

NEWSLETTER



World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region



No.33 · May 2016

新闻动态 WHITRAP NEWS 01

太平洋地区世界遗产行动计划 (2016-2020) 地区研讨会在斐济首都苏瓦举行 / 亚太地区历史性城镇景观 (HUL) 国际培训班在中国上海举行 / 联合国教科文组织执行局主席 Michael Worbs 先生访问我中心

Regional Meeting on the Pacific Region World Heritage Action Plan (2016-2020) held in Suva, Fiji / The Asia-Pacific Region Training on HUL Held at WHITRAP Shanghai on 14-17 December 2015 / The Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Mr. Michael Worbs visited WHITRAP

学术会议 ACADEMIC CONFERENCE 05

亚洲木构建筑保护哲学的几点认知 / 2013年“重温木构建筑保护哲学——木构建筑的修复方法及其保护哲学”国际会议总结 / 2014年“重温木构建筑保护哲学——木构建筑和本土社区相关的文化景观”国际会议总结 / 2015年“重温木构建筑保护哲学——亚洲木构建筑的价值和真实性概念”国际会议总结

Views on the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures in Asia / Conclusion of the International Conference 2013—“Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: Restoration Method for Wooden Structures and Its Philosophy” / Conclusion of the International Conference 2014—“Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: Cultural Landscape with Wooden Structures and Local Communities” / Conclusions of the International Conference 2015—“Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: The Value of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Concept of Authenticity”

研究前沿 RESEARCH FRONTIER 15

文化遗产保护的“真实性”和“完整性”——纪念《威尼斯宪章》50周年和《奈良文件》20周年学术沙龙观点摘要 / 从中国文物古迹保护准则修订看文化遗产保护观念的发展 / 城市世界遗产与真实性问题

The Authenticity and Integrity of the Conservation of Cultural Heritage—Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Venice Charter and the 20th Anniversary of Nara Document Heritage Forum / Development of Cultural Heritage Protection reflected by the Revised Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China / Urban World Heritage Sites and the Problem of Authenticity

遗产现场 HERITAGE ON SPOT 39

“坚持活态保护 传承乡村文明”——松阳县传统村落保护发展工作的主要做法

Insistence on Living Culture Protection, the Inheritance of Rural Civilizations—The main strategy of Song Yang County Traditional Villages' Conservation and Development

遗产知识 HERITAGE KNOWLEDGE 42

IUCN 世界公园大会
IUCN World Parks Congress

亚太地区世界遗产 WORLD HERITAGE IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION 44

方芽 - 科邦国家公园 / 百济遗址区

Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park / Baekje Historic Areas

总 编 周 俭	Editorial Director: ZHOU Jian
主 编 邵 雨	Editor-in-Chief: SHAO Yong
执行主编 刘 真	Managing Editor: LIU Zhen
助理编辑 林玟均	Assistant Editor: LIN Chieh Chun
翻 译 裴洁婷 林玟均 罗 希	Translators: PEI Jieting LIN Chieh Chun Luo Xi
审 校 刘 真 林玟均	Proofreading: LIU Zhen LIN Chieh Chun
英文审校 Catherine Lennartz	English Proofreading: Catherine Lennartz
发 行 裴洁婷	Publishing: PEI Jieting
美术编辑 蔡奇杉	Design: CAI Qishan

本刊属内部刊物。未经本单位书面许可，任何个人或单位不得以任何形式使用本刊发表的所有形式的图文资料，本刊将保留一切法律追究的权利。

Copyright Notice:

WHITRAP Newsletter is a restricted publication, and the written and visual contents of it are protected by copyright. All articles and photos cannot be reprinted without the prior written consent of WHITRAP Shanghai. All rights reserved.



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织



World Heritage
Convention

世界遗产
公约



The World Heritage Institute of Training and
Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region
under the auspices of UNESCO

亚太地区世界遗产
培训与研究 中心

联合国教科文组织亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究 中心 (以下简称 WHITRAP) 是联合国教科文组织的二类国际机构, 是在发展中国家建立的第一个遗产保护领域的此类机构。它服务于亚太地区《世界遗产公约》缔约国及其他联合国教科文组织成员国, 致力于亚太地区世界遗产的保护与发展。

联合国教科文组织亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究 中心由北京、上海、苏州三个中心构成。上海中心 (同济大学承办) 主要负责文化遗产保护相关项目, 包括城镇、村落保护与可持续发展、建筑 / 建筑群 / 建筑遗址保护以及文化景观保护等; 北京中心 (北京大学承办) 主要负责自然遗产保护、考古发掘与遗址管理以及文化景观管理; 苏州中心 (苏州市政府承办) 主要负责传统建筑技术和修复、保护材料分析以及历史园林的修复与维护。

The World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITRAP) is a Category II institute under the auspices of UNESCO. It was the first international organization in the field of world heritage to be established in a developing country. Mandated by the States Parties of the World Heritage Convention and other States Parties of UNESCO, the institute was founded to promote the conservation and development of World Heritage in Asia and Pacific Region.

WHITRAP has three branches: one in Beijing, another Shanghai, and the third in Suzhou.

The Shanghai Centre at Tongji University focuses on the conservation of cultural heritage, such as the sustainable development of ancient towns and villages, architectural sites, architectural complexes, and cultural landscapes.

The Beijing Centre at Peking University is in charge of natural heritage conservation, archaeological excavation, and management of the sites' cultural landscape.

The Suzhou Centre, hosted by Suzhou Municipal Government, is in charge of traditional architectural craftsmanship and restoration, conservation materials analysis, and historic garden restoration and maintenance.

焦点新闻

In Focus

太平洋地区世界遗产行动计划 (2016-2020) 地区研讨会在斐济首都苏瓦举行



2015年12月1-4日,太平洋地区世界遗产行动计划(2016-2020)地区研讨会在斐济首都苏瓦举行,来自世界遗产中心、太平洋有关岛国以及地区性保护机构的近20名专家参加会议,我中心副秘书长李昕博士及顾问专家Cristina Iamandi应邀出席会议。与会专家首先分析了太平洋地区面临的诸如气候变化、保护管理薄弱、旅游对遗产地的影响等现状问题,随后分组讨论如何通过具有可实施性的行动计划改进地方的保护现状,我中心提议愿从能力建设(提供更多人才培训机会)和联合制定遗产地保护规划等方面对有关国家进行支持并展开合作。

Regional Meeting on the Pacific Region World Heritage Action Plan (2016-2020) held in Suva, Fiji

From the 1st to the 4th December 2015, the Regional Meeting on the Pacific Region World Heritage Action Plan (2016-2020) was held in Suva, Fiji. Nearly 20 professionals from the World Heritage Centre, Pacific Island Countries and relevant regional organizations attended the meeting. The Deputy Secretary-General of WHITRAP, Dr. Li Xin and Consultant Cristina Iamandi were invited to attend the meeting as well. The attending professionals analyzed the Pacific region's current problems such as climate change, weak protection and management, and tourism impacts on heritage sites, followed by group discussions on how to improve the situation of local protection through a practical action plan. WHITRAP proposed to support and cooperate with relevant countries through capacity-building (to provide more training opportunities) and co-develop protection plans for heritage sites.

“重温木构建筑的保护哲学:亚洲木构建筑的价值和原真性概念”国际会议在日本奈良举行

2015年12月16日至17日,由联合国教科文组织亚太文化中心(日本奈良)(ACCU)和我上海中心共同主办,日本文化厅、日本国家遗产院、国际文物保护与修复研究中心(ICCRUM)等机构协办的“重温木构建筑的保护哲学:亚洲木构建筑的价值和原真性概念”国际会议在日本奈良举行。为期两天的会议上,来自中国、日本、挪威、韩国、马来西亚、尼泊尔的遗产保护专家们汇聚一堂,分别介绍了所属国家与地区对原真性概念的不同阐释与理解。在讨论环节,各位专家从理论与实践方面对木构建筑的保护哲学进行了思考与探讨,并最终通过了《重温木构建筑的保护哲学建议书》。东南大学教授朱光亚、同济大学建筑与城市规划学院教授张松和我上海中心常务副主任陆伟应邀出席本次会议。连续三年举办的“重温木构建筑的保护哲学”国际会议所取得的丰硕成果,将对亚洲木构建筑的价值阐释以及真实性保护理念的发展起到一定的推动作用。



International Conference on “Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: Value of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Concept of Authenticity” held in Nara, Japan

The International Conference on “Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: Value of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Concept of Authenticity”, which was organized by the Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (Nara), WHITRAP Shanghai, in cooperation with the Agency for Cultural Affairs, Japan, the National Research Institute for Cultural Properties and ICCROM, was held from December

16th to 17th 2015 in Nara, Japan. The International Conference 2015 is the third and the last of the series, the first session was themed “Restoration Method for Wooden Structures and Its Philosophy” held in December 2015 in Nara and the second, themed “Cultural Landscape with Wooden Structures and Local Communities” was held in December 2014 in Shanghai.

The two-day meeting gathered heritage conservation experts from China, Japan, Norway, South Korea, Malaysia and Nepal to present different interpretations and understandings of authenticity among countries and regions. The participants revisited the conservation philosophy of wooden structures from both theoretical and practical aspects in the general discussion session, and adopted a final Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures Recommendation. WHITRAP Shanghai's Executive Deputy Director Ms. Lu Wei, Mr. Zhu Guangya, a Professor from Southeast University and Mr. Zhang Song, a Professor from Tongji University attended the meeting on behalf of WHITRAP.

The fruitful outcomes of the three sessions of the “Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures” conference series will promote the interpretation of values for wooden structures in Asia and the development of the idea of authenticity.

亚太地区历史性城镇景观(HUL)国际培训班在中国上海举行



2015年12月14日至17日,“亚太地区历史性城镇景观(HUL)国际培训班”在中国上海同济大学举办,来自德国、西班牙、荷兰、哥伦比亚、印度尼西亚、中国的17位遗产地管理者与专业人员参加了本期

培训。国内外知名专家向学员系统性地阐述了HUL的概念、方法和工具，并通过实地考察、圆桌讨论等方式，针对HUL方法在应用中的挑战和对亚太地区的影响展开了深入探讨。通过此次培训，我中心将继续加强并扩大HUL相关领域内的专家网络和项目合作平台，并提高学员具体实施HUL项目的能力。

The Asia-Pacific Region Training on HUL Held at WHITRAP Shanghai on 14-17 December 2015

The Asia-Pacific Region Training on HUL was held at WHITRAP Shanghai from 14th -17th December 2015. Within the framework of the Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals, this course aimed to reflect on the “what, why, and how” of the HUL approach, the latest developments in the field, as well as strengthened and enlarged the specialist network for HUL in the Asia-Pacific Region.

During the four-day training programme, practitioners and specialists participated in lectures, a field visit to Tongli Town, and a round table discussion on the challenges and impacts of the HUL approach. These activities were led by Chinese, regional, and international experts in the field. Among others, Zhou Jian (Director of WHITRAP-Shanghai and Professor of Urban Planning at Tongji University), Francesco Bandarin (UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture), Shao Yong (Executive Director of WHITRAP-Shanghai and Professor of Urban Planning at Tongji University), Han Feng (Director of Department of Landscape Architecture, Tongji University), Ken Taylor (Adjunct Professor at Australian National University), Cristina Iamandi (Conservation Architect and Urban Planning Consultant), Ana Pereira Roders (Assistant Professor at Eindhoven University of Technology), Susan Fayad (Coordinator Heritage Strategy for the City of Ballarat, Australia), Giulio Verdini (Co-Director of Research Institute of Urbanisation of Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University) and Harry Den Hartog (Professor at Tongji University), who all presented the HUL approach and its tool Kit implementation.

我中心、澳大利亚巴拉瑞特市和澳大利亚联邦大学澳大利亚历史联合研究中心 (CRAH) 签署了新的备忘录

2015年12月15日在上海中心，巴拉瑞特市、澳大利亚联邦大学的澳大利亚历史联合研究中心 (CRAH) 和我中心签订备忘录，目的是为了发展出一套历史城镇景观 (HUL) 的实施指导手册，协助当地政府实行2011年的HUL建议书。这份文件会在2016年7月于奥地利举办的国际历史城市联盟大会刊物中出版。

WHITRAP, Ballarat City and CRAH signed a New Memorandum of Understanding

On December 15th 2015, at WHITRAP Shanghai, Ballarat City, the Collaborative Research Centre in Australian History at Federation University in Australia (CRAH), and WHITRAP signed an MoU in order to develop an HUL Implementation Guide that will assist local authorities to implement the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. This document will be published within the context of the forthcoming International League of Historical Cities to be held in Austria next July 2016.

联合国教科文组织执行局主席 Michael Worbs 先生访问我中心



2016年4月25日，在中国联合国教科文组织全国委员会周家贵副秘书长的陪同下，联合国教科文组织执行局主席 Michael Worbs 先生访问我中心。中心副秘书长李昕博士首先介绍了中心自2008年成立以来的主要工作，随后同济大学副校长伍江介绍了同济与联合国教科文组织长期以来深度合作的历史，并与 Worbs 先生就双方未来合作进行了交流。最后，同济大学外办副主任严爱华及我上海中心常务副主任陆伟陪同 Worbs 先生一起参观了同济大学校园。

The Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Mr. Michael Worbs visited WHITRAP

On April 25th 2016, the Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Mr. Michael Worbs visited WHITRAP, accompanied by the Deputy-Secretary General of UNESCO China National Committee, Mr. Zhou Jiagui. The Deputy-Secretary General of WHITRAP, Dr. Li Xin introduced the main activities of WHITRAP since 2008, followed by the Vice President of Tongji University, Mr. Wu Jian introducing the long-term past of cooperation between UNESCO and Tongji University. Mr. Wu and Mr. Worbs also discussed the plan for future cooperation. In the end, the Deputy Director of Tongji University International Exchange and Cooperation Office, Ms. Yan Aihua and the Standing Deputy Director of WHITRAP Shanghai, Ms. Lu Wei accompanied Mr. Worbs for a visiting tour at Tongji University.

我中心与中国城市规划学会历史文化名城规划学术委员会签订合作备忘录



2015年12月14日，我中心与中国城市规划学会历史文化名城规划学术委员会（简称“名城学会”）在中国上海同济大学签订了合作备忘录。名城学会主任委员张兵、副主任委员赵中枢、秘书长鞠德东，联合国教科文组织文化助理总干事 Francesco Bandarin 和我中心秘书长周俭教授共同出席了签约仪式。在此合作框架下，双方将在未来三年内，为中国文化遗产保护建立国际性的合作平台，并共同建立维护文化遗产地保护的网路、数据库及相关材料。

WHITRAP and Historic City Planning Academic Committee of Urban Planning Society of China signed a Memorandum of Cooperation

On December 14th 2015, WHITRAP and the Historic City Planning Aca-

demic Committee of Urban Planning Society of China (UPSC) signed a Memorandum of Cooperation at Tongji University, Shanghai. The Chairman of UPSC, Zhang Bing; the Deputy Chairman, Zhao Zhongshu; the Secretary-General, Jude Dong; UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, Francesco Bandarin; and WHITRAP Secretary-General, Professor Zhou Jian attended the signing ceremony. Under the framework of the cooperation, WHITRAP and UPSC will establish an international cooperative platform for Chinese cultural heritage protection within the next 3 years, and co-build the networks, databases and related materials which will assure the continuation of cultural heritage protection.

联合国教科文组织创意城市网络国内工作组第二次会议在中国杭州举行



2015年12月12日，联合国教科文组织创意城市网络国内工作组第二次会议暨中国创意城市与金融创新合作发展论坛在中国杭州黄龙饭店举行。会议由中国联合国教科文组织全国委员会秘书长杜越主持，有关城市（深圳、成都、上海、杭州、北京、顺德、苏州、景德镇）及企业代表等约30人出席会议。杜越秘书长首先对下一步工作进行了总体部署，我中心副秘书长李昕博士介绍了工作组秘书处未来工作计划，随后各城市进行了工作交流与讨论。此后举行的2015中国创意城市与金融创新合作发展论坛，邀请来自京沪等地的代表性文创企业家和金融人士一起参加，旨在以工作组为平台推进有关政府与企业在金融领域的跨界合作。

The second meeting of the UNESCO Creative City Network Domestic Working Group held in Hangzhou, China

On December 12th 2015, the second meeting of the UNESCO Creative City Network Domestic Working Group and the China Creative City and Financial Innovation Cooperation and Development Forum were held in Hangzhou

Dragon Hotel, China. The meeting was hosted by the Secretary-General of UNESCO China National Commission Du Yue, and attended by representatives of related cities (Shenzhen, Chengdu, Shanghai, Hangzhou, Beijing, Shunde, Suzhou, Jingde Town) and enterprises. Du Yue first arranged the next steps for the overall deployment, the Deputy Secretary-General of WHITRAP Dr. Li Xin introduced the future work plan of the Working Group from the Secretariat, followed by work exchanges and discussions between representatives. Later on, the 2015 China Financial Innovation and Creative City Cooperation Forum was held: representatives of cultural and creative enterprises and financial professionals from Shanghai and other places were invited. They used the Working Group as a platform for promoting cooperation between governments and enterprises in the financial sector.

“我的社区我做主——参与式社区规划的理念与运作机制”学术沙龙在我上海中心举行



2016年3月21日，由同济大学建筑与城市规划学院景观系与我上海中心联合主办的学术沙龙“我的社区我做主——参与式社区规划的理念与运作机制”在我上海中心举行。台湾国立联合大学创意统合设计研究中心主任、社团法人台湾社区培立学会理事长王本壮教授首先作了主题报告，随后与会嘉宾围绕活动主题进行了深入交流与探讨。最后还举行了同济大学景观学系与上海杨浦区四平街道之间关于“景观提升与社区营造基地联合建设”校企联盟协议的签约仪式。

“My Community, I manage--the concept and operational mechanism of participatory community planning” Academic Salon held at WHITRAP Shanghai

On March 21st 2016, the academic salon “My Community, I manage--the

concept and operational mechanism of participatory community planning” co-sponsored by the School of Landscape Architecture, Urban Planning Department of Tongji University and WHITRAP Shanghai was held. The director of the National Taiwan United University Creative and Interdisciplinary Design Research Center, Professor Wang Ben Zhuang, gave a presentation, then the guests started in-depth exchanges and discussions. The result was a signing ceremony for the “Enhance the landscape & the joint base construction between communities” school-enterprise alliance agreement, signed by the Tongji University School of Landscape Architecture and Shanghai Yangpu District Siping Street.

我上海中心首个“文化遗产上海推广基地”在上海公益新天地揭牌



2016年3月27日，上海“公益创客”揭幕仪式在上海公益新天地举行。我中心秘书长兼上海中心主任周俭教授和遗产推广项目负责人刘真女士应邀出席揭幕仪式，并为我上海中心首个“文化遗产上海推广基地”揭牌。同日举行的还有同济大学“城市年轮”遗产教育社区二课堂公益创新项目启动仪式。“文化遗产上海推广基地”在上海公益新天地挂牌，将有效促进中心与各类致力于社会创新的政府部门、社会组织、企业、社区及个人之间的交流与合作，为中心文化遗产保护与推广项目的社会创新模式与地方经验的探索提供重要支持。

WHITRAP Shanghai's first "Cultural Heritage Promotion Base in Shanghai" unveiling in Shanghai Gongyi Xintiandi

On March 27th 2016, Shanghai's "Welfare Project" unveiling ceremony was held in Shanghai Gongyi Xintiandi. The secretary-General of WHITRAP, Professor Zhou Jian and the Leader of heritage promotion projects, Liu Zhen, were invited to attend the opening ceremony, and to unveil WHITRAP Shanghai's first "Cultural Heritage Promotion

Base in Shanghai". On the same day, Tongji University also launched the "City's Rings-Heritage Education Community II: Welfare Innovation in the Class" project. The new "Cultural Heritage Promotion Base in Shanghai" in Shanghai Gongyi Xintiandi will effectively promote exchanges and cooperation between WHITRAP and governmental departments, social organizations, businesses, communities and individuals dedicated to social innovation. It will also support the exploration of social innovation models, local experiences of cultural heritage protection, and promotion projects under WHITRAP.

城市年轮遗产教育社区二课堂在上海公益新天地启程



2016年4月16日和23日, 同济大学建筑与城市规划学院“城市年轮”的大学生志愿者们来到上海公益新天地, 为参与活动的小朋友和家长们分享了一堂题为“公益新天地的前世今生”的遗产宣讲课程。志愿者们通过介绍上海公益新天地的历史文化和园区内的建筑知识, 加深了孩子们对城市历史与建筑文化的了解, 同时也提升了孩子们对于非物质文化遗产的保护意识。在授课环节中, 主讲志愿者给小朋友和家长们介绍了公益新天地的历史变迁、通过介绍公益新天地园区内建筑的不同材质引出用老城墙砖建造普育堂所蕴含的文化遗产传承精神、公益新天地1911牌坊的历史意义与纪念价值。身处于公益新天地遍布历史遗产的环境之中, 讲述着历史文化的故事, 引起了孩子们的共鸣, 并激发了他们的想象力和参与性。大家还通过亲手拼装微型木制牌坊, 直观感受了牌坊的建造过程, 并了解了牌坊的组成结构, 加深了孩子和家长们对传统建筑文化的理解。寓教于乐的活动, 帮助孩子和家长们了解了公益新天地的历史和保护城市遗产的意义, 让遗产保护的观念与精神得以传播和传承。

"City's Rings-Heritage Education Community II" Course started at Shanghai Gongyi Xintiandi

On April 14th and April 23th 2016, Tongji University College of Architecture and Urban Planning held the "City's Rings-Heritage Education Community II". Volunteer students arrived at Shanghai Gongyi Xintiandi, gave a heritage presentation entitled "The past and now of Gongyi Xintiandi". By introducing the history and the architecture in Shanghai Gongyi Xintiandi, the volunteers promoted the knowledge of urban history and architectural culture, enhancing the children's awareness of intangible heritage protection. Hearing the historic stories in an environment full of historic heritage activated the imagination and enthusiasm of participant of the children. They also had chance to hand-make a mini model of the 1911 memorial arch, learning the building process and structure of the arch, understanding more about traditional architectural culture. The whole event combined education and entertainment, offered an opportunity for the children and their parents to understand the meaning of urban heritage protection, and promoted the idea of heritage protection.

乡村创客新型城镇化主题论坛在中国苏州芦墟镇举行

2016年3月18日, 乡村创客新型城镇化主题论坛在苏州芦墟镇318文化大院举行, 该论坛由途家网、上海慧域文化等主办, 来自环太湖地区相关政府代表、知名文创人士及有关专家一百多人等就农村供给侧改革、文旅小镇发展模式等问题进行了专题研讨。我中心秘书长周俭教授及副秘书长李昕博士应邀出席论坛, 周俭教授在嘉宾主题分享环节发表了题为“遗产保护与美丽乡村”的演讲。

"Rural Area Creative Project: New Urbanization Forum" held in Luxu Town, Suzhou, China

On March 18th 2016, the "Rural Area Creative Project: New Urbanization Forum" was held in Cultural Compound 318, Luxu Town in Suzhou. The forum was organized by Tujia.com and Shanghai Hui-yu Cultural Development Co., Ltd. Governmental representatives from the Taihu Lake area, well-known professionals from cultural and creative industries and over 100 experts from related fields gathered together to research and discuss is-

such as rural supply reformation and development models of cultural tourism towns. WHITRAP Secretary-General, Professor Zhou Jian and Deputy Secretary-General, Dr. Li Xin, were invited to attend the forum. Professor Zhou Jian gave a presentation entitled "Heritage protection and beautiful countryside" during the guest sharing session of the forum.

