

ICOMOS ACTION PLAN ON THE 20TH CENTURY HERITAGE / SURVEY

Sandra Uskokovich *

1) Introduction

Originally, initiated as ICOMOS Action Plan on 20th C. Heritage, and named *Montreal Action Plan* (MAP20), this plan expresses the concern of ICOMOS members and committees about the protection, conservation, management and presentation of more recent forms of cultural heritage that demonstrate intellectual, social, technological or artistic evolution. MAP20 is the production of a global survey of the theme from the worldwide network of ICOMOS National and International Scientific Committees. It took place thanks to the financial support of Québec's Ministère de la Culture et des Communications, the City of Montréal, ICOMOS Finland, US/ICOMOS, and private organizations. This initiative has been actual for nearly 20 years and had brought together ICOMOS to co-operate with organizations such as DOCOMOMO, ICCROM, UNESCO, TICCIH, Council of Europe, the US and Canadian National Parks Services. ICOMOS has also been cooperating closely with UNESCO's World Heritage Center to promote the nomination of 20th century properties for the World Heritage List. Additionally, many national reports included in the Heritage at Risk 2000 Report, mentioned concern over the fate of various heritage types associated with 19th and 20th century that has been finally documented and identified in *the 20th century Heritage Survey* project that was undertaken with the support of the US/ICOMOS Summer Intern Program 2002.

At this moment, 19 countries have responded on the Survey Questionnaire to ICOMOS National and International Scientific Committees. The received responses in the Survey have been used as the basic nomenclature for this paper that addresses the issues of documentation and public awareness regarding the 20th century Heritage.

2) Documentation

Documentation of the 20th c. heritage represents a particular problem, made more difficult by the quantity of information and its diversity. The number and diversity of properties and their territorial distribution are such that preliminary processing of the information and critical analysis is essential. In order to assemble systematic documentation on 20th c. heritage it was essential to draw up list specific to 20th century heritage so as to take account of survey practices in the different world countries that promote mutual communication and understanding of these informative and analytical methods throughout the world.

The buildings of the 20th century are many in number and of

varying in character; they reflect both traditional and modernist values. The architecture of the 20th century cannot be considered in the same way as that of earlier centuries. It differs in terms of quantity, typology, and diversity. Considering its character, the 20th c. heritage is defined not only in relation to its architectural forms but also by taking into account the broad ecological, anthropological, economic and cultural framework. It is thus important for an understanding of 20th century architectural heritage to consider it within a broader social and cultural framework.

The process of the recognition of the 20th century architecture as a Heritage identifies heritage of outstanding universal value through new thematic approaches, such as the modes of occupation of land and space, industrial technology, urban ensembles, vernacular and reused buildings, environment and cultural landscape. These new thematic approaches formulated in the responses of the countries-participants given in 20th century heritage Survey underline the wealth of regional diversity within the 20th century heritage defining a 'heritage' as a point of convergence between location and culture. It should be also mentioned that the concept of the 20th century Heritage has been defined at the beginning of this project by:

- the international scope of the concept;
- the existence and importance of "permanence" and "continuity" in 20th century;
- the interrelationship between the concepts of "material" and "memory";
- the influence of tradition on the international expression alongside the development of local or regional expressions. Such framework enabled to postulate the concept of the 20th century heritage from a regional perspective that starts at the local level and proceeds successively to the national and international perspectives.

The application of authenticity as a criterion for evaluating the 20th century Heritage, which is at least as subject to change as earlier heritage, is still one of the topic of on-going discussion in the heritage field and has also become actualized in this Survey. Since far more was built in the 20th century than in any other century, the sheer amount of buildings demands a certain selection that is critical in terms of the historic and artistic quality of what is to be preserved.

Most of the countries responded that there are no specific

riteria regarding the listing of the 20th c. heritage properties. The methodology that has been adopted for the identification of the 20th century heritage is “significance” based, that includes either or both: historical, architectural, technological, cultural-social and national significance.

In the same way that countries participants are not specific regarding the criteria for the identification/recognition of the 20th century Heritage, most of them do not define a legal or regulatory constraint for its listing and protection (see Table I). Responses regarding the issue of time constraint for the recognition, evidence that there is still a great caution in approaching post-war heritage what becomes verified by imposed ‘50 years’ time constraints as a minimum age for listing of 20th c. heritage.

One may argue that by removing and/or changing the legislated ‘50 year’ (‘fifty year rule’ for listing) cutoff date would enable professionals to more consciously expand the notion of heritage and create a more inclusive, representative register of historic places. This hypothesis raises a whole series of following questions such as: “Would not this initiative only make more difficult to choose what to save and what to demolish since this section of the heritage is recent, abundant in examples, wide-ranging and diverse in character? Would such approach produce only quantitative contribution to 20th c. Heritage List, resulting in informative publication without control on how these properties will be utilized. Is time constraint necessary in order to allow sufficient time for historical perspective and scientific analysis? Also, can we have sufficient critical distance to judge the outstanding universal value of a product of our generation?” These are the questions that need to be answered, and we hope that this Survey on the 20th century Heritage could be used as a springboard for identifying and establishing a criteria regarding legal, time and other constraints regarding the recognition of this heritage.

