

‘Built Heritage Conservation Education’

Edited issue of *Built Environment*

An International Perspective to Conservation Education

Dr. Jukka Jokilehto, July 31, 2006

How are the best conservation practitioners cultivated?

Historical background: To appreciate the achievements in conservation practice, it is necessary to reflect on the nature of safeguarding cultural heritage, taking into account the paths we have taken in the past and speculating where we are heading. Already in the mid 19th century, the **French** architect, Eugene Viollet-le-Duc renounced to restore an historic building because he thought that there were not sufficient skills available at the time. Since then, education and training have accompanied and sustained the development of modern conservation theory and practices. In France, from the mid 19th century, restoration of historic buildings was understood as based on building archaeology, and it was interpreted as a scientific activity. The purpose was to “ascertain exactly the age and character of each part – to form a kind of specification of trustworthy records, either by written description or by graphical representation” (Viollet-le-Duc, 1854-68, VIII:22f). This attitude characterized Viollet-le-Duc’s approach, and it has also formed the foundations for later training in restoration, though he has also been criticized for having “corrected” history, and the exaggerated reconstruction of lost architectural forms.

In **England**, there developed a different line of thought, emerging from the criticism of the results of this rather positivistic attitude, and emphasizing a more conservative approach to keeping the historical stratigraphy in the built heritage, as indicated by John Ruskin and William Morris . The influential Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) published, in 1903, *Guidelines* and, in 1911-36, a handbook for the *Repair of Ancient Buildings* (by A.R. Powys, secretary of SPAB), which summarized the principles of conservative repair, and how the work should be done with the least alteration to the qualities that make a building worthy of notice in its workmanship, form, colour, and texture. Subsequently, SPAB was involved in the organization of field training, instructing in the practical execution of repair and maintenance works on historic buildings, thus educating practicing architects through hands-on experience.

In **German countries**, from the end of the 19th century, were organized yearly meetings of conservationists, the so-called *Tage für Denkmalpflege* (“days for conservation”). During these meetings much time was dedicated to discuss training and education in the care of the built heritage. In terms of theory, fundamentally two attitudes were debated, one based on restoration in the French manner, and the other referring to minimum intervention and conservative repair as in England. Similar debate developed in **Italy**, where Gustavo Giovannoni, in the 1920s, introduced the foundations for university education in the restoration of historic buildings and ancient monuments. In the aftermath of the Second World War, due to much destruction, education and training in the restoration of historic buildings became an urgent task, and the above-mentioned early experiences became a reference for training of professionals also in other countries worldwide.

International framework: Gradually, over the past four decades, the different approaches have tended to merge, and the principles of restoration and conservation

of the built heritage have been given an international backing through the recommendations of UNESCO and the doctrine promoted within the membership of ICOMOS. In UNESCO recommendations particular attention has been given to educational programmes. For example, the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*, recommends: “The States Parties to this Convention shall endeavour by all appropriate means, and in particular by educational and information programmes, to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural and natural heritage” (art. 27). Education and training, in fact, have become one of the principal forms of assistance provided to the States which have ratified the Convention. The 1976 UNESCO *Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas* emphasizes the fundamental importance of raising the standard of work of the skilled workers and craftsmen, but also the need to encourage the whole population to realize the need for safeguarding and to take part in it. The *Amsterdam Declaration*, which in the fall 1975 concluded the Council of Europe’s European Architectural Heritage Year, emphasizes: “The architectural heritage will survive only if it is appreciated by the public and in particular by the younger generation. Educational programmes for all ages should, therefore, give increased attention to this subject.”

From this time on, an increasing number of training programmes have been organized at universities and technical training institutions. In this development, the role of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of the Cultural Property, ICCROM, has been specially important. As an intergovernmental organization, founded by UNESCO in 1956, ICCROM was able to draw from the most updated knowledge and experience in the different countries of the world. The conservation of cultural heritage is, as Prof. Paul Philippot, former Director of ICCROM, has often noted, a cultural problem. It is based on values that are generated by our contemporary society, and the choices and strategies are the result of cultural policies. The concept of heritage itself has been broadened enormously in the second half of the 20th century with the consequent involvement of an ever increasing number of disciplines and stakeholders in the process.