中国驻法大使馆教育处公使衔参赞马燕生先生访问我上海中心



2015年12月9日, 中国驻法国大使馆教育处公使衔参赞马燕生先生, 在同济大学外办主任于雪梅老师和同济大学组织部部长石成老师的陪同下, 参观我上海中心。我中心副秘书长兼上海中心副主任李昕博士负责接待, 并介绍了我上海中心的发展情况和主要活动。马燕生先生在听取汇报后肯定了中心的国际化平台作用, 并期待将来上海中心能给同济大学的学科建设与发展带来新的活力。

Mr. Ma Yansheng, Education Minister Counselor of the Chinese Embassy in France visited WHITRAP Shanghai

On December 9th 2015, the Education Minister Counselor of the Chinese Embassy in France, Mr. Ma Yansheng, visited WHITRAP Shanghai, accompanied by the Director of Tongji University International Exchange and Cooperation Office, Yu Xue-mei and the Vice Minister of the Organization Department of Tongji University, Shi Cheng. WHITRAP's Deputy-Secretary General and WHITRAP Shanghai's Deputy Director, Dr. Li Xin was responsible for the reception and introduced the development and main activities of WHITRAP Shanghai. After the report, Mr. Ma Yansheng endorsed WHITRAP's role as an international platform, and expressed his expectation that WHITRAP Shanghai will bring new vitality to the disciplines and developments of Tongji University in the future.

亚洲木构建筑保护哲学的几点认知

Views on the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures in Asia

文 / 张松¹

Written By/ ZHANG Song

按照联合国教科文组织亚太文化中心遗产保护与合作办事处（奈良，ACCU Nara）与联合国教科文组织亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究中心（WHITRAP）签署的合作协议，2013年至2015年连续三年在奈良、上海和奈良举办了“重温木构建筑保护哲学”的国际会议，来自中国、日本、韩国、印度尼西亚、印度、尼泊尔、不丹、斯里兰卡、越南等国家以及相关国际机构的代表参加了会议研讨和实地考察。会议通过特邀专家主旨报告、会议研讨以及实地调研，围绕亚洲木构建筑保护修缮的相关理念、方法和差异性进行了有深度的交流和深入的研讨，形成的具体成果见三册会议文件。

回顾ACCU和WHITRAP共同主办的三次“重温木构建筑保护哲学”国际学术研讨会，第一次会议以“木构建筑的修复方法及其保护哲学”为主题，关注于修复方法和《奈良文件》的相关问题；第二次会议的主题是“木构建筑和本土社区相关的文化景观”，针对“本土社区与文化多样性”，结合中国江南地区的保护实践经验进行了广泛而深入的探讨；第三次会议的主题为“亚洲木构建筑的价值和原真性概念”，在前两次会议的基础上，围绕木文化保护的意义，活的社区及宗教类木构建筑的保护等关键性问题，进行了全面的梳理、总结和行动呼吁。

在此，就自己了解的中日两国木构建筑的保护情况，并结合三次会议总结的要点，谈点个人的体会与大家分享、交流。

一、木构建筑保护和木文化遗产的意义

在亚洲，由于地理、气候、历史、文化、习俗和交流等因素影响，带来了亚洲建筑、城市及人居环境地缘的关联性和形态的多样性。与欧洲地区相比，亚洲地区这种基于历史关联的文化多样性和差异性可能更加明显，仅就利用木材建造房屋和聚落而言，材料基本相同，聚落形式、建筑形态和建造技术却呈现出千差万别的景观。

近代以来，新材料、新技术对亚洲地区的传统建造方法带来了巨大的冲击，在城市建造几乎全盘西化的同时，对如何对待传统生活文化和建筑技艺也走进了极大的误区。二次大战后，日本由于经济的快速发展，可能更早在对待传统文化方面开始觉醒，1950年制定的《文化财保护法》中针对古建筑、民居建筑以及传统技艺、民俗文化的保护均有涉及。

¹ 张松，同济大学建筑与城市规划学院教授。

¹ ZHANG Song, Professor of Collage of Architecture and Urban Planning, Tongji University.

Three international conferences named “Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures” were organized in consecutive years from 2013 to 2015 in Nara, Shanghai and again Nara by the Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (ACCU Nara) and the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITRAP) under the auspices of UNESCO. Representatives from China, Japan, South Korea, Indonesia, India, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam, along with experts from relevant international institutes attended the conferences and the field trips. Through a range of keynote presentations given by specially-invited experts, workshops and field work, the participants of the conferences held in-depth exchanges and discussions about preservation and restoration philosophies, methods and the different characteristics of wooden structures in Asia, the outcomes of which have been expanded into three documents, one at each conference.

Looking back on the three sessions of “Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures” International Conference co-organized by ACCU and WHITRAP, the first meeting’s sub-theme, “Restoration Methodology and Philosophy of Conservation of Wooden Structures” focused on methods of restoration and issues relating to the Nara Document. The second meeting, named “Cultural Landscape with Wooden Structures and Local Communities” prompted extensive and in-depth discussions based on the perspectives of “local communities and cultural diversity” and on conservation experience from the South Yangtze Delta region in China. The third meeting focused on the topic of the “Value of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Concept of Authenticity”. Based on the outcomes of the previous two sessions, it reviewed

and summarized the significance of the preservation of wood culture, as well as other major issues concerning living communities and religious wooden heritage in Asia, culminating in a call to action in this regard.

In this article, the author will share some personal insights on his understanding of the preservation of wooden structures in China and Japan, along with the major outcomes of the above three meetings.

1. The Preservation of Wooden Structures and the Significance of Transmitting Wood Culture

Influenced by various factors such as geography, climate, history, culture, social customs, and human exchanges, the architecture, cities and living settlements of Asia are characterized by geographical correlations and a diversity of forms. The historical cultural diversity and differences in Asia are more significant than their European counterparts. In terms of the utilization of wood materials in building houses and settlements alone, the same construction material are used in a wide range of diversified settlement patterns, building forms, and construction techniques.

In modern times, new materials and technologies have had a huge impact on traditional building techniques. Taken over by a westernized style of urban construction, it was a mistake to choose modern ways of life and building techniques over traditional ones. After World War II, thanks to its rapid economic development, Japan was among the first countries to be aware of the significance of traditional culture. The 1950 Japanese Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties prescribed the protection of historical buildings, residential buildings, traditional skills, and folk culture. A number of Japanese scholars of culture studies and architectural

不少的日本文化学者、建筑理论家，对木文化开展了深入的研究，甚至提出了日本是“木文化之国”的观念，将木文化研究和保护的意義提升到国家意识层面。

比较而言，我国木文化的历史更为悠久，历史上还影响到朝鲜、日本、越南等亚洲国家和地区，然而自身对木文化的研究和保护还缺乏系统和深入的研究，至今，对木构建筑保护的重要性的认识在全社会也并未达成共识。不少人以为欧洲城市保护好是因为他们的建筑是石头建造的，自然比木结构建筑可以更长久保存，容易进行保护。事实并非这么简单，传统石构建筑在自然灾害、人类战争和建设性破坏的威胁面前，同样也是十分脆弱的。如果欧洲国家没有保护立法，没有长期的保护实践探索，结局可想而知。因而，我们对木构建筑的永久性或短暂时问题的看法，绝不应简单化，或是先入为主形成固有思维，如果以木结构“难保存”、“无法保护”这样的观念指导实践、处理问题，在保护实践中必然会造成各种无法挽回的损失。而且木构建筑的保护修缮，与传统民居等普通建筑遗产保护再生的关系相当密切，直接涉及到历史街区、传统村落等不同类型的城乡建成遗产的保护和地区的文化复兴。

二、原真性和完整性原则下的亚洲木构建筑修缮

说到木构建筑保护的基本准则，早在1999年10月在墨西哥召开的ICOMOS第十二届会议上就通过了《历史性木构建筑保护的准则》(Principles for the Preservation of Historic Timber Structures)的国际文件，该文件前言中已明确阐述了在木构建筑保护方面应达成的共识：认识到作为世界上文化遗产的组成部分各历史时期木构建筑的重要性；考虑到历史性木构建筑的广泛多样性；考虑到建造它们的木材的不同种类和品质；认识到在不同环境和气候条件下，由湿度变化、光照、真菌和虫害，磨损、火灾以及其他灾害造成的材料损毁与衰退，带给木构建筑整体结构或局部结构的脆弱性；认识到因其脆弱性、不适当使用以及传统设计与建造技术技能和知识的丧失，历史性木构建筑的日益稀缺状况。

强调对历史性木构建筑进行保护修缮的任何干预必须谨慎。文化遗产保存和保护的首要目标是保持其历史的原真性和完整性(historical authenticity and integrity)。因此，任何干预都必须以适当研究和评估为基础。问题的解决应根据相关条件和需求，尊重历史性建筑或场地的美学价值、历史价值、以及物质的完整性(physical integrity)。采取的任何干预措施都应做到优先选取传统方式；如技术允许应当是可逆的；或是在未来进行必要干预时，至少不会对其保护工作造成不利影响或阻碍；并且不妨碍今后的保护工作者了解所做干预证据的可能。

这些基本原则和要求无疑对作为文化遗产的木构建筑保护与修缮具有指导意义。然而，因亚洲地区

theory have carried out in-depth research on wood culture and proposed that Japan is “a country of wood culture”. This was meant to raise awareness for the significance of studying and conserving wood culture in the whole nation.

In China however, wood culture has an even longer history and even influenced Korea, Japan, Vietnam and other Asian countries and regions. However, the study and preservation of its wood culture have not been carried out in a systematic and extensive way and society has not reached a consensus on the significance of protecting wooden structures. There are many who argue that European cities are better protected largely because their buildings are mostly made of stone, which are naturally more durable and better preserved than their wooden counterparts. But nothing is as simple as it seems. Traditional masonry structures are also vulnerable to various natural disasters, human warfare and destruction for development. Without proper legislations and a long-held conservation practices, European cities would not be as well preserved as they currently are. Therefore, *when it comes to the permanent and temporary aspects regarding problems of wooden structures, we shall neither simplify the conclusions nor fall into a fixed and pre-conceptualized way of thinking. The false idea that wooden structures are difficult or even impossible to preserve applied in practice will definitely cause irreversible mistakes.* Furthermore, the preservation and restoration of wooden structures goes hand in hand with the protection and regeneration of architectural heritage in general which includes residential buildings. It directly involves the protection of historic districts, traditional villages and a number of other urban-rural built heritage categories, as well as the cultural revival of the entire region.

II. The Preservation of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Principles of Authenticity and Integrity

In October 1999, an internation-

al instrument named Principles for the Preservation of Historic Timber Structures was adopted by ICOMOS at its 12th General Assembly in Mexico. It outlines the fundamental principles of the preservation of wooden structures. In the preamble, the document establishes a consensus regarding the principles to follow: to recognize the importance of timber structures from all periods as part of the cultural heritage of the world; to take into account the great diversity of historic timber structures; to take into account the various species and qualities of wood used to build them; to recognize the vulnerability of structures wholly or partially in timber due to material decay and degradation in varying environmental and climatic conditions, caused by humidity fluctuations, light, fungal and insect attacks, wear and tear, fire and other disasters; to recognize the increasing scarcity of historic timber structures due to vulnerability, misuse and the loss of skills and knowledge of traditional design and construction technology.

The document emphasizes that any preservation and conservation interventions carried out on historic structures should be cautious. The primary aim of preservation and conservation is to maintain the historical authenticity and integrity of the cultural heritage. Each intervention should therefore be based on proper studies and assessments. Problems should be solved according to the relevant conditions and needs with due respect for the aesthetic and historical values, and the physical integrity of the historic structure or site. Any proposed intervention should for preference follow traditional means; be reversible, if technically possible; or at least not prejudice or impede future preservation work whenever this may become necessary; and not hinder the possibility of later access to evidence incorporated in the structure.

These principles are certainly of great importance in guiding the preservation and conservation of wooden structures as part of the cultural heritage of the world.

的木构建筑类型、特征和保存状况存在巨大的差异性，简单套用并不能解决实际问题，特别是面对大量普通建筑遗产和历史地区内的木构建筑时。因而，在1994年的《关于真实性的奈良文件》中就提出了任何文化遗产都是一定时空的产物，认识和评价文化遗产需要尊重其文化及信仰系统的所有维度的主张。文化遗产价值以及相关信息来源可信度的评估和判断，在不同的文化间、甚至是相同的文化内，都可能会存在差异，因而基于某些固定的准则进行价值与真实性评估是不可能的。

在奈良召开的“重温木构建筑保护哲学”第一次会议上，针对**过于强调材料真实性和最小程度干预，可能带给木构建筑修缮、修复的困难程度做了充分的讨论，尤其是涉及活的遗产、文化景观和城市保护等更大范畴的文化遗产时，需要重新思考我们的保护原则和保护哲学。**而且世界遗产委员会、ICOMOS等国际机构制定的相关宪章中的保护理念与实际操作过程中的技术处理并不是简单地服从的关系。事实上，基于1964《威尼斯宪章》精神的《世界遗产实施公约操作指南》每一、两年就要进行修订和增补。2015年，ICOMOS中国委员会对《中国文物古迹保护准则》也进行了大幅修订和增补，这些都是在国际保护理念和原则指导下，结合时代变化和地区实践经验行的必要行动。

三、传统木构建筑的技艺传承与人才培养

与整个文化遗产保护领域国际合作的局面类似，木构建筑保护修缮的国际交流与合作需要加强，特别是亚洲地区的木构建筑保护领域的合作、交流，保护技术的切磋和经验分享，需要更为广泛且深入的开展。

在亚洲国家中，日本的木构建筑保护与修缮实践积累了相当丰富的经验，并且参与国际遗产保护合作也比较早。因而，其文化遗产保护研究和修缮技术探索，特别是传统木构建造工艺和修缮技术的传承和应用方面，都有一些值得我们学习和借鉴之处。如何排除主观主义和虚无主义的干扰，实事求是地进行分析、鉴别和参考借鉴，需要在了解、理解的基础上逐步摸索。

保护技术方面的合作与交流互动，也要尊重文化多样性，尊重不同地域的实践探索。但首先应当相互了解，在国内有少数人把日本的经验简单化，如将伊势神宫“式年更替”这类少数特殊的宗教建筑的建造传统，当作全日本传统建筑的建造或修缮模式看待。此外，日本的无形文化遗产保护的经验和世界上也是领先的。就建筑方面的传统工艺培训、匠人精神培养、传承人制度而言，在京都市就设有数所专门学校为年轻人学习传统木构建筑技术提供机会，由于匠人的地位和收入

However, the application of simple models is not the solution to practical problems, especially in the case of wooden structures which are spread among massive historical buildings and within historic areas. This is because of the diversity of architectural styles, characters and states of conservation of wooden structures in Asia. The 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity proposes that cultural heritage diversity exists in time and space and demands respect for other cultures and all aspects of their belief systems. All judgments about values attributed to cultural properties as well as the credibility of related information sources may differ from culture to culture and even within the same culture. It is thus not possible to make judgments on values and authenticity within fixed criteria.

During the first meeting in Nara, *participants fully examined the obstacles and challenges to the conservation and restoration of wooden structures based on the existing excessive emphasis on material authenticity and minimum intervention. They considered the necessity of reexamining existing preservation principles and philosophies when it comes to living heritage, cultural landscape, urban conservation and other broader categories of culture heritage.* Moreover, the techniques and interventions applied in practice do not always follow the conservation philosophies of relevant charters formulated by international institutes such as WHC and ICOMOS. In fact, the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, which was conceived in the spirit of the 1964 Charter of Venice, is subject to periodic revisions every one or two years. In 2015, ICOMOS China revised and supplemented the Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China. Both reviews were necessary to incorporate changing outlooks and regional experiences into the overall guidelines of international conservation philosophies and principles.

III. The Transmission and Training Systems of Traditional Skills for Wooden Structures

International cooperation is important for the protection of culture heritage in general. Correspondingly, Asian countries need to strengthen international exchanges and collaborations in the field of wooden structure preservation and restoration, in particular to extensively facilitate the dissemination and sharing of preservation technology and experience related to wooden structures in Asia.

In Asia, Japan is very experienced in protecting and restoring wooden structures, and was among the first to be engaged in various international collaborations. Thus, its experience in the exploration of protection theories and techniques for cultural heritage, especially those related to the transmission of traditional restoration craftsmanship and skills for wooden structures, is very valuable to China. Further learning and understanding are the basis needed to gradually find a way to remove the influences of subjectivism and nihilism, analyze objectively, identify issues, and draw on others' experiences.

Collaborations and exchange activities in conservation technology also require respect for cultural diversity and practices in different regions. Most importantly, mutual understanding is essential. In China however, a few people tend to simplify Japan's experience: mistaking traditional practices employed by a few special religious buildings, such as the "Shikinen Sengu ceremony" in the Ise Shrine, for a universal construction or restoration model applicable to all historical buildings in Japan. Japan also leads the world in experience protecting intangible cultural heritage. In order to strengthen training in traditional crafts, cultivate craftsmanship and establish proper transmission systems across generations in architectural terms, schools specialized in the training of traditional wooden structure techniques for young people were established in Kyoto. With the increase in income and social status of craftsmen, more and more young people are getting engaged in the conservation and restoration of wooden structures. The national and local governments have also de-

不断提高，年轻人参与木构建筑保护修缮的积极性越来越高。国家和地方政府，在鼓励传统技术和材料的科学研究、新技术在保护实践中的应用、以及与传统工艺的相结合新技术新材料开发等方面，均有制度保障和资金投入。而且，传统技术与材料的研究、传承和创新、再利用，同整个建筑领域的技术发展和管理水准的全面提升也有关系。很难想象一个国家建筑技术水平还比较落后情况下，文物建筑、木构建筑的保护修缮技术在世界上可能出现遥遥领先的局面。

木构建筑是亚洲地区建筑遗产的主要形式，保护修缮关系到文化遗产整体状况甚至是地区的文化复兴。正如与会专家达成的共识，**不同社区内在关系的延续和变化，每种文化景观及其木构建筑遗产的独特性，在一定程度上取决于本地方的传统设计和固有技术。**与此同时，我们还应注意到当下的实际操作与传统延续性之间的差异性，传统不是永恒不变的事物、而是时刻变化着的生命体。今后，在亚洲地区如何通过各种教育培训和遗产保护交流，促进历史性木构建筑的文化价值再生，将成为可持续的遗产保护政策的重要前提。而“重温”一些现有的理念，并制定更多的用来有效保护和管理亚洲遗产的指南和工具是极为迫切的课题方向。继续开展与历史性木构建筑保存、保护和管理相关的、有深度的培训教育也是其中不可欠缺的重要环节。📍

veloped institutional tools and invested capital to motivate scientific research on traditional technology and materials, the application of new technologies in practice, and the development of new technologies and material combined with traditional techniques. Moreover, research, continuity, innovation, and reutilization of traditional techniques and materials depend heavily on the technology development and management capacity of the architectural world. One can hardly expect leading techniques in preservation and restoration of historic and wooden structures in a country still lagging behind in construction techniques.

A major share of heritage structures in Asia are wooden and the preservation and restoration of wooden structures will influence the overall state of conservation of cultural heritage and even cultural revival in the region. Participants in the three conferences agreed that *the continuity and change of the interconnection between various*

communities, the distinctive character of each cultural landscape and its wooden heritage depends in part on its own indigenous designs and techniques. It is also worth noting that contemporary practices somehow always differ from those passed on traditionally. Rather than being frozen in time, traditions gain vitality from constant change. For the future, regenerating values related to the cultural significance of historic wooden structures through educational programmes is an essential requisite for a sustainable preservation and development policy in Asia. It is urgent to revisit the existing philosophies and to develop more effective guidelines and tools for the protection and management of heritage in Asia. One of the most important aspects of such an effort is to establish and further develop training programmes on the protection, preservation and conservation of historic wooden structures.

(上接第 14 页)

建筑材料的一大特征。在一些案例中，传统社区把建造新的建筑当作一种庆祝新生的宗教仪式。一些日本的神社，如伊势神宫，都保有每二十年用新的材料来进行全部或部分仪式性重建的传统，并已经延续了一千多年。它们与周边的森林文化景观一道，构成了多样化的木结构文化遗产中一个宝贵案例。在这些案例中，通过仪式性的重建，分崩离析的旧材料被重复用于其他宗教建筑中，木材资源的循环利用成为传统知识不可分割的一部分。📍

(continued on Page 14)

essential for the preservation of wooden architectural culture.

The beauty and perfume of fresh, newly processed timber is a characteristic of the material of wooden architecture. In some cases, traditional communities build new structures as a religious ritual to celebrate the renewal of life. Some Japanese shrines, such as the Ise Shrine, have a tradition of complete or partial ritual rebuilding

with new materials every twenty years that has continued for over one thousand years. Together with the cultural landscape of the forests that surround them, they constitute one invaluable example of the diversity of wooden cultural heritage. In these examples, after the ritual rebuilding, the old dismantled members are reused in other religious buildings, and the recycling of timber resources is an integral part of traditional knowledge.

2013年“重温木构建筑保护哲学——木构建筑的修复方法及其保护哲学”国际会议总结(2013年12月17-19日)

Conclusion of the International Conference 2013——“Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: Restoration Method for Wooden Structures and Its Philosophy”17-19 December 2013, Nara

前言

“重温木构建筑保护哲学——木构建筑的修复方法及其保护哲学”国际会议由联合国教科文组织亚太文化中心遗产保护与合作办事处(奈良)(以下简称“ACCU Nara”)和联合国教科文组织亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究中心(以下简称“WHITRAP”)共同举办。本次会议主要探讨了自1994年奈良真实性会议以来的二十年中,木构建筑遗产保护政策的发展。2013年12月17至19日在日本奈良举办的会议是即将连续举办三年的系列会议的首届会议。

共18位来自WHITRAP、ACCU、ICCROM,以及不丹、中国、印度尼西亚、印度、日本、尼泊尔、斯里兰卡和越南的政府和研究机构的特邀专家以及多位观察员出席此次会议。12月17日,与会人员在相关人员的带领下考察了少年寺(今井町)和法隆寺的保护情况。之后的两天(12月18、19日)会议包括一场关于保护哲学的专题讲座,2个主题演讲和7个案例研究报告。

与会者对ACCU和WHITRAP的热情款待及会议组织表示感谢。对本次旨在针对当代挑战和在当代语境中提出保护理念和方法的共同努力,他们表示赞赏并通过了以下建议。

结论与建议

关于真实性的问题,大家公认1994年奈良真实性会议,以及文化景观的概念,均标志着保护政策方式的重大转变。奈良会议之前,在遗产评估中针对材料真实性的重视,现已扩展到遗产的非物质方面,以及对多样性的认可。联合国教科文组织制定的国际原则也对这些概念进行了阐述和细化,包括2003年通过的《保护非物质文化遗产公约》、2005年《保护和促进文化表现形式多样性公约》,以及2011年《关于城市历史景观的建议书》,体现了从特殊遗产向共同遗产的不断扩展。

尽管意识到遗产政策在不断演变,但是与会者依然认为,1994年的《奈良真实性文件》是与1964年《威尼斯宪章》类似的一份历史性参考文件。新的文件应当用来诠释相关政策的新需求,并参考1994年《奈良真实性文件》。

关于真实性在保护实践中的可操作性解释,与会者认为,奈良会议前所强调的材料真实性和最小程度干预,将依然在受国家保护的建筑遗产的公共保护

Preface

The International Conference on “Restoration Methodology and Philosophy of Conservation of Wooden Structures: Restoration Method for Wooden Structures and Its Philosophy” was co-organised by the Cultural Heritage Protection Cooperation Office, Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO (ACCU Nara) and World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO (WHITRAP Shanghai). The scope of the conference was to look into the developments in conservation policies particularly concerning wooden structures over the two decades since the Nara Conference on Authenticity in 1994. It was the first of three agreed to be organized over a three year period, and it took place in Nara from 17 to 19 December 2013.

