

The Protection of Archaeological Heritage in Times of Economic Crisis

From the proceedings of the regional conference
***“From Past Experience to New Approaches and Synergies:
The Future of Protection Management for Archaeological
Heritage in Times of Economic Crisis”***
New Acropolis Museum, 23-25 May 2012

Organized by ICOMOS Hellenic
(International Council on Monuments and Sites)
and ICAHM (International Scientific Committee
on Archaeological Heritage Management)

The Protection of Archaeological Heritage
in Times of Economic Crisis

Edited by

Dr. Elena Korka

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

The Protection of Archaeological Heritage in Times of Economic Crisis,
Edited by Elena Korka

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Elena Korka and contributors
Assistant Editor: Lloyd Barton
Editorial assistance team: Sofia Spyropoulou, Emorphyle Panteliadou
The logo of the conference on the front page was designed by Eleni Oeconomopoulou

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or
otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-6622-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-6622-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	x
List of Tables	xv
Prologue.....	xvii
Marianna V. Vardinoyiannis	
Introduction	xviii
Elena Korca	
Greetings of the Conference	xxii
Chapter One: Conference Keynotes	
Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development.....	2
<i>Mounir Bouchenaki</i>	
World Heritage and Sustainable Development on the 40 th Anniversary of the Convention	10
<i>Giovanni Boccardi</i>	
The International Regime for the Protection of Cultural Heritage and the Global Economic Crisis: In Search of Institutional Synergies	18
<i>Antonia Zervaki</i>	
Chapter Two: Environmental Harmonization	
Assessing and Measuring Economic Risk for Cultural Heritage.....	30
<i>Cristian Ost</i>	
Protection and Preservation of the Olympic Landscape: The Case of the Olympic Botanical Garden	38
<i>George Lyrintzis, Andreas Lyrintzis, Georgia Chadzi, Nikolaos Proutsos, George Mantakas, Athanassios Bourletsikas and Kostas Kaoukis</i>	

The Economic Crisis: Is the Protection of a Nation's Cultural Heritage Still Possible? The Significance and the Role of an Accurate 3D Documentation	49
<i>Nikolaos A. Lianos</i>	
Persevering with the Underwater Archaeological Surveys of the Greek Mission in Alexandria: The Continuation of our Work Notwithstanding the Financial Crisis in Greece and the Post-Revolution Situation in Egypt	57
<i>Harry E. Tzalas</i>	
Chapter Three: Management, Best Practices in Sustainability	
Investigating Sustainability of Bazaars in Iranian Historical Cities	64
<i>Ali Assari, Talkad Madamma Mahesh and Erfan Assari</i>	
Key to Sustainability in <i>Qanat</i> Management Systems	78
<i>Malihah Chamani</i>	
Chapter Four: Management Action Plans	
Review of Various Management Plans to Understand their Advantages as a First Step of the Conservation Process of Historical Monuments	92
<i>Zahra Abdollahnejad, Linda Watson and Mohammad Mastali</i>	
The Master Plan for Wadi El Deir, Sinai, Egypt	99
<i>Petros Koufopoulos and Marina Myriantheos</i>	
Building Partnerships in Eco-archaeology: Lessons from Yeronisos off Cyprus	111
<i>Joan Breton Connelly</i>	
New Ways of Conducting Business for Museums	123
<i>Michael J. Reppas II</i>	
Archaeological Management in the Republic of Armenia: From Past Experiences to New Approaches	129
<i>Arsen Bobokhyan</i>	
Theft Response Action Plan	138
<i>Elena Korka</i>	

Chapter Five: Risk Mitigation Confrontation

The MuA Project: A Value-Based Database for the Documentation, Assessment and Monitoring of Architectural Heritage at Risk 158
Vassilis Ganiatsas and Stelios Lekakis

Civil Protection Reforms and Policies: The Need for Optimal Implementation by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism For Cultural Heritage Protection 173
Despina Minos-Minopoulos, Kosmas Pavlopoulos, Dale Dominey-Howes and Efthimios Lekkas

Aphrodite Temple in Amathus, Cyprus: Seismic Response of the Eastern Colonnade, Design of Structural Interventions and Pilot Worksite Applications as Tools for Earthquake Risk Mitigation..... 180
Eleni-Eva Toumbakari, Ioannis Psycharis and Martin Schmid

Chapter Six: Research in Conservation, Preservation and Technologies, Shelter Protection

Archaeology in Times of Economic Crisis: The Role of Preventive Archaeology 192
Stefano De Caro

Risk Assessment of Salt Laden Building Materials at Archaeological Sites 204
Hilde De Clercq, Sebastiaan Godts and Roald Hayen

Protective Shelters for Archaeological Sites: A Management Process.... 214
Angeliki Ioakeimopoulou

Parameters for Designing and Constructing Protective Shelters For Archaeological Sites 222
Pamela Jerome

The Shelter Construction for Terrace House 2 in Ephesos: A Unique Museum and Scientific Workshop..... 234
Sabine Ladstätter and Lilli Zabrana