Training curricula: In 1974, Prof. Philippot prepared a draft typology for the curricula of training of specialists in conservation (ICCROM *Newsletter* 2, 1974). He observed that the discipline of conservation was not clearly defined, and the aim of his scheme was to describe in a schematic way, what type of training would be required by the main categories of specialists involved in conservation work. The categories were the following:

- architects, engineers and town planners;
- historians, art historians and archaeologists;
- foremen in charge of restoration field work;
- restorers and conservators, distinguishing between professionally qualified restorers and technicians in conservation;
- artisans and craftsmen working under the guidance of the foremen;
- conservation scientists and laboratory technicians.

Each of these specialists would need to be trained in the theory and history of restoration, the history of art and culture in one’s field of specialization, the history of technology, the methods of examination of the heritage resource, knowledge of

materials and causes of deterioration, techniques of recording and documentation, as well as the organization of the conservation work. While the scheme was proposed as an “organic whole”, the training of each category of specialist needed to be tailored according to his or her specific requirements. In some cases, it meant an in-depth knowledge of a particular field, while in others it might require an introduction to the topic.

In 1993, ICOMOS adopted *Guidelines on Education and Training in the Conservation of Monuments, Ensembles and Sites*, giving a general outline for the contents of educational and training programmes. The document states: “There is a need to develop a holistic approach to our heritage on the basis of cultural pluralism and diversity, respected by professionals, crafts persons and administrators. Conservation requires the ability to observe, analyze and synthesize. The conservationist should have a flexible yet pragmatic approach based on cultural consciousness which should penetrate all practical work, proper education and training, sound judgement and a sense of proportion with an understanding of the community's needs.” (par. 4)

These guidelines are very much based on the experience gathered in ICCROM’s training programmes. The first of ICCROM’s international courses, from the mid 1960s, focused on the built heritage, followed by training in the conservation of mural paintings, care of archives and museum collections, earthen architecture, stone structures and wooden buildings, and, from the 1990s, on historic urban areas and cultural landscapes. The principal training course on the built heritage, the International Architectural Conservation Course, was addressed to all the different disciplines involved in the preservation and conservation of the built heritage. The participants were mainly architects, engineers, urban planners, art historians or archaeologists, while the teaching faculty included a broad spectrum of professionals. In the 1970s, the course lasted about six months; later it was gradually shortened. While started as ICCROM-based courses in Rome, the scope has gradually been broadened to collaboration at the regional and national levels in the Member States, addressed to heritage in Africa, Asia, Oceania, as well as the Americas and various European countries.

Target groups: Looking at the target groups who would need awareness of conservation policies and strategies, the involvement depends on the type of heritage concerned. In relation to historic urban and rural areas, there is generally need for decision-makers and legislators at central government level, such as: the ministries (Public Works and Planning, Culture, Environment); at the regional or provincial levels: Local authorities, City Councils, Mayors; City Planners, various services and municipal departments. For individual buildings, the stakeholders obviously depend. In any case, in addition to conservation professionals, the property owners, building contractors are of strategic importance. Taking a look at the existing training opportunities, we can observe that most existing programmes are addressed to a limited range of specialized conservation professionals, such as restorers, conservators and architects. There is a need to give much more attention to surveyors, engineers, city-planners, site supervisors, not forgetting building up the attitudes of property owners and investors.

Training in the world: From the 1970s, ICCROM has kept a list of on-going training activities in the different countries of the world. While this list does not necessarily give the whole picture, it however provides an idea of the number of training in the

different regions. In this picture, looking at the situation in 1994, Europe is by far number one, having some 57% of all training. It is followed by USA and Canada with ca. 30%, and the rest of the world having only some 13%. Since 1994, the situation outside Europe has been gradually improving thanks to a number of initiatives taken by ICCROM itself as well as various national and international conservation organizations and universities, including the Getty Conservation Institute. Various states, who have gained experience in conservation training, have also collaborated in the establishment and development of research and training outside their own territory. Of ICCROM's initiatives, we can mention the "Africa 2009" programme (Conservation and Management of Immovable Cultural Heritage in Sub-Saharan Africa, 1999-2009), which focuses on the built heritage, as a follow-up to the earlier museum-oriented programme, PREMA (Prevention in museums in Africa, 1986-2000). Other ICCROM initiatives have included the ITUC programme (1995-2005) in the planning and management of historic urban areas and cultural landscapes, which has generated parallel programmes in Brazil for Latin America, and the "Athar programme" in the Arab region, focusing on the conservation management of archaeological sites.