Eighteen invited experts, and several observers, attended the conference representing WHITRAP, ACCU, and ICCROM, as well as governmental and research institutions in Bhutan, China, Indonesia, India, Japan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam. On 17 December, guided visits were organized to examine conservation work in Shonenji Temple (Imai cho), and in Hōryū-ji temple. During subsequent two days (18 and 19 December), a special lecture on conservation philosophy, followed by two Keynote Speeches, and seven Reports on Case Study Reports were presented.

The participants appreciated the hospitality, sponsorship, and excellent organization by ACCU and WHITRAP. They commended the initiative to have undertaken this collaborative initiative to address conservation philosophy and

methodologies, and adopted the following conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Regarding the issue of authenticity, it was recognized that, together with the introduction of the concept of cultural landscape, the 1994 Nara Conference on Authenticity marked a significant paradigm shift in conservation policies. The pre-Nara emphasis on material authenticity in heritage evaluation has now broadened to include intangible aspects of heritage, and for recognition of diversity. These concepts have been further elaborated and specified in UNESCO's international doctrine, including the 2003 convention on intangible heritage, the 2005 convention on heritage diversity, and the 2011 recommendation concerning the Historic Urban Landscape, showing an increasing broadening from exceptional to common heritage.

While recognizing the continuously evolving heritage policies, the participants sustained that the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity be maintained as a historic reference, similar to the 1964 Venice Charter. The emerging needs for relevant policies should be interpreted in new documents and referred to the 1994 Document.

Regarding operational interpretation of authenticity in conservation practice, the participants observed that the pre-Nara emphasis on material authenticity and minimum intervention continues to prevail in governmental policies on conservation of state protected built heritage. However, in the broader context of cultural landscape and urban conservation, such policies are not strictly attained to and

政策中盛行。然而，在文化景观与城市保护的大背景下，这种保护政策却无法实现，也需要我们进行重新思考。当今国际上对遗产政策的辩论与国家与地方对真实性的阐释之间确实存在差距。对特定术语使用上不一致，导致地方在阐释上的困难。在对遗产重要性进行界定时，更希望拥有一种对地方语境和信息来源进行考量的更为整体性的视角。

1994年《奈良真实性文件》的概念和原则应当作为开展保护措施的实践指南，并辅以案例研究进行说明。这份指南起先可作为一份非正式文件，加以巩固整理后便可由相关机构提请通过并发布。该指南应被制成多语言版并附上一份术语表。

关于完整性与真实性之间的关系似乎存在一些疑惑。根据《世界遗产实施公约操作指南》，完整性指识别共同决定遗产重要性的所有要素的过程，而真实性则指这些要素的真实度和可信度是否合格。在某些案例中，我们可能会发现，由于修缮或部分重建，一个遗产部分的材料真实性可能因此丢失，但与此同时，建筑完整性得以恢复了。在其他案例中，被毁坏的建筑物可能已不具备形态上的完整性，但残余碎片的材料真实性仍然存在。

以上提出的指南应从不同的方面来讨论真实性，如关于创造性文化的表现形式、历史资料，以及决策过程中的社会文化背景。此外，讨论应延伸至完整性的条件下，如能在遗产地背景及保存状况中，构成其重要性的元素的识别以及各元素间在文化、功能、或象征意义上的关系。

此外，参会者还注意到当下在实际操作和传统延续性之间的差异性关系。尽管确实存在通过世代反复灌输形成的纯正传统，但若不加以控制，当人们可以诸如从国际旅游业和全球贸易中获取过多的资源，则现代的保护实践可能轻而易举地改变上述传统。随着压力的日渐增加，这些行为将加剧遗产的脆弱性，并带来各类干预措施，如不幸的19世纪的“周期恢复”理念一直成为旅游宣传的手段之一。

因此，我们一直鼓励科研机构在各自背景中开展关于人类创造性表现形式的历史、认知和处理的研究项目。这些研究也应该关注国际社会在保护理论框架方面的演变。

关于优先层级，急需阐明遗产资源的重要性及其如何关联到对价值的判断。虽然真实性本质上和遗产的重要性相关，但价值判断确实是学习过程的最终结果。这些观点应纳入到相关能力建设项目中。

may actually need reconsideration. A gap is recognized between the on-going international debate on heritage policies, and the national and local interpretation of authenticity. Challenges are encountered more holistic view that takes into consideration local context and sources of information is desirable for defining the significance of the property.

The concepts and principles of the 1994 Nara Document should be elaborated as practical guidelines for undertaking conservation interventions, illustrated with selected case studies. The guidelines could start as an informal document, but once consolidated could be proposed for adoption and publication by relevant institutions. The guidelines should be made multi-lingual with a recommended glossary of terms.

Regarding Appears to be some confusion regarding the relationship between Integrity and Authenticity. According to the WH Operational Guidelines, integrity refers to the process of identification of all the elements that together define the significance of the property. Authenticity instead refers to the qualification of such elements in terms of their truthfulness and credibility. It can be observed that, in certain cases, part of the material authenticity of a property may be lost due to repairs or partial reconstruction, while the architectural integrity gets re-established at the same time. In other cases, the formal integrity may have been lost in ruined structures, while material authenticity of the remaining fragments still exists.

The illustrated guidelines proposed above should discuss the different aspects of authenticity, e.g. in relation to creative cultural expressions, historical material, and

the social-cultural context of the decision-making processes. Furthermore, discussion should extend to the condition of integrity, e.g. the identification and the cultural, functional, or symbolic relationship of elements that contribute to the significance of a place in its context, and its state of conservation.

Further, the participants observed certain differences in current relationship between on-going practices and traditional continuity. While there do exist genuine traditions inculcated over generations, modern practices in conservation may easily cause changes if not properly controlled when excessive resources are made available, e.g. from international tourism and/or globalized trade. These practices may augment vulnerability of heritage due to increased pressure and lead to interventions such as the 19th-century concept of 'period restoration' that unfortunately continues to be an option in tourism promotion.

Research institutions are therefore encouraged to undertake research projects on the history, the recognition and treatment of human creative expressions in their context. Such research should also take note of the evolution of the international doctrinal frameworks for conservation.

Regarding hierarchy of priorities, there is urgent need to clarify the meaning of significance of heritage resources and how this relates to value judgements of values. While authenticity is basically related to the significance of the property, value judgements, instead, are the result of learning processes. These concerns should be integrated into relevant capacity building processes.

2014年“重温木构建筑保护哲学——木构建筑和本土社区相关的文化景观”国际会议总结（2014年16-18日）

Conclusion of the International Conference 2014——“Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: Cultural Landscape with Wooden Structures and Local Communities”16-18 December 2014, Nara

1. 2014年正值《威尼斯宪章》五十周年和《奈良真实性文件》二十周年之际，上述两份都是国际社会用来指导文化遗产保护的重要文件。然而，一方面承认其复杂性以及不断增加的挑战，另一方面也要看到尊重文化、地理和类型等多样性的需求，“重温”一些现有的理念，并制定更多的用来有效保护和管理我们遗产的指南和工具，这是极为迫切的。与会人员就2014年12月16日至18日在上海组织举办的“重温木构建筑的保护哲学：文化景观之木构建筑与地方社区”国际会议，向亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究中国中心上海中心以及联合国教科文组织亚太文化中心（日本奈良）表示祝贺。

2. 参会人员强调需要以一种更为整体的方式来思考和描述木结构遗产。把木结构遗产看做文化产品，它们是由精神关系决定的人与自然共同作品的典范，也标志着各社区间内在的延续、变化和互动过程，参会人员将其视作文化景观。这种针对木结构遗产的整体性方法超越了当前使用的各类定义。

3. 鉴于定期的修缮、维护和替换是确保通过集体努力来持续地参与、运用知识和利用自然资源的关键所在，因此参会人员一致认为稳定的社区作为被赋权的利益攸关方在推动木结构遗产可持续发展的决策过程中是至关重要的。

4. 参会人员还一致认为，这些社区具备在与自然互动中所需的知识、技能和技术，来利用可获得的资源并为木结构遗产的维护和发展提供符合其所在背景的可持续的抗灾害性的方法。木结构遗产具备上述无形价值，并经过了实践的检验，但在众多国家中，这些经验不是消失殆尽便是遭到忽视。会议的讨论揭示出在木结构作为典型文化遗产特征之一的东亚国家，这些无形价值依然存在或可能得以复原。

5. 每种文化景观及其木结构遗产的独特特征取决于其本土固有的设计和技术。在维护和改善该等文化景观建成要素的过程中，应当更多地关注保持当地社区，尤其是能工巧匠们所传承的知识的多样性和独特性。

6. 需运用遗产方面的立法以及其他规划手段等积极的规划，来捕获文化遗产实体、社会、经济和生态等方方面面，包括有形和无形的产品以及与人们生计和社会活动相关的动态过程，并推动其利用来确保其能够持续地为当代的使用者谋福利。

1. The year 2014 marks the 50th and 20th anniversaries of Venice Charter and Nara document on Authenticity respectively, two important documents used by the international community to guide the safeguarding of cultural heritage. However, recognizing the complexity and increasing challenges on one hand and the need to respect cultural, regional, geographical and typological diversity on the other hand, ‘revisiting’ some of the existing ideas and developing more guidance and tools for effective conservation and management of our heritage is considered timely. The participants congratulated WHITRAP-Shanghai and ACCU Nara for organizing the International conference ‘Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: Cultural Landscape with Wooden Structures and Local Communities’ held in Shanghai from 16 to 18 December 2014.

2. *The participants highlighted the need to conceptualize and characterize wooden heritage in a more holistic manner.* By recognizing wooden heritage as cultural products exemplifying the combined works of humans & nature often defined by spiritual relationships, which also signal the inherent processes of continuity & change and interaction among communities, participants viewed them as cultural landscapes. This holistic approach for wooden heritage extends beyond currently used definitions.

3. Considering the regular repair, maintenance and replacement as key ingredients which necessitate persistent engagement, application of knowledge and utilisation of natural resources through collective efforts, participants agreed

that *consistent community presence as empowered stakeholders in decision making be considered ‘sine qua non’ (essential) for the sustainability of wooden heritage.*

4. Participants further agreed that *the communities have mastered the knowledge, skills and techniques required for interaction with nature in utilising the available resources and providing contextual, sustainable and disaster resilient solutions for maintenance and development of wooden heritage.* These important intangible aspects of wooden heritage were well established and time tested but either disappeared or got neglected in many countries. However, presentations revealed that they are still extant or recoverable particularly in the East Asian countries, where wood is a dominant feature of cultural heritage.

5. Distinctive character of each cultural landscape and its wooden heritage depends much on its own indigenous designs and techniques. *In the process of maintaining or enhancing such built elements of a cultural landscape, more attention should be paid to keep the diversity and uniqueness of knowledge inherited by the local community, in particular the skilled craftsmen.*

6. Proactive planning using heritage legislations as well as other planning instruments are required to capture physical, social, economic and ecological dimensions of cultural heritage; both as tangible and intangible products as well as dynamic processes that are related to livelihoods and social activities and to promote their utilisation to ensure their continuity for the benefit of contemporary users.

7. 对社区的提及也突出强调了向当地社区提供谋生之道的需求, 以此来确保遗产推动可持续发展的积极作用。同时认为应当以遗产和社区间的互惠作用为一切遗产管理过程的最终目标和结果。保护或修缮技术应当为那些参与维护作为文化景观一部分或者位于文化景观范围内的自身所处的人们提供切实、经济和可持续的解决方案。

参会人员重温了木结构遗产并建议将其理解为文化景观, 并在该方法的基础上, 提出以下建议供进一步补充、研究和扩展:

- a) 地区内所拥有的任何由各国国家制定的当代原则和方法, 包括为认识其不足之处而针对这些原则和方法进行的重要评论
- b) 传统的以及既有的知识、技艺和艺术, 包括针对其在变化和全球化社会中适用性的重要评论
- c) 用来改善社区与木结构遗产相关的生计生活的现有和创造性方法
- d) 把木结构遗产作为文化景观进行保护, 并在需要时对其引进或增强的官方及传统的管理机制。

7. The reference to communities also *highlighted the need to provide livelihood opportunities for the local communities thereby ensuring the proactive role of heritage towards sustainable development. It is recognized that reciprocal benefits to both heritage and communities should be the aim and final outcome of all heritage management processes.* Conservation or repair techniques should provide practical, economical and sustainable solutions for those engaged in care of their own places which are part of or within the domains of cultural landscape.

The participants revisited wooden heritage and suggested conceptualizing it as cultural landscapes and based on this approach, recommended the following *proposals* for further documentation,

research and outreach :

- a) Contemporary principles and approaches developed by the countries including critical review of them to understand shortcomings if any in the region
- b) Traditional and established knowledge, skills and techniques including a critical review of their applicability in a changing and globalizing society.
- c) Existing and creative approaches to improvement of livelihood of communities linked to wooden heritage
- d) Management systems, both formal and traditional, for the protection of wooden heritage as cultural landscape and introducing and strengthening them where needed.

(上接第 24 页)

识、信息的积累, 在这个基础上才能把握好保护、利用和发展的“度”。

与会嘉宾的三点共识

沙龙临近尾声时, 同济大学副校长伍江教授借用习总书记“最大公约数”总结了本期沙龙与会专家所表达的三点共识:

其一, 文化遗产保护需要更多的专家、学者、年轻人一起, 好好地潜心深入研究;

其二, 理论的思考和成果才能真正推动中国的遗产保护事业的发展并做出世界级的贡献;

其三, 不管理论和观点的争论有多大, 我们需要牢牢守住底线, 尽可能不让历史文化遗产在我们手里加速消失、损坏, 对这条底线的坚守我们责无旁贷。



(continued on Page 24)

from the experience, and to seek a balance between conservation, utilization and development.

Consensus reached by all the guests

As the forum neared its end, by quoting President Xi Jinping's "greatest common divisor" concept, Prof. Wu Jiang concluded with three consensus that had been reached among the participants:

Firstly, the conservation of cultural heritage requires efforts by experts, scholars and young people to do further studies and research;

Secondly, the development of Chinese heritage conservation and contribution to the world can only be made through fruitful results of theoretical research and breakthrough;

Thirdly, no matter how controversial the issues are, we should stick to the underlying principle, which is to try our best to prevent cultural heritage from disappearing and deteriorating in our generation.

2015年“重温木构建筑保护哲学——亚洲木构建筑的价值和原真性概念”国际会议总结(2015年12月16-17日)

Conclusions of the International Conference 2015——“Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: The Value of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Concept of Authenticity” 16-17 December 2015

2015年“重温木构建筑保护哲学——亚洲木构建筑的价值和原真性概念”国际会议是连续三年举办的探讨亚洲木结构遗产保护哲学的会议之一，也是该系列最后的总结讨论。本文件与所附的2013年和2014年前两届会议形成的文件是一个整体。历届会议的主题如下：

“重温木构建筑保护哲学”

2013: 木构建筑的修复方法及其保护哲学

2014: 木构建筑和本土社区相关的文化景观

2015: 亚洲木构建筑的价值和原真性概念

亚洲的木结构遗产

相对于世界其他地区，木构建筑是亚洲主要的遗产建筑形式，不仅包括各类乡土建筑，还包括拥有丰富林业资源地区的重要历史性建筑。在亚洲某些国家，多数的传统建筑是由木材建造的，包括其多数甚至全部的构件，针对木结构的维护和修缮体系也已经得到高度的发展，也是各国遗产保护部门最主要的工作内容之一。

相对于诸如石材和砖等非有机材料，木材本身的性质决定了其更易受到环境的影响，除此以外，由于地区所处的热带和亚热带气候也让该地呈现高度的脆弱性，这些自然条件会加剧木结构的自然腐蚀，也更易遭到自然灾害的影响，因而进一步放大其保护的艰巨性。

这些脆弱的木构建筑，尽管它们尚未能满足既有的各项材料保护标准，但我们不应将之排除在针对珍贵遗产类型的普遍识别体系之外，尤其是那些位于东南亚地区的木结构建筑，它们是当地文化景观和文化认同的基本组成部分。我们必须看到，正是因为《世界遗产公约》的操作指南中现有真实性标准的局限性，导致东南亚地区的木结构遗产至今都未能进入世界遗产名录。

面对这些挑战，我们的任务是建立起针对地区内所有类型木构建筑价值和真实性的共识，从具有历史意义的建筑，到构成该地历史城市肌理的其他建筑，甚至其本身就是文化景观固有组成部分的乡村建筑，并考虑真实性和完整性相关的结构、材料、视觉和社会问题。

木结构遗产的保护原则

原有的材料、构造体系和建筑设计是同等重要的要素，决定了亚洲地区木结构建筑遗产的文化意

The international conference 2015 “Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures: The Value of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Concept of Authenticity” was held as a part of the consecutive three-year conference project to discuss the philosophy of preservation of wooden heritage in Asia, and it was the concluding discussion. This document is to be read together with the documents developed in the former conferences held in 2013 and 2014 that are also attached to this document. The themes of each year’s conference were the following:

“Revisiting the Philosophy of Preserving Wooden Structures”

2013: Restoration Method for Wooden Structures and Its Philosophy

2014: Cultural Landscape with Wooden Structures and Local Communities

2015: The Value of Wooden Structures in Asia and the Concept of Authenticity

Wooden heritage in Asia

Wooden structures make up the major share of heritage structures in Asia more than in any other regions of the world, going beyond not only vernacular architecture but also including historic monumental buildings in areas blessed by rich forestry nature. In some countries in Asia, most of the traditional buildings are of wooden construction, comprising most or all of their structural components, and their systems of maintenance and repair have been developed to a high degree and are regarded as part of the most important work of the national heritage protection authorities.

Beyond the very basic nature of

the wood itself, which is of course more vulnerable to environmental impact than non-organic materials such as stone or brick, the region is also characterized by an inherently high degree of vulnerability due to the tropical and semi-tropical climates of the region which foster natural decay of the wooden structures, and which are vulnerable to natural disasters, thus magnifying the difficulty of their material conservation.

Such vulnerable wooden structures, in particular those in the South East Asian region that are essential components of their cultural landscapes and cultural identity, should not be excluded by our universal system of recognition of precious heritage typologies even though it is difficult for them to meet the established standards of material conservation. It is important to note that due to limitations posed by the existing criteria of authenticity in the operational guidelines of the World Heritage Convention, no wooden heritage structures from South East Asian region have made their way onto the World Heritage list.

Considering these challenges, our task is to establish a common understanding of the value and the authenticity of all types of wooden structures in our region, from buildings of historic significance to other structures that make up the historic urban fabric and the rural architecture as inherent parts of the cultural landscapes, taking into consideration the structural, material, visual and social issues related to authenticity and integrity.

Principles of the preservation of wooden heritage

The presence of original material, the structural system and the architectural design are all equally im-

义。因此，应当具备以最大程度保存原有结构和保留原有材料肌理为目标的必要措施，并在此基础上确认这建筑的真实性。

这些措施也可以是针对各建筑结构作用的恢复、整体变形和偏移的校准，以及建筑原有承重能力情况的恢复。同时，也应当尽可能保留现存的材料，从而保存其科学价值和历史脉络。

用以建造和维护这些建筑的木工技术和其他传统技艺也是其重要性的基本组成，因此也要作为修缮方法引起适当重视。必要时，应鼓励开展针对旧材料抢救和贮存，以及传承这一保护体系传统的工匠和手工艺人的培训机制。

热带和亚热带地区的木结构遗产

鉴于南亚东南亚热带和亚热带地区木结构遗产易遭腐坏的现实，以及各地区特有的文化习俗和精神信仰的重要性，我们应当确认相关传统技艺、知识、非物质习俗和管理机制真实性的文化和地理因素，通过定期维护和更新来保护这些遗产。我们应当努力推动它们在当今和未来间的代际传承，并且在必要时支持其演化，从而使其满足不断变化的需求和新的经济和环境考量，并降低其面临灾害的脆弱性，同时支持传统工匠们的生计并维持其手工技艺的品质。

各国政府在诸如 UNESCO 等组织的支持下，应当把这些遗产的重要样本当做传统建筑风格和保护技术在当今的遗存保护起来，并进一步提升利益攸关方对这些问题的觉悟。

鉴于该地区内的木结构文化遗产遭受诸如地震等自然灾害的影响不断增大，我们可能需要加强其恢复过程（如尼泊尔）来确保这些传统建筑生命周期的延续，通过一种周期性更新的机制来保护建筑的寿命以及传统建筑体系的延续性。

亚洲的木结构文化

我们应当探索和尊重社区的信仰及相关的非物质维度，从而保护亚洲的活态社区以及宗教类的木结构遗产。

无论是重要纪念物抑或仅仅是传统的乡村建筑，木结构建筑遗产的传承都需要地方知识的延续，包括针对森林保护区体系管理以及利用其来修缮历史木建筑的知识。传统社会相信森林是自然诸神的居所，树木拥有自身的灵魂。这种信仰体系意味着在木料的采集、运输、加工和组装过程中必须体现对自然神灵的尊重，同时让当地社区可持续地管理森林和环境资源成为可能。

虽然多数现代社会已经丢失了其信仰体系，但在亚洲一些国家所实行的基于传统知识的森林资源管理机制，如日本的故乡森林公园和韩国的松树林保护区，都对木结构建筑文化的保护极为重要。

新鲜加工过的木料所具有的美感和芬芳是木构

（下转第 8 页）

portant factors that determine the cultural significance of the wooden architectural heritage of Asia. *The authenticity of these structures should therefore be recognized on the basis of the necessary interventions that are aimed at preserving the original structural system and retaining the original material fabric to the greatest extent possible.*

These interventions may also aim at recovering the structural role of each member, correcting overall deformations and misalignments, and reinstating the condition of the original load-bearing capacity of the structure. At the same time, as much as possible, the extant material should be retained to preserve the scientific value and historical context.

The carpentry techniques and other traditional skills used to build and maintain these buildings are inherent part of their significance, and should be given proper recognition as methods of repair. Where needed, the rescue and storage of old materials and the training systems for artisans and craftsmen who carry on the traditions of this conservation system should be encouraged.

Wooden heritage in tropical and semi-tropical regions

Considering the perishable nature of wooden heritage located in the tropical and sub-tropical regions of South Asia and South East Asia and the significance of the particular cultural practices and spiritual beliefs in each area, such heritage should be protected through periodic maintenance and renewal by recognizing the cultural and geographical considerations regarding the authenticity of associated traditional skills, knowledge, intangible practices and management systems. Efforts should be made to promote their transmission to present and future generations and, where necessary, to support their evolution for addressing changing needs, new economic and environmental considerations and the reduction of disaster vulnerability and by supporting the livelihoods of traditional craftsmen and maintaining the quality of their craftsmanship.

National governments with the support of organizations such as UNESCO should protect important examples of such heritage as a living legacy of traditional architectural styles and preservation techniques, and further raise awareness about these issues among the various stakeholders.

Considering the increasing vulnerability of wooden cultural heritage to natural disasters such as earthquakes in these regions, recovery processes such as in the case of Nepal may have to be strengthened to ensure the continuity of the life cycle of these traditional buildings through a system of cyclical renewal for protection of the life of the buildings as well as the continuity of traditional building systems.