Chapter Seven: Conservation, Restoration, Coordination and Site Use

Study on the Conservation of Grotto No. 10 at Anyue Yuanjuedong
Grottoes, Sichuan Province, China..... 244
*Yang Sheng, Wang Yi, Jiang Cheng, Tang Shi-wei, Mathias Kocher
and Zhao Zhou*

On the Preservation and Conservation of Archaeologically Recovered
Anthropological Remains: A Brief Communication to Younger
Colleagues 254
Anagnostis Pan. Agelarakis

The Diachronic Management of Alepotrypa Cave, Diros:
Mani from Neolithic Inhabitant to Modern Man 260
George A. Papathanasopoulos and IroNikolakea

The Past and the Future of an Excavation Project in Alexandria, Egypt... 266
Papakosta Limneos Kalliopi

The Issue of “Handling” Restoration and Conservation Works
through the example of the Palace of Knossos..... 269
Elissavet Kavoulaki

Chapter Eight: Illicit Excavation and Trafficking, Protection of Collections and Movable Finds

A Legal Action Plan to Preserve and Protect Antiquities and Restore
Heritage Rights..... 276
John Voorhees

Archaeological Heritage for Sale? Legal, Ethical and Political
Considerations focused on the Greek Case..... 284
Daphne Voudouri

The Return of Colonial and Other Treasures: The Netherlands 293
Jos van Beurden

Illicit Trafficking in Cultural Goods and the Economic Crisis 300
Irini Stamatoudi

Protection of Movable Finds and Collections: Zeugma Mosaic Museum	309
<i>Yakup Harmanda and Hasan Hüseyin Öztürk</i>	

**Chapter Nine: Preservation of Intangible Heritage in Sites
and Monuments**

The Historic Gardens of the Former Royal Estate of Tatoi: History, Contemporary State and Restoration	316
<i>Electra Kanellou and Maria Papafotiou</i>	

Chapter Ten: Heritage, Economy and Development

The Sustainable Management of the Museum Network of the Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation	326
<i>Aspasia Louvi</i>	

Heritage, Economy and Development of Historic Towns after the “Tourism Explosion”: Foça in Western Turkey	330
<i>Ayşem Kılınç-Ünlü</i>	

Conservation Management of the Benin Earthworks of Southern Nigeria: A Critical Review of Past and Present Action Plans	341
<i>Patrick Darling and Kokunre Agbontaen-Eghafona</i>	

Chapter Eleven	355
Brief Summary and Conclusions of the Conference <i>Elena Korka</i>	

Chapter Twelve.....	363
Conclusions on Round Table for the SE Mediterranean Region of ICAHM “Capacity Building for the SE Mediterranean” <i>Douglas Comer</i>	

Appendix I: Conference Committees	366
---	-----

Appendix II: Contributors	369
---------------------------------	-----

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

(The photos without specific citations belong to the authors)

Chapter Two

- Fig. 2-1: Display of a long-wave perspective in terms of both real growth in World GNP (Gross National Product) (A, 1972-2010), and the number of inscriptions on the World Heritage List following the adoption of the 1972 UNESCO convention (B, 1978-2010). Graphs indicate a decreasing trend in economic growth, plus several business cycle downturns (recessions), and the impact on the listing and protection pattern.
- Fig. 2-2: Mapping of a use value indicator for the carrying capacities and visits with a two- (A) and three-dimensional (B) graphical display of the historic city center of Diest, Belgium.
- Fig. 2-3: View of the Palaestra (built during the 3rd c. BC) in Olympia during springtime.
- Fig. 2-4: Zoomorphic figurines, votive offerings from the Altis, 8th c. BC (Chadzi 2008).
- Fig. 2-5: The flow of the Kladeosriver after a rainfall.
- Fig. 2-6: The evolution of Olympic landscapes over the last two hundred years: **A.** gravure 1824 (Stanhope J.S., Archaeological Receipts Fund – Greece). **B.** photograph taken during the early period of the excavations, 1876/1877 (Romaides brothers). **C.** photograph taken during the excavations in 1881 (Curtius E.). **D.** photograph taken in 1930. **E.** photograph taken before the fire in 2004. **F.** photograph taken after the restoration in 2012.
- Fig. 2-7: The visitors' pathway in the Olympic Botanical Garden with view to Kronios hill.
- Fig. 2-8: The archaeological heritage management cycle before and during the economic crisis.
- Fig. 2-9: This 3D digital model can be exported and elaborated by any common CAD program at any time in the future.
- Fig. 2-10: The Hadrian Library of Athens.
- Fig. 2-11: The Temple of Hephaestus, Athens.

Chapter Three

- Fig. 3-1: Location of the cities of Isfahan and Tabriz.
Fig. 3-2: Iranian traditional cities source: Eckart EHLERS and Willem FLOOR (Ehlers 1991) Urban change in Iran, 1920-1941.
Fig. 3-3: Morphology of Iranian bazaars.
Fig. 3-4: Elements of Iranian bazaars.
Fig. 3-5: Sustainability of bazaars by urban elements of the Iranian city.
Fig. 3-6: Mouth of the Qassabeh Qanat.
Fig. 3-7: Galleries of Qassabeh Qanat.
Fig. 3-8: Aerial view of Zarch Qanat.
Fig. 3-9: Mouneh Qanat.

