *Our Past Before Us: Why Do We Save It?* (London, Temple Smith, 1981).

¹² *The Times*, ???

Increasing demands for access to the surviving past conflict, moreover, both with private ownership and with the need to discover history for oneself. The greatest part of the English countryside heritage remains virtually inaccessible to public view. Partly as a consequence, concentration on the most accessible sites makes them increasingly unattractive. The press of visitors at many historic homes and ancient monuments requires fences, guards, and other paraphernalia that erodes their atmosphere if not their fabric. Some insist that in a democratic society everyone has a right to easy access, with full interpretation, to any site. But popularity already leaves Stonehenge scarcely viewable and now begins to threaten the ambience of Avebury as well. Soon no truly spectacular monument will be left for those who seek the past on their own terms, unobstructed by car parks and ticket kiosks. It is already hard to find an American historical landmark neither obliterated by progress nor Disneyfied by popularity; to be saved for true appreciation, some sites need to be hidden, not advertised. As a State of Washington leaflet report notes, "no one knows where the historic Goose Creek Rock shelter is, and the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation wants to keep it that way"¹³.

It is equally hard to reconcile present-day entrepreneurial uses with any sense of heritage, for large-scale farming and manufacturing increasingly erode an enduring sense of locale. Yet to residents and visitors alike, stability, continuity and cherished features from times past are not luxuries but basic constituents of life.

Finally, the interests of a small professional elite need to be reconciled with those of the public at large. Notwithstanding their television image, archaeologists do not satisfy public demands for meaning and mystery in prehistory; scholar's zeal for knowledge is remote from popular interests in death and treasure. The inherited past in cathedrals, castles, and country houses now has to cater for more numerous but less knowledgeable visitors, just as the popular demand for historical romance, fed by TV nostalgia, now outruns highbrow, even middle-brow, interest in history. Anything that seems to be old takes on value for collectors simply because it is not of our time. But the personal and communal meanings the public at large attach to the surviving past often involve forms of use and of interpretation which fly in the face of established canons of truth or beauty.

Coping with the contrived All preservation alters the past, and hence makes it at least partly contrived; but new techniques of display increasingly refashion relics into modern artifacts. The past's new popularity spawns

¹³ *New Yorker*, ???

pseudo-historical scenes, some reconstructed from surviving shells, others built from scratch. On these "historic" sites actors in period costumes bring history to life, re-enacting the shoeing of horses, the dipping of candles, the killing of desperadoes, the clangor of ancient battle. Such interpretative re-enactments, still most common in the United States, are no longer shunned even in Britain. A diorama with fanciful depictions of early armour introduces visitors to Battle Abbey, transforming 1066 into 1066 *and All That*. At Blickling Hall, in Norfolk, National Trust re-enactments feature the earl in 18th century costume and require the vicar in period garb to baptise the same village infant ten times a week.

Such operations do make history vivid for millions who would otherwise pass ancient monuments by with a blind or bored eye. But they are apt, in the process, to turn venerable places into self-conscious replicas of themselves, bearing out gloomy predictions about Britain's degeneration into a quaint museum of antiquities.

The prevalence of replicas and memorials also tends to relegate actual survivals to a back seat. A copy of Abraham Lincoln's restored long cabin birthplace is almost lost inside the modern marble Greek temple that houses it. Mark Twain's actual home in Hannibal, Missouri, attracts less attention than Tom Sawyer's fictional whitewashed fence. An old bar in a 19th century building at Rockefeller Center in New York lost its lease to a phony 19th century replica with a "real-old-fashioned 19th century tavern"¹⁴. *Early American Decorating*, a popular magazine, advises readers that "the essential flavor of Colonial is easy to capture" — for example, an enlarged and tinted old photograph in a suitably weathered frame "gives much the same impression as a genuine oil painting". A repro-furniture firm that prides itself on historical respectability nonetheless sells do-it-yourself staining for "that 200-year-old look", and tells customers "it is always flattering to have your creations mistaken for originals". Some reproductions are avowedly *better* than originals: a manufacturer of a rustic long cabin boast that "Davy Crockett sure never had it so good!" — just as the copy of the Vieux Carré at Disneyland was praised as a lot cleaner than the original in New Orleans. Contrivers of new pasts follow the 19th century precept that "a happy imitation is of much more value than a defective original"¹⁵.