Wood Culture in Asia

Community beliefs and associated intangible dimensions should be explored and respected for conserving the living communities and the religious wooden heritage in Asia.

The transmission of wooden architectural heritage, whether they are important monuments or whether they are simply traditional village buildings, requires the continuity of the local knowledge that includes the management of forest reserve systems and their utilisation for repair of historic wooden buildings. Traditional societies held the belief that forests housed the gods of nature and trees had their own spirit. This system of beliefs meant that the collection, transportation, processing and assembly of timbers had to show respect for the spirits of nature, and made possible a sustainable management of the forest and environmental resources by local communities.

While most modern societies have already lost this system of beliefs, management systems of forest resources based on traditional knowledge implemented in some countries in Asia such as the Furu-sato no Mori (hometown forests) in Japan and the Jun-gyung-meyo (pine forest reserves) in Korea are

(continued on Page 8)

文化遗产保护的“真实性”和“完整性”

——纪念《威尼斯宪章》50周年和《奈良文件》20周年学术沙龙观点摘要

The Authenticity and Integrity of the Conservation of Cultural Heritage

—— Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Venice Charter and the 20th Anniversary of Nara Document Heritage Forum

为纪念《威尼斯宪章》诞生50周年、《奈良文件》诞生20周年，联合国教科文组织亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究中心（上海）（以下简称“上海中心”）于2014年12月10日晚举办了本期专题纪念沙龙，由上海中心执行主任邵甬教授与李昕博士联袂主持，并有幸邀请到了我国文化遗产保护领域的十多位专家共聚一堂，包括国家文物局文物保护考古司副司长陆琼，住房城乡建设部城乡规划司历史文化名城保护处副处长傅爽，中国城市规划设计研究院张兵，同济大学副校长伍江，中国城市规划学会历史文化名城学术委员会副主任委员赵中枢和张广汉，联合国教科文组织北京办事处项目专员杜晓帆，东南大学建筑学院副院长董卫，上海市规划与国土资源管理局历史风貌保护处处长王林，苏州市规划局总规划师相秉军，上海中心主任、同济大学建筑与城市规划学院教授周俭，北京清华同衡规划设计研究院有限公司张飏，以及同济大学建筑与城市规划学院教授张松、卢永毅和副教授陆地、张鹏。各位专家、学者积极围绕文化遗产保护中的“真实性”与“完整性”问题及其在我国的实践，各抒己见，展开了精彩的讨论和睿智的对话。

同济大学副校长伍江教授在开幕致辞中肯定了《威尼斯宪章》和《奈良文件》对我国遗产保护的重大意义，但目前在学术界对真实性与完整性仍存在着不同的理解，他指出：在现实中一些正常的学术争论常常被外界不健康势力所利用，打着“保护”的旗号，行“破坏”之实，少数领导同志对“保真还是作假”仍然认识不清。《奈良文件》提出的“文化多样性”为其他文化形态提供了不同的“可能性”，但在我国违背《威尼斯宪章》的做法却每天都在发生，我们不得不以《威尼斯宪章》作为武器来保卫历史文化遗产。从东方角度看“真实性”背后是价值判断，最关键是如何把握“度”，如何从保护实践最微观的思考来反映最宏观的问题。

上海中心执行主任邵甬教授随后介绍了本期沙龙的内容：首先由同济大学建筑与城市规划学院陆地和张松两位教授进行主题发言，着重介绍两个国际文件产生的背景及其影响，其次由与会嘉宾围绕两个文件的影响和当今的价值，以及如何更深入理解、更好地实践真实性和完整性展开对话。

To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Venice Charter and the 20th of Nara Document, WHITRAP Shanghai held a specialized forum in the evening of 10 December, 2014. The forum was chaired by Prof. Shao Yong, the Executive Director of WHITRAP Shanghai, and Dr. Li Xin. More than 10 Chinese experts from cultural heritage area were invited and brought together to the event, including Ms. Lu Qiong, Deputy Director of Department of Cultural Heritage Conservation and Archeology-SACH, Ms. Fu Shuang, Head of Historical Cities Conservation Department, Urban-Rural Planning Division-Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development of China, Mr. Wu Jiang, the Vice President of Tongji University, Mr. Zhao Zhongshu and Mr. Zhang Guanghan, members of Academic Committee on Historical and Cultural Cities-Urban Planning Society of China, Mr. Du Xiaofan, Cultural Heritage Conservation Specialist-UNESCO Beijing Office, Mr. Dong Wei, Vice-dean and Professor of School of Architecture - Southeast University, Ms. Wang Lin, Director of the Department of Conservation and Redevelopment of Historical Areas and Buildings at Shanghai Planning and Land Resource Administration Bureau, Mr. Xiang Bingjun, Chief engineer of Suzhou Planning Bureau, Mr. Zhou Jian, Director of WHITRAP Shanghai and professor of College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Tongji University, Mr. Zhang Yang, Deputy Director of Research Center for Historical and Cultural City, Tsinghua Tongheng Urban Planning and Design Institute, and Mr. Zhang Song, Ms. Lu Yongyi, Mr. Lu Di and Mr. Zhang Peng, and other professors and associate professors from Tongji University. The participants discussed and shared insights with each other about the issues around

authenticity and integrity, as well as the Chinese practices in this regard.

In his opening speech, Prof. Wu Jiang, the Vice Dean of Tongji University reiterated the significance of the Venice Charter and Nara document in heritage conservation in China, and the fact that there were different understanding and interpretation of the two concepts among the scholars. He pointed out that normal disputes among the academic circle were distorted by those with ulterior motives, who had conducted damages in the name of “conservation”. A few of the authorities are still in lacking of awareness to differentiate between “preserving the genuine and fabricating counterfeits”. The “cultural diversity” concept which is proposed in Nara Document has offered us new opportunities to preserve different cultural expressions. But activities which are contradictory to the principles of the Venice Charter continue from day to day, and we have to use the Charter as our weapon to defend the cultural legacy we have inherited from the history. *When putting in an oriental cultural context, the authenticity is more about making value judgment, among which the key is to find out the balance and to approach the most macro issues from a more micro level of practice.*

Prof. Shao Yong, Executive Director of WHITRAP Shanghai continued with a brief introduction to the forum. The meeting would begin with two keynote speeches by two professors from Tongji University, to present the history and influence of both documents. Then the forum would be followed by a brainstorm and open discussions about the values and implication of the documents today, as well as how to deepen our understanding and practice in authenticity and integrity.

主题发言¹

陆地:

《威尼斯宪章》有两个很重要的特点。第一，它是全球性的建筑遗产保护宪章。当然以前也有1931年的《雅典宪章》，但《雅典宪章》完完全全是欧洲人制定出来的，即便有些代表是欧洲之外来的，但那也是欧洲殖民地的欧洲人代表。而《威尼斯宪章》的制定大概只缺一个洲的代表，就是大洋洲，其他洲的代表都有。第二，在保护对象上首次涵盖了我们现在理解的所有有形建筑遗产。《雅典宪章》里面没有城市、街区，只提到了单体保护中附带的环境问题。《威尼斯宪章》除了有monument还有site，即遗产地。所以在《威尼斯宪章》之后，ICOMOS会制定《佛罗伦萨宪章》、《华盛顿宪章》等，其实这些文件的对象都属于site，所以，从对象上讲，它是第一个完整的建筑遗产保护宪章。

还有一个特点，就是它的理论基础是全新的。当年的《雅典宪章》是根据意大利的科学性修复理论制定的。但是《威尼斯宪章》是以评论性修复理论为基础，更强调当下的主观感受和美学效果。

另外，《威尼斯宪章》事实上是ICOMOS的成立依据。《威尼斯宪章》起草于1964年，1965年第一次ICOMOS大会批准。

第二部分要重点讲一下《威尼斯宪章》背后的理论基础。《威尼斯宪章》的条文其实就那么十几条，但它背后事实上有更深刻的立法精神和立法原理，如果不知道它的立法精神和立法原理，就难以知道《威尼斯宪章》里面讲的概念到底是什么意思，可能理解错。

现在大家公认《威尼斯宪章》背后的理论基础就是以布兰迪为代表的评论性修复理论。而且《威尼斯宪章》相当多的条款和布兰迪所写的《修复理论》几乎一模一样。我们再看制定《威尼斯宪章》的人，当年有23位起草委员，最后写《威尼斯宪章》的就三个人，戈佐拉、帕耐、菲利波。前两个人是公认的意大利评论性修复在建筑领域的代表人物。比利时人菲利波也是大家公认的布兰迪最忠实的追随者和解读人，很多实质性的东西都是他起草的。所以我们可以看出来，评论性修复流派的思想对《威尼斯宪章》有着实质性的影响。

下面讲一讲《威尼斯宪章》里面最核心的两个概念，就是对保护对象如何认识？这就是宪章第三条所说的将其视为“历史证言”和“艺术品”。更注重保护的

Keynote Speeches¹

Lu Di:

There are two key features of the Venice Charter. *Firstly, it is a global charter for the architectural heritage conservation.* Certainly, there was the Athens Charter in 1931, but the Athens Charter was entirely written by Europeans. Although there were some representatives from countries outside Europe, they were European representatives from European colonies. However, the enactment of the Venice Charter only lacked the representatives from one continent, which was Oceania. *Secondly, the conserved objects cover all types of architectural heritage in our understanding.* The Athens Charter only mentions problems about the surroundings of single monuments, while cities and streets are neglected. On the contrary, the Venice Charter includes monuments and sites. So after the enactment of the 'Venice Charter', ICOMOS also wrote the The Florence Charter, Washington Charter and so on. In fact, the objects of these documents are sites, so in terms of the objects considered, the Venice Charter is the first entire charter in architectural heritage conservation.

There is another feature where the theoretical basis of the 'Venice Charter' is completely new. The 'Athens Charter' was written according to the Italian 'restauro-scientifico' (scientific restoration) theory. However, the 'Venice Charter' is based on the 'restauro-critico' (critical restoration) theory, which places more emphasis on current subjective feeling and aesthetic effect.

In addition, the Venice Charter was, in fact, the basis of the establishment of ICOMOS. The Venice Charter was written in 1964 and approved in the first conference of ICOMOS in 1965.

The second part is mainly about the hidden theoretical basis of the Venice Charter. There are just over ten clauses in the Venice

Charter, but there is legislative spirit and principle hidden deeper. If the legislative spirit and principle is not known, it is hard to understand the concepts in the Venice Charter which may cause misunderstanding.

Currently, the recognized theoretical basis of the Venice Charter is critical restoration, and its key representative is Brandi. Moreover, many clauses in the Venice Charter are the same as those in Brandi's 'Carta del Restauro' (Restoration Charter). Then let us look at the writers of the Venice Charter. In those days, there were 23 people on the drafting committee, and three people wrote the final version of the Venice Charter: Gazzola, Pane and Philippot. Gazzola and Pane were recognized as representatives in Italian critical restoration. Philippot, a Belgian, was also recognized as Brandi's most loyal follower and interpreter, and had drafted many substantial contents. As a result, we can see that the ideology of critical restoration had a substantial impact on the Venice Charter.

Then let us talk about the two core concepts in the Venice Charter, which refer to how to recognize the conserved object. Content in Article 3 recognizes conserved objects as 'historical evidence' and 'works of art'. It is a very prominent feature in critical restoration that more attention should be paid to the objective character as 'works of art'.

The reason for this refers to the hidden development in history. After the French Revolution, when restoration was still very strict, conserved objects were recognized as 'historical evidence'. After several decades had passed, stylistic restoration emerged, according to which, restoration was considered entirely based on its architectural function and art value. The Notre Dame de Paris is a typical case. For example, the rose window near the entrance of south transept has a turned angle in the adjacent of the window so the central line is changed into vertical, increasing the sense of

¹ 所有发言均根据现场实录整理，并按发言先后顺序排列。

¹ This account of the forum is based on the speeches made in the meeting according to the order of speakers.

象的“艺术品”性质是评论性流派一个非常突出的特点。

之所以会这样，背后其实有相当长的历史演变。法国大革命之后，是把保护对象首先当成历史证言来看的，当时的修复还是很谨慎的。后来又过了几十年，风格性修复出来了，基本上是从纯粹的建筑学功能角度，从它的艺术价值来考虑修复。很典型的就是巴黎圣母院，例如南耳堂入口处的玫瑰窗，窗棂的角度在修复中转了一点，这样的话，中心线就变成了垂线，中心感更强了。而且窗棂的深度不一样，原来没那么深，维奥勒把它凿深了。为什么凿深呢？就是嫌“眼睫毛”不够长，拉长一点好看。我们从中可以看出维奥勒是单纯从建筑艺术品的角度来考虑修复的。

又过了几十年，意大利冒出来了文献性修复和史实性修复，这两个流派相对风格性修复又是180度大转弯，完全把建筑当成历史证言来看。但问题同样很多。修复时根据什么时期的“历史证言”来修复？大量的建筑是根据原来的史料。

《威尼斯宪章》讲的历史证言到底是什么？保护的时候以什么样的历史证言为依据？

在评论性修复里面，最大的贡献就是对保护对象的历史证言方面进行了很精细的区分，分了第一历史、第二历史、第三历史。

第一历史就是原状，当然很少能看到建筑遗产经过漫长历史之后能完整地原状保留下来。追求第一历史的话，按照评论性修复的看法就是追求一个纯粹的知识概念，而且这个纯粹的知识概念不具有直接的普遍价值。在评论性流派里，这个普遍价值是什么呢？早在20世纪初，他们就在讨论遗产对象的普遍价值到底应该是什么，按他们的理解，反而应该是这种直觉的，即艺术的，而非知识性的普遍价值。

第二历史，是基于时间维度。就像我们刚造好的上海中心，它没有经过时间的推移，没有第二历史，那么它的历史价值、文化价值在哪呢？所以第二历史是我们完全不能忽略的。

第三历史就是我们真的看到遗产，感到要保护的时候。从评论性修复流派讲，此时才是最重要的，什么时候意识到要保护了，那么保护对象前面的历史，所有经历的历史都算我们应该保护的历史。

在历史证言方面，结论就一点，保护的出发点不应该是原状，而是现状。因为只有这个时候，我们才是最现实最客观的，所有的东西都在我们面前，不用找史料之类推测性复原。在第二历史方面举一个例子，中世纪有一个很有名的耶稣木制雕像，后来在历史变迁中加了金色的皇冠，小裙子，还有像小拖鞋、高跟鞋那样的东西，但是意大利人坚决反对把这些东西去掉。当然，不是不可以去掉，因为这些东西不是和本体连为一体的，拿掉就行。但是它们一旦去掉了，我们面对的就是一个完全没有第二历史的第

centralization. Moreover, the depth of the adjacent of the window is also changed. It was not as deep as it is now, because Vitet made it deeper. Why did he do that? Because he thought the ‘eyelash’ was not long enough, and would be better if it was longer. We can learn from this case that Vitet considered restoration as completely based on architectural works of art.

Over another several decades, ‘restaurofilologico’ (philological restoration) and ‘restaurostorico’ (historical restoration) emerged in Italy. Compared to stylistic restoration, these two schools were opposites, in that they recognized architecture as ‘historical evidence’. But there were still many problems. What ‘historical evidence’ could be referred to in restoration? A lot of architecture was based on original historical material.

What is ‘historical evidence’ in the ‘Venice Charter’? What kind of ‘historical evidence’ should conservation be based on?

The most remarkable contribution of critical restoration is the elaborative classification of ‘historical evidence’, in that it was classified into the first, second and third phases of history.

The first phase of history is the original situation but it is hard to see the original architectural situation after a long-term history has passed. According to the view of critical restoration, the chase of the first phase of history is just of pure conceptual knowledge. Moreover, this pure conceptual knowledge lacks direct universal value. What is the universal value of critical restoration? In the early 20th century, the question of the universal value of objective heritage was discussed. According to their understanding, it should not be the instinctive type of universal value, meaning it is artistic rather than intellectual.

The second phase of history

is based on time dimension. For example, if our newly built Shanghai Centre had not experienced time lapse, it would not have the second phase of history. So where can we find its historical and cultural value? As a result, we cannot neglect the second phase of history.

The third phase of history is the moment when we see heritage and decide it should be conserved. In the view of critical restoration, this moment is most important, in that when conservation is aware, the past and entirely experienced history of the conserved object is the history we should conserve.

There is only one point in the conclusion of ‘historical evidence’, that the start of conservation should be the current situation rather than the origin. Only at this moment are we in the most practical and objective situation where everything is in front of us and we do not need to search through historical material for suppositional conservation. I will show you an example of the second phase of history. There is a famous medieval wooden structure of Jesus, and in the historical changes, a golden crown, small skirt, small slippers and something like high heels were added to the structure. However, the Italians strongly opposed removing them. Surely it was not impossible to remove these decorations, because they did not connect to the structure. So it could be taken away. However, if they were removed, what we faced was just the first phase of history, without the second phase. The first phase of it was unreal, so it was also something entirely empty. Certainly, there will be some conflicting situations in reality, but despite this, the current situation should be the basis.

What are ‘works of art’ in the ‘Venice Charter’? According to critical restoration, the value of ‘works of art’ entirely corresponds with the three phases

一历史，第一历史被架空了，完全是空洞的东西。当然在现实中的确也会有冲突的情况，但不管怎样，还是应该以现状为基础。

在《威尼斯宪章》中，“艺术品”到底是什么？按照评论性修复流派的思想，艺术品的价值其实和上述三个历史时期划分是完全对应的。李格尔很早就认识到，第一历史对应的艺术价值应该是“新物价值”，和我们讲的文化遗产在第二历史中形成的“age value”，即老化价值，或者说一种年岁价值，是最可怕的对头，而且两者你死我活，一种价值获胜了，另一种价值肯定活不下来。从本质上来讲，我们要保护的文化遗产的艺术价值应该是一种历史性价值，即经历了历史之后产生的价值，而不应该是原本的新物价值。

第二点是跟逻辑有关的。维奥勒都是把建筑当成一个活的人体来看的，所以，在风格性修复里，所有的修复逻辑都是由这种思想驱动的，建筑必须“完整”。但是到了评论性修复流派，逻辑却是截然相反的。我们面对艺术品的残损时，不能把它当成真正的残损来看。比萨斜塔其实也是一个例子，它绝大部分的斜度其实是后期形成的。假如把它扶正了，恢复到第一历史的状态，那么最重要的历史证言价值没有了，最重要的美学价值其实也没有了。

事实上，上述所说的问题是评论性流派对“历史证言”和“艺术品”长期思考与讨论的成果。在评论性修复流派里，作为遗产保护对象的“艺术品”应该是真正的“历史艺术品”，而不是普通的只有第一历史的“工艺品”，应该是带有历史痕迹的艺术品。于是，无论从历史证言或艺术品角度出发，我们的保护出发点永远应该是现状，这就是评论性修复流派最重要的一个结论，其实也是《威尼斯宪章》想要表达的思想。

接下来我们看看《威尼斯宪章》面临的挑战。讲到《威尼斯宪章》最大的挑战，就是物质遗产保护和非物质遗产保护之间产生的争议。

文化多样性引出的问题是普世价值和个体价值的对立。原来在建筑遗产保护中总是讲普世价值，现在普世价值似乎正在瓦解、正在崩溃。但有意思的是《世界遗产公约》、《世界遗产名录》追求的恰恰是普世价值，而且是突出的普世价值，也就是所有人都认同的价值。假如没有普世价值，也就意味着我们所要保护的物体不是共同遗产，只是对某个小圈子有效的遗产，其实也就不需要共同标准。《奈良文件》文件之前、1989年之后，就已经有这个问题了。

此外，在文化多样性引发的冲突方面需要注意的是，文化多样性是西方人提出来的一个概念，是西方最早搞文化人类学的一批人在60、70年代逐渐发展出来的概念。从这个意义上讲，需要思考的是，如果我们认为西方人提出的“现代性”概念是个陷阱，基于那种现代性的《威尼斯宪章》是本末倒置的，那么，我们现在对同样是西方人提出来的文化多样性理论应该怎样放在更宏大的背景下认识？应该怎样将这种认识带入我们的建筑遗产保护中去？

of history mentioned above. Riegl has already realized that artistic value, corresponding with the first phase of history, should be the ‘newness value’. ‘Age value’ is, what we said, generating from cultural heritage in the second phase of history. They are the most awful opponents, in that only one of them can survive. If one type of value stays, the other must be lost. Essentially, the artistic value of architectural heritage that we need to conserve should be one type of historical value, which means it was generated from the experience of history rather than the original newness value.

The second point involves logic. Vitet always regarded architecture as a living human’s body, so in stylistic conservation, the logic of all types of conservation is driven by this method that architecture must be ‘integrated’. However, the logic of critical restoration is the opposite. When we face the damage of works of art, we cannot regard it as real damage. The Leaning Tower of Pisa is an example, in that most of its leaning was formed later. If the tower was made upright, back in its first phase of history, its most important ‘historical evidence’ and artistic value would be lost.

In fact, the issue mentioned above is the outcome of the long-term consideration and discussion of ‘historical evidence’ and ‘works of art’ in critical restoration. In critical restoration, the ‘works of art’, as in the conserved objects, should be real ‘historical works of art’ with ‘historical evidence’, rather than common ‘crafts’ which only have the first phase of history. Hence, no matter where conservation starts, from ‘historical evidence’ or ‘works of art’, our conservation always starts from the current situation. This is the most important outcome in critical restoration, as well as the more important

idea that the Venice Charter wants to present.

Then let us talk about the challenges that the Venice Charter faces. *The greatest challenge of the Venice Charter is the debate between the conservation of tangible heritage and intangible heritage.*

The opposition between the universal value and individual value is triggered by cultural diversity. In the past, universal value was always discussed in architectural heritage conservation, but it seems that universal value is collapsing. However, it is very interesting that the ‘World Heritage Convention’ and ‘World Heritage List’ are both pursuing universal value, and in particular outstanding universal value, which is approved by everyone. If there is no universal value, this means that our conserved objects are not common heritages and they are only effective in a certain small group, so the common criterion is also unneeded. During the period before the implementation of the Nara Document and after 1989, this issue had already emerged.