Chapter Four

- Fig. 4-1: Location of Isfahan on Iran's map.
Fig. 4-2: Jame mosque.
Fig. 4-3: Jame mosque plan (Iranname, available at: <http://www.iranname.net/>).
Fig. 4-4: Some of the common problems existing at the Jame mosque (Iranname, available at: <http://www.iranname.net/>).
Fig. 4-5: General view of the Monastery of St. Catherine and Wadi el Deir from the southeast.
Fig. 4-6: Map of Wadi el Deir showing the general proposal set by the Master Plan.
Fig. 4-7: Plan showing the proposed layout of the new entrance zone to the valley.
Fig. 4-8: Plans of the proposed information centre and the complex of Bedouin shops; built with rammed earth and timber components.
Fig. 4-9: Aerial view of Yeronisos from the southeast (1992, J.B. Connelly) and facing east (2004, J.B. Connelly).
Fig. 4-10: Central South Complex, Yeronisos, facing north (2004).
Fig. 4-11: Plan of "Circular Structure," dancing platform? (2010, R.C. Anderson)
Fig. 4-12: Yeronisos from the southeast (2012, J.B. Connelly).
Fig. 4-13: Map of Hecataeus of Miletus, mentioning Armenia, ca. 500 BC (after Korfmann 2001, 32).
Fig. 4-14: Armenian landscape with the mountain, Ararat, in the background as seen from the "Arch of Charents" near Garni.
Fig. 4-15: Ararat Valley, view of the Bronze Age "cyclopean" fortress Nazravan.

- Fig. 4-16: Theft from the Museum of Ancient Corinth.
- Fig. 4-17: Theft from the Museum of Ancient Sicyon.
- Fig. 4-18: The Aidonia treasure, product of illicit excavation, was recovered and returned to Greece.
- Fig. 4-19: The two confiscated kouroi from Klenia in Corinthia. Picture taken by E. Korcka as soon as they were brought to police headquarters in Athens.
- Fig. 4-20: Looted images of saints from the church in Steni in Euboea, returned to Greece with the help of the Italian authorities.
- Fig. 4-21: Chart of illicit excavations in Greece.

Chapter Five

- Fig. 5-1: The “declare a monument” page.
- Fig. 5-2: The MuA database map featuring clusters of monuments at risk. On the right, the “filters bar” can be spotted along with the “declare a monument” and the “login to the personal profile” page buttons. On the left, the social media buttons are located with the “timeline” and “gallery” features below.
- Fig. 5-3: The structural model of the eastern elevation of Aphrodite’s temple.
- Fig. 5-4: Structural repair of architrave A2 with the use of embedded metal bars.

Chapter Six

- Fig. 6-1: The Mikveh at Cologne during sampling.
- Fig. 6-2: The site of Coudenberg on the Rue Isabelle.
- Fig. 6-3: A weather-monitoring station was installed adjacent to the Hajar Qim, one of the megalithic temples in Malta, to record conditions prior to the installation of the protective shelter.
- Fig. 6-4: Despite the perforated-metal screen applied remedially to the open-sided shelter over the House of the Fountains at the Roman site of Conimbriga, Portugal, direct sunlight still reaches the mosaics under the shelter.
- Fig. 6-5: Inca-period stone and mud-brick grain-storage buildings are protected by simple thatch wall-top shelters in Pisac, Peru. Thatch, however, requires periodic renewal.
- Fig. 6-6: The gutters at the House of the Fountains in Conimbriga, Portugal do not have downspouts and rainwater is disposed directly onto the artifact being protected.

Fig. 6-7: Tensile structures can be appropriate as long as precipitation run-off is controlled as is the case with the shelter over Hajar Qim in Malta.

Fig. 6-8: Ephesus, the Shelter Construction Terrace House 2 (© ÖAI, N. Gail).

Fig. 6-9: Ephesus, Shelter Construction Terrace House 2. The Guiding System, open to the public since 2006 (© ÖAI, N. Gail).

Fig. 6-10: Restoration project sponsored by Borusan-Holding. The reconstruction of the marble decoration of the outstanding dining room in Unit 6 (© ÖAI, N. Gail).

Fig. 6-11: Restoration project sponsored by the Ephesus Foundation. The wall painting before and after restoration (© ÖAI, N. Gail).

Fig. 6-12: Restoration project sponsored by the Ephesus Foundation; wall painting details before and after restoration (© ÖAI, N. Gail).

Chapter Seven

Fig. 7-1: Overview of Grotto N. 10.

Fig. 7-2: Sampling spots for layer d from the left wall of Grotto No.10.

Fig. 7-3: Loose structure of illite and quartz grain, and surface erosion.

Fig. 7-4: Damage Assessment Map.

Fig. 7-5: Examples of damages.