History in books is no less contrived than on the ground. The Michigan

¹⁴ Huxtable, *op. cit.*, p. 261.

¹⁵ James Dallaway, *Anecdotes of the Arts in England, or Comparative Remarks on Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting* (1800), quoted in Kenneth Clark, *The Gothic Revival: an Essay in the History of Taste* (London, John Murray, 1962), p. 113.

Historical Society sells T-shirts with the legend "History Tells It Like It Was". But history often tells it like how it *should* have been, if not how it should be now. American history textbooks frequently imply that the national values they catalogue have not changed at all in four centuries¹⁶.

Does preservation stifle creativity? Preservation is a cause now embraced by millions. Advocates show that saving old structures costs less in materials, energy, and capital than replacing them with new buildings, or that national pride or tourism justify their retention¹⁷. But do these arguments justify preserving as much as we do? A British critic charges that "much local authority rehabilitation of old housing represents poor value today and a large scale maintenance problem for the next generation"¹⁸.

Others fear that excessive admiration of old buildings inhibits contemporary creativity. Old buildings that are helped to survive pre-empt space and talent from new ones; the taste for the antique stifles innovation. Antiquities may exhaust too much of our energy, as Nathaniel Hawthorne thought at the British Museum as long ago as 1856. He admired the frieze of the Parthenon, the Elgin Marbles, Egyptian statues, but feared their stultifying effect:

The present is burthened too much with the past. We have not time, in our earthly existence, to appreciate what is warm with life, and immediately around us; yet we heap up all these old shells, out of which human life has long emerged, castrating them off forever. I do not see how future ages are to stagger under all this dead weight, with the additions that will be continually made to it¹⁹.

Much more of the past has since accumulated, yet we seem to welcome its weight, to regard the old rather than the new as "warm with life". "Conservationists rob us of our cultural self-confidence", Douglas Johnson charges. "We can no longer create, construct, imagine something new. We have to conserve, preserve, restore"²⁰. Where the past is gone we replace it with pale ghosts intended mainly to "fit in" with what has been preserved. "Design has to conform to the 'character' of the conservation area, which

¹⁶ Frances Fitzgerald, *America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston, Little Brown, 1979).

¹⁷ Marcus Binney and Max Hanna, *Preservation Pays* (London, SAVE Britain's Heritage, 1979).

¹⁸ Owen Luder, « Shouting rude words at the vicar », *Building*, Vol. 235, December 15, 1978, p. 35.

¹⁹ Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The English Notebooks* (New York, Modern Language Association, 1941), p. 294.

²⁰ Douglas Johnson, « Now what it used to be », *Vote*, 5, 1978, p. 43.

rules out any dynamic modern architectural solution"²¹. Conservation-style architecture may be well-mannered and discreet, but it is often depressingly low key. Many old buildings are preserved less for their architectural merit than for fear of the bleak, blank monolithic, brutal structures that would replace them. Some preservationists seem to feel that only past epochs produced authentic things. "Beneath the visible attachment to 'souvenirs', to photographs, memorabilia, old movies, old furniture, old styles in clothes", writes Antony Brandt, "runs this sense that everything important is somewhere else, in another time"²².

Were nostalgia confined to a few avid collectors of antiques, a few old grumblers, a few aspects of the built environment, it might be harmless enough, "but for a whole culture to be looking backwards is surely alarming". Conservationists "wish to stop things happening; ... to prevent old buildings from being pulled down and new buildings from being put up", Johnson adds, "because they fear the future, they dislike the present, and they think things were better in the past"²³.