Furthermore, it should be noticed in the conflict of cultural diversity that cultural diversity is a concept presented by westerners, and gradually generated by the people who first studied cultural anthropology in the 1960s and 1970s. Based on this significance, we should consider that if we think the ‘modernity’ concept presented by westerners is a trap and the Venice Charter, which is based on the ‘modernity’, is just putting the cart before the horse, *how can we understand the cultural diversity theory that is also presented by westerners in larger background? How can we bring this understanding into our architectural heritage conservation?*

张松:

我发言的题目是“遗产保护的原真性和完整性，从《奈良文件》谈一点认识”。

《奈良文件》中文版是说真实性和完整性，还是说原真性和完整性？其实同济很多老师是说原真性，包括阮老师等。当然阮老师可能还是要尊重官方翻译的版本，但是翻译的人可能是没有遗产知识背景，所以有人以为原真性是日本人的词。其实日本是拿西方的东西，官方的文件就是用片假名，“authenticity”音译的，没有任何的翻译。然后它有的文件翻的是“真正性”，台湾人翻成“纯正性”，我们有的翻译成“本真性”，韩国人也另外有个词。其实这个文件非常简单只有13条，两三个章节。

第一条序言里面第三条讲的《奈良文件》还是在《威尼斯宪章》上的一个扩张，也就是《威尼斯宪章》为基础的，并没有推翻宪章制定的原则，而是在修订或者说更包容说这件事。另外它比较强调的是文化多样性下面的遗产多样性，所以它就说整个世界的文化遗产多样性是人类共有的，我们不大可能用一个模式或者一种评价方式去评价它。然后所有的文化和社会都根植于有形无形的各种手段表现出来的，这些形式方法构成遗产的都要受到相应的尊重。

还有一节讲是价值与真实性，或者是 authenticity 的关系。这个第九条有句话非常重要，就是“基于遗产价值的保护形式的各个时期的遗产都应该得到考虑，人们理解这个价值的 ability 是依赖于这些价值来源的信息源的”，并且信息源这个词是专门有注释的。所以对遗产的信息的认识与理解，是要基于它与初始的和后续特征有关的所有东西，然后这些东西又是评价这些遗产的真实性的必要基础。

第四条讲到，一切有关文化项目的价值及其相关的信息源的可信度判断都可能存在文化差异。欧洲比较注重物质实体材料、空间，我们是精神的象征的。但是，不是说你要把物质的东西全部弄掉，只追求非物质的东西。所以其实《奈良文件》是跟世界遗产文件相关的补充说明，后来被 ICOMOS 大会认可，就纳入到它的重要文件系列。在《操作指南》里面对于真实性的一些说法也有很多，形式、材料、设计、场所、环境都包含在里面，传达了它的价值的真实的信息。

完整性最初是对自然遗产来评价的，像生物多样性、生物链、环境的关联，但现在就拿视觉的，一直延伸到社会的背景里面，来谈物质或者文化遗产的保护了。它是说所有的突出普遍价值反映的所有要素都要放到这里面考量，同时应该有足够的量来反应，不是你挑选一部分具有代表性的。比如四合院或者里弄，这我们冯先生早就说过，你保护个别是不行的，它是一个片的关系，社会关系。

Zhang Song:

My topic today is “the authenticity and integrity of heritage conservation —opinions on the Nara Document”

There has been a long discussion about whether it is “zhen shi xing” (authenticity) and “integrity” or “yuan zhen xing” (originality) and “integrity” when the Nara Document was translated into Chinese. A number of professors in Tongji University, including Prof. Ruan Yisan, prefer the later over the former. Prof. Shao supports the former perhaps out of a respect for the official translation. I guess it is possible that the translator is someone outside the heritage conservation world, thus the current translation sounds like words from Japanese. But in fact, “authenticity” was transliterated directly from its English pronunciation in Japanese. There are also other translations in Taiwan (“chun zhen xing” - purity) and South Korea (“ben zhen xing” - genuineness), as well as other translations such as “zhen zheng xing” (true). The document is short and simple, and entails only two or three chapters with its 13 articles.

In Article 3, it states that *the Nara Document builds on the Venice Charter and extends it*. Therefore, it is not designed to overrule or replace the latter but to revise for a more inclusive perspective. By emphasizing the diversity of heritage as one dimension of cultural diversity, the document proposes that the cultural heritage of each is the cultural heritage of all, and it is impossible to have “one solution mode or one evaluation criteria fits all”. It also pointed out that all cultures and societies are rooted in the particular forms and means of tangible and intangible expression which constitute their heritage, and these should be respected.

The next chapter is dedicated to *the issue of values and authenticity, or the relationship between the two*. There is one important point in Article 9 that says “Conservation of cultural

heritage in all its forms and historical periods is rooted in the values attributed to the heritage. Our ability to understand these values depends, in part, on the degree to which information sources about these values may be understood...”, with a specific definition of information sources in the appendix part. The document continues, “Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage, and their meaning, is a requisite basis for assessing all aspects of authenticity”.

According to Article 11, “*All judgments on values attributed to cultural properties, as well as the credibility of related information sources, may differ from culture to culture*”. In contrast with the European emphasis on physical entities, materials and space, we have a more spiritual inclination. But this does not mean an excessive attention to the intangible dimension, eradicating all physical domains. Thus the Nara Document, initially as an important supplementary to world heritage documents, was recognized by the General Assembly of ICOMOS and later included into the document series. The Operational Guidelines also entail the conditions of authenticity through a variety of attributes such as form, materials, design, location and setting etc., which can truthfully and credibly express the cultural values of the properties.

“Integrity” was a criterion first applied to the evaluation of natural properties, associated with biodiversity, biological chain and environment, but gradually borrowed by the visual dimension and extended to the social setting for the conservation of tangible or cultural heritage. *Examining the conditions of integrity requires the assessment of all elements necessary to express the Outstanding Universal Value of a property, which furthermore, should be of adequate size rather than a reprehensible part, to ensure the complete representation*

然后还要考虑到你未来面临的发展和被我们忽略的一些因素，对遗产产生影响来评价完整性。但完整性不是完美性。

还有一个是日本的伊势神宫，它拆了建、建了拆不还是也很好吗？这是一个特例，20年建一次，为什么呢？这里是天皇的先祖供奉在这里面。就是最最好的条件，有内宫和外宫，到20年的时候就开始，两块基地一模一样，然后就参照这边的样子建。他们的工匠是专门的，叫“宫大工”，就是宫殿里的木匠，专门做宫殿的人。这些钱国库每年都拨，有财政的支持但是还是缺钱。2013年靖国神社刚刚完成的第62次的式年迁宫的仪式，规模非常大。这里有一系列的活动，但是最大的活动就是里面刚好20年的时候，把神迁过来了，不是说房子换了一下。现在这些材料其实20年没坏的。像这种没有坏的材料又拿去修别的文化遗产。所以无形的技术是一直传承的，形式一直留下来的，还有材料也是在循环使用的，但这是非常特殊的情况。

说到这里，日本有一些做法也让人郁闷，比如在2010年奈良迁都1300年的时候有一个重大的一系列纪念活动，当时是10多年前就开始策划的事情，官僚和有钱人一定要恢复朱雀门和大殿，就做了，大家又觉得不好。其实真正的保护专家，像我的老师他们，都是强烈反对的，当然反对无效。所以跟中国一样，也找了一些旅游，作为遗产诠释的一种方式、老百姓能够解读等理由来证明应该这样做。我相信修的品质会比我们的一些仿古建筑稍微好一些，但是我个人觉得并不是一个很好的方式。到了韩国就更糟糕，韩国人这两天在斯里兰卡开的会，他们的专家英文题目就写的“Making Korea Heritage”，重造的遗址宫殿，打造韩国或者是朝鲜的遗产，跟我们中国一样的。所以有时候中国跟韩国更像一些。

还有一些特例，波兰的华沙重建，实际上这个也是有争议的，它有很重要的战争的共同记忆的，都是重建的一部分。在里面没有炸毁的还留存一点点。在法国有一个战后重建的城市。你看有钢筋混凝土的材料，做的很新很大的教堂，这个东西在2005年也被列为了世界文化遗产，都是因为战后重建，也有很重要的意义来确定的，所以我们不能把这个作为样板来考虑正常的遗产保护问题。

今年刚好是奈良文件20周年，上个月开了会，会议通过了《奈良+20：关于遗产实践、文化价值和真实性概念的回顾性文件》。我大致看了下内容也没觉得有太多特别的新意。“authenticity”是什么呢？最根本的，实际上反映的是地方和全球的一个对抗，就是我们一方面是世界遗产，总归有共同评价的标准和共同讨论的平台，但是另外每个地方的文化越有特色越应该是地方的，越不是世界规则出来的东西，所以这里面怎样平衡怎样讨论是这样意思，麻烦就很大。当然这里面还有政治冲突和文明冲突等问题存在。

在我们的历史街区保护也要强调真实性、完整性、延

of the features and processes that convey the property's significance. Take courtyard dwellings or lilong housing for examples. According to Mr. Feng, it makes little sense to conserve the individual buildings instead of protecting the entire area along with its social networks.

We should take into account development in the future and other factors that we tend to overlook, but are significant to the heritage and its integrity. We should also be aware that the conditions of integrity are not conditions to be perfect.

One example is the Ise Jingu Shrine in Japan, which has been torn down and rebuilt every twenty years. Housing the supreme deity that is considered the ancestor of the imperial family, the shrine consists of inner and outer parts. These shrines will be re-constructed at adjacent alternate sites every twenty years, which are exactly identical to the original ones. The reconstruction is conducted by specialized carpenters and craftsmen, with financial support from the state treasury. Various ceremonies related to rebuilding the shrines and transferring the deities from the old to the new buildings are performed by people for the relocation. After the reconstruction of the new buildings, the materials from the old sanctuary are utilized for the renovation and restoration of other heritage properties. The custom has helped to transmit the craftsmanship and skills through the generations, as well as the recycling of materials, a very special case we can refer to.

However, some actions in Japan have also caused concerns domestically, such as the events that happened during celebration of the 1300th anniversary of Nara, an ancient capital in history. The event had been planned for a decade prior to the year. Upon the proposal of a group of bureaucrats and rich people, the Suzakumon Gate and part of the Palace was reconstructed,

but was criticized. A number of conservation experts, including my professors, objected to the proposal but to no avail. Similarly to what we have done here in China, tourism was proposed as a way for heritage interpretation and an accessible way for the public to justify the practices. I think the quality is possibly better than a few of the antique buildings reconstructed here, but the approach is absolutely not recommended.

Another exceptional, but controversial example is the reconstruction of Warsaw, associated with events and battles of considerable historic significance. A cathedral which was reconstructed with steel and concrete in France was also inscribed as a World Cultural Heritage Site in 2005. Both cases are determined with significance as part of post-war reconstruction campaign, but they should not be considered as an ordinary model for heritage conservation.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the Nara Document. The conference held last month adopted the Nara + 20: On Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity. I didn't find much new content in this document through a brief skimming. *What exactly does "authenticity" mean? I think fundamentally it reflects the conflict between local and global.* Above all, world heritage is something with universal standards to be evaluated and discussed internationally; when given the different and specific cultural contexts of each place, it is also supposed to be rooted and developed in the local soil. Therefore, we face the tough issue of finding the balance in between, which also involves other problems like political conflicts and tensions between different civilizations.

We should also pay attention to integrity, completeness and continuity when it comes to the conservation of historic districts. We have reproduced a number

续性，但我们一开始做了很多仿古，觉得是“形神兼备”的做法，认为木材料是不行的，都拆除后做了钢筋混凝土结构，以为只要有精神的传达就可以了，这样就导致了保护实践中的许多误区。现在，一些历史街区从过去的钢筋混凝土，到现在全木结构的。但是把老的全拆掉，居民搬走的这些做法都是不对的。这个东西还会讲到是遵守了整体保护的原则，世界遗产公约，真实性等等，甚至会说到在继承梁思成的精神等等。

简单地讲，把一栋建筑固定到某一个时刻来讨论来保护是不科学的。同样，一处建筑群、一个历史街区、一座历史城市就更不应该这样做了。所以到 ICOMOS 的《西安宣言》，已经延伸到社会的一些背景，有了 Setting 这个词，有时候应该翻译成社会文化的关系，不仅仅是视觉的背景环境。强调把遗产保护和规划要更好结合起来。

再说一点，我们大家讨论的 authenticity，到底是说真实性，还是原真性好呢？其实就是个翻译问题。无论你翻译成真实性原真性纯正性本真性，但是英文词就一个。徐高龄先生说如果换成真实性，可能就只有考虑了实体，无形的这一块就会被忽略。还有在整个里面“真”是与时间有关系的，他说的是“原初”，但我觉得也不是原初的，就是历史的、各时期的痕迹、特征或者是留下来的东西，当然要经过评估，不是全部留下来，全部留下来的话没有任何干预就随他去了，那就没有保护。所以他还说了你如果翻译成“真实性”你就翻不回来的。

最后再说一下历史城市，城市的真实性指什么？现在有人说我们这里唐朝的城市，就拼命要寻找城市起源或城市最原初的东西，像有的考古的人喜欢拼命往底下挖一样，其实也是错误的做法。美国学者朱金（Sharon Zukin）在她的《裸城》一书中就讲城市场所的生与死，讲它的本真性，或者是原真性。她讲所有东西起源不是哪一群人你住在哪里，最早在哪里，这种事不仅难以考证，也是很荒谬荒唐的。她说城市是建立在层层叠叠的，我们讲历史城镇景观也是，很多层，历史性的层积的。她说的起源是什么呢？每个人都能在城市生根落地的道德权力和这种居住在这个空间的权力，不仅是作为经验来消费，从这种意义上讲真实性不是苏荷地区的历史建筑的舞台布景，也不是时代广场的灯光秀，而是一种生活和工作的持续过程，经验的逐渐的累积，一种周遭的居民和眼前的建筑明天依然还存在的一种期待，就是这种连续性。如果这种连续性丢掉了，城市的真实性，场所的真实性就没有了，它的灵魂也没有了。不是说城市没有真实性可以讨论的问题。

嘉宾对话观点摘要

赵中枢：《威尼斯宪章》和《奈良文件》都是非常重要的文件，它们作为国际语境里的科学性和延续性值得我们尊重，总体来说保护的概念在扩大，文物本身扩大周围的环境，再到历史地段、历史文化街区，再后来中小城市

of antique architectures and considered it a presentation of both the physical form and the spirit. We replaced the wooden materials with steel and concrete structures, assuming that all we needed was to allow the intangible elements to be well maintained, leading to a number of mistakes in practice. Actually, neither replacing the wooden structures with steel and concrete nor vice versa, neither tearing down the old nor relocating the residents are advisable options. A lot of other issues are also involved, such as the principle of integrated conservation, World Heritage Conventions, authenticity, and even the ideas of Mr. Liang Sicheng.

To put it simply, *it makes no sense when we discuss the conservation of a building to put it in a specific and static time-frame*. It is the same with groups of buildings, historic quarters and historic cities. Therefore, the concept of “setting” was proposed in the Xi’an Declaration, which could be interpreted as a socio-cultural relationship rather than a visual environment, with more emphasis put on a combination of heritage conservation and planning.

Whether it is Zhen Shi Xing (authenticity) or Yuan Zhen Xing (originality), after all, it is no more than issue of translation, and all the Chinese phrases have only one English equivalent – authenticity. Mr. Xu Songling even criticized that Zhen Shi Xing placed more emphasis on physical aspects while toning down the intangible dimension. Furthermore, he also mentioned that Zhen (genuine) was a time-related concept, which meant “the very origin”. But for me, it’s more about something historical, the traces, attributes or remains from each stage in history. Of course they would be protected selectively subject to evaluation, not preserved entirely.

The last thing I would like to discuss is the authenticity

of historic cities. Those who have presumed cities originating from the Tang Dynasties would be desperately in search of the city’s origin or the most original attributes as much as archaeologists dig down a site. But as Sharon Zukin, an American scholar pointed out in her book “Naked City”, “Origins” refers not to which group settled in a neighborhood earliest; that would be difficult if not ridiculous to prove, since every city is built up of layers of historical migrations. Exactly what the HUL (historic urban landscape) says about the layering of places. “Origins” suggests instead a moral right to the city that enables people to put down roots. This is the right to inhabit a space, not just to consume it as an experience. *Authenticity in this sense is not a stage set of historic buildings as in SoHo or a performance of bright lights as at Times Square; it’s a continuous process of living and working, a gradual buildup of everyday experience, the expectation that neighbors and buildings that are here today will be here tomorrow*. A city loses its soul when this continuity is broken. So it is with the authenticity of a place and a city.

Key Points from Guests

Zhang Zhongshu: Both the Venice Charter and the Nara Document on Authenticity of 1994 are significant documents, which are acknowledged in terms of the scientific nature and the continuity. *On the whole, the concept of conservation has been expanding*, from the heritage to the surroundings, to the historic site and the historic community. Later small and medium-sized cities and towns are included with increasing frequency. Then came the Washington Charter, which emphasizes urban planning. For instance, when it comes to the restoration of Yongding Eastern Gate and Yang He Tower, many things need to be factored in. Local attachment

和城镇出现的频率也越来越高了,到了《华盛顿宪章》更多的偏重于跟城市规划的。例如正定东城门、洋河楼的恢复问题,有好多说法,首先是地方情感和选择,其次才是规划技术的支撑,事实上还是一个度的问题。在现实工作中我希望文物和建设部门应该更好地结合起来,在 ICOMOS 体系下体现我国文化遗产及其保护的精华、特殊性和多样性。

王林: 历史文化遗产保护概念应该让更多的老百姓了解,我们确实需要这样的文化教育,可以通过网络去普及。我的想法是真正是历史遗产的东西,它的真实性要保存,并且我们要尽可能保存地好。第二个我想需要有一些新建和复建的原则,如果复原不破坏历史遗产,与其造一些非常丑陋的现代建筑,复原一些中国的传统的空间也是可以商榷的。在旧城改造里,我们抢救性保护,比如上海石库门的保护,面对客观事实不得不去做一些更新,但保护整体风貌的真实性和完整性是核心。在保存历史的同时也是不断地在书写历史,以尊重历史的角度,认真地态度去书写历史,都是值得考虑。

张鹏: 我个人觉得,我们国内的保护制度跟国外最大的区别是,我们的保护还是对物质形态的一个保护,试图找到一个标准,唯一的正确。但事实上保护更应该追求一种主体共识下的真实,所以我个人更倾向于用“原真性”这个词,因为原真性里面包含了一点主体选择的过程,并且应建立更多机制,使保护成为一种社会活动。伍校长也在此补充道:修缮方案背后一定是不同国家、不同城市,不同地区、不同建筑有不同答案,只有让社会公众获得和了解背后知识和文化的积累,才能真正体现出遗产的价值。

杜晓帆: 我想,“原真性”、“真实性”怎么叫都可以,没有必要在字面上做更多的讨论。实际上在修复过程中我们可能面临很多的问题,如何解决?关键应该是我们对遗产核心价值的认识问题,遗产对我们来说到底是什么?可能东方人,包括日本和中国,从哲学层面上还没有给自己一个交代,所以会说不清楚到底要保护什么。在我们东方人的内心,是否觉得形更重要?只要把形保住了,我们的遗产也就存在了。和西方保护物质的材料不一样,我们对材料真实性的追求没有像西方那么关注。所以,我们会认可一些复建、新建,例如日本奈良世界文化遗产平城宫遗址上复建了朱雀门和大极殿。不过,欧洲也有重建,比如德国德累斯顿城区的许多建筑都是重建的。因此,“真实性”问题似乎不仅仅是东西方的矛盾,西方内部也有矛盾,有必要去做更深入的研究。

相秉军: 就我们的实践,举两个例子供大家讨论,一个是山塘和平江两个历史街区分别采用了落架与不落架两种修缮方法,比如材料、墙、梁架在山塘街基本都是新的,但是在平江路基本都是原来的,所以如

and choices will be at the top of agenda. Secondly, the technologies of urban planning will be taken into account. *As a matter of fact, there is also the matter of degree.* It is urged that the department of cultural relics and the department of construction work together to better display the heritage of China and the essence, character, and diversity under a system specified by ICOMOS.

Wang Lin: More and more people should be exposed to the concept of the preservation and restoration of heritage, which is in dire need and can be achieved via the Internet. I think that the authenticity of the real heritage should be preserved, and it will be better if we can preserve it as best as possible. What's more, some principles of new construction and reconstruction should be established. If restoration doesn't damage the heritage, the restoration of some heritage will be better than the construction of some ugly and weird modern buildings. While the old urban quarters are being regenerated, emergent protection is necessary. Shikumen in Shanghai is the case in point. Although the reality entails some changes, what makes all the difference is preserving the authenticity and integrity. *We are writing history when preserving history. It's worth recommending when it is taken seriously with respect for history.*

Zhang Peng: As far as I'm concerned, the major difference between China and other countries in heritage conservation lies in the fact that Chinese heritage conservation always tends to stipulate one standard to the conservation of physical heritage. In fact, *conservation should be more oriented by the principle of authenticity that is agreed by all.* Therefore, I prefer the translation Yuan Zhen Xing, which connotes the process of the formation of a consensus of the public. It's necessary for more mechanism to be set up to make heritage conservation a social activity. Vice President Wu remarks that lying behind different proposals of restoration are different

nations and cities. Different areas and buildings have their own answers to the question. Only when the public have great command of the background knowledge and culture can the value of the heritage manifest itself.

Du Xiaofan: I hold the view that both Zhen Shi Xing (ingenuity) and Yuan Zhen Xing (authenticity) are OK. We needn't spend time discussing which one is more applicable. How can we solve the problems in the process of conservation and restoration? *What counts is our definition and concept of core values of heritage.* What does heritage mean to us? Orientals, including the Chinese and Japanese, have yet to find the answer philosophically. They have no idea what needs defending and preserving. Do we attach great importance to the form, believing that as long as the form is preserved the heritage is preserved? Unlike the westerners, we fail to attach great importance to the authenticity of the heritage. Hence, we reconstruct or rebuild some heritage. For example, Suzakumon and Daji Palace are reconstructed where Heijo Palace, a Japanese world culture heritage site in the city of Nara, stood. There is reconstruction of heritage in Europe nevertheless. For example, many buildings in the German city of Dresden are replicas of the old buildings. Consequently, the matter of authenticity is not just the difference between east and west, but also the difference among western countries, which is well worth delving into.

Xiang Bingjun: I would like to present two cases from my practice to discuss. Firstly, the Shantang historic street was repaired by taking apart and readjusting its wooden truss, while the Pingjiang historic street was renovated without taking apart and readjusting its wooden truss. The materials, walls, and beams in Shantang were mainly new, while the original materials were used in the Pingjiang case. Thus when it comes to specific matters, more needs to be done in terms of how authenticity and integrity

何坚持真实性、完整性在具体问题上需要进一步讨论；另一个，是否恢复怡园历史街区中第二直河，恢复就意味着必须拆除此河被填埋后建造的历史建筑，这就两难了，事实上我们苏州古城保护在时间点问题上的态度是比较实际的，尽可能保留和修缮现状留存的老东西，修到什么程度，也是可以讨论的，比如说我们的山塘和平江修的方式、程度不一样。

张颢：我个人觉得在《奈良文件》提到真实性和完整性，要在一个比较广泛的文脉下理解，这是我们判断问题的主要出发点。针对杜博士提到的故宫和潼南大佛，很多要从文物技术，材料，历史信息这个角度来探讨，但是如果放到开放的城市或者街区，尺度也不能完全固化在具体的梁柱或者瓦片，应重视城市街区不断发展和演进，允许建筑的更新，但必须维护整个城市风貌的传承。从我们规划编制的角度，把握不同语境环境下标准的尺度，可能有助于处理一些实际的问题，所以现在我们也试图在历史街区的工作中探讨怎么具体掌握这个度，有必要做一些比较细致的分解和深入认识。

张兵：这两个宪章确实值得很好研究，我们国家面临的真实性、完整性的一些问题，确实有很多值得探讨的地方。怎么来理解真实性？我觉得**关键还是历史，是历史信息的真实性**。对历史信息的解读，这个时代这批人去解读文物建筑也好，历史街区也好，我们对它的真实性的理解是我们这个时代的，是我们这批人的，我们的后人怎么解读？最重要的是应保证更多历史信息传承下去，对今后信息的解读会更有帮助。在历史文化街区保护问题上应该尽可能保留原样，因为它包含了大量的文化信息。我还是倾向于原来是什么样就是什么样。换句话说能少拆就少拆，能少换就少换，这样对信息的解读会更有意义。

卢永毅：对我们、对中国来讲，历史保护理论思想探索过程的每一步，都是非常有价值的。我非常同意真实性是基于对遗产对象本身的认识，两个文件都特别强调遗产对象信息的可信度和真实性，是我们走向修复真实性的源头，所以对于历史的尊重和仔细的研究是非常重要的；其次从《威尼斯宪章》到《奈良文件》对我们来说非常有意义，特别是《奈良文件》强调的文化多样性，它不仅存在于国家之间，在我国地域文化也非常丰富，遗产本身的差异给理解真实性造成了更多的复杂性，所以**重要的是理性地认识地方遗产的特征**。但现实中我们对大量遗产的认识仍然不够，突出问题是目前很多城市把遗产保护和旅游捆绑在一起，为了突出自己，随意地诠释遗产价值，根本上不能忽视城市自身文化和历史的多样性。

傅爽：我认为这两个文件表明了我们对遗产传承应当承担的责任，还涉及到遗产本体保护和周边环境保护的关系，以及遗产保留下来后怎样合理利用的问

can be realized. The second case is whether it is advisable to recover the second straight river in Yiyuan Garden, a historic quarter in Suzhou. If so, it means that the historic buildings built on the land reclamation are destined for demolition. We are on the horns of a dilemma. In fact, the attitude towards the timing of the preservation of the ancient city of Suzhou is practical. Preserve and restore what is authentic as much as possible. The degree is open to discussion. For example, the way and degree of preservation and restoration in the above two cases were very different.