Fig. 7-6: Alepotrypa cave, dwelling area and collective burial site.

Fig. 7-7: Views from the inside of the Alepotrypa Cave (natural and anthropogenic deposits).

Fig. 7-8: General view of the museum.

Chapter Eight

Fig. 8-1: Wooden box with parts of statue, coming from Angkor Wat in Cambodia.

Fig. 8-2: Hand-over of a small Parthenon marble by the National Museum of Antiquities in the Netherlands to Greece.

Fig. 8-3: Illicit art trade in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Chapter Nine

Fig. 9-1: Aerial photo of the estate as it appears today.

Fig. 9-2: The 1896 plan of the palace garden (Stamatopoulos, 2004).

Fig. 9-3: Schematic of the vegetation zones from the 1950s (Stamatopoulos, 2004).

Fig. 9-4: A 1936 aerial photo of the “kepos” (Stamatopoulos, 2004).

Fig. 9-5: Proposal master plan.

Chapter Ten

Fig. 10-1: Location of Foça in relation to İzmir. Source: Google Maps, © 2013 Google, © 2013 Basaroft.

Fig. 10-2: Looking north from Küçük Deniz, 2011.

Fig. 10-3: Adaptive reuse projects for old stone houses; *left*, a café whose restoration project won a local preservation award; *right*, an art gallery/café. Source: Author, 2011; Mete Murat Metin, 2007.

Fig.10-4: *Above*, examples of a few traditional buildings remaining in the commercial center; *below*, new constructions dominating the scene on Reha Midilli Caddesi. Source: Author, 2011.

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter Three

Table 3-1: Diagram showing the relation between *Qanat* management dimensions, humans and nature.

Table 3-2: Dimension of Comprehensive *Qanat* management.

Chapter Five

Table 5-1: The “ontological approach” of the MuA database: The monument is placed at the centre of the discussion and the interrelated systems of values (Material, Related to the materiality of the monument, Immaterial) are arranged around it. Each system is further analysed in Historical (i.e. scientific perception, subjective), Emotional (i.e. individual perception, objective), Social (i.e. collective perception, subjective) and Aesthetic (i.e. artistic perception, objective) values, but no further. Threats are ascribed to these final values in an attempt to document risks in their totality and also form an analytical basis for counter action.

Table 5-2: The schema of the seven profiles of users. Users have differential access to the database, according to their professional and personal interests, allowing them to avoid information overload. Each user can “upgrade” his profile in order to have access to more detailed information about a monument at risk.

Table 5-3: Dataflow from central level to the services of the Ministry of Culture.

Table 5-4: Proposed measures and actions for each of the key stages of Civil Protection.

Table 5-5: Displacement (a) and acceleration (b) response spectra for 5% damping of the four earthquakes considered in the analyses.

Table 5-6: Time-history of the displacements of the base block and the capital of the isolated column (Earthquake ARC-1, in black: displacement of the base, in grey: displacement of the capital).

Table 5-7: Time-history of the displacements of the base block and the capital of the second column, when the whole model is considered

(earthquake ARC-1, in red: displacement of the base, in black: displacement of the capital).

Chapter Six

Table 6-1: Crystallization sequence of soluble salts using ECOS (mortar, 15 cm height, 0-1 cm depth).

Table 6-2: Crystallization sequence of soluble salts using ECOS, brick 0-1 cm (zone I) (top) and mortar 0-1 cm (zone II) (middle) and evolution of the RH in the Chapel (March 1st–mid December 2011) (bottom).

Table 6-3: Methodology and Design Criteria.

Table 6-4: Database for recording the efficiency and effectiveness of protection and preservation of the site and its values.

Table 6-5: Recording the existing shelters at the national level and creating a database with their technical characteristics and construction material.

Chapter Seven

Table 7-1: Monthly Rainfall in the past few years.

Chapter Eight

Table 8-1: Division of return instances per year.

PROLOGUE

MARIANNA V.VARDINOYIANNIS

In a world full of challenges with respect to the protection of cultural heritage, all initiatives that give us the chance to join our forces are much appreciated. For this reason, the “Marianna V. Vardinoyannis Foundation” has chosen to support the publication of the Conference Proceedings entitled “The protection of Archaeological Heritage in times of economic crisis” and the efforts of the Hellenic National Committee of ICOMOS and of ICAHM, in order to contribute to the dissemination of valuable knowledge which has been acquired by this important regional gathering, held at the Acropolis Museum in Athens. Our Foundation gives special emphasis to the importance of international co-operation for the protection of the world cultural heritage in all its forms, since it is a fundamental component of the cultural identity of communities, groups and individuals. I hope this book will reach the hands of all the people concerned with, and mobilized towards, the building of a better future for mankind based on the respect of peoples’ past and the dialogue among its civilizations.

Marianna V. Vardinoyannis

Goodwill Ambassador of UNESCO

President of the “Marianna V. Vardinoyannis Foundation”

INTRODUCTION

ELENA KORKA

The ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) Hellenic National Committee and ICAHM (International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management) organized a regional conference of international importance in Athens at the New Acropolis Museum from the 23rd to the 25th of May 2012, titled “*From past experience to new approaches and synergies: The future of protection management for archaeological heritage in times of economic crisis*”.

