

Cultural Heritage Management

Assignment 2

Student Name: **Akashdeep**

Submission Id: **DE240119**



The "Expert-First" Way: Material-Centric Conservatism

The **conventional approach** is what most of us have seen throughout history. It is built on the idea that a building or object is important simply because it is old, beautiful, or was built by a famous architect. Scholars like Laurajane Smith (2006) describe this as the "Authorized Heritage Discourse" (AHD). In this world, the experts the archaeologists, historians, and conservators are the ones who hold the power. They are the ones who get to decide what is "important" enough to be saved, often based on rigid academic criteria.

The main goal here is preservation in its most literal sense. It is almost like trying to stop time or trap history in a bell jar. You want to make sure the physical "fabric" of the building doesn't change or decay (Jokilehto, 2017). While this sounds noble, it can be very exclusionary. A famous example of this is the historical management of the **Acropolis in Athens**. For decades, experts wanted it to look like a "perfect" Classical Greek monument. To achieve this, they actually tore down medieval towers and Ottoman-era structures that had been part of the site for centuries. They basically "edited" history to make the site fit a specific, expert-approved vision of the past, treating the physical marble as the only thing that mattered while ignoring the living layers of time that followed.

The "People-First" Way: Managing Social Significance

Then we have the **value-led approach**, which really started to change the landscape of heritage management with the **Burra Charter (1979)**. This philosophy argues that a pile of rocks isn't heritage just because of its age; it becomes heritage because of the values we the living community attribute to it. It looks beyond the physical and considers social, spiritual, and even emotional values (Fredheim & Khalaf, 2016).

In this model, the local community is just as important as the professional expert. Instead of trying to keep everything exactly the same, the goal is to manage change in a way that keeps the "soul" of the place alive. Take **Uluru in Australia** as a prime example. For a long time, it was managed conventionally as a geological wonder for tourists to climb. However, when management shifted to a value-led model, they began to prioritize the spiritual significance of the site to the Anangu people. This eventually led to the permanent closure of the climb in 2019, proving that living cultural values can and should be more important than physical recreation or tourism revenue.

Evaluating Effectiveness: Why This Matters Today

In our modern, fast-moving society, the **value-led approach** is widely considered the more effective way to work, though it isn't without its hurdles.

The reason it works so well today is that it keeps heritage relevant. If we only focus on the "old stuff" and ignore the people living nearby, we end up with something called "museumification." This is where a site becomes a "dead zone" a place that feels like a ghost town visited only by tourists, completely disconnected from the local community (Harrison, 2013). When people feel like a site belongs to them and reflects their own stories, they are much more likely to advocate for its protection. It turns heritage into a tool for social identity rather than just a dusty history lesson (Smith, 2006).

Furthermore, the value-led approach is better suited for contemporary challenges like urban development and decolonization. It allows us to ask whose history we are actually saving. By acknowledging that different groups might value a site for different reasons, we can avoid the "erasure" seen in conventional methods.

However, we can't completely throw out the conventional side. We still need the technical experts to make sure a 500-year-old building doesn't literally fall down. The most successful modern projects find a "sweet spot" or a hybrid balance. They use the technical skills of the conventional approach to ensure physical longevity, but they use the value-led approach to make sure the building has a purpose and a heartbeat in the modern world (Veldpaus et al., 2013). This ensures heritage is not just something we look at behind a glass case, but something we live with every day.

Conclusion

Ultimately, the shift from conventional to value-led management is a shift from seeing heritage as a "thing" to seeing it as a "process." While the conventional approach gave us the technical tools to save the physical past, the value-led approach gives us the reason to keep it. In a contemporary context, a site that is physically perfect but socially ignored is a failure. Effectiveness today is measured not just by how much of the original stone remains, but by how deeply the site is woven into the lives of the people who interact with it.

References

- **Fredheim, L. H., & Khalaf, M. (2016).** The significance of values: heritage value assessment in theory and practice. *Heritage & Society*, 9(2), 155-181.
- **Harrison, R. (2013).** *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Routledge.
- **Jokilehto, J. (2017).** *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Routledge.
- **Smith, L. (2006).** *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge.
- **The Burra Charter (1979/2013).** *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*.
- **Veldpaus, L., Pereira Roders, A. R., & Colenbrander, B. J. (2013).** Urban Heritage: Putting the Past into the Future. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 4(1), 3-18.