What teaching methodologies work most effectively, and why?

For the ancient Greeks, *paideia* was the process of educating man into his true form. In the same context, Aristotle refers to 'virtue' as a settled disposition of the mind determining the choice of actions and emotions. In many ways, we can see this applicable to the conservation of cultural heritage, considered an essential part of our modern culture. Any training must necessarily be more than instruction and following some rules. Conservation teaching must obviously be tailored taking into account who is being taught. Therefore, necessarily, the actual application of the forms of teaching may well differ from one discipline to another. The main issue is that the conservation of the built heritage requires its appreciation and acceptance by the society nearly as a starting point. Many important decisions regarding this heritage are taken by politicians and administrators, who are not necessarily introduced to conservation, but whose impact is crucial.

Career structure: The methods of training conservationists should be based on clearly identified and suitable career structures. Such careers should take into account the necessary time required for maturing of the individual. For architects, this should be carried out in a series of steps, and should normally integrate knowledge and understanding of the history of building techniques and materials, as well as methods of repair and maintenance. Architects receive their basic training at university. In many cases, during or after these basic studies they are already introduced into practical experience in design and field work. Nowadays, many schools of architecture offer one- or two-year training to specialize in the conservation of the built heritage, which leads into practice, and research, and can be followed by refresher courses and workshops on specific issues as well as eventual contribution to training of others, conferences, and publications.

On the initiative of Sir Bernard, and based on the ICOMOS Training Guidelines of 1993, the British association COTAC (*Conference on Training in Architectural Conservation*) drafted a series of notes in relation to conservation on the required competences of sixteen disciplines. These included property owners, conservation specialists, as well as architects, engineers and surveyors. The effectiveness of conservation does not only depend on the skills of a single person, even though

important, but on the synergy of the various disciplines. Therefore, the basic requirement is to be capable of working in a team. This in itself needs communication skills, which are often missing from ordinary training curricula.

The COTAC document stresses that the basic professional qualification of an architect should help him/her understand the social significance of historic buildings, understand the nature of materials and their appropriate uses, be able to consider causes of decay, ensure maintenance through design and follow-up services, and to be able to act as an “enabler”, coordinating all stakeholders in the conservation process, both specialists and non-specialists. The architect should also be able to visualize solutions to complex problems and advocate new uses with a minimum of adaptation so as to preserve the historically essential features. Considering the broad definition of the built environment as heritage, it is indeed becoming compulsory for all architects to be conversant with the assessment of the qualities of historic buildings, and be able to consult other specialists when needed. Conservation culture should thus be integrated into the career structure of an architect, starting by the basic university education, and followed by specialized courses and seminars according to the needs of each individual. Similar career structures can be foreseen for other professionals, such as engineers, town planners, art- and architectural historians, archaeologists. The training of curators, conservators and restorers should be based on basic vocational training, with additional courses of specialization and professional improvement.

Conservation (restoration or preservation) of cultural heritage is based on a methodology describing the decision making process. Cultivating conservation practitioners requires a clear career structure, where the necessary ingredients are merged, whether concerning concepts and theory, scientific methodologies or field practices. The right balance of such ingredients needs to be assessed, taking into account the requirement of critical judgment. Considering that cultural heritage in its broad definition involves a vast number of interests, it is seldom possible to achieve what could be perceived as the best solutions, but rather more often “the least bad”, as noted by Sir Bernard Feilden.

Through its courses, over some forty years of training of conservation professionals, ICCROM has developed and tested methods to teach multidisciplinary and multicultural groups of professionals. This has meant, first of all, a close collaboration with the teachers, as teaching such groups differs from common university or technical school training. At ICCROM, in addition to lecturing, there has been a great emphasis on field exercises, developed for the specific needs of each course. The idea has also been to expand the intellectual capacity of critical thinking of each participant by making him/her confront situations also outside one’s specific professional tasks. An example has been to take laboratory workers to examine historic buildings together with architects, and to introduce architects and art historians to laboratory testing and touching materials. As a result, ICCROM’s courses have become a cultural experience that has generated follow up as a ‘snow ball effect’ in many parts of the world.