This publication titled “*The Protection of Archaeological Heritage in Times of Economic Crisis*” includes the main core of the extended and updated presentations of the conference along with conclusions that ensued after a round table discussion, which was organized specifically for capacity building in the SE Mediterranean Region.

The scope of the conference and that of the publication in hand is to present existing experiences with a view to contributing valuable material for the basis of a think tank seeking new ways of managing the protection and preservation of archaeological heritage in times of economic crisis. The challenges are now greater than ever as the cultural society needs to find new ground, discover innovative modules, create new synergies and undertake fresh initiatives in order to maintain standards in the field of archaeological heritage management and offer sustainable solutions.

Today the economic crisis is considered as a main threat, a man-made risk among those facing archaeological heritage worldwide. It is for this reason that ICORP (International Committee on Risk Preparedness) as well as UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) and ICOM (International Council of Museums) have contributed highly to the enrichment of the conference proceedings. This crisis is not a phenomenon existing only in the countries facing economic difficulties. It is a global problem and source of grave concern, since its impact and implications affect the whole world. The inability of certain communities to maintain quantitative and qualitative standards, the degradation of services,

preservation, communication, security, proper documentation, and so many other resources, impoverish the world community of its values and exchange of knowledge and expertise.

It is for this reason that many scholars and professionals from so many different parts of the world attended the conference and participated vigorously in all the discussions and the round table exchange of views.

As Greece belongs to the ICAHM South-East Mediterranean Region, special interest was given to difficulties existing in this area of the world, which is so rich in archaeological remains and cultural wealth. The specific character of the region and all the recent difficulties it is undergoing due to conflict, unrest, destruction and theft were analyzed and a strategic plan for ICAHM was formulated.

Heritage can effectively work as a tool to alleviate poverty and secure a source of income and employment. Without doubt, it incurs both benefits and costs. Resources are invested to maintain cultural sites, and museums and society have justifiable interests in the efficient allocation of these resources vis-à-vis the value and reciprocal benefits created. For this reason and especially in times of economic crisis, assessment of management methods is necessitated and sustainability indicators must be reevaluated.

Clearly archaeological heritage has a dynamic, intricate relationship with local communities in terms of identity values and is a key motivator for the application of effective management. For this reason there should be provisions made for the systematic involvement of all stake holders within a feasibility analysis in view of planning and development with regard to archaeological heritage. The politics of heritage management must involve and must target socioeconomic growth along with the conservation, promotion and use of sites and monuments.

This publication eloquently shows the great international interest in these issues through the various papers, which offer an in-depth comparative picture of policies, strategies, action plans, risks, methods, principles, legal systems, tools, technologies, synergies and funding possibilities as they are implemented around the globe. Even though systems can vary extensively and radically throughout the world, problems are common and solutions can be applicable in many different environments.

The themes, which are addressed and according to the papers presented, are various and cover all aspects of the multifaceted prism of the management of archaeological heritage. Some of the key note presentations fall under a separate entry as they introduce the reader to the quintessence of the scope of the publication's theme. They also elaborate

on the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, as well as the 50th anniversary of the Venice charter, both celebrated in 2012.

The themes include main topics, such as: Environmental Harmonization; Management and Best Practices in Sustainability; Management Action Plans; Risk Mitigation Confrontation; Research in Conservation, Preservation and Technologies, Shelter Protection; Conservation, Restoration, Coordination and Site Use; Illicit Excavation and Trafficking, Protection of Collections and Movable Finds; Preservation of the Intangible Heritage of Sites and Monuments; and Heritage and Economy.

Through these themes, the publication wishes to bring together and present expert opinions and experiences in regard to preoccupations and various solutions concerning the protection of archaeological heritage in times of economic crisis as a point of reference and as food for thought. Hopefully, it may even lead professionals around the world to join forces and create new synergies. Furthermore, it may lead more professionals and decision makers in the South-East Mediterranean region to become involved in the initiatives of ICAHM. Additionally, it has provided opportunities to network with other experts in the area for the benefit of the protection of archaeological heritage in view of the challenges of the times.

As editor of the publication, vice-chair of ICAHM for the South-East Mediterranean region, member of the board of the ICOMOS Hellenic National Committee, and member of the council of ICCROM, I wish to warmly thank good will ambassador to UNESCO, Mrs. V. Vardinoyiannis for generously sponsoring this publication, the president of ICOMOS, G. Araoz, for supporting this endeavor, and the two co-presidents of ICAHM, W. Willems and D. Comer especially, for his guidance and participation. Additionally, I would like to thank the president of ICORP, R. Jigyasu, for his help, the Director-General of ICCROM, St. de Caro, for his participation, the Director-General of ICOM, J. Anfruns, for his presence, and the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO, Fr. Bandarin, for his encouraging greetings. Further, I wish to express my gratitude to the representatives of the many international organizations that attended the conference, the members of the honorary, advisory, scientific, and organizing Committees, those who delivered addressees of greetings, the panelists and speakers, contributors, sponsors, authorities, and all those who helped in many ways with the conference. Last, but not least, I must thank the president of the ICOMOS Hellenic National Committee, A. Nakasis, and the board.

