Using heritage: let's begin by using the same language.

G.J.Ashworth,

Faculty of Spatial Sciences, University of Groningen, NL g.j.ashworth@rug.nl

Academy of Tourism NHTV Breda

AESOP 2012 ANKARA

Track: Heritage, Urban Cultures, Urban Design.

Abstract

Any attempt to use heritage in the pursuit of place planning and development objectives is bedevilled by terminological and conceptual confusion. This stems largely from the way thinking about the past in the present evolved and the resulting contribution of many different academic disciplines to the creation and application of heritage, resulting in a plurality of paradigms and quite different, even contradictory attitudes to the past and its contemporary uses. This creates a lack of understanding or dialogue between those involved and drastically reduces the instrumental effectiveness of heritage in place development and planning. This paper will explore the confusion in terminology and the concepts behind it and argue for a common, less ambiguous and logically underpinned language. The heritage phenomenon itself should not be viewed as object, artefact or site but as process, outcome and experience. As a contemporary creation in the service of current needs, the spurious dichotomies of natural /cultural and tangible / intangible are a meaningless distraction. As heritage is produced by the user of it, its values are extrinsically ascribed rather than intrinsically authenticated and thus authenticity can relate only to the contemporary consumer experience not the contributory historical resources. However this also implies that heritage is multi-used and multi-consumed, which renders its management a necessity. The role of the preservation, conservation and heritage paradigms in development will be explored and the contradictions inherent in the first two will be resolved in the third. Heritage plays many potential but quite different roles in development, including as a commodifiable resource for products and services, an enhancer of environmental amenity, a catalyst in local area regeneration and revitalisation and contributor to place image or brand. The characteristics of heritage, so defined, as a ubiquitous, flexible, and inexhaustible development instrument thus render it ideal for place management but until we resolve these terminological and conceptual issues its potential will remain largely unrealised.

keywords: heritage, paradigm, terminology

'Words are like leaves; and where they most abound,
Much fruit of sense beneath is rarely found'
(Alexander Pope, *Essay on Criticism* 309)

Pasts, presents and futures

Heritage is a process and an outcome. It is a process whereby objects, events, sites, performances and personalities, derived from the past through relict structures, memories and histories, are transformed into experiences in and for the present, with an intention of bequeathing these to a future. It is an outcome in which the present evokes imagined pasts and imagined futures in fulfillment of contemporary political, social, economic and psychological needs. The problem is that those engaged in this process and involved in managing these outcomes have varied, different and even contradictory intellectual backgrounds, approaches, motives, working methods, ethos and responsibilities. These differences are manifest in the paradigms, concepts and terminology used. The result is not just cacophony; it is a counter-productive, often fractious, misunderstanding and loss of opportunity. If the enormous, flexible, multifaceted contribution of heritage, not least to the planning and management of environments, is to be realized then at its most basic level we must begin by using the same language.

Historical paradigms

Three main paradigms have been, and are still being, applied to aspects of the relict past in the present. Each evolved its own focus, obsessions, justifications, and modes of expression not least in language (Ashworth, 1997; 2011).

The language of preservation: the absolutist paradigm.
Assigning value to the past, and even the wish to sustain elements or qualities derived from it into the present and bequeath these to a future, has a very long history and may arguably (such as by Tuan 1977) be an inherent human trait. However the idea of preserving obsolete forms for their own sake, when the functional requirements that produced them no longer exist, is much more recent. Almost every Gothic cathedral in Europe was built on the demolished ruins of its predecessor. The European cultural renaissance of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries may have rediscovered and revalued the ideas of the classical world but was simultaneously using the surviving classical monuments as just a quarry of building materials (Larkham 1996). What Lowenthal (1996) has called the heritage "crusade" begun in the middle of the nineteenth century and has often been linked to three long-term, inter-related trends in the cultural, economic, and political spheres of Western European and North American societies. It would need a lengthy historic study (such as attempted by Lowenthal 1985 and Denslagen 1994; 2009) to trace why this radical change in thinking occurred and why it became so deeply entrenched as to become for many today effectively an unchallenged self-evident truth. However suffice it to note that the rapid economic and concomitant social changes, which are

encapsulated in the term the 'industrial revolution', accelerated the replacement of many centuries of urban evolution by new forms, spatial patterns and ways of life that in reaction fuelled a romanticism, powered by nostalgia, etymologically pain for what has been lost. This became intertwined with the rise of nationalism, an ideology necessitating the creation and propagation of the entity 'nation'. This imagined entity is bound together and separated from others, by the bonds of a collectively memorialized past, within which built environments played a major role through their very visibility and thus the raucousness of their message.