Zhang Yang: Personally, the authenticity and integrity mentioned in the Nara Document should be comprehended in a relative broad context, which is where we start when considering a verdict. As for the cases of the Forbidden City and the Big Stone Buddha at Tongnan county mentioned by Dr. Du, a number of discussions dwelled on the technology, material, and historical information of cultural heritage. *But when it comes to an open city or districts, we should not focus entirely on a specific beam or tiles but on the continuous development and evolution of the urban block. The changes of buildings are permitted, conditional to the maintenance of the entire landscape of the city.* Different standards for specific contexts will provide answers to certain problems. So now we are making every effort to determine those specific measures, entailing some specific analysis and in-depth knowledge.

Zhang Bing: Both of the two documents are well worth researching into. Our country faces the question of authenticity and integrity and needs further understanding. What do we think of authenticity? *I think it is history that matters, the authenticity of history.* Our interpretation of history, whether it's to do with heritage buildings or historical urban streets, belongs to us only. What is the future generation's interpretation? What is of premier importance is to make the point

of the transmission and inheritance of more historical information, which will contribute a lot to future interpretation. *Where there is substantial cultural information, the historical cultural block should be retained as much as possible.* I prefer to leave it as it is. In other words, demolish and substitute as little as possible. It will be more helpful for the interpretation of information.

Lu Yongyi: As far as we and China are concerned, every progress in the process of the exploration of the theory on heritage preservation is significant. I completely agree with the opinion that authenticity is based on the understanding of the heritage per se. The two documents put a premium on the credibility and authenticity of the information on heritage and are the source of the restoration of authenticity. Therefore, the respect for and careful research into history is of great importance. We can find the Venice Charter and the Nara Document of great significance. The latter document emphasizes cultural diversity, which exists not only between nations, but also within China. The cultural diversity and heritage differences in China make it complicated to make sense of authenticity. Therefore, *it is important to have reasonable comprehension of the characteristics of regional heritage.* Unfortunately, our comprehension is scanty. A case in point is that heritage preservation and tourism are tied together in myriads of cities in China, which interpret heritage values as they wish to highlight themselves. It's ill-advised to ignore their own urban culture and diversity.

Fu Shuang: I believe that the two documents show the responsibility we should shoulder for the transmission of heritage, the relationship between the preservation of the heritage and its surroundings, and the matter of how heritage can be tapped into reasonably. Many experts argue that the preservation of historical relics is that of cultural diversity. Historical cultural streets differ

题。很多专家提到对于历史遗存的保护,也是对文化多样性的保护。历史文化街区不同于文物保护单位,是人生活或工作的场所,是一种活态的遗存,它跟老百姓的现代生活关系密切。*历史文化街区保护最理想的状况是居民在、街区内的房子也能留下来,通过政府投资疏解人口达到合理的居住容量。*可实际情况往往是政府资金不足,将整治工作交给开发公司运作,公司为了赢利就会对遗存的完整性造成破坏。历史文化街区的保护确实是个难题,房子留下来怎么修,怎么协调好保护和改善居民生活的关系,也希望今后能共同探讨。现在城镇化要走集约型内涵发展的道路,特别是像北京、上海这样的特大或大城市,今后的用地可能是零增长甚至是负增长,在这种情况下土地的利用会更加紧张,我们面临保护的会更加艰巨,所以这个也是我们需要共同面对的现实。

陆琼:《威尼斯宪章》中最少干预的原则,这50年以来常用不衰,我们国家文物局依照文物法依法在方案审批中,最多使用的也是最少干预原则,不改变我们文物原状,也包括保护真实性和完整性原则,但仍然有大量困惑和问题。虽然多年来做了很多的探索、实践和努力,但始终没有中国自己保护理念和体系,希望在这方面今后可以做得更深入的研究。在这一点上杜晓帆博士也表示,只有真正潜心去做研究,才能形成中国自己的保护理论和体系,正如《奈良文件》虽是欧洲团队起草的,但基本原则是经过日本专家团队多年潜心研究直到1992年才逐渐形成的,希望中国也能够通过潜心研究形成自己的学术观点。

周俭:不管真实性还是完整性,我们要从不同层面谈,否则一个城市跟金箔、跟彩画来比,那肯定是不对的。房子或者街区修了之后,它也会留存下去,它也是有价值的。其次是原有功能的延续,当然需要兼顾遗产形成的背景和业主的意愿,例如周庄等很多古镇历史上因商而兴,目前也有发展商业旅游,从城市角度讲是社会现实需求的反映。*要关注社区与居民,要特别尊重在当前社会发展背景下如何处理文化遗产保护。*很多保护原则必须讨论,必须形成保护的概念和价值观,但在实践中也需要有针对性的处理方法。

邵甬:其实有一个很争议的话题就是有关丽江。我们质疑它的商业发展影响了它的突出普遍价值,而当地政府并不这么认为,认为丽江历史上就是茶马古道上的重镇,商业是其它的主要功能。但是,不要忘记丽江的突出的普遍价值是由三个部分组成:古老的王国、茶马古道重镇和纳西族人的家园,因此商业只是其中一小部分。目前正是现状过度的商业发展特别是大规模的旅游地产破坏了其他方面的价值,对古城真实性和完整性构成了很大威胁。因此,根本问题是*对遗产地的价值与特征的正确认识*,这来自于不同知

(下转第12页)

from heritage sites under government protection in the fact that the former are where people live and work. They are living remains and closely related to people's modern lives. *It would be ideal if the houses inhabited by the people and located in the historical cultural streets could be preserved. Governments can invest to ensure that the houses accommodate a reasonable number of residents.* In fact, seeking money, governments will transfer the work of redevelopment to developers, which will damage the integrity in pursuit of profits. The preservation of historical cultural streets is difficult indeed. I hope that we can discuss how to renovate the houses left, and what to do with the relationship between the protection and improvement of the quality of life of the residents. Nowadays, the urbanization will be intensive and connotative. The urban land in such megacities and major cities such as Beijing and Shanghai is expected to increase at a zero or even negative rate. In this case, less land will be available, and the task of preservation will be tough. So this is the reality we need to face together.

Lu Qiong: The minimum intervention principle in the Venice Charter has often been quoted and used in the past five decades. It has also been referred to by SACH when plans are examined and approved, according to the Law of the Peoples Republic of China on Protection of Cultural Relics, which sets out that the principle of keeping the cultural relics in their original state shall be adhered to, including the principle of conserving integrity and authenticity. Still, we face a number of challenges. In spite of years of practices and efforts, China still has not completed a system of conservation concepts and mechanism of its own. We will deepen our research in this regard. As Dr. Du Xiaofan said, we need to really devote ourselves and concentrate on the study to develop a Chinese system for conservation. Just like the example of the Nara Document, though it was initially drafted by a European group, it was not developed and finalized

by Japanese experts until 1992 after years of exploration. *We hope the same story will happen here in China.*

Zhou Jian: Whether it is authenticity or integrity, it should be dealt with at different levels. It is definitely pointless to compare a city against gold foils or colored paintings. Buildings or city blocks, after being renovated, will continue to be preserved and considered valuable. As for the continuation of the original functions, we should listen to and respect the context in which the heritage is originated as well as the will of its owners. A number of old towns such as Zhou Zhuang were prosperous in history because of their trading activities, and often focus on the development of commercial activities and tourism today, which is partially a reflection of the current demands of the local community. *We need to focus on community and residents, and put the conservation of cultural heritage in a local context of social development.* Based on that, we will proceed with the discussions on conservation principles, their concepts and values, as well as specific measures and interventions in practice.

Shao Yong: Lijiang has caused a lot of controversy recently. We question whether the commercialization has negatively affected its Outstanding Universal Value, while local authorities think otherwise; they believe that the town had long been a trading hub in the ancient Tea-horse Road with business as a main function. But we cannot leave behind the other two elements namely the ancient kingdom and home land of Naxi ethnic group, which together with the ancient Tea-horse route constitute the three aspects of its OUV. The excessive development of business and mass tourism today have hampered the values of other aspects, and imposed threats to the authenticity and integrity of the old town. Therefore, *the fundamental issue is how to properly understand the value and character of a heritage site* based on the knowledge and information accumulated

(continued on Page 12)

从中国文物古迹保护准则修订看文化遗产保护观念的发展¹

Development of Cultural Heritage Protection reflected by the Revised Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China¹

文 / 吕舟² Written by / LV Zhou²

2000年中国古迹遗址保护协会通过的《中国文物古迹保护准则》(以下简称《准则》)是中国文化遗产保护的一部重要的基础性文件。它反映了中国文化遗产保护不仅建立起了自己的保护体系,而且形成了与国际文化遗产保护原则相连接的“接口”。这一文件在其公布的13年中发挥了巨大的作用,促进了中国文化遗产保护的发展。

“《准则》是文物古迹保护事业的行业规则。凡是从事文物古迹保护的人员,包括政府公务员和管理、研究、勘测、设计、施工、教育、传媒的一切人员,必须在专业行为和职业道德上受到《准则》的约束。《准则》是评价保护工作的标准。保护事务都必须严格遵守相应的法规、规定,同时所有专业性方案的制订及其成果都应以《准则》为依据进行评估。”³

由于20世纪90年代以来国际文化遗产保护产生了一些的新观念,在发展趋势上也有新的变化,中国文化遗产保护2000年以后也有了巨大的发展,面临的问题发生了很大的变化。在这种情况下,中国古迹遗址保护协会2009年启动《准则》的修订工作,现已基本完成。修订版的《准则》更深刻地反映了中国文化遗产保护与国际文化遗产保护运动的关系;反映了文化多样性背景下,国际文化遗产保护普遍性原则与地区性实践之间的关系。

一、关于文化价值的保护

1972年《世界遗产公约》规定文化遗产为具有历史、艺术或科学价值的纪念物和建筑群,以及具有历史、审美、人种学或人类学价值的遗址⁴。《中华人民共和国文物保护法》同样提出文物应当具有历史、艺术、科学价值⁵。

这种价值认识的一致性促进了1985年中国加入《世界遗产公约》,并在1987年成功申报了北京故宫、长城、

The Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China adopted by ICOMOS China in 2000 (hereinafter referred to as the Principles) is an important foundational document in China's cultural heritage protection. It symbolizes that China has not only established its own system for cultural heritage protection, but also formed an “interface” connected to the principles of cultural heritage protection at the international level. This document has played a significant role over the 13 years after its publication in promoting the development of China's cultural heritage protection.

“The Principles is a set of professional guidelines for heritage conservation. All those who work in heritage conservation, including public servants and persons involved in management, research, survey, design, construction, education, and the media, are bound by the Principles in matters of professional practice and ethics.”³

The Principles specify criteria for the evaluation of all conservation work. Conservation practice must conform strictly with relevant legal regulations and provisions. The Principles also

provide the basis for evaluating all professional plans and the results of their implementation.

Since the 1990s, some new ideas and new trends have emerged in the international cultural heritage protection and China's cultural heritage protection has also experienced tremendous development and is facing very different problems since 2000. In this context, ICOMOS China started to work on the revision of the Principles in 2009 and the work has mostly done. The revised version reflects more profoundly the relationship between China's cultural heritage protection and the international movement of cultural heritage protection; it also reflects the relationship between the universal principles of international cultural heritage protection and regional practices in the background of cultural diversity.

1. On the Protection of Cultural Values

The 1972 World Heritage Convention provides that cultural heritage refers to monuments and groups of buildings which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science, as well as sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.⁴ The Law of the People's Republic of China on Protection of Cultural Relics has also proposed that cultural relics should have historical, artistic or scientific value.⁵

This consistent view towards the value prompted China to ratify the World Heritage Convention in 1985, and managed to have six sites nominated into the World Cultural Heritage list, includ-

¹ 本文为吕舟教授在2014年5月召开的“文化遗产保护国际原则和地方实践”会议上发表的论文。首载于“清源文化遗产”微信平台。

² 吕舟,清华大学国家遗产中心主任,教授。长期从事文化遗产保护研究和实践。

³ 中国文物古迹保护准则,中国古迹遗址保护协会,2000,p14

⁴ 保护世界文化和自然遗产公约,UNESCO,1972,p2。

⁵ 文物保护管理暂行条例,1961,《新中国文物法规选编》,文物出版社,1987,p44。

¹ This article is the research paper launched by professor Zhou Lv on the conference “International principle and local practice of cultural heritage protection”, May 2014

² LV Zhou, Director of Tsinghua University National Heritage Center, and Professor. He has worked on cultural heritage protection and practice for a long time.

³ Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China, ICOMOS China, 2000, p14

⁴ World Heritage Convention, UNESCO, 1972, p2

⁵ Provisional Regulations on the Protection and Control of Cultural Relics, 1961, Compilation of China's Cultural Heritage Regulation, Cultural Relics Press, 1987, p44

敦煌莫高窟、秦始皇陵、周口店猿人遗址和泰山六处遗产列入世界遗产名录。加入《世界遗产公约》加速了中国原有文物保护体系通过世界遗产的保护、管理,与国际文化遗产保护体系的融合,促进了中国与国际文化遗产保护运动之间的交流。

20世纪80年代以后,国际社会开始强调对文化多样性的保护。UNESCO(UNESCO)发挥了重要的作用。1988-1997年UNESCO发起了“世界文化发展十年”行动,提出:“认识文化向度的发展;肯定和鼓励确认文化身份;扩大文化参与;促进国际文化合作”⁶的主题。

在涉及文化遗产保护时,UNESCO 1990-95中期战略指出:“文化遗产是一个物化的信息整体,它既具有特定的艺术或象征性,又由于被过去的各个文化所传承而属于整个人类。作为实在而丰富的文化身份的复合体,作为属于全体人类的遗存,文化遗产给予每一个特定的地点以独特性,它同时也是人类经验的宝库。从这一角度文化遗产的保护与诠释是文化政策的基石。”⁷

世界遗产委员会在1990年代提出了世界遗产的不平衡问题,反映为文化遗产与自然遗产的不平衡,地区间遗产数量的不平衡,遗产类型之间的不平衡以及保护能力的平衡。针对这一问题,世界遗产委员会和专业咨询机构提出了文化景观、文化线路等新的遗产类型。这些新的遗产类型的核心价值是文化价值。

在中国同样也表现出了对文化价值的关注。在五台山的申遗文本中突出了佛教圣地的价值,登封古建筑群强调了天地之中的概念,西湖和红河哈尼梯田采用了文化景观的申报方式反映了中国在运用文化价值保护遗产方面已经积累了一定的经验。

在《准则》修订中,提出文化价值是文物古迹的重要价值的条件已经具备。

《准则》修订版中提出的文化价值,是在对国际文化遗产保护发展趋势认识的基础上,根据中国近年文化遗产保护的实践提出来的,它反映了中国文化遗产保护的基本情况。关于文化价值的评估,在20世纪90年代三峡工程库区文物抢救工程中就已经得到了运用,三峡文物抢救重点工程之一的云阳张飞庙的搬迁选址就是依据了对文化价值和社会价值的分析。

澳大利亚的《巴拉宪章》提出了文化重要性(Cultural Significance)的概念,并认为文化重要性是一项整体价值,涵盖了历史、艺术等其他多种价值。与《巴拉宪章》不同,《准则》修订版中的文化价值是一个与历史价值、艺术价值、科学价值相平行的价值认识对象,与社会价

ing the Beijing Forbidden City, the Great Wall, the Dunhuang Mogao Caves, Mausoleum of the First Qin Emperor, Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian and Mount Taishan. By joining the World Heritage Convention, China has accelerated the integration of its cultural heritage protection system into the international system through the protection and management of World Heritage sites, promoting the dialogue between China and the cultural heritage protection movements in the globe.

In the 1980s, the international community started to focus on the protection of cultural diversity, in which UNESCO has played an important role. In 1988-1997, UNESCO launched the “World Decade for Cultural Development” action and pointed out the theme: “acknowledging the cultural dimension of development; affirming and enriching cultural identities; broadening participation in culture; promoting international cultural co-operation”.⁶

When it comes to the protection of cultural heritage, UNESCO pointed out in its 1990-95 Medium-Term Strategy: “The cultural heritage may be defined as the entire corpus of material signs - either artistic or symbolic - handed on by the past to each culture and, therefore, to the whole of humankind. As a constituent part of the affirmation and enrichment of cultural identities, as a legacy belonging to all humankind, the cultural heritage gives each particular place its recognizable features and is the storehouse of human experience. The preservation and the presentation of the cultural heritage are therefore a corner-stone of any cultural policy.”⁷

The World Heritage Committee raised the issue of the existing imbalance of the World Heritage List in 1990, reflected as the

imbalance between cultural and natural properties, between regions, between different heritage types as well as the imbalance of protection ability. To solve this problem, the World Heritage Committee and its professional advisory bodies proposed new types of properties such as cultural landscape and cultural routes, the core of which lies in cultural values.

China has also paid attention to cultural values. In their nomination dossiers for UNESCO’s World Heritage List, Mount Wutai and Historic Monuments of Dengfeng stresses the value of a sacred Buddhist mountain and the idea of “the Center of Heaven and Earth”, while the West Lake and Honghe Hani Rice Terraces were nominated in the category of cultural landscape, which all reflect China’s accumulating experience in using cultural value to protect heritage.

The conditions we have when revising the Principles have been ripe for the proposal that cultural value is a significant value of cultural heritage.

The cultural value proposed in the revised Principles is based on the understanding of the development trend of international protection of cultural heritage and China’s practice in cultural heritage protection over recent years. It has reflected an overview of China’s effort in this regard. The assessment of cultural value was applied in the works to save the cultural relics in the Three Gorges as early as in the 1990s. One of the key projects in is the relocation of Yunyang Zhangfei Temple, during which the selection of the new site was based on the analysis of cultural values and social values.

The concept of Cultural Significance was proposed in Australia’s Burra Charter, which is defined as a complete range of values from historical, artistic to other values. the Principles takes a different view by defining cultural value as a parallel concept to historical value, artistic value and scientific value, with equal

⁶ 第25届UNESCO大会,巴黎,1989,中期计划草案(1990-1995),p51。

⁷ 第25届UNESCO大会,巴黎,1989,中期计划草案(1990-1995),p57。

⁶ General Conference Twenty-fifth session, Paris 1989, Draft Medium-Term Plan (1990-1995), p51

⁷ General Conference Twenty-fifth session, Paris 1989, Draft Medium-Term Plan (1990-1995), p57

值具有同等重要的位置。这一认识和定位符合中国目前文化遗产保护的基本情况和发 展要求，这一价值认识促进中国文化遗产保护的发展，为文化多样性的保护和“活态遗产”的保护建立新的价值评估体系发挥重要的作用。

二、关于真实性的保护原则

真实性是《实施世界遗产公约操作指南》中提出的文化遗产评估的重要指标。这一指标发展变化的过程，反映了国际文化遗产保护领域理论和实践的发展。真实性的概念最早源于对艺术品的保护，特别是在 18、19 世纪欧洲在艺术品收藏、保护的领域逐步形成了关于真实性的思考。这种强调物质遗存真实性的保护概念在《威尼斯宪章》中得到了反映。

这种强调物质遗存真实性的观念同样在 1977 年的第一版《实施世界遗产公约操作指南》中反映出来：“文化遗产应当接受设计、材料、工艺和地点方面的真实性检验；真实性不局限于考虑文化遗产原初的形式和结构，而且还包括随着时间的推移，它们自身演化过程所有具有历史和艺术价值的持续的变化和添加。”⁸

1994 年的《奈良文件》也引发了中国关于真实性问题的讨论。有人把“真实性”翻译成“原真性”，并把“原”字延伸为“原状”，重谈中国文物保护中曾经出现的所谓“恢复原状”思想，强调文物的“复原”。他们提出：“对于已经损坏了的文物建筑，只要按照原型制、原材料、原结构、原工艺进行认真修复，科学复原，依然具有科学价值、艺术价值和历史价值。按照‘不改变原状’的原则科学修复的古建筑不能视为‘假古董’”⁹。有人则将从其他地方拆来的明清建筑材料用在另一处明清建筑的修缮上称之为保护了对象的“原真性”；更有人把“真实性”与《威尼斯宪章》对立起来，希望通过对所谓“真实性”的强调来突破《威尼斯宪章》提出的文物保护原则。

《奈良文件》把《威尼斯宪章》中关于真实性的概念发展为在尊重文化多样性的语境下对文化遗产相关联的各种文化内涵的整体保护；把真实性包括设计、材料、工艺和地点的内容，扩展为形式与设计、材料与物质、用途与功能、传统与技术、地点与背景、精神与情感，其他内在或外在因素。这种对真实性的表述，强调了整体认识和保护文化遗产，把物质遗产和非物质文化遗产作为一个整体进行保护。但世界遗产委员会直到 11 年后的 2005 年才把《奈良文件》关于真实性的阐述放到当年的《实施世界遗产公约操作指南》（2005 版）中，这时距离 UNESCO 通过《保护非物质文化遗产的国际公约》已经两年，失去了建立起一个以现有的世界遗产保护体系为基础的包括物质和非物质文化遗产的更为整体

importance as social value. This understanding is in line with the current situation and development requirements of China's cultural heritage protection, which promotes the development of China's cultural heritage protection and plays an important role in the establishment of a new evaluation system for the protection of cultural diversity and "Living Heritage".

II. On the Protection Principle of Authenticity

Authenticity is an important condition that is proposed in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention when assessing cultural heritage. The involvement of this condition has reflected the development of the theories and practices in international cultural heritage protection. The concept of authenticity originates from the protection of artworks. Authenticity was gradually given more consideration in the fields of artwork collection and protection in Europe in the 18th and 19th century. The protection ideas with emphasis on the authenticity of historical remains was further elaborated in the Venice Charter.

The concept of authenticity was also highlighted in the 1st edition of Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in 1977: "the property should meet the test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship and setting; authenticity does not limit consideration to original form and structure but includes all subsequent modifications and additions over the course of time, which in themselves possess artistic or historical values."⁸

The 1994 Nara document also triggered discussions about authenticity in China. Some people interpret "authenticity" as "originality", emphasizing on the so-called "restoration" thinking once appeared in China's heritage protection. They proposed that: "historic buildings which have been damaged will still

have scientific, artistic and historical value as long as they are rehabilitated in a scientific way by following the original prototype, material, structure and craftsmanship. Those historic buildings restored under the scientific principle of "without changing the original status" should not be considered as "fake antiques".⁹ Some people would believe that the "originality" was preserved when using materials taken from one building of Ming and Qing dynasties to restore another building from the same period of the history. Some even put "authenticity" in opposition to Venice Charter, to serve the purpose of breaking through the principles of cultural relics protection established in Venice Charter by making use of the so-called "authenticity".