In regard to the publication, I invaluablely thank S. Spyropoulou for the hard work of general assistance she offered in every possible way, Em. Panteliadou for her help and E. Oeconomopoulou for the inspirational logo of the conference.

In conclusion, the papers of the publication clearly present the grave challenges that the management of archaeological heritage needs to face due to the economic crisis and its broader impacts. The high standards of protection and promotion of sites, monuments, and museums are indicators of the well-being of society. Heritage, whether tangible or intangible, is a source of knowledge, a point of reference for the present, and a guaranty for the future. It necessitates the care it deserves and for this reason experience, expertise, and the exchange of information are vital for its preservation. The world cultural community needs to join forces and find new ways forward. The presentations in this publication offer knowledge and hope and, undoubtedly, prove that where there is a will, there is a way.

Dr Elena Korca

Director General of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage
Vice-chair of ICAHM responsible for the SE Mediterranean Region
Member of the Board of ICOMOS Hellenic

GREETINGS OF THE CONFERENCE

I have to begin by commending Hellenic ICOMOS for joining ICAHM in organizing this conference at a time when Greece grapples with the economic crisis and the difficult transitions of which we are all painfully aware. This is one more manifestation of your unwavering commitment to your cultural heritage—or should I say our cultural heritage?—and your ability to carry on with your work under the most difficult of circumstances. Your commitment and dedication are truly an inspiration and an example to us all.

The topic of the conference is generous because its benefits are not for Greece alone. In one way or another, many countries are beset by the same constraints and hardships that you are face so valiantly in Greece. Other regions—some very near you—are also undergoing different hardships in the form of delicate and unpredictable social and political transitions that inevitably bring with them a breakdown in cultural institutions, drastic budget cuts in heritage conservation and management, and an increase in the ever-present threat of looting and illicit trafficking of cultural properties. For all these reasons, it is of primary importance that you share broadly with the entire world the results and the conclusions of your proceedings in Athens.

Greece is the ancestral home to all who form part of Western traditions. Our first lessons in philosophy, in representative government, in architecture, and in so many other fields were born there, and we still return as modern pilgrims to the many places from where they sprang: to Mycenae, Delphi, Athens, Olympia, Corinth, Knossos, Delos, Epidaurus—all magical names and places where we can access, touch, see and smell our common ancestral roots; all places that deserve the very best custody that humanity can provide.

The topics identified for this conference are truly broad and crucial for developing more effective ways to steward our archaeological heritage at times of both scarcity and plenty. I urge you to plunge deeply into them, to explore how to mix the principles of environmental protection with those of preventive archaeology, of emerging technologies and of modern management in order to design new formulas for protecting and conserving our archaeological heritage in its fullest authenticity and

integrity, and for enhancing the public appreciation of their inestimable value.

I regret that I could not be with you in Greece today, but be assured that many who are not among you are with you in wishing you well and in looking forward to your conclusions.

Dr. Gustavo Araoz

President, International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)

This conference was undertaken in collaboration with the ICOMOS International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention and of the 50th anniversary of the Venice Charter. The conference is dedicated to the memory of Herb Stovel, whose absence makes poorer the family of ICOMOS.

ICOMOS Hellenic makes efforts for the protection and preservation of cultural heritage at the national and international level. Our Institution was founded in 1972 by the Technical Chamber of Greece, which remains our most important sponsor. The Hellenic ICOMOS has departments in Thessaloniki, Veroia, Agrinio and Crete and counts 550 members, among which are: 15% Archaeologists, 49% Architects, 13% other Engineers, 12% Conservators and 11% other scientists. Our website is connected with the Technical Chamber's and International ICOMOS' websites, with more than 1500 visits per month.

Hellenic ICOMOS has been honoured with the Abdi Ipekci Award for the Greek-Turkish rapprochement. Our institution, represented by our former president, Mr. Nikos Agriantonis, has been awarded by the journalists of Hellenic Radio Broadcasting (ERA) for the preservation of Architectural Heritage.

This conference has been organized in collaboration with the International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM), which supports worldwide initiatives and projects that pertain to all aspects of the management of archaeological sites and landscapes.

For the realization of the conference, I express my thanks to Mrs. Marianna Vardinoyannis and the other sponsors: S&B Industrial Minerals SA, LAVA SA, the Club for UNESCO of the Department of Piraeus and Islands, and Athens Center Square Hotel.

I thank Mr. Demetrios Pantermalis for hosting this event and the president of the Hellenic Committee of UNESCO, Mrs. Aikaterini

Tzitzikosta, for honouring us with her presence, as well as the representatives of international committees: Julien Anfruns, Stefano De Caro, Douglas Comer, Mike Turner and Bijan Rouchani.