This radical change in the way historic built environments were viewed, was pioneered by crusading prophets with a near messianic fervor, focused determination and impatient dogmatism such as among others John Ruskin, Augustus Pugin, William Morris, George Gilbert Scott in England, Victor Hugo and Eugene Viollet-le-Duc, in France and Victor de Stuers and Pierre Cuypers in the Netherlands. All shared a fundamentalism based upon an unshakeable belief in their righteousness, a feeling of being alone against an indifferent or hostile majority and impatience with counter argument. All combined in the single simple message to save what can be saved before it is too late. The paradigm is a clear, obvious and unchallenged imperative expressed in the word 'save'. The main unquestioned assumption is that the past is real, it actually existed, and it can be preserved through its sites, monuments, memories and historical narratives for the present and bequeathed intact to the future. The sharp and continuing schism among preservationists revolves around the application of the action 'save'. Some, notably Ruskin (1849) would save 'as found' after time and circumstance had impacted upon the relic, others, notably Viollet-le-Duc (1858 /1872) would not only save but also 're-establish a building in its finished state, which may in fact never have existed'. The word renovation was the dividing shibboleth.

Preservation appears to be a straightforward and uncomplicated idea associated with an equally simple action, saving. It is a protective intervention to maintain the current condition of an artefact, building or ensemble. It is notable that the word 'use' has not entered into the discussion except as a potential enemy of preservation. The objective is just to continue to exist with the idea of bequest so that such existence should continue also for future generations.

The language of conservation: the planning paradigm

The seeming success of the preservationists, expressed by their obtaining effective, comprehensive, official protective legislation and a consensus of popular support at least in Western countries by the 1960s, led to an extension and modification of the preservation ideas, which became manifest in official policy documents and ultimately very similar legislation in, for example, The Netherlands (1961), France (1962) Britain (1967) and Italy (1970) (Burtenshaw et al. 1991; Ashworth & Tunbridge 1990). The focus shifted to include not only individual buildings (the 'monument') but also ensembles (the 'historic or 'heritage' district). This in turn compelled a wider approach, if only because a single building could perhaps be treated as an art object in itself regardless of its contemporary use but a whole urban historic district could not. Function had to be added to form which inevitably

involved the planners and managers of place functions and thus what had been largely the preserve of architects and art historians now became linked to policy objectives, wider than the building or site itself, which became an element in more extensive schemes of local area renovation, revitalization, renewal and regeneration. Larkham's book (1996), entitled *Conservation and the City*, which is structured by local area policy objectives rather than the historic characteristics of the buildings and areas in which they are applied, chronicled these changes in the United Kingdom. The phrase "adaptive reuse" became a mantra in planning departments of local authorities throughout Western Europe and North America (Tiesdell, et al. 1996). The critical difference between preservation and conservation however was not so much in the actions themselves as in the methods, attitudes and goals of those who were performing them.

The term conservation, used in this way rather than as used in museums as a synonym for preservation, was evolved and applied largely by place planners and managers in the context of the built environment and to them was best expressed in the phrase "preserving purposefully" (Burke 1976) where the decision to save is linked with the intention to use. The increasing involvement of politicians and government officials in a field previously the almost exclusive preserve of experts, usually architects, is related for the United Kingdom by Delafons (1997).