The Nara Document has further developed the concept of authenticity in Venice Charter into an overall protection of various cultural implications associated with cultural heritage in a context of respect for cultural diversity; the sources of authenticity has also been expanded from design, material, workmanship and location to include form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, spirit and feeling and other internal or external factors. By emphasizing on understanding and conserving cultural heritage in a comprehensive and overall manner, this statement of authenticity considers to protect tangible and intangible cultural heritage as a whole. However, it was not until 11 years later in 2005 that the statement on authenticity in Nara Document was finally put into the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (2005 edition) by World Heritage Committee, almost 2 years after the adoption of the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage by UNESCO, thus losing the best opportunity to establish a more ambitious and holistic protection system which includes both

⁸ UNESCO, CC-77/CONF.001/8 Rev.

⁹ 曲阜宣言

⁸ UNESCO, CC-77/CONF.001/8 Rev.

⁹ Pronunciamento in Qufu

的宏大的保护体系的时机。

针对《奈良文件》库纳特·E. 拉森 (Knut Einar Larsen) 认为：“奈良文件反映了国际文化遗产保护的教条已经从以欧洲为中心的道路转化为以文化相对主义为特征的后现代立场。这并不意味着以后关于真实性的国际讨论失去了意义。在这种情况下保护专家们需要明确如何把这一真实性的概念与他们各自国家的实际情况和文化环境相结合”¹⁰。

稻叶信子认为：“1994年11月在日本古都奈良召开的关于真实性的奈良会议已经成为了遗产保护史中一个里程碑式的事件。奈良会议的重要贡献在于扩展了在经历了一百年的发展之后由《威尼斯宪章》确立的关注于文化遗产物质遗存（材料）保护的遗产概念范围，强调了文化多样性和遗产多样性的重要意义。

.....

在对奈良会议进行评价时，一些观察者认为这次会议是对欧洲中心主义的再检验（批判），特别是由于会议在日本召开，这里的遗产结构大多是由木材，这样一种脆弱的有机材料构成的，这涉及到经常出现的关于砖石材料的遗产和木结构遗产，或欧洲遗产和非欧洲遗产的争论。但这样的解释降低了这次会议的真正价值。

.....

1994年奈良会议把真实性的概念从材料的范畴扩大到了‘精神’和‘感觉’的领域，但随着我们使用真实性这个词来讨论那些扩展后的概念时，‘真实性’这个词本身却引起了困惑。”¹¹

事实上，尽管《奈良文件》提供了一种后现代主义的视角，但包括 ICOMOS 自己在内的许多文化遗产保护领域的人们在使用《奈良文件》提出的真实性原则的时候，却仍然是在现代主义思维的框架下，这本身也造成了对真实性认识和理解的混乱。中国文化遗产保护中关于真实性的讨论也反映了同样的问题。

尽管如此，从中国近年文化遗产保护的实践还是可以清楚地看到真实性对保护具有的指导作用，在《准则》修订版中，真实性被作为一个重要的保护原则，来重新整合 2000 年版《准则》中提出的一些保护原则，同时也基于对文化价值的认识，赋予了真实性针对中国文物保护存在的特定问题的内涵和意义。

2000 年版《准则》提出了中国文物古迹保护的十条原则，其中“必须原址保护”、“保存现存实物原状与历史信息”、“正确把握审美标准”、“必须保护文物环境”、“已不存在的建筑不应重建”等标准已经在

tangible and intangible cultural heritage on a basis of the existing protection system of World Heritage.

Knut Einar Larsen commented on the Nara Document: “The Nara document reflects that the international cultural heritage protection doctrines have shifted away from the Eurocentric path to a postmodern one characterized by cultural relativism. But it does not mean that the discussions about the authenticity internationally has lost their meanings, in which case the protection experts should be more clear on how to fit the authenticity concept into the reality and the respective cultural contexts of their countries.”¹⁰

Mrs. Nobuko Inaba commented: The Nara Conference on Authenticity held in Japanese ancient city of Nara in November 1994 has become a milestone in the history of heritage conservation. The significance of Nara Conference is that it has gone beyond the scope of heritage concept which focused on the conservation of physical remains of cultural heritage starting from the Venice Charter with one hundred years of development, and to the emphasis on the importance of cultural diversity and heritage diversity.

...

When commenting on the Nara Conference, some observers believe that the conference is a re-examination (to criticize) of Eurocentric thinking. Particularly since it was held in Japan, where most of the heritage structure is made of wood, a fragile organic material, it involves more controversy about stone and wood heritage or European heritage and non-European heritage. But this interpretation compromises the real value of this meeting.

...

Nara Conference in 1994 has expanded the concept of authenticity from a material scale to the mental or perceptual field. However, as we use the word “authenticity” to discuss the extend-

ed concepts, the word itself has caused confusion.¹¹

In fact, despite that the Nara Document provides a post-modernism perspective, people engaging in cultural heritage protection including ICOMOS itself still adopt the modernist thinking framework while using the principle of authenticity proposed by the Nara document, which has caused confusion in the understanding of authenticity. The discussion of authenticity in China’s cultural heritage conservation has also reflected the same problem.

Nevertheless, the guiding role of authenticity in conservation has been highlighted in the practices of China’s cultural heritage protection over recent years. *In the revised Principles, authenticity is used as an important protection principle to reintegrate some of the protection principles proposed in the old Principles (2000 Edition). Based on the understanding of cultural values, the principle of authenticity was also given specific meaning and significance as to China’s cultural heritage contexts.*

The Principles (2000 edition) proposed 10 principles for the conservation of heritage sites in China, and some principles among them, such as “conservation must be undertaken in situ”, “physical remains should be conserved in their historic condition without loss of evidence”, “appropriate aesthetic criteria should be observed”, “the setting of a heritage site must be conserved”, “a building that no longer survives should not be reconstructed” etc., have been widely recognized in the conservation of Chinese heritage. Falling into the scope of conservation of physical remains, they are integrated into the principle of authenticity in the revised Principles. Taking into account that the principle of authenticity covers a holistic conservation of both tangible and intangible aspects, the new Principles has emphasized the significance of preserving cultural traditions associated with tangible heritage. It is also marketing

¹⁰ 奈良真实性文件, xiii.

¹¹ Conserving the authentic, ICCROM, 2009

¹⁰ Nara Conference on Authenticity, xiii.

¹¹ Conserving the authentic, ICCROM, 2009

中国文物保护中被普遍认识，它们基本属于真实性原则中关于物质形态文化遗产保护的范畴，《准则》修订版将它们整合、并入真实性原则，同时考虑到真实性原则对物质与非物质文化遗产保护的整体性，强调了保护与物质遗产相关联的文化传统的意义。这也针对了一些地方存在的在对物质形态的遗产进行保护的同时，改变了原有的社区结构，使原本丰富多样的传统生活方式在保护过程中被彻底改变的问题。

三、关于文物古迹的合理利用

合理利用是国际文化遗产保护中被普遍认同的保护方式。1975年欧洲理事会通过的《欧洲建筑遗产宪章》指出：“建筑遗产是一项不可替代的具有精神、文化、社会和经济价值的资产。每一代人都从这些遗产产生自己对历史不同的阐释并获得新的启示。这些资产历经千百年，对它们的任何破坏将使我们变得更为贫穷，因为今天创造的新的东西无论多好都无法弥补我们的损失。我们的社会现在必须要节约资源。不是作为一种奢侈品，这种遗产是一项可以用来拯救社区资源的经济资产...整体维护是由运用精确的修复技术和对恰当的功能的选择来实现的”¹²。赋予建筑遗产恰当的功能，保持它们在当代社会中的活力是欧洲建筑遗产保护的重要经验。

1972年ICOMOS在布达佩斯召开的第三届大会上通过了“在历史城市中引入当代建筑的决议”，提出：“通过寻求新的用途，复兴纪念物和建筑群是合理和值得推荐的做法。这种用途无论对于建筑的内部或外部都不能影响其作为整体的结构或特征”¹³。在《华盛顿宪章》中，ICOMOS进一步阐释了保护与利用及社会发展的关系：“保护历史城镇与城区意味着这种城镇和城区的保护和修复及其发展并和谐地适应现代生活所需要的各种步骤”；“新的作用和活动应该与历史城镇和城区的特征相适应。使这些地区适应现代生活需要认真仔细地安装（设置）或改进公共服务设施”；“房屋的改进应是保存的基本目标之一”；“当需要修建新建筑物或对现有建筑物改建时，应该尊重现有的空间布局，特别是在规模和地段大小方面，与周围环境和谐的因素的引入不应受到打击，因为这些特征能为这一地区增添光彩。”¹⁴

1976年，UNESCO通过的《内罗毕建议》第33条提出“保护和修复工作应与振兴活动齐头并进。因此，适当保持现有的适当作用，特别是贸易和手工艺，并增加新的作用是非常重要的，这些新作用从长远来看，如果具有生命力，应与其所在的城镇、地区或国家的经济和社会

the issue of the change of the original community structure and its diversified traditional lifestyles during the process of dealing with the physical aspects of cultural heritage.

III. On the Rational Use of Cultural Heritage

Rational use is the generally accepted method among the international community of cultural heritage conservation. 1975 European Charter of the Architectural Heritage adopted by the Council of Europe points out that: “The architectural heritage is a capital of irreplaceable spiritual, cultural, social and economic value. Each generation places a different interpretation on the past and derives new inspiration from it. This capital has been built up over the centuries; the destruction of any part of it leaves us poorer since nothing new that we create, however fine, will make good the loss. Our society now has to husband its resources. Far from being a luxury this heritage is an economic asset which can be used to save community resources...Integrated conservation is achieved by the application of sensitive restoration techniques and the correct choice of appropriate functions.”¹² To vest proper function in architectural heritage and maintain their vitality in contemporary society is an important European experience in the conservation of architectural heritage.

In 1972, the 3rd General Assembly of ICOMOS held in Budapest passed the “Resolutions of the Symposium on the Introduction of Contemporary Architecture into Ancient Groups of Buildings” and proposed that: “the revitalization of monuments and groups of buildings by the finding of new uses for them is legitimate and recommendable provided such uses affect, whether externally or internally, neither their structure nor their character as complete entities.”¹³ In the Washington Charter, ICOMOS further explains the relationship between protection

and utilization and social development: “the conservation of historic towns and urban areas is understood to mean those steps necessary for the protection, conservation and restoration of such towns and areas as well as their development and harmonious adaptation to contemporary life”; “New functions and activities should be compatible with the character of the historic town or urban area. Adaptation of these areas to contemporary life requires the careful installation or improvement of public service facilities”; “The improvement of housing should be one of the basic objectives of conservation”; “When it is necessary to construct new buildings or adapt existing ones, the existing spatial layout should be respected, especially in terms of scale and lot size. The introduction of contemporary elements in harmony with the surroundings should not be discouraged since such features can contribute to the enrichment of an area.”¹⁴

Article 33 of the Nairobi Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas adopted by UNESCO in 1976 proposed that: “Protection and restoration should be accompanied by revitalization activities. It would thus be essential to maintain appropriate existing functions, in particular trades and crafts, and establish new ones, which, if they are to be viable, in the long term, should be compatible with the economic and social context of the town, region or country where they are introduced. The cost of safeguarding operations should be evaluated not only in terms of the cultural value of the buildings but also in relation to the value they acquire through the use made of them. The social problems of safeguarding cannot be seen correctly unless reference is made to both these value scales. These functions should answer the social, cultural and economic needs of the inhabitants without harming the specific nature of the area concerned. A cultural revitalization

¹² 《欧洲建筑遗产宪章》

¹³ “在历史城市中引入当代建筑的决议”，ICOMOS

¹⁴ 《华盛顿宪章》

¹² *European Charter of the Architectural Heritage*

¹³ *Resolution to Introduce Contemporary Architecture to Historic Cities, ICOMOS*

¹⁴ *Washington Charter*

状态相符合。保护工作的费用不仅应根据建筑物的文化价值而且应根据其经使用获得的价值进行估算。只有参照了这两方面的价值尺度,才能正确看待保护的社会问题。这些作用应满足居民的社会、文化和经济需要,而又不损坏有关地区的具体特征。文化振兴政策应使历史地区成为文化活动的中心并使其在周围社区的文化发展中发挥中心作用。”¹⁵

由于中国文物保护单位具有公共财富的特征,它的使用通常是作为博物馆或开放旅游的场所,供人参观、游览。部分仍然保持着原有使用功能的文物保护建筑,如寺庙、学校、公共建筑等则延续原有功能。

20世纪80年代后期到90年代初,一些地方政府出于发展地方经济的需求,把文物保护单位的经营权交给旅游公司经营,一些旅游公司由于缺乏文物保护意识和技能,造成了文物的损害。这种情况引起了社会对这种利用方式的强烈批评。针对这种状况,修订的《中华人民共和国文物保护法》第二十四条明确规定:“国有不可移动文物不得转让、抵押。建立博物馆、保管所或辟为参观游览场所的国有文物保护单位,不得作为企业经营”¹⁶。在此之后,这种把文物保护单位交由旅游公司经营的情况得到了抑制。

中国文物保护单位中近现代建筑的利用是一个突出的问题,近现代建筑的定义接近国际上的20世纪建筑遗产。这些建筑大多还在延续原有的功能,但随着时间的推移,它们大多已无法满足现有建筑安全规范的要求,要保持原有功能就需要对建筑进行加固和改造,这种加固和改造如何能够在保护它们的文化遗产价值和主要特征的同时满足当代使用的要求,在满足规范要求和保护原有建筑的结构特征之间达到平衡,是这类保护对象在使用中遇到的最大的问题。

中国从1970年代末开始了持续30年的工业化进程。近年一些城市开始进行产业结构调整,一些大型工业企业陆续从城市中迁出,例如上海的江南造船厂、北京的首都钢铁公司,沈阳铁西区的大量工业企业等。它们搬迁以后遗留下大量的厂房建筑,如何认识它们的价值,考虑它们在未来城市中的位置和作用,无论是对城市历史保护还是对城市未来的发展产生都将产生深刻的影响。针对这些工业遗存,中国开始了对工业遗产保护的讨论。一些城市也进行了合理利用的探索。例如北京组织了对首都钢铁公司的旧址的规划,强调了保护和利用并重;上海江南造船厂搬迁后,它的旧址在对一些重要建筑进行保护的同时,将部分大型厂房用于世博会的展览场地;沈阳铁西区工厂企业搬迁之后,原铸造厂被

policy should make historic areas centers of cultural activities and give them a central role to play in the cultural development of the communities around them.”¹⁵

As China's protected cultural heritage units are characterized as public assets, they are often used as museums or tourist sites open to the public, while some of heritage buildings still maintains their original functions, such as temples, schools, public buildings and will continue to be used as such.

From the late 1980s to the early 1990s, some local governments started to transfer the management right of protected heritage sites to tour companies, resulting in damages to the cultural relics as some tour companies lack necessary awareness and skills to conserve these cultural relics, thus incurred strong criticism towards the mode among the society. Under such circumstance, the revised “Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of Cultural Relics” clearly states in its Article 24: “State-owned immovable cultural relics should not be transferred or mortgaged. historical and cultural sites under protection used as museums or sites of storage or turned into sightseeing places should not be operated as corporate assets.”¹⁶ Since then, the transfer of management right of protected cultural heritage sites to tour companies has been discouraged.

The use of modern architecture is a prominent issue for the protected cultural sites in China. Modern building is defined similarly to those of 20th-century Built Heritage internationally. Most of those buildings still maintain their original functions, but over the course of time, no longer live up to the contemporary requirements of building safety regulations. To maintain

the original functions, it is necessary to reinforce and renovate the structures. How to meet the requirements of contemporary use via the reinforcement and renovation while preserving their cultural heritage value and main features? How to keep a balance between the preservation of the authentic features of the buildings and the fulfillment of regulatory requirements? These are the prominent challenges facing such protected sites.

China has kicked off its 30-year industrialization process since the late 1970s. In recent years, some cities started to go through industrial restructuring and a number of large industrial enterprises are gradually moving out from cities, such as Jiangnan Shipyard in Shanghai, Capital Iron and Steel Company in Beijing, a large number of industrial enterprises in Shenyang's West District and so on. After being relocated, these enterprises left behind a large number of factory buildings. How to recognize their values and the role in the future will have a profound impact on the urban conservation and future development of the city. Under such circumstance, China began to discuss about the protection of industrial heritage. Some cities have also explored ways of proper use. For example, Beijing has worked out a plan for the original site of Capital Iron and Steel Company, emphasizing on the dual goals of protection and utilization; after relocation, most factories of Jiangnan Shipyard have been used as the venue for World Expo while preserving some of the most important buildings; after being removed, original foundries in Shenyang's West District have been used as Chinese Industrial Museum and part of the former workers' residences were used as an exhibit of workers' life. In some cities, plants left by industrial enterprises are used as new art and design studios, as well as for commercial and catering purposes. In this way, the original architectural environment has been maintained and

¹⁵ 《内罗毕建议》

¹⁶ 国家文物局,《中华人民共和国文化遗产保护法律文件选编》,文物出版社,2007,p7。

¹⁵ Nairobi Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas

¹⁶ State Administration of Cultural Heritage, Compilation of Laws on the Protection of Cultural Heritage, Cultural Relics Press, 2007, p7

用作中国工业博物馆，原工人住宅用区的部分建筑被作为工人生活展示馆。在一些城市中，工业企业留下的厂房被用作新的艺术、设计工作室，以及商业、餐饮等各种用途，在保留原有建筑环境的同时，复兴了由于工业企业撤离而衰退的城市区域。

《准则》的修订对合理利用的问题给予了特别的关注。《准则》修订版除了在总则中提出合理利用的问题之外，增加了专门的章节，分别就“合理利用”、“展示”、“复建”、“保持原有功能”等内容做出了相关规定。

针对实际工作中存在的问题，《准则》修订版中强调了合理利用必须根据文物古迹的价值和自身特点，确保文物的价值不受损害。利用必须考虑文物古迹的承受能力，利用应当多方案比较，选择最为适当的功能，禁止超出文物古迹承受能力的利用。不能由于利用的需要改变反映文物古迹特征的原有形式、结构、工艺、材料、装饰和环境。强调了因利用而增加的设施应当是可逆的。《准则》修订版还强调了合理利用应当通过必要的程序保证文物古迹作为公共资源使用的公平性和社会效益的优先性。

基于“活态遗产”保护原则，那些仍然保持着原有功能的保护对象，它们功能是其价值的重要组成部分，功能与建筑、环境成为不应分割的整体。针对这样的对象，原有的使用方式同样也应当是保护的对象。《准则》修订版提出原有功能延续是保护的一个方面，主要是针对中国在历史街区、历史村镇保护中存在的强调物质遗存，忽视原有功能、原有社会结构、文化传统保护的问题，在这里延续原有功能并不仅仅是利用的问题，它同样反映了对真实性原则的认识。

结论

《中国文物古迹保护准则》修订版不仅在保护对象的价值、保护原则、利用问题方面根据中国文物保护的实际情况，考虑国际文化遗产保护的发展趋势提出了未来中国文物保护的导则，而且在社会参与分享文化遗产保护成果，强调管理在保护工作中的作用，强调了活态文化遗产的保护问题，关注了文化景观、文化线路、遗产运河、工业遗产、科技遗产等新的保护对象类型。针对这些新的类型，以及油饰彩画、壁画、彩塑、石刻、纪念地、历史文化名城、名村、名镇的保护提出了具体的保护要求。

在国际社会强调文化多样性保护，对文化多样性的尊重；强调在不同文化背景下，确定相应的保护原则，选择恰当的保护方法的背景下，如何从文化的内部获得遗产保护的内在动力，建立起文化保护的有效机制，是各国文化遗产保护需要面对的新问题。针对中国文化遗产保护问题，需要根据中国文化的自身的特点，考虑文化遗产保护政策的延续性，实现对文化遗产的有效保护，《中国文物古迹保护准则》修订工作正是一次这样的探索和实践。

the declining urban areas left by those industrial enterprises have been revitalized.

The revised Principles has paid particular attention to the issue of rational use. The revised Principles not only put forward the issue of rational use in its general provision but also added sections dedicated to “rational use”, “exhibition”, “rehabilitation”, “maintaining original function,” etc.

Targeting at problems in the work, the revised Principles stresses that the rational use must be based on the value and characteristics of heritage per se to ensure that the value of relics is free from damage. The most appropriate choices of function should be made based on the capacity of cultural heritage upon comparison of multiple plans. Cultural heritage should never be used beyond its capacity. No change shall be made, due to a need of use, to the cultural heritage in terms of the original form, structure, workmanship, material, decoration or environment which reflect the features of the heritage. The Principles stressed that facilities added due to the use should be reversible. The revised Principles also highlighted that the rational use should include necessary procedures to ensure the priority of the justice and social benefits of cultural heritage used as a public resource.

Under the protection principle of “Living Heritage”, the original function of the protected objects is an important part of their value and is inseparable from the building and environment. For such objects, the original ways of use should also be preserved. The revised Principles proposed that the continuation of original function is one aspect of protection, targeting at the tendency towards emphasizing on physical remains but overlooking original function, social structure and cultural traditions in some of China’s historic districts and historic towns and villages. The continuation of

original function is not only for use but also reflects the understanding of the principle of authenticity.

Conclusion

The revised Principles proposes the guidelines for the conservation of China’s heritage sites in the future in terms of values, principles and utilization of the protected objects by a comprehensive consideration of the actual situation of the Chinese context and the development trend at the international level. Besides, the Principles also emphasizes on the role of management in the conservation during social participation in sharing the benefits of cultural heritage conservation. It also highlights the protection of living heritage and pays attention to the conservation of the new categories like cultural landscape, cultural routes, heritage canal, industrial heritage, technical inheritance. It proposes specific conservation requirements for these new types, as well as decorative oil paintings, mural paintings, painted sculptures, stone inscriptions, memorials, historical and cultural cities, villages and towns.

The international community emphasizes on the protection of and respect for cultural diversity. Countries should identify appropriate protection principles and protection methods in different cultural backgrounds. Against this new background, a new issue facing all countries regarding the protection of cultural heritage pops out, that is how to motivate the conservation of heritage internally within the culture and establish an effective mechanism for this effort. As to the situation in China, it is necessary to consider the continuity of the policies regarding cultural heritage conservation and achieve effective protection according to the characteristics of Chinese culture. The revision of Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China is an practical attempt in this regard.