I thank our colleagues, members of ICOMOS Hellenic: Evangelia Kardara, Dimitra Korakaki, Eleni Oekonomopoulou, Emorfili Panteliadou, and Sophia Spyropoulou; and the members of the board of Directors of ICOMOS Hellenic: Sofia Avgerinou-Kolonias, Nikos Lianos, Vasilis Palantzas, Olga Polichronopoulou, Kyriakos Psaroudakis and Athanasios Ves, for their important contribution! I also express my appreciation to all of our colleagues from the Hellenic Ministry of Culture for their valuable help!

I thank personally from this stand and on behalf of the ICOMOS Hellenic, Mrs. Elena Korka, Vice President of ICAHM, who has been the inspirer of this conference and undertook the coordination, management and implementation of this task!

Dr. Athanasios Nakasis,
President, ICOMOS Hellenic National Committee,
Expert member, International Scientific Committee on Fortifications and
Military Heritage (ICOFORT),
Honorary Director, Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports

CHAPTER ONE:
CONFERENCE KEYNOTES

CULTURAL HERITAGE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

MOUNIR BOUCHENAKI

What is the meaning of Cultural Heritage today?

The term “Cultural Heritage” has not always designated the same things. In recent years, particularly in the last four decades, the notion of cultural heritage has changed considerably. After first referring to the most representative collections of works of arts and of monumental remnants of cultures, the notion of heritage was gradually extended to new categories drawn from non-artistic sectors of activity, such as industrial heritage, or from specific contexts, such as underwater cultural heritage.

Today, the notion of cultural heritage is an open one, which can develop new objects and put forward new meanings as it reflects living cultures rather than ossified images of the past. We have become aware over the last forty years that nature and culture cannot be separated in our approach to heritage, if we are to render a true account of the diversity of cultural manifestations and expressions; and particularly those in which a close link is expressed between human beings and their natural environment.

It is widely recognized at the beginning of this 21st century, that one key international document defining cultural heritage is the 1972 UNESCO Convention, concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, which has been signed by 183 countries up to now. By itself, this figure shows that the Convention is recognized as one of the most popular international treaties. It is true that we are really approaching the universality of its acceptance.

In article 1, the 1972 Convention states, “the following shall be considered as ‘cultural heritage’: Monuments, Group of buildings, and Sites.” In this context, the notion of “cultural landscape” (in French, *paysage culturel*), put forward over the last fifteen years (it was first mentioned in the 1990s within the framework of the 1972 Convention), is one of the achievements of the elaboration of a more coherent vision of cultural heritage. We can see that the extension to cultural landscapes

derives directly from the definition of cultural heritage, when under “sites” the inclusion of “works of man or the combined works of nature and of man” is mentioned. One of the latest publications on this subject was recently issued on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the 1972 Convention following a workshop, “Cultural Landscapes, the Challenge of Conservation,” organized in Ferrara, Italy, by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (Paris, 2003).

More recently, attention has focused on the conceptualization and the designation of a complementary dimension to heritage, related to the new notion of intangible cultural heritage. This is the result of closer focus on the individual and/or community systems of knowledge, both spiritual and philosophical, in which the individual pursues his creative activities. Beyond the quest for the components that fulfil intangible cultural heritage, the concept related to it has taught us that tangible vestiges and remains cannot be appreciated in their own right, but, necessarily, in relation to others and through an understanding of their interactions with their physical and non-physical environment, both natural and human.

Cultural heritage has, therefore, become a complex reality. It is all the more fragile and threatened now as we are more and more conscious of the part it plays in the life and development of societies. The awareness about the importance of cultural heritage and its preservation started, in our modern societies, with the Athens Charter in 1931 and later on with the “Venice Charter of 1964” issued forth by ICOMOS. Since the 1976 Recommendation of Nairobi concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas,¹ UNESCO has developed a strategic approach considering “urban heritage” as a starting point of all urban policies. The main elements of the UNESCO Nairobi recommendation were included afterwards in the Toledo-Washington ICOMOS Charter of 1987 for the conservation of historic towns and urban areas.² In 2011, UNESCO adopted, in this regard, a new Recommendation on the safeguarding of Historic Urban Landscapes.

A strategic approach concerning urban heritage

The new approach of cultural heritage and the global agreement on an innovative and development-based vision of *culture* is fine-tuned and streamlined through the experience of the World Commission on Culture

¹ http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13133&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

² http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/towns_e.pdf

and Development, the Stockholm Conference of 1998. The policies that are presently made operational, in many cases, should be integrated into all programmes of international governmental and nongovernmental organizations, such as UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, and IUA. It is important to remember that UNESCO's Constitutive Act charged the Organization to "see to the conservation and protection of the universal heritage of works of arts and of monuments of historical importance or scientific interest." For more than fifty years, UNESCO has been active in promoting and organizing international action in this area, which is the key to our identity and the source of our inspiration.