The language of heritage: the phenomenological paradigm

In many respects, heritage has evolved as a process of managing the consequences of the very success of previous paradigms and the heritage paradigm could be seen as a continuation of the shift in focus from object to process and outcome. Structures, sites and places are seen as vehicles for the transmission of historicity, contributing to many contemporary social, political and economic needs. It is the fashioning of some representation, a key word, of a past in the present from selected relics, memories and histories. The purpose is thus not to save anything from the past but to use the past in the present: the use determines and, in that sense, creates the resource rather than use being a subsequent action for something already preserved. As Lowenthal (1985) put it 'heritage is about creating something not about preserving anything'. A heritage approach has a significantly different way of viewing the basic time dimensions of past, present and future than does a preservation approach. A preservationist sees the responsibilities of the present as being to select and preserve aspects from an inherited past and to bequeath these to a future. The salient questions here are how is such a selection made, who makes it, on what criteria and on the basis of what authority. Preservationists seek to retain an objectivity in relation to the selection of the subject being preserved and see the process as devoid of ideological meaning. The questions about ownership or relevance are not posed or, if so, only answered by an appeal to the universal - all humanity. A heritage approach asks only what are the needs of the present that a past transformed into heritage can help satisfy. The future, when it becomes the present, will have not only its own needs but also will create its own heritage to meet those needs. If the past is treated as a resource to be activated by contemporary choice then the choice is likely to be quite different in content, criteria, agency and purpose.

This way of viewing the relics, memories and narratives of the past has a number of implications. If the process is demand driven then, at least in theory, resources will be activated as contemporary needs require and thus are mutable, ubiquitous and infinite. A major objection to the view that heritage resources are inexhaustible is that this view is plainly contradicted by countless cases around the world where demand is outstripping supply, not least the supply of space itself that is self-evidently bounded. A particular heritage site, district or city has a limited capacity to accommodate contemporary uses and users and that capacity may be exceeded causing damage to the resource itself, conflicts between users and a diminution of the quality of the user experience. However the supply of heritage in total is limited only by the limits of the human imagination to create it. Thus a local excess of demand over supply can be seen as just a result of specific time or place bound management failure to increase supply to meet the demand by shaping new heritage products and spaces (Ashworth, 2011).

The view that heritage resources are ubiquitous would also be countered by a glance around the world and the conclusion that there is just more heritage in some places than in others. This would be a misunderstanding of what has occurred. Deliberate choices were made to activate potential historic assets according to the prevalent idea of what constitutes heritage and to pursue heritage as a characteristic

element in preference to other options (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000). All places have that possibility: only some choose it. No place therefore is inescapably locked into, or out of, the heritage option by a fixed resource endowment.

An incomplete paradigm shift

In most sciences paradigm shift (see Kuhn 1962) is a successive challenge, conflict and replacement of one commonly accepted way of viewing and processing knowledge by another. However what has happened in the short few centuries of concern for the past in the present is that quite different paradigms have been successively introduced for use in particular areas of study or practice and instead of replacing those already in use have tended to be added to them so as to coexist simultaneously with them (see figure). There has been only a partial and incomplete paradigm shift. It is this uneasy coexistence of parallel paradigms and their languages that gives rise to confusion and many misunderstandings between those responsible for different aspects of the heritage process. A consequence of the incompleteness of the paradigm shift has been to emphasise and widen the gap between different phases and aspects of the process whereby past built and natural environments are transformed into contemporary heritage products. In particular the gap between the theorists and the practitioners may be tolerable if they operate in mutually isolated spheres. However when they come into enforced contact then this gap may have several serious consequences. Heritage place management and planning with the objective of contributing to local public policy objectives has many such contact zones (see Graham, et al, 2000).

Confusions and delusions

Values and value

Those engaged in the selection, care and safeguarding of historic resources apply a dominantly preservation paradigm in which value is assumed to be intrinsic, universal and immutable. The object itself possesses value, which although discovered and legitimated by experts is self-evidently present to all who wish to experience it and always will be. In the heritage paradigm all values are extrinsic and ascribed to the object by those who experience it. They are thus neither universal nor immutable, as different people at different times will ascribe different values. The value, and thus the heritage itself, is in this sense created by the current users in fulfilment of their contemporary needs. Heritage is a cultural creation of the present and as with all culture, is fashion driven: new presents will constantly imagine new pasts to satisfy changing needs.

What seems to have happened over time is that form, which was a direct creation of function, possessing only utility value, now becomes itself a creator of new functions and has other non-utility values ascribed to it. Thus the reversal is total. There is a direct parallel in approaches to the natural environment, which was treated for many millennia as usable space, most obviously for food production, This

was supplemented and at least partially replaced by the aesthetic concept of nature to which many non-utility attributes were ascribed (Denslagen, 2009).

