

## REPORT OF MRS. HAUSEN

There are two aspects of the question of the preservation of buildings which have not been discussed by this congress, or rather two kinds of approach to the problem.

One is realization of the question, something which has become more obvious the more people in general, as well as scholars from other fields, have enlarged the small circle of experts directly working in the field.

The other is the social approach to be found among the so-called "radical youth" today, which has led to direct action and new activities.

On interdisciplinary work for preservation I can give the example of one multi-disciplinary institution, which has during the years showed interest in the subject. That is the "Scandinavian Summer University" or "Nordiskt sommaruniversitet" known as the NSU. This organization holds seminars, congresses, discussions, and so on, and is not directly concerned with research, although the members are mostly academics. It has for many years had a town-planning group recruiting from all the Scandinavian countries architects, lawyers, sociologists, ecologists, art historians, mass-media people, social workers, and so on. The value of discussions on such broad terms has been obvious, although there have been difficulties. Interdisciplinary work in general is now accepted in every conceivable field as a matter of course. I suggest that it might be valuable for an organization like ICOMOS to enlarge its activity in this direction, which would mean establishing contacts with other organizations and institutions working in fields related in some way or other to preservation problems.

The question of the younger generation and the necessity of enlisting their support for preservation work is also of first-rate importance; since they are the ones who have to face the whole problem on a really world-wide basis and will have the necessary means at their disposal-technological and administrative means which are still only beginning to shape up. That means, however, that one has to accept their way of thinking and handling things, which are not always those the present generation would perhaps prefer.

To the young people the preservation problem is as much a social question as an aesthetic one, perhaps even more so. This attitude is related to a new way of looking at town-planning, to the efforts to get ordinary people interested in and able to shape their own environment, to work against alienation in advanced societies as well as backward ones. Preservation work as such has long since been related to ordinary town-planning in theory, although certainly not always in practice. In the discussion of goals for the future, ancient buildings and environments worth conserving are usually included in the system as an item among many others. In the socialist countries this system functions (or otherwise) according to how much money the government is willing or able to put into the work. In the countries with a capitalist economy great efforts are usually needed to save even very valuable monuments and buildings and purely economic criteria are usually in the end those which determine what is to be retained. What is taking place now among the young is the realization that this problem is not only economic but political and a matter of political ideology. This greatly increases the possibilities of fighting for preservation, as possibilities always increase once a situation is more clearly defined. This is now the case in Scandinavia, especially in Sweden, which is most advanced in this respect. The fight for preservation is closely linked to practical and down-to-earth action for the implementation of theoretical, ideological ideas, which has assumed many astonishing forms, sometimes with a very positive result. It has led to protest marches, meetings and occupation of buildings with some violence, but also to closer relations between people living in the same house or the same block in a city.

Thus people who were formerly total strangers now come together in corporations, parties and meetings, arrange collective services for themselves, force the landlord to repair a building when he would much prefer to let it go to pieces, whether valuable or not, or tear down walls in backyards and open up holes and doors to create a thoroughfare. Has such action been successful on a large scale? Certainly not. But every new incident brings up new points for discussion.

It is hardly far-fetched to suggest that Jane Jacobs with her "Death and Life of the Great American Cities" has provided one of the sources of inspiration.

This is a way to preserve many — though certainly not all — perfectly usable and valuable buildings and environments. A way of putting pressure on planning authorities to react to demands for preservation. A way to impose real and not merely symbolical restrictions on forces which see human environment only as something to be profitably exploited. Perhaps it should be added that this way of forcing the issue makes it necessary for everybody working in preservation to take a political standpoint and reflect upon the consequences of the political system he supports privately.

There is still a third question which I want to touch upon briefly, and that is world tourism, which was discussed by ICOMOS in the summer of 1969.

There are problems within the developed countries in this field, but this is not my point. What I would like to direct your attention to is the situation in the developing countries where big-scale exploitation has already begun.

This is a fruitful field for investments and no drawbacks have become apparent as far as I know. Just as natural resources have been used for exploitation and the resultant profits drained away from countries already poor, with little betterment of the condition of the people living in them, so can the national monuments and sites of a defenceless country — or even a continent — be taken care of by outsiders who build their own world-wide tourist networks. Tourism has a positive effect on most countries in many ways, to be sure. But it can of course be extremely destructive, and all the more so if it is not developed and built up in a realistic relationship with the inhabitants of the regions where the tourist sites are.

There is a great deal of money to be made, but why should the profits deriving from ancient buildings and structures which belong to all mankind go to the private concerns?

Marika HAUSEN,  
Finland.