

INTRODUCTION

Heritage Values and the Public

The term ‘heritage values’ refers to the meanings and values that individuals or groups of people bestow on heritage (including collections, buildings, archaeological sites, landscapes and intangible expressions of culture, such as traditions). These values have been a key factor in the legitimization of heritage protection and management, although the understanding of what they are has varied over time and there are nuances between one country and another. There are many classifications of values, including historical, aesthetic, economic, social, scientific and an array of other types [the literature on this subject is extensive and this is only a selection (Riegl 1903 (1998); Lipe 1984; Torre 2002; Lafrenz Samuels 2008; ICOMOS 2013)]. For the last 40 years, the increasing attention paid to social value, which Jones (this volume) defines as ‘a collective attachment to a place that embodies meanings and values that are important to a community or communities’, has led to a new importance being given to the role of the public in heritage management. This is particularly evident in the management of cultural heritage—including archaeological heritage—and has seen the introduction of new policies on international, national, regional and local level. However, this new legislation is presenting interesting challenges with regard to how to apply these policies and how to measure the effectiveness of their implementation. In addition to management, the new attention being paid to social value has also influenced other sectors of the profession, such as academia.

The public was the silent guest in the earliest publications dealing with heritage values. In the *Modern Cult of Monuments*, Riegl (1903) identified two major heritage values, historic and artistic, in which the first was dominant. As the subject who valued the heritage, his booklet deceptively referred to ‘modern man’ or ‘the modern viewer’, as if there were no need to distinguish between experts and everybody else or between those of different social class. However, he acknowledged that this was not quite the case when he mentioned that ‘age value’ was recognized by all, as opposed to ‘historical value’, which needed expertise to appreciate it. Later he also mentioned that even the most radical adherents of ‘age value’ belonged to the educated classes (Riegl 1903 (1998), 74–76). The heritage values he stressed—historic and artistic—remained unchallenged until World War II. The humanitarian crisis that unfolded during those terrible years was behind the Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 and the protest movements from the 1950s to the 1970s, including those organized by indigenous groups. These affected attitudes to heritage values. Some parts of academia also reacted to the new climate, with the ‘action anthropology’ movement led by Chicago professor, Sol Tax, being a good example of this (Stapp 2012). It was Sol Tax who first invited Native Americans to an anthropology congress—the Chicago American Indian Conference of 1961—to discuss issues relating to their affairs. Internationally, treaties were increasingly taking into account the role of heritage in contemporary society (Araoz 2011). However, most authors agree that one agreement in particular stands out: the Burra Charter, considered to be the event that finally turned the attention of heritage experts’ towards social values and the public.

The period leading up to the Burra Charter is well described by Josephine Flood (1989) and Meredith Walker (2014). During the late 1960s and early 1970s, Aboriginal relics—a term mainly referring to archaeological sites and artefacts—had been protected through legislative measures (Flood 1989). Aborigines' rights were then recognized, albeit only partially, in some parts of Australia, including Western Australia in 1972 and the Northern Territory with its Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act of 1978. In this climate of new sensibility to Aboriginal issues, the intention of the newly established ICOMOS¹ Australia to adapt the Venice Charter 1964 (The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites) to Australia was finally abandoned. The Eurocentric ethos of the Venice Charter led experts to devise and agree on a parallel text, now known as the Burra Charter, in 1979. A key element in it was the need to assess the significance of place (i.e. the values of the place beyond its utilitarian value) before policy decisions were made. This resulted in the appearance of the values-led approach in heritage management, first in Australia (Walker 2014) and later elsewhere. The values-led approach meant that the voices of local communities had to be seriously considered in heritage management.

At the same time as this was taking place in Australia, and perhaps because of it (Díaz-Andreu *et al.* 2016, 75–79), recognition by experts of social value was fostering discussions in academia, resulting both in the appearance of community archaeology (Marshall 2002) and the change in the meaning of public archaeology. This new type of public archaeology lost the strong administrative connotation the term had had until then (McGimsey 1972) and from the late 1980s came to indicate an 'archaeology for the public', aimed at creating an open, participatory and rational-critical debate concerning heritage (Matsuda 2004).