The intrinsic / extrinsic distinction over value should not be confused with two other debates that involve the idea of value. The first is common in cultural studies in general and is between the 'economists' and the 'culturalists' (Klamer, 2003). The former attempt to value culture in the sense of ascertaining its worth, ideally through some comparative measure, ultimately market price, thus allowing selection, prioritisation and comparison to be made. The latter see culture as possessing non-commodifiable values that render both comparison and selection of the basis of objectively determined value all but impossible.

The second distinction is between the instrumental and non-instrumental uses of the past and its artefacts. In the former heritage is used as a means towards some other political, social or economic objective. Heritage becomes a resource for political legitimation, socialisation or an economic enterprise. However heritage may also confer non-instrumental values, in itself such as aesthetic satisfaction or just pleasure. In both of these conditions the values remain extrinsic as art appreciation is a learned, culturally specific and time bound response and the values experienced are not intrinsic to the paint, stone or musical notes.

Objects and resources

Heritage can be constructed from an enormously varied range of physical objects, sites, events, personalities, memories and cultural expressions. If the focus is upon the object then heritage could be classified according to the characteristics of that object. The temptation to do that in practice is strong if only because the expertise required in the creation, maintenance and presentation of different categories of object is itself quite different. The task of a museum curator, an administrator of a cultural performance or manager of a natural landscape or physical phenomenon requires different skill-sets. It is understandable therefore that these difference have led agencies to add the adjectives 'cultural', 'natural' and even 'mixed', to the noun heritage. Such usage has become embedded and legitimated by UNESCO in its application of the World Heritage Convention to specific sites and is echoed in numerous national ministries and non-governmental agencies around the world. From the perspective of heritage as experience such usage is in part tautological and more seriously a misleading misdirection of attention. The resources from which heritage is shaped may be categorised in this way but the heritage itself cannot, as all heritage, whether a building or a landscape, is a cultural construction. The stones and bricks, or trees and hills, are not heritage until recognised and designated as monument or park.

A similar misdirection to the resource rather than the experience is the distinction between tangible and intangible heritages, introduced by UNESCO in the interests of political balance between countries, continents and cultures in its bestowing of World Heritage accolades. Apart from its comic aspects such as French cuisine or carnival costumes at Binche, being designated 'intangible', more

fundamentally it misdirects attention from heritage, which is all inherently intangible, to the resources from which it is constructed, which may or may not be.

There is a further related source of misunderstanding concerning probably the most toxic and divisive word in heritage debate, namely authenticity. An object based preservation paradigm is dependent upon the authenticity of the object, whether this means the authenticity of the date of creation, hand of the artistic creator, or historical accuracy. Such authenticity in turn is dependent upon authentication and ultimately upon the authoritative authenticator resulting in an expert-driven, top-down validation. An experienced-based heritage paradigm however has no such dependence. This is not because heritage, as its preservational critics charge, is inauthentic and essentially false. It is because heritage relies upon the authenticity of the experience, not the object. Thus a reconstruction or a facsimile may convey more the sense of how it was, or how we now wish to imagine how it was, than some partial degraded relic however authenticated as validly of the period. Ultimately heritage relies upon a user-driven, bottom-up validation.

Objectives and outcomes

The objective of preservation is to save: the objective of heritage is to use.

The ostensibly simple idea of preservation can be logically challenged by posing the question of whether preservation, in this negative sense of protection from change, is actually possible. The preservation of physical objects created in past time can of course be attempted, as can their reconstruction. However the past is by definition not here now and a preserved or recreated historical townscape is of the present not the past, however perfectly preserved or reproduced are the physical forms of which it is composed. We cannot experience it as it was, if only because we are different.

In a preservation paradigm the subsequent uses of what is saved, apart from any aesthetic satisfaction or pleasure derived from experiencing it or just from the knowledge of its continued existence, are irrelevant to the action. First save, then maintain and only then, if grudgingly possible, reuse. This was expressed in the UNESCO so-called "Venice Charter" of 1964, whose article 5 states clearly that uses of preserved buildings would only be permitted in so far as they do not cause change to the structure or site. This idea, echoing the much earlier (1931) 'Athens Charter', became a central dogma of ICOMOS, established in 1964, and has been reiterated in all 12 subsequent such 'Charters'. The sole purpose is preservation and bequest not use (ICOMOS 1974).

The relationship of preservation as saving, to development as change, is ostensibly simple: they are opposites between which no logical compromise is possible as an increase in one inevitably causes a corresponding decrease in the other. The slogan "save by developing" is a terminological contradiction. Heritage however contains no such contradiction; indeed heritage is a development option.