We are not the first generation to indulge in slavish antiquarianism. A similar mood of despair, of all good times lying behind, of uncreative adulation of things and persons past, infected the Roman Empire near its end. Second-century taste "prostrated itself before Greek models, and educated Romans grew ecstatic over ruins", as Peter Gay paraphrases Gibbon. "This indiscriminate antiquarian movement was not so much a cause as a symptom of exhaustion, of self-contempt"²⁴. Like them, we generally cling to inherited things but seldom emulate them.

By contrast, artists and architects from the Renaissance through the 19th century, harking back to Greece and Rome or to the Middle Ages, were excited by the *spirit* of ancient times as well as by their remains. They cared less about preserving the past than about using it as an inspiration for their own works. Historical visions drawn from books, from artifacts, from landscapes, inspired them not simply to revere but to rival antiquity. Some of their creations copied or imitated antique models, but most were freshly inspired by a freely reinterpreted past. Structures modelled after antique precepts embellished Europe and America: towns and cities, gardens, buildings, furnishings, paintings, sculpture recalled Classical or Gothic forms and

²¹ Luder, *op. cit.*

²² Anthony Brandt, « A short natural history of nostalgia », *Atlantic*, December 1978, pp. 58-63, ref. on p. 60.

²³ Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

²⁴ Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation* (London, Wilwood, 1970), pp. 119-20.

patterns. British preference for historically-derived themes and decor survived in vestigial form in Tudoresque and other revival semi-detached houses of the 1920s and 1930s. Indeed, a large part of what has been made or built in the past five centuries reflects this eclectic use of tradition.

Appreciation of the past today, however, means protecting ancient structures, not making new ones after their example. We save old buildings but do not look to them for models. Survivals are hardly ever used as sources of contemporary inspiration. Just as the modern conservation ethic requires that past glories should not be altered, so it insists that they should not be emulated. Scholarly knowledge about an increasing range of past epochs, styles and forms expands at the expense of living involvement with any past. Indeed, a past so indiscriminately preserved is difficult to use creatively. Few architects deliberately employ antiquity; those who do, use antique motifs in a humorous or ironic way, as if embarrassed to be caught admiring them.

The rejection of tradition as a source of creativity disjoins past from present, leaving what is preserved in a segregated realm of its own. Our cultural forebears made no such disjunction. Renaissance structures redolent of the past were often viewed as more truly antique than actual survivals. Neo-Classical architects, painters, and patrons experienced the past as part of their present, imagining themselves in intimate converse with Greek or Roman poets and philosophers. What we make today may fit in with treasured survivals, but is seldom a dynamic reaffirmation of them.

Preserved buildings weigh as heavily on us as the great writers of the past — Shakespeare, Milton — weighed on 18th century poets and playwrights, convinced they could neither match nor imitate their great legacy. "The greatest single cultural problem we face", concludes W. J. Bate, "is how to use a heritage, when we know and admire so much about it"²⁵.

To prescribe or proscribe how to treat the past is pointless, for our view of it is determined by everything that we are and do. Yet to assess our own feelings against those of other times, to enter vicariously into our predecessors' modes of experiencing their pasts can provide an illuminating historical perspective. We cannot emulate Dante in walking with Virgil, Petrarch in corresponding with Livy, or Holbach in enjoying conversing with Horace, or gaze on ruins as Shelley did, but we can appreciate the strength of these empathetic connections, and recognize that the pull of the past can lead in other directions than our own. We may question the authen-

²⁵ Walter Jackson Bate, *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet* (London, Chatto & Windus, 1971), p. 134.

ticity of Renaissance and Enlightenment rapport with their beloved Ancients, but we cannot deny that antiquity truly inspired them. We may be spared the ubiquitous Irish sense of past grievances, but we can admire the imaginative force with which Irish storytellers, memories, and landmarks bring the past to life. We may find Victorian obsessions with Anglo-Saxon origins and pre-Raphaelite innocence no less outré than some scholars today find the anachronisms of *Roots*, but we may envy the 19th century's capacity to draw communal sustenance from historical paintings, architecture, and literature.