ICCROM ARC: It may be useful to go to some depth into the International Architectural Conservation Course (ARC), organized by ICCROM from the 1960s until 1998. This programme can be seen as a test case for the development of training methodologies, which has served as a model for many other training programmes, including those of Bruges (later Louvain), York, Split, Lisbon, as well as the University of Rome, with which this six-month was closely associated. At the time,

the programme followed the normal university curricula, and was taught by professors who generally gave one lecture per week on their subject. From 1972, a new approach was developed, where the topics were grouped into weeklong periods, forming the basic structure of the course. The topics were organized in a logical order, starting by the definition of the significance of the built heritage, discussing the conservation principles and theory, the recording and documentation, analysis of materials and structures leading to their treatment and consolidation. The last part of the course was dedicated to rehabilitation and the planning and conservation management of historic urban areas, concluding with a discussion on legal issues related to the implementation of protection and conservation plans.

The day-to-day management of the course was based on a balanced schedule, where about one third were lectures, one third was dedicated to visits and debates, and one third on exercises. Particular attention was given to have an inner logic in treating a particular topic. For example, for the materials, a series of lectures provided the theoretical understanding of the nature of porous building materials, their behaviour and the analysis of decay processes. These followed by courses on specific types of materials, accompanied by laboratory exercises (also published as small manuals) and hands-on exercises. Particularly important were the field reports, where the students prepared individual visual inspection reports, describing a selected building and its state of conservation. The preparation of such reports was expected to follow a certain methodology, making a clear distinction between observations and opinions.

As ICCROM, in the 1970s and 1980s usually organized three or four courses at the same time, it was also possible to have contacts with the other course members. Similar training strategies were also included in the other courses. One of these was the Course on the Scientific Principles of Conservation, which dealt with the conservation of objects and collections and worked mainly in laboratory. While the participants of the Architectural Conservation Course were introduced into the laboratory, the scientists and conservators attending this other course were introduced into a historic building, and were asked to prepare a short inspection report in the field. The purpose of these strategies was to facilitate communication between different disciplines, a fundamental requirement in the conservation of the built heritage.

The issue of the conservation of historic towns was a constant issue throughout the history of the course. In certain years it was possible to make agreements with municipal administrations and carry out an analysis of the historic fabric. Such studies were undertaken, for example, in Kocula and Kotor, on the Dalmatian coast, as well as in Capua, Tivoli, Ferrara, Matera, and Rome, in Italy. The case of Ferrara was particularly important because it brought the course participants directly into the heart of the debate on the conservation of historic towns. This town was one of the cases examined during the European Architectural Heritage Year, 1975, and it continued being a significant case also in the management of the cultural landscape that extended into the delta of Po river and to the coast of the Adriatic Sea. Matera was another interesting case, considering that the government had decided to evacuate the historic centre in the 1950s due to poor hygienic conditions. However, from the 1990s, the municipality was keen on rehabilitating the historic structures, providing an excellent opportunity for week-long studies by the ICCROM course participants.

ICCROM ITUC: On the basis of an expert meeting in Rome in 1995 and another in Montreal in 1996, ICCROM undertook a systematic development of the programme

strategy and outline in order to further strengthen the training specifically on historic urban and rural areas. The new programme, Integrated Territorial and Urban Conservation, ITUC, was planned as an integrated system, involving teaching, research, seminars, and the development of technical cooperation between several centres. The programme included the organization of an international training programme at ICCROM. This two-month course was addressed to mid-career professionals and teachers dealing with urban and territorial planning. The programme was organized as a series of short workshops, open for professionals who could come to attend a limited number as observers. As part of the programme development, ICCROM also prepared a questionnaire, investigating on: a) the required qualification of the team involved in urban conservation, b) on the needs of training, and c) what should be the main issues touched in the ITUC course in Rome. The questions were articulated in three groups: a) knowledge required for planning, b) skills required, and c) attitudes. The following outline of the competences of urban and territorial planners was then prepared on the basis of the responses.