As far as planning or development is concerned the saved and preserved relict historical artifacts and sites are at best irrelevant and at worst an obstacle. There are

three possible planning reactions, discounting illegal demolition. First, the spaces and buildings designated as saved are removed from 'normal' planning consideration and development occurs elsewhere. A spatial fossilization occurs as evolution and change is brought to a halt at such designated places. One practical difficulty of this is that the monumental designations contain no time limit with the preservation extending into an infinite future. Thus our built environments are increasingly cluttered with the museumified artefacts, monumentalised buildings and sacralised sites that previous societies believed were worthy of preservation for us and for future generations stretching into infinity. This may appear an exaggeration in countries yet to develop effective building preservation official structures and corresponding popular ethos. However in the countries of Western Europe a position has been reached where large swathes of most cities have been effectively fossilised and a millennium of urban development has come to an abrupt end. This raises some uncomfortable planning and management issues and there are very few precedents for de-listing or un-inscribing historic buildings or districts so as to preserve the future's capacity to make its own choices rather than to be imprisoned in the choices of the past.

Secondly, if the legislative protection permits, the preserved structures can be somehow incorporated undamaged into the development, which occurs around and even above and below them. Thirdly, the protected structure can be moved, which saves the object but divorces it from the location upon which it was built. This solution is quite common in North America, where individual buildings or clusters are relocated from the path of development. Europe, however, can be credited with devising whole concentrations of such relocated structures known as 'skansens' (a now generic term for open-air museums of displaced and rearranged buildings, originating from the location in Sweden of the first such collection by Artur Hazelius in 1891). The structural authenticity of the object is preserved at the cost of the authenticity of the ensemble, the site and the function.

A linguistic cacophony of fragmented meanings

Given the long list of the potentially beneficent characteristics of heritage it could be simply concluded that heritage is an ideal policy instrument whose benefits, of whatever sort, will accrue more or less inevitably and the only determining variable is management. However, it is not so simple and there is an inherent condition of heritage that at the very least complicates its use as an instrument of public policy, namely its fragmentation. This in turn is both a consequence of a mutual unintelligibility and also its cause.

Fragmented consumption

Heritage is multifaceted and because it can serve many purposes, it generally does. It is therefore unlikely that the utilisation of heritage for any public purpose is the only, or even the major, use of any given set of heritage resources. The almost inevitable consequence is the multi-use of the same resources, even at the same location; the multi-consumption of diverse heritages by different consumers for different purposes; and the polyvocality of the messages being conveyed and

received. The reason why this matters is that the public policy claim upon heritage is likely to have to compete with other claims.

Heritage producers, notably but not exclusively in the public sector, tend to be product driven. They focus their attention on the selection, maintenance and management of the product itself rather than upon the manner of its consumption. They see their task as being completed once the product has been made available often to a market that they only vaguely and cursorily envisage. However, heritage consumption is not only highly selective it is driven by changing trends and fickle fashions. The idea that heritage is the expression of timeless, universal, immutable value is a comforting delusion. All culture tends to be fashion driven and heritage is no exception. Thus what is today selected may be ignored tomorrow and vice-versa. The more rapid are the changes in an increasingly fluid society, then the more rapid and less predictable will be such changes in fashion.

It also needs to be remembered that all heritage is essentially individual. Each individual creates their own heritage from their own resources of personal relics, histories and memories for their own self-identification and self-positioning within society. Collective memory is not a physiological reality it is a metaphor for attempts outside the individual to add to or modify the individual's identification with ideas, places or other people. The collective in heritage is not an aggregate of the individual. It is, like the 'public interest' it is frequently called upon to serve, an abstraction useful in the formulation of public policy.

Fragmented production

To accept that public heritage is what someone has decided we collectively should remember is not to reduce it to any simplistic 'Bourdieuian' or 'Habermassian' conspiracy theory of dominant ideologies legitimating themselves through the capture of cultural capital and imposing this on the passive subordinate consumers. Merriman succinctly disposed of that simplistic idea in 1991. It is actually much more straightforward. Heritage is an undoubtedly potent instrument in the expression and exercise of ideology, power, and social control. It is not however intrinsically an instrument of any specific version of any of these. Therefore the significant questions will turn out to be, who is doing this and for what reasons. The answers are likely to be as multiple as the agencies competing in this struggle for attention and power.