The articles included in this special issue reflect on the challenges brought about by the voice given to communities and, in heritage management, to the values-based approach. The authors' diversity of professional backgrounds—the state management sector (formerly, Olivier), a private company (Maaer) and universities (the rest of the authors)—also clearly reflects how profoundly these changes are affecting all sectors of the profession. Also, as the authors are based in Europe, the reflections made in the following pages show how a movement that started in Australia has influenced the way archaeological heritage is managed, taught, researched and practice in other continents, and in particular in Europe.

Adrian Olivier provides an excellent summary of how the changes in approaches to heritage management reached Europe, shifting from an exclusive interest in the values of experts to one in which public views have increasingly been incorporated. He demonstrates this by looking at the legislation passed by the Council of Europe. He contrasts attitudes to the public in four conventions agreed by the Council of Europe between 1969 and 2005. The earliest of them, the Granada Convention (Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage) of 1969, went beyond previous agreements. It did not only see the historical and artistic value of monuments, but recognized that their contemporary social uses had to be respected. The revision of this agreement resulted in the Valetta Convention of 1992, which went a step further by also acknowledging the need for experts to understand the cultural value of archaeological heritage and to help make people aware of the value of that heritage for understanding the past. However, despite their positive moves towards the public, both in their original and revised forms, these conventions followed a top-down approach. In contrast to these 1969 and 1992 conventions, the Florence Convention (European Landscape Convention) of 2000 represented the beginning of a bottom-up approach, at least in part, as it encouraged the active participation of the general public, as well as local and regional authorities, in landscape, policy and its implementation. The final convention discussed in the article, the Faro Convention of 2005, went even further. It acknowledged every person's right to participate in the cultural heritage of their choice and an 'individual and collective responsibility

towards cultural heritage' (Council of Europe 2005, Article 1). The difficulty that the implementation of this agreement has come up against, however, is how to operate and assess its application; in other words, how to move from theory to practice. For this, he argues, a new regulatory framework is needed.

In the next article, Siân Jones starts out by mentioning similar difficulties to those Olivier encountered: the complexity involved in attempting to consider social value and then measuring its effectiveness. She alerts us to the challenges that taking social values into account are bringing to the state of affairs. This is, for example, because communities may value places for their spiritual or symbolic meaning, whereas experts would have never considered them, given their only moderate historical character. Moreover, the supposed objectivity of values is now confronted by the new understanding of them as fluid, changeable and prone to challenge and negotiation. In this new acceptance, values may also be linked to intangible aspects of monuments and places. For the implementation of research sensitive to social values, Jones proposes social research methods, including focus groups, qualitative interviews and participant observation. She argues that the most useful method for producing social value is counter-mapping. She illustrates this with a reference to the ACCORD project,² whose purpose was to explore the potential of digital visualization technologies in community engagement and research.

A concrete example of how renewed interest in social values has affected heritage management is found in Gareth Maaer's article, which deals with the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). Started on 19 November 1994, the revenue generated by the Lottery has reached £32bn, of which £7bn has been invested in heritage projects. Initially, grants were given to large projects put forward by heritage experts. However, in 1999, the recently elected Labour government decided to prioritize wider public access to culture. As a result of the second strategic plan in 2002, people were encouraged to apply for smaller grants for projects related to heritage that they believed to be valuable. From 2012, the pursuit of social impact has led to an 'outcomes framework' in which expected outcomes have to explicitly address not only issues relating to heritage, but also people and communities. Maaer coincides with the two previous authors in highlighting the difficulties of assessing social benefit, despite the HLF commitment to fostering it.