- 1) Related to the analysis of the existing situation of the territory concerned:
 - Ability to identify and interpret values and their relation with the physical and functional structure of the city. The related objectives include increasing the ability to identify the critical points and their dynamics within the set of values of a local or regional context.
 - Ability to investigate the historic development process of a city, the main constraints, political and economic forces and actors that have driven the process in the recent past. The objectives include increasing ability to analyse critically different approaches to historic investigation.
 - Ability to read and interpret the main data for the physical, social and economic characterisation of a city, with the aim of fostering a perspective view of its development and future. The objectives involve ability to understand the methods and 'systemics' undergoing the design of future scenarios.
- 2) Creation of the conservation master plan:
 - Ability to develop planning methods and tools for the preparation of plans and projects in the conservation and development of a historic city. Amongst the objectives there is a need to increase knowledge of approaches and techniques required for the study of feasibility plans, understanding the economic and political constraints, and having an ability to reach stated objectives within the planning process.
 - Ability to lead and motivate team work in the conservation planning process with the objective of enhancing awareness of diversity as a group resource and of the potentials and limits of personal styles of leadership management.
 - Ability to deal and negotiate with different interpreters and actors and conflict situations in the planning process. One of the principal objectives is ability to activate basic problem- and conflict-solving strategies.
- 3) Implementation and management of the plan:
 - Ability to implement and manage integrated conservation plans, including legal, administrative and political frameworks, forming relationships and partnerships, monitoring and maintenance planning, planning for and management of crisis situations, and identifying the role of the conservation planner in the management process.
 - Ability to establish contacts and involve different actors in the integrated planning and development process, with the principal objectives of increasing knowledge of the tools and techniques for social communication regarding promotion, lobbying, advocacy and fund-raising, and paying attention to enhancing effective communication with the public.

The ITUC Programme was continued at ICCROM until 2005, and it followed the experience already acquired through the ARC course. In the later period, an increasing attention was given to the conservation management and planning of cultural landscapes. As with the ARC course, close collaboration was established with planning and management authorities in suitable locations, such as the Via Appia archaeological park in Rome, and the Cinque Terre region and Genova in Northern

Italy. Generally speaking, we can say that the ICCROM courses have always been addressed to mid-career professionals with a minimum of four years of experience after graduation. The participants selected to attend the ITUC courses were even more advanced in age and experience than previous ICCROM courses, ranging between 35 and 60, and having at least ten years of experience in the field or in teaching. In fact, the purpose of this training was to establish links with professional and academic institutions, inviting them to collaborate and to undertake similar training addressing relevant issues in their own context.

Special links were developed within ITUC to Lithuania for a programme addressing the problems of the Baltic States, and to Brazil facing the Latin American problems. The Brazilian programme developed into a particularly strong component organized by CECI (*Centro de Estudos Avançados da Conservação Integrada*), based in Recife. This centre has organized several training programmes (ITUC-AL) first for Brazilian participants, representing the different administrations of historic towns in the country. Subsequently, based on the acquired experience, CECI initiated a distance-learning programme addressing all Latin American countries. This programme, lasting one academic year, was articulated in two phases: a) the first part consisting of guided study and examinations in home country, using Internet contact with appointed professors; b) the second part: field seminar during about one month, during which the course participants were involved in the preparation of a conservation master plan for an historic town. The first such plan was prepared for Olinda, a colonial town on the World Heritage List of UNESCO. This plan was also the first urban management plan in Latin America.

Judging from feedback received from former participants and from faculty invited to teach in the courses, the teaching methodologies developed within ICCROM programmes have been proved to be effective. Perhaps even more than the technical skills learnt from the courses, the most important aspect of these programmes would seem to be the cultural impact on the participants and their later career. Part of the question is related to the length of the training programmes. Until the 1980s, the ARC courses were first six and then five months. Since then, the length was gradually reduced due to various reasons, particularly related to financial issues, including the difficulty to find scholarship. The problem has also been that mid-career professionals had some difficulty to have a leave of absence that extended to more than two or three months. In fact, the ITUC courses at ICCROM were mainly oriented on the length of two months. Dealing with regional courses, which can also be organized on a part-time basis, this question may find solutions more easily than in international programmes.

Another question that has emerged from the ICCROM experience is the contact with people representing different cultural and professional backgrounds. Together, these elements contributed to building up a common basis, resulting in a new cultural approach to the conservation of the built heritage. Part of this culture was that the participants were able to tackle the often widely different problem areas in a critical manner based on a systematic methodology. In fact, we can understand that the policies of the conservation of the built heritage cannot be based purely on international charters, though these can provide a useful reference. Instead, conservationists must necessarily be able to understand that appreciate the specificity and significance of each place, and consequently be able to select “the least bad solution” out of the possible alternatives, and implementing the relevant strategies in communication and collaboration with all stakeholders.

How should conservation educators create effective bridges between broad and significant concepts, and specific, localized contexts?