It is in this spirit that more than fifty years ago, in 1956, the founders of UNESCO considered scientific research, capacity building, and advocacy of major importance in the field of cultural heritage and thus created the intergovernmental body ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property). In that same period, a large number of Third World states entered UNESCO recognizing that "political emancipation is relatively meaningless if it is not accompanied by cultural emancipation." They, in this spirit, expressed their attachment at that time to manifestations of cultural identity, particularly the tangible ones.

Later, in the twenty-first century, it is the same strong feeling that brought the overwhelming majority of states to give support, in addition to the Convention on World Cultural and Natural Heritage, to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention as part of the protection and promotion of the cultural diversity of humanity. Urban heritage, with its complexities, can certainly be considered as part of the richness of this cultural diversity.

Throughout the years, urban heritage, which was very often seen as a burden in different countries, started to be of interest to the private sector. Since the 1980s, we have seen a great number of private initiatives flourishing. It is, nevertheless, important to note that public policies for preserving historic urban areas were launched in the 1960s by countries like France and Italy. A typical and now historical example is that of the project of rehabilitation undertaken in the sixties in the historic area of Le Marais in Paris. Under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture with the support of the well-known French Minister Andre Malraux, we owe a debt to this initiative in promoting the concept of "protected urban areas."

In parallel to this evolution, the programme, "International Campaigns for the Safeguarding of Cultural Heritage," has certainly offered one of the most privileged arenas for implementing the idea of "common and universal heritage." After the largest operation for the safeguarding of archaeological heritage ever recorded, that of Philae and Abu Simbel in

Egypt, and the restoration of the Borobudur Temple in Indonesia, UNESCO has embarked on an ambitious programme aimed at safeguarding some major historic areas within cities worldwide.

These include:

- Venice in Italy
- The Acropolis in Athens and its surroundings
- Havana Vieja in Cuba
- Historic Centre of San Francisco de Lima in Peru
- Ancient cities of Mauritania (Chinguetti, Oualata, Ouadane and Tichit)
- Medina of Fes in Morocco
- Historic cities of Sanaa and Shibam in Yemen
- Historic city of Hue in Vietnam
- Historic island of Goree, Senegal
- Valley of Kathmandu in Nepal

The UNESCO contribution, with the expert advice of ICCROM, ICOMOS, and IUA, among others, was embodied in the preparation of a plan of action for each of these historic cities in collaboration with the national authorities concerned. I participated personally in this process in Italy, Mauritania, Morocco, Senegal, Vietnam, and Yemen, to promote a global, integrated, and multidisciplinary approach. Beyond the actual safeguarding operations, the plan of action takes account of the problems of a socio-economic nature and the aims to generate an impetus for development for the benefit of the communities.

The perception of a cultural site, which in former times, was limited to religious monuments and those related to political authority, has been extended. It now includes common buildings or garden constructions such as dwellings and workshops, as well as tiny shops. This parallels current theoretical movements that have expanded the time periods that are considered worthy of interest, which now include 20th century buildings and modern architecture.

At the International Conference on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture, held in Vienna, Austria from the 12th to the 14th of May 2005, the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, Mr. Themba Wakashe, explained in the session dedicated to “managing the historic urban landscape” that there is an increasing and intensifying debate with regard to the rapidly changing face of historic cities in many parts of the world. From the London skyline to Beijing’s, or Suzhou’s transformation, public discussion is taking place about new urban and architectural

developments and the extent to which change is possible in order for cities to maintain their historic character and identity.

In this trend, railway stations, factories, and ancient harbours are now regarded as cultural sites insofar as they testify not only to architectural importance, but they have also impacted on economic and social life. Accordingly, in the same way as archaeological sites, all cultural sites with recognized value should now be protected without fail as a legacy for future generations.

A city's future should, therefore, be based on its identity and particular features in order to preserve what may be called its "urban landscape." "Urban heritage" should be the starting point for the development of all urban policy. Heritage and its "accumulation" over time—the history of its buildings, streets, districts, and residents—should be regarded as the force and foundation of all sustainable development of historic cities and their future.

The uncontrolled frenzy of construction, land speculation, and massive rural to urban migration or excessive tourist development, has resulted in ecological, aesthetic, and cultural disasters at the very heart of historic cities. The need to harmonize the new economic and social needs of inhabitants with the original urban pattern, without compromising identity and authenticity, is now a major challenge. In view of the special and elemental role of culture in enhancing the quality of life, strategies should be worked out to protect historic centres and promote spaces for encounter and exchange so that the city's cultural identity may be grounded in its history, architecture plurality, and diversity. This should enable the development of the historic heritage of cities to be regarded as a vector for sustainable development.

Conclusion

It is worth investing in the preservation of cultural heritage. Heritage, whether tangible or intangible, is increasingly perceived and used as an economic resource. In less affluent countries, however, economies cannot afford to invest in conservation on the same scale as it is done in Western countries. Moreover, spending funds on historic preservation remains difficult to justify in the midst of poverty. Additionally, we should be reminded that the fight against poverty is one of the UN Millennium Development Goals. As a non-renewable resource, heritage preservation has not always been approached in the most equitable and sustainable way. As a development asset, it should help meet the needs of poor communities and broader society. Heritage is a form of cultural capital