Once we become alert to other routes to the past, we may see our own relations with it as less binding, more contingent on circumstances, and destined some day to give way to other forms of appreciation. Our grandchildren may wonder no less at our passion for authentically restored old buildings than we smile at the naiveté of our grandparents, who thought that visiting a site where a hero fought — or even slept — would improve one's character and inspire patriotism.

Awareness of the myriad ways others have appreciated their heritage could enlarge our tolerance for present-day manipulations of the past that often seem false or bizarre. Even a sanitized, Disneyfield past has its virtues; Ye Olde Englishing, mock Georgian, and fake mansarding are popular partly because scrupulous academism leaves genuine survivals barren or lifeless. Better a misguided awareness of history than none; a lighthearted dalliance with the past than a wholesale rejection of it. So too with copies or sham pasts; forgery is in a sense the sincerest form of flattery.

We need not always require that restorations and reconstructions be wholly "correct"; things can be enjoyed as "old" even through patently inauthentic. Our heritage does not continually demand solemn respect; the past can be amusing as well as serious, incongruous as well as meaningful. We can afford to smile at the anachronisms that make bygone times like those old *Punch* cartoons to which new legends are fitted. The past is often funny because it *is* old hat. Fake 18th century ruins and follies, now doubly ruined by time and disuse, divert as well as instruct us.

Revival buildings are nowadays scorned for being either untrue to their prototypes or mere copies of them. But revivals always reflect the genius of their own epoch as well as that of the valued past. Artists should never be afraid of their work appearing derivative and unoriginal, as James Lees-Milne writes, "for whatever they produce inevitably retains the flavour of their [own] epoch"²⁶.

²⁶ James Lees-Milne, *Ancestral Voices* (London, Chatto & Windus, 1975), p. 40.

Very little of what has endured, on the other hand, can be certified as original. Our apprehension of any past derives only in small measure from its own remains, much more from subsequent copies and emulations. The current image of "Classical", for example, depends far less on actual Greek and Roman relics than on Hellenistic, humanist, and neo-classicist versions. Much of Edinburgh and America bears a Classical face the 19th and 20th centuries.

We need not save everything old in order to appreciate the tangible past. Indeed, we cannot do so: more of every epoch has perished than has survived, and most of what remains is fragile and doomed. The past is not only the Rock of Ages; it is also the passing moment, and transience lends the past its own special charms.

A few emblematic elements may suffice to convey historical continuity; mere fragments of the past can lend temporal weight to a new creation. The marble Corinthian columns in New York's Bank of Tokyo, above Wall Street, contrast with Isamu Noguchi's rectangular aluminium sculpture in what Huxtable terms a "dramatically successful counterpoint of new and old"²⁷. Even a word, a vanished place-name, can conjure up past visions. At some historical attractions, modern visitor centres are carefully screened from view. But shutting out the present is not the best way to achieve or sustain a sense of continuity. Contemporary features, deliberately inserted into otherwise mummified historic precincts, give point to the past in many locales.

A past appreciated only by means of preservation satisfies mainly passive needs. A heritage should move its admirers to participate, not merely to look on; in order to incorporate surviving relics into our own lives, we must make something new of them, acting on what we venerate. The past is not simply a film flashing us back to earlier, more compelling times; it is a theatre of real life, from which present-day actors draw creative sustenance. A present that is content with retrospection can build no past worthy of the future.

Let me summarize my conclusions:

What to save We must save more than we like, remembering the pace of destruction and the needs of posterity. Future generations will require relics we have touched lightly or not at all. But as we can save nothing forever, we should keep a balance between public symbols and fields of care, great monuments of all time and intimate familiar scenes of our own immediate past.