One of the frequent questions emerging over the years in ICCROM's training activities has been the relationship of international training to the specific needs of the participants representing a particular country or region. In this regard, one can refer to the UNESCO *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* (2001), which reminds about the specificity of each cultural heritage resource. Conservation training can thus not be based on ready-made recipes, but rather on methodologies and critical judgment. If well described and illustrated, this approach can assist one to overcome the gaps between teaching and practice. It is obvious, however, that building bridges is not an easy task, and there is need for relevant case studies as part of teaching material. Teaching should also not be limited to one single event but have continuity over the career.

A part of the question is: how to apply internationally promoted concepts and methodologies to different types of historic building stock in widely differing social-cultural and economic contexts. It can also be noted that in many cases historic buildings are treated by contractors and technicians who have not been introduced to conservation concepts or methodologies. At the level of urban areas, the notion of culturally sustainable development highlights some of the issues that are often lacking attention in imposing renovation projects on historic quarters. In recent years, and probably much to the credit of international activities, such as those promoted by the World Heritage Convention, there is an increasing desire to promote and provoke debate about the applicability of conservation concepts to the different cultural contexts. Such debate is going on particularly between the so-called Western World and the Orient, and one can also note that frequent conflicts between the global world society and the values traditionally generated by a local community. To some degree, these conflicts are being noticed and relevant actions taken thanks to the activities by the increasing number of NGOs and grass-roots associations even in the developing world. On the other hand, building bridges remains a constant task for culturally sensitive persons or associations, particularly those who have access to the use of the media and can influence public opinion in the different localities.

In the conclusions of a UNESCO conference on "linking local and universal values", in Amsterdam in 2003, the participants:

Emphasize that universal and local values are part of a continuum, not a hierarchy, and should not be separated. Indeed, it is not viable to identify or manage universal value without acknowledging and maintaining value of place to the local peoples.

Acknowledge that World Heritage properties are dynamic entities where cultural and social values evolve. They should not be frozen in time for purposes of conservation. Indeed, the continuity between the past and future should be integrated in management systems accommodating the possibility for sustainable change, thus ensuring that the evolution of the local value of the place is not impaired.

This statement is of interest in the sense that it indicates that the values in a World Heritage site are necessarily of local importance as well as being internationally recognized. The basis for the planning, management and conservation of cultural heritage resources in each country is necessarily at the national and/or local level according to relevant legislation and norms. Also the basic education and training should, in principle, be carried out at the national level. This is particularly relevant to crafts persons, and lower and middle-level technicians. In fact, much of vocational

training will be carried out at the local or provincial level. Higher education, and specialized training at the university level, would usually be concentrated in larger urban centres. In certain fields such training is not possible in each country, and students need to look for facilities in other countries of the region or even further. This is the case also with conservation studies; many existing training centres actually serve as a basis for this type of specialization especially for academic professions, and for conservator-restorers.

We can well ask: How should conservation educators create effective bridges between broad and significant concepts, and specific, localized contexts? The question is first of all about the definition of heritage, and about the issue of cultural and heritage diversity. We appreciate that each heritage resource has its specificity and its “uniqueness” as recognized by UNESCO: “Culture takes diverse forms across time and space. This diversity is embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the identities of the groups and societies making up humankind. As a source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations.” (*Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, article 1) In fact, considering that all cultural heritage thus reflects this cultural diversity, any restoration must necessarily be based on the recognition of its significance and its values. According to the well-known definition by Cesare Brandi: “*Restoration consists of the methodological moment in which the work of art is recognized in its physical being and in its dual aesthetic and historical nature, in view of its transmission to the future*” (Brandi, 1963, English edition 2005) In each case, therefore, there will be different values, depending on the interests of each stakeholder. Restoration cannot be based simply on some broad principles. Rather, it should be understood as a methodology that stems from the identification and recognition of the qualities of a particular place. Restoration itself is a learning process. Conservation education, therefore, must necessarily be based on a methodological approach, where the students should learn to think critically and to communicate. Restoration is also communication.

References:

Viollet-le-Duc, E. 1854-68. *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIème au XVIème siècle* (10 vols).

Jokilehto, J. 1999. *A History of Architectural Conservation*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Conference: *Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage*, Amsterdam, 22-24 May 2003

UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, 2001.

Brandi, Cesare, 1963. *Teoria del restauro*, Rome (English edition: *Theory of Restoration*, Istituto del Restauro, Rome, 2005)