3) Monitoring

Type of Recognition

Countries-participants demonstrate their determinacy of acknowledging the value of significant works taken from the whole range of styles, types and construction methods of the 20th century architectural heritage (see Table I for details). The overall impression of the responses received in this survey, suggests and follows the path towards *localizing* universal modernistic concepts. The selection of the 20th century heritage properties refers to diverse types of cultural goods, but more important, to their significance to the community.

This section of the 20th century heritage Survey relates to the types of recognition that is a reflection of how heritage is evolving in terms of perception which in turn reflects on the methodology for its documentation and recognition. The methodology used in this survey does not correspond to any traditional classification of the heritage according to the

architectural style or tendencies that is based purely on the aesthetic terminology but is formulated as thematic survey. The themes included are: type of recognition, time/legal constraint, conservation, youngest features. It is the quality of the total urban concept, that is important and that should bring potential answers to the *place as a whole* rather than focusing on style or authenticity alone.

Considering the all-previous mentioned factors, it should be noted that the responses to this survey does not present coherent list, as well as the responses of the participants to the survey’ questionnaire are not in quantitative but also in qualitative way equally contributive. Regarding the previous mentioned, it should be taken into consideration the fact that the national registers vary from each other and we are not completely familiarized with them at this phase of the survey.

4) Public awareness

ICOMOS Action Plan on 20th century heritage (MAP20) initiated the understanding of the full diversity of the 20th century Heritage including the issues related to its documentation, recognition and conservation with special concern for cultural cross-fertilization and exchanges. The considerations on the constructed 20th century heritage elaborated in the Survey relate to a *dynamic concept of Heritage*, which must include the present and future of social life within the framework of sustainable development. This concept places the 20th century Heritage within the framework of general expectations of the community, with special attention given to the environment, economic activities, and cultural life. Over and beyond its expression as a work of architecture, the 20th century Heritage illustrates a social and cultural vision of community life, which can be situated in its international context through anthropological analysis. The involvement of all sectors of community is needed in the ‘construction of values’ and participation in the process of evaluation, itself an instrument for the development of new networks and motivation of participation.

The first notion that one becomes aware in dealing with 20th century heritage is the “international character” of this recent heritage that is expressed by its international coverage with the exchanges and influences among different regions. The study and promotion of the 20th century Heritage offers a unique opportunity for cultural cooperation and dialogue between cultures. The 20th century heritage expresses reciprocal influences, transnational artistic currents, the propagation of lifestyles, and underscores the interplay of both great universal tendencies and regional appropriations and original contributions.

MAP20 is intended to express the necessity of raising social and public awareness by understanding what heritage represents to the community. One of the major problems in the public reception of the 20th century Heritage is caused by unsuccessful dialogue between professionals and public. Professional language requires certain expertise that the

public can hardly master and instead is being introduced to “the world of heritage” by touristic animators. We are often witnesses of the mere passive role of local inhabitants who participate by being tourists on the site. In order to get the broader audience we seek for the involvement of cultural tourism that will enhance public participation in such a way that it will preserve local differences and prevent the trivialization of human environment.

But far more, when it comes to the public response and receptiveness to the 20th century heritage, the same imperatives that establish it such as functionalism, economy of means, total detachment from past and reliance on modern technologies have become the main argument in defining the 20th century Heritage for not being “historic” or detached from “history” and by so not accepted in public.

Our argument of raising public awareness is directed to the point when the public will begin to understand the cultural values of their own habitat since such process offers them the opportunity to acquire a sense of identity with their habitat that is modifying rapidly and continuously. Public understanding is not only important in terms of deepening the “metaphysical dimension” of human existence but is also contributing factor in their educational experience.

Notwithstanding the significance of national inventory lists, the contributive factor that evidence the importance and increase of public awareness considering the 20th century, is that each country participant has enlisted national selective bibliography of publications relating on 20th century heritage and their own local/national activities on 20th century heritage and organizing groups. These organizations – ICOMOS, Art Deco Society, 20th century Society, National Trusts, DOCOMOMO, and State heritage agencies, perform an advocacy role, raising awareness and promoting interest when places are under threat. On one hand lobbying by some of these groups has resulted in certain places being listed or conserved and on the other hand these groups were instrumental in organization of many activities on 20th century heritage such as: seminars, conferences, international symposiums and publications (from leaflets, local newspapers and journals to books and dissertations).

We are hoping that this kind of project will promote awareness of the value and distinctive character of the various forms of the 20th century heritage among professionals, the media and the public at large. The co-operation of the ICOMOS National Committees and the participating countries is vital for the recognition, promotion and protection of the 20th century Heritage.

5) Conclusion

Survey results suggest that 20th century heritage needs wider criteria if it is to be designated as ‘historic’. Countries like Finland and Australia have already adopted the ‘wider’ criteria whose lists are more culturally and socially diverse in recognizing the broad range of properties and themes as the

20th century heritage. The values corresponding to ‘wider’ criteria must reflect the in-depth of the 20th century culture what is not easy task since this kind of approach requires evaluation of the rapidly changing culture.