Heritage is also used as an instrument of public social policy, becoming burdened by governments with many social goals and expectations. It is expected to further social inclusion by promoting social cohesion and combat social exclusion by mitigating social division (Ashworth, 2012). Assumptions are made about the unifying nature of heritage when the reality is that it is as often divisive. All heritage by definition disinherits and all heritage is dissonant to someone, which allows it to evoke feelings ranging from vague disquiet through distress to a complete cognitive alienation and rejection (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). The producers of the heritage product may react by denial and claim they do no more than relate 'the facts of history' or display the cultural, architectural or technical ingenuity of previous ages. They may even claim to be fulfilling an educational role, using an imperfect

past to teach various commendable lessons for a perfect future through 'edutainment'. Both reactions are usually spurious. The point is just that heritage is not a universal common public good that automatically bestows benefit to everyone and anyone. Any use of heritage opens up a potential Pandora's box of particular and often unanticipated reactions, all of which require recognition and sensitive management.

It is often assumed that heritage is a zero-priced freely accessible public good. To many it is. However, heritage from the position of the producer, or indeed the place, is not free. To the costs of selection, maintenance, accommodating collections, promotion, interpretation, marketing and consumer site-management, must be added the opportunity costs of development options foregone. Heritage may be an instrument for some types of development but it also inevitably imposes restrictions, reflected in costs, upon many other types of development. Such costs will be paid at least in part by local communities, whether or not they are the beneficiaries of the heritage development.

Finally in this list of fragmentations and resulting cacophony of messages, there is the issue of spatial scale. Although the national scale has tended to dominate the political legitimation uses of heritage, other scales have become powerful competitors. The continental and even global scales have been recognised in policy at the European scale and at the world scale by UNESCO and its agencies. Similarly at the sub-national scale, regional and local heritage has been explicitly used in the furtherance of place identities at these scales. It may well be that these various jurisdictional scales harmoniously complement each other in a 'Russian doll heritage model' but equally they may not and may project different, distracting and even competing messages.

Does it matter?

The fragmentation in the experience of heritage evident among consumers and producers in all of the various dimensions of heritage sketched above is manifest in the deepening chasms of misunderstanding between the collective and the individual, public agencies and commercial enterprises, theorists and practitioners, the local and the global and many more dichotomies. All are expressed in mutually unintelligible terminologies derived from assumptions that are neither stated nor argued. The question must now be posed, does it matter and if so can such chasms be bridged.

A failure to respond or even to be aware of the issues of fragmentation raised here could, at the least serious, render most public heritage simply irrelevant. There is at least an arguable case that this drift into an irrelevant obscurity is already occurring. At a time when popular interest in personal heritage has never been greater, as witness the increasing interest in genealogy, and family and local history, public museums are becoming concerned about their function and a future in which they serve only an elite minority. While marvelling at the large numbers of local history activists, heritage guide purchasers, heritage trail followers or viewers of television heritage programming, we should not be blind to the even larger number

who eschew all of these activities. The overwhelming majority of national monumental buildings in most countries serve no obvious social or cultural function and a high percentage of even the occupiers of state protected monuments and areas in a recent Dutch study (Kuipers, 2005) were just unaware of the status conferred and, of those that were aware, many were indifferent to it. This popular irrelevance can descend into ridicule as the ever-lengthening heritage lists, designations and appellations are extended to the curious, ingenious and bizarre. (A reading of UNESCO's tentative list of 'intangible' heritage provokes but incredulous hilarity rather than indifference.)

The influence of public heritage policy is reduced by the multiplicity of official agencies and commercial enterprises operating in this field and the resulting unavoidable absence of coherence or consistency in the messages they attempt to project (Ashworth & Graham, 2012). In addition most public heritage producers and promoters underestimate or just fail to consider, let alone understand, the reactions of their targeted consumers. Most public heritage is not noticed and, if noticed, is ignored. Even if noticed and experienced, it is highly unlikely that public heritage will be understood in the way the producers of it intended. Such evidence as does exist suggests that consumers have conscious or unconscious strategies of resistance to the messages intentionally conveyed by public heritage. They change and adapt public heritage to conform to their much more significant private heritages, even to the extent of creating a counter-culture supported by a counter-heritage that, being unexpressed publicly, is unknown to the public authorities.