How to use what we save Not everything old belongs in museums or

historic precincts; most of what is saved should be a vital part of the present, but our tangible heritage cannot be wholly adapted to modern needs; nor would we like it if it did. Private possession concerns only the present, the past is everyone's: the need to walk the road, to see the view, to refresh a memory, to retrace a heritage, are universal and essential.

Coping with the contrived The past is what we make it, not what it was; the very process of preservation changes the look and feel, if not the form and substance, of protected sites and artifacts. We should accept such transformation as inevitable, and make the best of it.

The past as inspiration We preserve not too much but too exclusively; other epochs treated their heritage more creatively. Past and present should be commingled rather than always separated. Every trace we inherit should testify not only to the spirit of the past but to our present perspectives.

²⁷ Huxtable, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

NOM: DAVID LOWENTHAL - Département de Géographie, Université de Londres - Royaume-Uni.

THEME: DOCTRINE

TITRE: DILEMMES DE LA PRESERVATION.

RESUME:

La destruction croissante de notre patrimoine est le résultat de l'évolution technologique, de la pollution, de la spéculation et de la négligence alliés à une recrudescence de l'importance donnée aux vestiges du passé plus prisés que jamais et de ce fait plus exposés. Parallèlement, le passé que nous souhaitons préserver et reconstruire s'est élargi dans le temps, dans l'espace et en contenu et couvre actuellement un domaine de structures et d'artefacts extrêmement étendu. Ces progrès, toutefois ne parviennent pas à satisfaire la nostalgie moderne et une grande partie de l'histoire est fabriquée de toute pièce pour faire face à la demande croissante.

La nouvelle popularité de la conservation historique nous amène à nous poser quatre questions: que devons-nous sauver et pourquoi? Comment utiliser ce que nous sauvons? Comment éviter qu'un passé faux ne se mêle à notre passé authentique? Comment la conservation, louable en soi, peut gêner les différentes possibilités d'utilisation du passé. L'auteur se penche sur ces problèmes et parvient aux conclusions suivantes:

1) La préservation, nécessairement sélective, devrait maintenir un équilibre entre les monuments de grande importance et les sites d'un caractère plus familier.

2) On ne peut conserver dans les musées, intérieurs et extérieurs, qu'une très faible partie de notre héritage; la majeure partie de ce qui est sauvegardé doit être réutilisée et par conséquent adaptée aux besoins modernes.

3) L'opération même de préservation, y compris l'évaluation, transforme les sites protégés et les artefacts; comme cette transformation du patrimoine est inévitable, on ne devrait pas la déplorer.

4) Nous sommes peut-être trop exclusivement préoccupés par la préservation et pas assez par l'émulation. Le passé survit non seulement pour être sauvegardé, mais pour inspirer des oeuvres créatrices aujourd'hui et demain.

NAME: DAVID LOWENTHAL - Department of Geography, University College London - England.

SUBJECT: DOCTRINE

TITLE: DILEMMAS OF PRESERVATION.

SUMMARY:

The increasing destruction of our heritage is a consequence of technological change, pollution, greed, and neglect, together with a heightened appreciation of the past that makes its relics ever more precious and popular, and hence at risk. At the same time, the past we seek to preserve and reconstruct has expanded in time, in space, and in content, and now includes a wider range of structures and artifacts than ever before. Not even these additions satisfy modern nostalgia, however, and much history is fabricated to meet the growing demand.

The new popularity of historic conservation engenders dilemmas: what to save from the past and why; how to use what is saved; how to prevent the fake past from inundating the true; and how preservation, laudable in itself, may hinder alternative uses of the past. This paper considers each of these problems and concludes:

1) Preservation, necessarily selective, should maintain a balance between great monuments and familiar everyday scenes.

2) Only a small part of our heritage can be kept in museums, indoor or outdoor; most of what is saved has to be re-used, and hence adapted to modern requirements.