In the last article, by Margarita Díaz-Andreu and Apen Ruiz, the leading role of the expert denounced by all three previous authors is reversed. The case study discusses social values in practice in an event that, had it been organized in the UK, may well have been funded by the HLF. In this event, experts became participants in an activity led by members of the public. The case study relates to the Rua Xic festival, an intercultural project organized in Barcelona aimed at strengthening personal relations in a neighbourhood of great cultural diversity, which in 2014 chose 'antiquity' as its main theme. Two archaeologists joined the team with the aim of undertaking participatory action research. This led to mixed feelings among the experts, due to the people's lack of interest in historical accuracy. The project had its positive side: residents from many different ethnic backgrounds living near the Archaeology Museum reported having visited it for the first time; history indeed reinforced their sense of identity, although this was mainly an imaginary history. Their identity was also strengthened by creating pride in a place in their neighbourhood—the museum. However, the same problem identified by all the authors remained: how could the social value created by this event be assessed? There are no means by which the museum was able to tap this experience to claim social value, except by alluding to anecdotal accounts.

This special issue stems from the discussions held within the framework of the European JPI-JHEP Heritage Values Network (H@V) project (www.heritagevalues.net) (grant number AH/L50371X/1), whose Spanish team was financed by the Spanish Ministry of

Economy and Competitiveness (Project ref. PCIN-2013-036). Other results of the same discussions can be found in Díaz-Andreu (2016).

Funding

This work was supported by Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad [grant number PCIN-2013-036] supporting the Spanish participation to the EU JPICH-JHEP Joint Pilot project “Heritage Values Network” [grant number AH/L50371X/I].

Notes

¹ International Council on Monuments and Sites.

² <https://accordproject.wordpress.com/>.

Citation information

Díaz-Andreu, Margarita. 2017. ‘Introduction’. Special Issue, Heritage Values and the Public, edited by Margarita Díaz-Andreu. *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 4(1): page 2–6.

MARGARITA DÍAZ-ANDREU , Guest Editor
Dept. de Prehistòria, H. Antiga i Arqueologia, Facultat de Geografia i Història,
Universitat de Barcelona, Carrer de Montalegre, 6, Barcelona 08001;
ICREA, Pg. Lluís Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain

ORCID

Margarita Díaz-Andreu  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1043-2336>

References

- Araoz, Gustavo F. 2011. “Preserving Heritage Places Under a New Paradigm.” *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 1:55–60.
- Council of Europe. 2005. *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. European Treaty Series 199. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Available at: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/199.htm>
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita. 2016. “Special Section: World Heritage and the Public.” *European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies* 6:189–332.
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita, Pastor, Ana & Apen Ruiz Eds. 2016. *Arqueología y comunidad: el valor social del patrimonio arqueológico en el siglo XXI*. Madrid: JAS Arqueología.
- Flood, Josephine. 1989. “‘Tread Softly for You Tread on My Bones’: The Development of Cultural Resource Management in Australia.” In: H. Cleere, ed. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Unwyn Hyman, pp. 79–90.
- ICOMOS. 2013. *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* 2013. Paris: ICOMOS (Online. Accessed 2 August 2016).
- Lafrenz Samuels, Kathryn. 2008. “Value and Significance in Archaeology.” *Archaeological Dialogues* 15:71–97.

- Lipe, William D. 1984. "Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources." In: Henry Cleere, ed. *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage. A Comparative Study of World Cultural Resource Management Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (New Directions in Archaeology), pp. 1–11.
- Marshall, Yvonne. 2002. "Special Issue: What Is Community Archaeology." *World Archaeology* 34:211–19.
- Matsuda, Akira. 2004. "The Concept of 'the Public' and the Aims of Public Archaeology." *PIA. Papers from the Institute of Archaeology. University College London* 15: Online.
- McGimsey III, Charles R. 1972. *Public Archaeology*. Nueva York: Seminar Press.
- Riegl, Alois. 1903 (1998). "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origins." In: K. Michael Hays, ed. *Oppositions Reader*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 69–83.
- Stapp, Darby C. (Ed). 2012. *Action Anthropology and Sol Tax in 2012: The Final Word?* Richland, WA: Northwest Anthropology.
- Torre, Marta de la. (Ed). 2002. *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage. Research Report*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Walker, Meredith. 2014. "The Development of the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter." *Association for Preservation Technology Bulletin [Special issue on values-based preservation]* XLV:9–18.