However, irrelevance is not the worst future scenario. The loss of the opportunities presented by an effective engagement with a pluralizing society is enormous. Heritage can divide as well as unite, be a source of conflict as well as harmony, can lead to social exclusion and disintegration as well as inclusion and cohesion. Many public agencies seem to be unaware of the fragmentation of the societies in which they operate, let alone set out to manage such inherent pluralism through their heritage policies (Ashworth et al. 2007). Finally heritage can be a powerful instrument for the furtherance of many laudable and increasingly necessary social goals as well as the source of much individual satisfaction and plain enjoyment. The loss of this potential, as heritage theorists and practitioners imprison themselves in their mutual linguistic solitudes, would be close to tragic. A necessary precursor of liberation would be the use of the same language. Common concepts, paradigms, theories, goals and instruments of practice could follow.

References

Ashworth, G. J. 1997. Conservation as preservation or as heritage: two paradigms and two answers. Built Environment 23(2) 92-102

Ashworth,G.J. 2011. Preservation, conservation and heritage: approaches to the past in the present through the built environment. Asian Anthropology 10 1-18

Ashworth G.J. 2012. Heritage and local economic development: a reluctant relationship. In Rizzo I and A Mignosa. eds Handbook on the Economics of Cultural Heritage

Ashworth, G.J. 2012 The Heritage of the Built Environment as Development. In Lawtence, R.J. ed. IAPS series Requalifying the Built Environment: Challenges and Responses. Gőttingen: Hogrefe Publishing

Ashworth, G.J. 2012. Heritage in Planning: Using Pasts in Shaping Futures. Young, G. (ed) Ashgate research companion to planning and culture

Ashworth, G. J., Graham, B., & Tunbridge, J. E. 2007. Pluralising Pasts; Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies. London: Pluto Press.

Ashworth, G.J. and Graham B. 2012. Heritage and the reconceptualisation of the postwar European city. In Stone,D. ed. Oxford Handbook of Postwar European History. Oxford: OUP, 582-599

Ashworth G.J. and Tunbridge J.E 1990. The tourist-historic city. London: Belhaven,

Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge, J.E 2000. The Tourist-Historic city: retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city. London: Pergamon/Elsevier

Burke, G. 1976. Townscapes. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Burtenshaw, D. Bateman, M. and Ashworth, G.J. 1991. The European city. London: Fulton

Delafons, J. 1997. Politics and preservation: a policy history of the built heritage 1882-1996 London: Taylor and Francis,

Denslagen, W. 1994. Architectural restoration in Western Europe: controversy and continuity, Amsterdam: A&NP.

Denslagen, W. 2009. Romantic Modernism: nostalgia in the world of conservation. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press,

Graham, B.J,, G.J.Ashworth and Tunbridge J.E.. 2000. Geography of heritage: power, culture and economy. London: Arnold.

International Council on Monuments and Sites 1974. Venice Charter: International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites article 5 Venice

Klamer, A. 2003. Social, cultural and economic values of cultural goods. Cultural Economics 3(3) 17-38.

Kuhn, T. 1962. The structure of scientific revolution University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Kuipers, M. J. 2005.. The Creation of Identities by Government Designation: A Case Study of the Korreweg District, Groningen, NL. In G. J. Ashworth & B. Graham.Eds., Senses of Place: Senses of Time. 205 - 218. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Larkham, P. 1996. Conservation and the City. London: Routledge

Lowenthal , D. 1985. The past is a foreign country. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal , D. 1996. Possessed by the past: the heritage crusade and the spoils of history. Toronto: Toronto Free Press.

Merriman, M 1991. Beyond the glass case. Leicester: Leicester University Press,

Ruskin, J. 1849. The seven lamps of architecture. Pp. 353-9. London: Allen and Unwin.

Tiesdell, S., T. Oc, and Heath, T. 1996. Revitalising historic urban quarters Oxford: Architectural Press.

Tuan, Y.-F. 1977. Space and place: the perspective of experience London: Arnold

Viollet-le-Duc,E.E. 1858/1872. Entretiens sur l'architecture [translated 1875 H van Brunt] as Discourses on architecture. New York: Osgood