3) The very process of preservation, even of appreciation, alters protected sites and artifacts, since such transformation of relics is inevitable, it should not be deplored.

4) We are perhaps too exclusively concerned with preservation and too little with emulation. The past survives not simply to be saved, but to inspire creative acts in the present and the future.

NOMBRE: DAVID LOWENTHAL - Departamento de Geografía, Universidad de Londres - Inglaterra.

TEMA: DOCTRINA

TITULO: DILEMAS DE LA PRESERVACION.

SUMARIO:

La creciente destrucción de nuestro patrimonio es consecuencia del cambio tecnológico, la polución, voracidad y negligencia junto a una apreciación avivada del pasado que hace sus reliquias más apreciadas y populares que nunca y en consecuencia más en peligro. Al mismo tiempo, el pasado que queremos preservar y reconstruir se ha expandido en el tiempo, en el espacio y en el contenido, y ahora incluye un campo de estructuras y artefactos más extenso que nunca. Sin embargo, ni aún estas adiciones satisfacen la nostalgia moderna del pasado y gran cantidad de historia es fabricada para atender a la creciente demanda.

La nueva popularidad de la conservación histórica, engendra cuatro disyuntivas: qué salvar del pasado y por qué; cómo usar lo salvado; cómo evitar que el pasado falsificado inunde al auténtico; y cómo la preservación, laudable en sí misma, puede aceptar las distintas alternativas de uso para el pasado. Esta ponencia considera cada uno de estos problemas y llega a las siguientes conclusiones:

1) La preservación, selectiva por necesidad, debe mantener el equilibrio entre los grandes monumentos y los escenarios familiares de cada día.

2) Solamente una pequeña parte de nuestro Patrimonio puede guardarse en museos, cubiertos o al aire libre; la mayor parte de lo que se rescata debe volverse a usar y en consecuencia, adaptarse a los requerimientos modernos.

3) El proceso mismo de preservación, aún de apreciación, altera los sitios y los artefactos salvados; puesto que la transformación de las reliquias es inevitable, no debe deplorarse.

4) Estamos quizá demasiado preocupados por la preservación y muy poco por emulación. El pasado sobrevive no sólo para ser salvado, sino para inspirar la creatividad del presente y el futuro.

Имя : ДАВИД ЛОВЕНТАЛЬ

Географический Отдел, Лондонский Университетский Колледж, Англия.

Предмет : ДОКТРИНА

Оглавление : ДИЛЕММЫ СТАВЛЕННЫЕ СОХРАНЕНИЕМ - Резюме.

Краткий Очерк : Увеличивающееся разрушение нашего наследства есть последствие технологических изменений, загрязнения, жадности и запущенности, вместе с улучшенным пониманием прошлого, делающим остатки его еще более драгоценными и популярными, в чём заключается некоторый риск. В тоже самое время, прошлое, которое мы стараемся сохранить и перестроить, расширилось во времени, в пространстве и в связи с содержанием и теперь включает более широкую гамму структур и человеческих работ чем когда бы то не было. Но даже прибавления такого рода не могут успокоить современную тоску, и много исторического фабрикуется чтобы удовлетворить увеличенный спрос.

Новая популярность исторической консервации порождает четыре дилеммы : что сохранить из прошлого и почему; как употребить спасенное; как предотвратить чтобы фальшивое прошлое не наводило правдивое; и как сохранение, которое само по себе заслуживает похвалу, не помешало бы пользоваться прошлым. Настоящий документ изучает каждую из этих проблем и делает следующие выводы :

1. Сохранение, будучи непременно селективным, должно поддержать равновесие между знаменитыми памятниками знаменными повседневными окрестностями.
2. Только малая часть нашего наследства может быть сохранена в музеях, наруже или внутри; большинство того, что можно было спасти должно быть употреблено наново, и следовательно быть приспособленно к новым требованиям.
3. Самый процесс сохранения, даже понимания, меняет способ предохранения местности и работ человеческих рук; такая трансформация реликвий неизбежна и о нем не нужно жалеть.
4. Возможно, что мы слишком исключительно занимаемся охранением и слишком мало возбуждением энтузиазма. Прошлое остается в живых не только для того чтобы его спасли, но для того чтобы вдохновить на дела творчества в настоящем и в будущем.