Finally, this Survey evidences that the concept of the 20th century Heritage has been expanded from the exclusive concept of the material culture to the intangible aspects of heritage including industrial heritage, education, cultural landscape, planning, and community life. Such notion expresses the inextricable link between built and non-built environment that compose the 20th century heritage as a “whole”.

The 20th century Heritage should be chosen as exemplar from the vast field of historic heritage as the one that concerns our daily environment most directly. This project-ICOMOS ACTION PLAN on 20th century Heritage/Survey evidence that the notion of historic heritage and its practices have spread beyond geographical borders and consequently, due to the new modes of “communication” have gained world-wide recognition. Historic heritage should not be just a phrase that refers above all to an institution but should refer also to a resource for the enjoyment of a community. Our heritage is our “mirror” that raises important issues on the state of society in which we are living.

The remaining question is how to link professional criticism and more direct response of a visually uneducated public to an admittedly unfamiliar, experiential world.

We must be aware that in comparing the taste of public and of professionals we are “walking on the slipping floor”. Any kind of aesthetic category such is the question of the taste (we can recall the numerous debates on the issues of the “style”) can not be relevant in establishing any significant criteria since we are entering into subjective field and such, in this case reveals only divergence between two poles. Our intention is to present “humanist” 20th c. Heritage that is idea of human habitat rather than some fixed architectural pattern as it is often described.

* **Sandra Uskokovich**

Art Historian (University of Zagreb, Croatia). Historic Buildings Conservator (National Committee for Monuments and Sites, Dubrovnik, Croatia; currently on leave of absence). M.A. candidate in Historic Preservation Program (The George Washington University, U.S.). Summer intern 2002 (US/ICOMOS, Washington). Coordinator of the ICOMOS 20th century heritage Global Survey (present work).

The 20th century heritage Global Survey is an international action plan and a scientific and co-operative program for ICOMOS. With the support of US/ICOMOS, this survey is carried out through all its National and International Committees. The 20th century heritage survey is aimed to promote 20th century heritage; to put a special emphasis on the 20th century heritage in the 2002 edition of the Heritage@Risk Report and to co-operate fully with UNESCO and the other partners to develop workshops and meetings on that theme.

Table 1

Country	Recognition	Type of Recognition	Time/legal constraints	Conservation issues	'Youngest feature'
Argentina	No*	Dwellings, technical design, churches, new cities.	No		SEBRA bank, 1966
Australia	No*	Streetscape, beaches, botanical gardens, urban places, public buildings, native/vernacular aboriginal sites, environmental arch.	No	<i>Burra Charter</i> guides conservation practice	Sculpt. garden in NGA, 1982
Austria	No*	Miner's settlement, schools, factories, housing, commemorative sites	No		Kerzengeschaft Retti, 1985
Bolivia	No*	Urban complexes, palaces, universities, industrial arch.	50 years age limit		Univ.La Paz, 1948
Czech Republic	No*	Urban ensembles, new towns reconstructions, industrial arch., technical and vernacular design.	No	Preservation maintained to the level of authenticity, adaptation	Radio Free Europe, 1996
Cyprus	No*	Residences, schools, industrial arch.	No		
Finland	No*	Cottages, housing districts, suburbs, shopping center, banks, tourism/transport buildings, hospitals, roads, schools, cinemas, churches, industrial arch.	No	<i>Land Use Building Act</i> forms a basis of building conservation	Finlandia Hall, 1971-1975
France	Yes	City hall, sports buildings, city parks, residential arch, industrial and educational architecture.	50 years age limit	Restoration trend in 1970s and 1980s	Grand Stade France, 1997
Indonesia	No*	City plan, gardens, hotels, villas, streets, districts.	50 years age limit		
Luxembourg	No*	Residential, industrial, commercial and transportation arch.	No		
Netherlands	Yes	Commercial architecture, new towns, industrial arch., housing, engineering works, public buildings, churches.	50 years age limit		Groothandelsgebouw, Rotterdam, 1953
Poland	No*	Department store, dwelling colony, new cities, sports hall.	No		Katovice, 1960-71
Slovenia	No*	Libraries, villas, skyscrapers.	No		Trg Republike
Spain	No*	Banks, universities, hotels, housing, commercial arch...urban ensembles.	No		Control tower, Ceuta airport, 1999.
Suisse	No*	All types/styles	No		Cube,J.Nouvel
Turkey	No*	Apartment buildings, residences, mosque, industrial arch.	No	Restoration with a new function/adaptation	Mosque Turk. Assembly, 1987
UK	No*	Social housing schemes, industrial arch., cathedrals, world heritage sites.	30 years age limit	Differing practices in three home countries	Express Lift Tower, 1982
Venezuela	No*	Urban complexes, schools, airports, tourist buildings.	50 years age limit		C.C.La Vega, 1956-8
Zambia	No*	Residences, industrial buildings, vernacular arch.	No		Pres.Residence 1946

*. country has no specific criteria regarding the listing of the 20th century Heritage