NOME: DAVID LOWENTHAL - Dipartimento di Geografia, University College, London - Gran Bretagna.

TEMA: DOTTRINA

TITOLO: DILEMMI DELLA PRESERVAZIONE.

SOMMARIO:

La crescente distruzione del nostro patrimonio è una conseguenza del cambiamento tecnologico, dell'inquinamento, della cupidigia e della negligenza. Insieme ad un aumentato senso di apprezzamento per il passato, ciò rende tali reliquie ancora più preziose e famose e, di conseguenza, in pericolo. Nello stesso tempo, il passato che si cerca di preservare e ricostruire si è esteso nel tempo, nello spazio e nel contenuto, includendo oggi una più vasta serie di strutture ed opere artigianali di prima. Ma neanche queste addizioni soddisfano la moderna nostalgia e molta storia viene inventata per rispondere alla crescente richiesta.

La nuova popolarità della conservazione storica produce quattro dilemmi:

- 1) Cosa salvare dal passato e perché.
- 2) Come usare ciò che si è salvato.
- 3) Come evitare che il falso passato sommerga quello vero.
- 4) Come la preservazione, lodevole in se stessa, possa impedire l'uso alternativo del passato.

Questo saggio considera ognuno di questi problemi e conclude:

- 1) La preservazione, necessariamente selettiva, dovrebbe costituire un elemento di equilibrio tra grandi monumenti e scenari familiari di ogni giorno.
- 2) Poiché una piccola parte del nostro patrimonio può essere tenuta nei musei, internamente o esternamente, la maggior parte di ciò che viene salvato deve essere usato di nuovo e quindi adattato alle moderne esigenze.
- 3) Il processo di conservazione vero e proprio come quello di valutazione, altera i siti e gli artefatti protetti e, poiché tali trasformazioni delle reliquie è inevitabile, ciò non dovrebbe essere deplorato.
- 4) Forse siamo troppo esclusivamente preoccupati per la preservazione e troppo poco per l'emulazione. Il passato sopravvive non solo per essere salvato, ma anche per ispirare atti creativi nel presente e nel futuro.

BUNJI KOBAYASHI

THE CASE OF THE ISE GRAND SHINTO TEMPLE IN JAPAN

1.

The Jingū or the Ise Grand Shinto Temple in which the ancestor of the Japanese Imperial family is enshrined is well known for its simple and beautiful temple structures. The form and style of the buildings, it is said, have been well preserved from the ancient time, because they have been rebuilt every twenty years in the same as originals, using the same kind of materials. In this brief talk, I would like to describe how the temple has been rebuilt for the past thousand of years and discuss the problems of such a programmed renewal activity, or *shikinen-zōtai* in Japanese, from the point of conservation of buildings.

Because the Imperial ancestor was enshrined in the temple, the temple was originally located in the Imperial palace, but it was soon decided to move the temple out of the palace. After a couple of moves, according to the *Nihon-shoki* or the oldest chronicle in Japan, the temple was finally and permanently founded at the present place by the Isuzu river in the reign of Emperor Suinin. It can be said that as the power of the Imperial family grew, the family goddess became that of the region and then of the nation. The symbol of the goddess is a mirror which was, we are told, given to the goddess when she came down from heaven to this country in the age of mythology.

The god of food and agriculture was then enshrined in the temple during the reign of Emperor Yūryaku some several centuries later. This shrine became the outer temple while the first was called the inner temple, resulting in the two focus temples in the vast temple complex of the Jingū.