城市世界遗产与真实性问题

Urban World Heritage Sites and the Problem of Authenticity

Written by /John Pendlebury^a Michael Short^b Aidan While^c

导论

1972年,联合国教科文组织大会通过了《保护世界文化与自然遗产公约》,又称《世界遗产公约》。该公约以一些地方所具有的“突出的普遍价值”为理论依据,该类地方作为全人类遗产的组成部分,其保护责任应由全人类共同承担。众所周知,由此开启了对文化和自然遗产的识别,以及作为国际遗产届最高等级的世界遗产名录的登录工作。无论过去还是现在,这些遗产地都由国家政府进行提名。其录入的依据是“突出的普遍价值”(OUV),即“罕见的、超越了国家界限的、对全人类的现在和未来均具有普遍的重要意义的文化或自然价值”(UNESCO, 2008; 第49段)。而要被认定为具有“突出的普遍价值”,遗产地则必须符合十项标准中的至少一项标准,并通过真实性和完整性的检测,同时展示适当的保护和管理制度。1978年,7个不同国家的12处遗产地被提名为世界遗产。截至2009年夏,共有890处遗产地(689个文化遗产,176个自然遗产以及25个“双遗产”)成为世界遗产,分布于148个国家。

世界遗产往往涉及具有历史或建筑意义的相对自成一体的场所及其周围环境。自克拉科夫(波兰)历史城区名列1978年首批登录的世界遗产以来,历史城市也成为世界遗产的一大类型。随着世界遗产地数量的增加,世界遗产的范畴也扩展至城市内众多广阔的非均质性地区。1993年成立的世界遗产城市联盟(The Organization of World Heritage Cities),列入了242个不同规模大小的城市(<http://www.ovpm.org/cities,xxxx>),包括例如开罗历史城区(埃及,1979年登录)、哈瓦那(古巴,1982年)、巴斯市(英国,1987年)、布拉格(捷克共和国,1992年)、那不勒斯(意大利,1995年)、卡尔克鲁纳(瑞典,1998年)、会安(越南,1999年)、桑给巴尔石头城(坦桑尼亚,2000年),以及波尔多历史中心(法国,2007)等。这些世界遗产通常位于城市中心或中心周边区域,划定的遗产边界有效把这些地区变为了世界遗产城市,而负责管理该等遗产地的主管部门,也必须考虑遗产地边界以外的开发项目给遗产带来的影响。

但我们认为恰恰是城市世界遗产,更确切地说是其所具有的“城市性”,给世界遗产的管理带来了一系列的问题,

Introduction

In 1972 the UNESCO General Conference adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World's Cultural and Natural Heritage, otherwise known as the World Heritage Convention. The rationale of the convention was that there are places of 'outstanding universal value', that these are part of the heritage of all humankind and that their protection is therefore a shared responsibility. The most well known outcome of this was the identification of cultural and natural properties and their inscription as World Heritage Sites (WHS) that effectively sit at the pinnacle of international heritage status. Sites were, and still are, considered on the basis of nominations put forward by national governments. Sites are inscribed on the basis of their 'outstanding universal value', 'cultural and/or natural significance which is considered so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity' (UNESCO, 2008; para 49). To be considered to have outstanding universal value (OUV) a site must meet at least one of ten criteria and must meet tests of authenticity and the related concept of integrity as well as demonstrating an adequate protection and management system. The first 12 WHS were inscribed in seven countries in 1978. By summer 2009 the total had reached 890 sites (689 cultural, 176 natural and 25 'mixed') across 148 states.

World Heritage Sites are often associated with relatively self-contained sites of historic or architectural importance and their immediate surroundings. However, WHS inscriptions have included historic cities from the inception of the designation with Cracow (Poland) inscribed in the first World Heritage list in 1978. As the World Heritage list has grown so have the number of WHS that extend to broad and heterogeneous areas within cities. The Organisation of World Heritage Cities, founded in 1993, lists 242 cities (<http://www.ovpm.org/cities,xxxx>), varying vastly in scale and extensiveness of site, but including, for example, historic Cairo (Egypt, inscribed 1979), Havana (Cuba, 1982), the City of Bath (UK, 1987), Prague (Czech Republic, 1992), Naples (Italy, 1995), Karlskrona (Sweden, 1998), Hoi An (Vietnam, 1999), Zanzibar Stone Town (Tanzania, 2000), and the historic centre of Bordeaux (France, 2007). Often located in or around the central areas of cities, the designation of a WHS can effectively transform those places into World Heritage cities, especially as the authorities responsible for managing the site are required to consider the impact on the site of developments beyond the site boundary.

It is our contention that urban WHS, and more specifically the 'urbanness' of urban WHS, has opened up a series of problems for WHS management, resulting in what has become a nascent crisis. Part of this is about the conflict between the preservationist ethos of the WHS designation and attempts by local authorities to extract economic benefit or at least secure appropriate economic and social development. In this sense *problems around*

^a 英国新堡大学建筑、规划与景观学院全球城市研究所

^b 英国西英格兰大学规划与建筑学系

^c 英国雪菲尔大学城镇与地区规划学系

^a Global Urban Research Unit, School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, Newcastle University, UK

^b Department of Planning and Architecture, University of West of England, UK

^c Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield, UK

导致了新危机的形成。其原因部分来自世界遗产提名方面的保护主义主张，与地方政府试图获取经济利益，或至少保证适当的经济与社会发展的努力间的矛盾。因此围绕世界遗产提名的相关问题，其实涉及如何让保护价值的理念着眼于动态的非均质的城市景观。有人可能会说，我们既渴望保护历史感，但又认识到遗产城市是发展和人类定居行为层层累积的产物，这两者从根本上就是冲突的。

由此，城市世界遗产为城市保护中常常出现的争议和跨等级观点，提供了一个极具说服力的例子。世界遗产的治理（至少在英国）是由地方政府领导的，这些政府机构的职权范围远不仅仅局限于文化议题。地方政府往往与颇具分歧的地方利益、国家政府和机构，以及国际保护机构之间存在复杂的交互关系。而国际保护机构是世界遗产地所独有的特征，因此可以说代表了一种使价值（及场所本身）问题具体化的自上而下式的观点。

与多数保护相关的情境相似，这些议题主要围绕价值与真实性的概念，以及随之而来的管理问题。事实证明，对于城市世界遗产而言，阐明何谓真实性以及如何使其持续发展是极其困难的。在我们所讨论的案例中，比起我们认定为具有“突出的普遍价值”的特定的物质文物，“真实性”问题与为这些文物提供一个恰当的更广泛的框架的关系更为密切。因此，国际古迹遗址理事会 (ICOMOS) 和联合国教科文组织都制定了各自的概念框架来思考历史城市，甚至更进一步，思考对正在进行的发展实施监察，从而出现了对国家和地方政府采取强硬态度的趋势。

因此，本文在开篇首先简要回顾了世界遗产管理几乎普遍面临的问题，如商品化压力以及“所有权”问题带来的紧张关系，之后聚焦于特别针对城市世界遗产的有关议题。这些议题包括：城市世界遗产作为城市的组成部分，与分散的纪念性遗址相比，所独有的不同的经济和治理背景。更为关键的是，城市世界遗产管理中出现多数冲突，都是由于我们把真实性用于城市尺度时，缺乏对城市背景下“真实性”本质的清晰阐述和共识，这也是文章下一章节讨论的重点。为了进一步澄清这个棘手的问题，教科文组织正在努力发展“历史性城镇景观”的概念。

世界遗产的城市挑战

世界遗产地数量的飞速扩张，背后是国家和地方政府对提名热切向往。其目的不但是为了获得提名所带来的荣誉，更重要的是随之而来的经济利益，尤其是跟随申遗成功而来的旅游业的发展。（请见范例：Smith, 2002 on Maritime Greenwich）遗产地的登录是基于“突出的普遍价值”的性质，然而想要获得世界遗产地身份的最直接的动力却来自其所能增加的经济活动和利益。因为人们往往认为“世界遗产”这一称谓属于那些非常特殊的对象，从旅游业的角度则是“必看的景点”……不用说，这样的一场地对旅客而言极具吸引力，因此新遗产的登录，辅以相应的宣传，自然保证了游客数量的增长。（Shackley, 1998: Preface）

the WHS designation revolve around attempts to fix ideas of conservation value on dynamic, heterogeneous urban landscapes. It might be argued that there are fundamental tensions between the desire to preserve a sense of the past and recognising that heritage cities are the product of layers of development and habitation.

In this context urban WHS present a particularly telling example of the contestations and multi-scalar perspectives that frequently exist with urban conservation. WHS governance (in the UK at least) is led by local government bodies that have a remit that extends much wider than cultural issues. Local government is engaged in a complex interaction between frequently divergent local interests, national government and agencies and international conservation bodies. This latter dimension is unique to WHS and arguably presents a top-down view in which questions of value (and places themselves) are objectified.

As in most conservation contexts, these issues have revolved around the idea of value and authenticity and its subsequent management. *Articulating what authenticity is and how it should be sustained has proven particularly difficult with urban WHS.* In the examples we discuss this has often been less to do with the particular material artefacts in which outstanding universal value is said to rest as in providing a broader framework for these objects that is considered appropriate. This has led to both ICOMOS/UNESCO seeking to develop its own conceptual framework for thinking about historic cities and to a higher degree of scrutiny by these agencies over development taking place. In turn there has been a greater willingness to ‘get tough’ with national and local governments.

Thus the paper begins by briefly reflecting on some of the ten-

sions of WHS management that might be considered near-universal, such as the pressures of commodification and tensions over ‘ownership’, before focusing on issues more specific to urban WHS. These include the very different economic and governance contexts of urban WHS, as part of cities, when compared to more discrete monumental sites. Crucially, *a significant part of the conflict that arises in the management of urban WHS derives from a lack of clarity and consensus over the nature of authenticity when translated to an urban scale*, and this is the focus of the next section. UNESCO is seeking to develop the idea of ‘historic urban landscapes’ to give greater clarity to this vexed issue.

The urban challenge for WHS

The rapid escalation in the growth in WHS has been underpinned by the keenness of national and local governments to nominate WHS. This in turn is linked to the kudos benefits of such status, but also, critically, the economic benefits, especially in terms of tourist development, that are assumed to flow with such status (see e.g. Smith, 2002 on Maritime Greenwich). Inscription of sites is made on the basis of qualities of ‘outstanding universal value’, and yet a clear motivation for achieving this status is the benefits of increased economic activity that ensue. For, ‘the term “World Heritage Site” is instantly recognised as designating something very special, in tourism terms a definite “must see”……Needless to say, such sites are magnets for visitors and the enrolment of a new property on the World Heritage list, with the concomitant publicity, is virtually a guarantee that visitor numbers will increase.’ (Shackley, 1998: Preface)

However, *in the act of inscription, a site is becoming something different*; it will be regarded conceptually in a different light and will acquire a new set of institutional and economic

然而，遗产地一旦被提名为世界遗产，其本身也发生着变化；它被置于一种全然不同的角度进行审视，并得到一套全新的制度和经济关系。这些关系固会伴随着一些困境；赋予这些遗产地全球认可地位的是一些国际保护机构，但其未来的管理和发展却必须“回归现实”，主要由地方的治理过程进行协调。

因此，举例来说，我们硬要运用从旅游业角度出发的方法来展现遗产地，或为了旅游消费将之商品化，都是与围绕文化真实性的管理目标有所冲突的。Van-der-Borg 等人 (1996) 对七个欧洲的“艺术城市”进行研究并得出结论，认为旅游业不但会危害当地经济的活力，也会威胁遗产的完整性以及当地居民的生活品质。再者，大量的游客也会带来重大的现实问题。例如，意大利的托斯卡纳圣吉米尼亚诺是一个风景如画却异常迷人的山顶城市，但每年高达 300 万人次的游客量严重破坏了当地的环境。(Cleere, 2006)

Maaria Seppanen 提到，秘鲁首都利马的历史城区在登录为世界遗产后，管理策略发生了根本性的改变，而背后的动力就是希望把遗产地改造成更符合游客需求的地方。其目标是将该地区“重现想象历史的殖民地幻象”(Seppanen, 1999: 69)。具体的改进措施包括众所周知的设定交通限制，并制定对商业广告牌等问题的引导准则。不过，当地也特别关注遗产区的使用，强制驱散了大量的沿街小贩，对少数留下的只贩卖旅游相关产品的商家进行严格管理。

如此的管理方式，不但引起了真实性问题的争论，也带来了其他众多显而易见的问题，尤其是“所有权”问题。虽然利马可能是一个极端的案例，也是世界遗产的倒退，但它也揭示了世界遗产地在空间冲突方面的一系列问题。在利马的例子中，主要体现在当地冲突，因为对世界遗产地的管理被当做一种社会控制或绅士化的手段。空间和“所有权”的冲突通常是全球视野下的“突出的普遍价值”(和随之而来的旅游业)，与地方对当地管理和发展前景之间不同级别主张的互为竞争。Graeme Evans(2002) 探讨了加拿大魁北克市的城市案例，以及包括居民和游客在内的不同利益相关者的观点，并意识到地方的声音在绅士化和“旅游化”的过程中被边缘化了。这样的紧张关系在众多世界遗产都曾发生，包括尼泊尔的加德满都谷地(Owens, 2002)、柬埔寨的吴哥窟(Winter, 2004)、墨西哥的中美洲文明遗产(Evans, 2004)。

上述众多关于游客管理、商品化和所有权竞争，以及管理上的冲突等，都跟城市世界遗产的管理密切相关，但这些问题也反映在几乎所有类型的遗产地上。然而，我们认为城市遗产地的管理呈现格外复杂的层次性。其中最关键的是世界遗产在经济上扮演的角色。因此，尽管与遗产有关的旅游业非常重要，但对大部分城市遗产而言，遗产地旅游仍然只占城市经济的一小部分。除了对遗产地资源的经济开发，不同模式的经济发展和更新在多数利益相

relationships. Some of these are almost inherently freighted with difficulty; a site has acquired a global accolade, determined by international conservation bodies, but the management and future of the site must ‘come to ground’ and be mediated principally by local governance processes.

So, for example, *the pressure to present heritage locations in ways deemed suitable by the tourism industry, to commodify them for tourist consumption, raises tensions with management objectives centred around notions of cultural authenticity.* Van-der-Borg et al. (1996) considered seven European ‘art cities’ and concluded that tourism menaced not only the vitality of their local economies, but also the integrity of their heritage and the quality of life of their residents. Furthermore, sheer weight of visitor numbers can present major practical problems. For example, the picturesque, but tiny, hilltop city of San Gimignano in Tuscany apparently receives three million visitors a year, causing severe environmental problems (Cleere, 2006).

The desire to construct a location more acceptable to tourists was one of the motivations behind radical changes made to the way the Historic Centre of Lima was managed, post-inscription as a World Heritage Site, described by Maaria Seppanen. The goal was to cleanse the area to ‘become a colonial fantasy re-enacted from an imaginary past’ (Seppanen, 1999: 69). Physical improvements included works such as restriction of traffic and guidelines on such issues as commercial signage, familiar the world over. However, there was also a very particular focus on uses in the area and the forcible displacement of large numbers of street vendors, apart from small numbers of carefully controlled vendors selling tourist-related items.

Such management practices,

whilst raising issues of authenticity, also render evident many other questions and especially ideas of ‘ownership’. Whilst the Lima case maybe an extreme and regressive mobilisation of WHS status, it exposes wider questions over the role of WHS in terms of conflicts over space. In Lima these were essentially local conflicts, as WHS management was used as an explicit device of social control and gentrification. *Very often conflicts over space and ownership are perceived more in terms of the competing scalar claims that can exist between the global accolade of OUV (and the tourist industry that follows) and more local aspirations for the management and evolution of place.* Graeme Evans (2002) discussed the urban example of Quebec City and the differing perspectives of different stakeholder groups, such as residents and tourists, perceiving local voices to be marginalised in a process of gentrification and ‘touristification’. Such tensions have been recorded for a wide variety of WHS including the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal (Owens, 2002), Angkor in Cambodia (Winter, 2004), and Mesoamerican WHS in Mexico (Evans, 2004).

Many of the specific examples given above of visitor management, commodification and contested ownership, and the management conflicts that result, are urban, but these challenges of managing WHS are not restricted to urban sites and potentially apply to all types of site. *However, it is our contention that the management of urban WHS presents additional layers of complexity. A critical part of this is the economic role a WHS might play.* Thus, whilst heritage-related tourism may be significant, it is only ever going to be modest part of the urban economy for most urban WHS. Alongside the economic exploitation of heritage assets different modes of economic development and regeneration are perceived by most stakeholders to be at least equally

关者看来也至少是同等有效的。简而言之，这些城市除了拥有保护的目标，还有一种需要发展、更新和变化的与生俱来的预设。从这种观点出发，一旦世界遗产的身份阻碍了当地再开发的意愿，世界遗产的经济潜力将一下子变成威胁。事实上，在英国曼彻斯特的案例中，尽管政府当局意识到可能对当地在未来成为一个城市世界遗产地的计划形成阻碍，但还是采取一种放任式的发展方式。(Hebbert, 2009; Short, 2007)

此外，世界城市遗产的制度安排跟一般遗产地也有所不同。一般来说，普通的遗产地由单个所有者进行管理，例如文化机构（如在英国就是 English Heritage 或 National Trust）。但是城市世界遗产则更加复杂甚至完全不同。其管理是由当地的规划机关通过广泛的城市规划和管理过程进行主导。除了旨在让世界遗产可持续地发展的管理规划以外，还有很多其他的规划政策机制，然而这些机制彼此间并不协调甚至各自的目标也不相兼容。这些矛盾，在不同遗产地的不同技术与政治背景下都会发生，跟许多因素有关，如城市的建成遗产，或不同地方存在的不同的发展文化差异。再者，不同的遗产地存在着与其他类型的城市资产相比，不同的地缘关系；在从遗产地得到的经济利益，以及与其他形式的经济发展相比所付出的经济成本这两者的关系上，不同的遗产地也有不同的观点；不同的遗产地对于遗产价值和管理也有不同程度的共识。

因此，城市世界遗产为与城市空间竞争和治理相关的一系列广泛议题打开了一扇特殊的但又说明问题的窗口。城市世界遗产所面临的部分状况，是在当下的经济转型和城际竞争时代，许多城镇都面临着高度压力（见 Harvey, 1989）。这些压力来自于世界遗产地的管理者不但要设法管理地方社区和游客的需求，同时作为城市领导者，还要寻找能保持其所在地生存能力和活力的经济机遇。

再开发的压力已经让国内政府（地方和国家）与 UNESCO 和 ICOMOS（负责世界遗产提名和管理以及顾问的机构）在特定的发展建议上产生明显的冲突。UNESCO 担忧各国的法律不能担负起对遗产地的保护，于是引入了“缓冲区”这个概念，指在主遗产地外围，作为遗产地重要的敏感环境的区域。和主遗产地的边界一样，对缓冲区的提案和修改必须经过 UNESCO 的同意。1997 年，UNESCO 进一步规定所有新的提名遗产地，都必须附有管理规划，意图使现有的遗产地能够改进的管理规划。UNESCO 继续施展影响力，规定如果遗产地文化价值受到损害，将被列为濒危遗产，之后将面临被从世界遗产名录上除名的威胁。2009 年，德国德累斯顿易北河谷成为第一个被除名的文化遗产¹。

¹ 除此之外，另一个唯一被除名的世界遗产是自然遗产，阿拉伯羚羊保护区。(2007)

¹ *The only other WHS that has been taken off the list was natural WHS, the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary in Oman (2007).*

valid. In short, these are cities, where, alongside conservation objectives, there is generally an in-built assumption of dynamism, redevelopment and change. In this context the perceived economic opportunity of WHS can quickly change to perceived threat, if WHS status threatens to stymie redevelopment aspirations. Indeed, in the case of Manchester, England the city authorities have pursued a *laissezfaire* approach to development in the knowledge that it is likely to stymie plans to bring forward a potential urban WHS (Hebbert, 2009; Short, 2007).

Furthermore, *the governance arrangements for urban WHS are often very different than for site-based WHS*. Typically discrete sites will be managed by a single owner, such as a cultural agency (e.g., in England, English Heritage or the National Trust). For urban WHS the context is generally very different and more complex. Governance is led by local planning authorities, through wider processes of urban planning and city management. Alongside management plans aimed at sustaining the WHS, there will be a raft of other planning policy mechanisms, often in an imperfect relationship and with potentially incompatible goals. All this occurs in a range of very different technical and political contexts between different sites, relating to various factors such as the built heritage of the city and the different development cultures that exist in these different locales. Furthermore, different sites have different locational relationships vis-à-vis other urban assets, different local perceptions of the economic benefits that can be derived from the site versus the opportunity cost against other forms of economic development and different degrees of consensus locally about the value of heritage and its management.

As such, urban WHS provide a particular, but telling, window into a series of wider issues about competition over and the

governance of urban space. Part of the context for urban WHS is the intense pressure that many towns and cities face in the current era of economic restructuring and inter-urban competition (cf. Harvey, 1989). Pressures arise from WHS managers seeking to not only manage the demands of local communities and visitors, but to also, as urban leaders, look for the economic opportunities needed to retain the viability and vitality of their locality.

The pressure for redevelopment has led to high-profile struggles between domestic governments (local and national) and UNESCO and ICOMOS (the body responsible for WHS designation and compliance and their advisors) over specific development proposals. UNESCO's anxiety over the degree of conservation protection afforded to sites by national legislation led to the introduction of the concept of buffer zones; an area outside the principal site but providing the key sensitive context for the site. As with principal site boundaries, proposals for and changes to buffer zones need the consent of UNESCO. Moreover, in 1997 UNESCO introduced a requirement for new nominations to be accompanied by a management plan, with the intention that existing sites would be retrofitted with such plans. UNESCO has increasingly sought to flex its muscle by threatening to place sites on a danger list as a possible first stage in the withdrawal of WHS status in cases where cultural value is under threat. In 2009 the first cultural WHS to lose its status was the Dresden Elbe Valley in Germany.¹

It is evident that within UNESCO the management of urban World Heritage Sites has become a particular concern. In part this reflects the consequence of a wave of development pressure affecting urban centres across the western world sustained by the credit-fuelled property boom of the 1990s and, until recently, 2000s. One particular issue has

由此可见,城市世界遗产的管理已成为 UNESCO 内部的一大重点。这也部分反映了二十世纪九十年代至二十一世纪初,由信贷刺激下产生的房地产热所推动的,横扫了西方世界影响其城市中心的一波房地产开发压力所带来的结果。其中一个突出的问题就是 90 年代 2000 年代初期对高层建筑更新的推动力 (Short, 2007)。借由下文整理而来的英国案例,我们得出城市世界遗产的本质其实是探讨了裁定“突出的普遍价值”受到多大程度的损害,其实是极具争议也极为困难的。鉴于城市地区问题的负载型,如何定义其真实性等问题的思考可能是极度含糊且不确定的。

因此,城市世界遗产涵盖了那些普遍具有异质化特征,且对遗产价值有不同阐释范畴的城市地带。由此,也对城市未来发展的不同可能性产生影响。例如,建筑创新的历史,是留下了一份保证了严格保护的遗产,还是为将来的大胆创新提供了正当的理由?再者,什么样的标准跟技术,可以用来衡量不同类型的开发的合理性?简而言之,人们已日渐意识到上述所说的遗产地必须作为一个有着特定问题的单独类型进行探讨。

城市尺度下的真实性、完整性与文化价值

有关城市世界遗产管理的忧虑,其本质上是因为缺乏一套清晰的、受到国际认可的关于应当如何管理、如何定义和保护其真实性的原则,与之相对的则是长久以来建立的针对更为传统的纪念性遗产的保护和修复原则。(Pendlebury, 1999, 2009)

第二次世界大战后,城镇规划活动扩展至历史城市,并在六十年代进一步强化,建筑现代化遭到反对以后,城镇规划更为趋向于以保护为基础的方式,逐渐地,必须在不同的范围内定义保护目标—从城市、小镇、村庄到更小的范围。(请见 Larkham, 2003; Pendlebury, 2003)除了个别国家内部作出的反应以外,例如英国对保护区划定的立法(《城市宜人环境法》the Civil Amenities Act, 1967),国际机构也开始关注并投入到以城市为尺度的保护工作中。七十年代提出了两份重要的国际声明:一份是由欧洲议会提出的《阿姆斯特丹宣言》(欧洲议会, 1975),另一份是由 UNESCO 在肯尼亚首都内罗毕会议中提出(UNESCO, 1976)。随后,ICOMOS 颁布了 1987 年关于保护历史城镇与城区的《华盛顿宪章》(ICOMOS, 1987)。三份声明都不断重复着既有的“科学”原则,强调研究以及保持真实性的重要意义。它们都强调了在城市尺度内整合保护与城镇规划的重要性,公众意见与支持的意义,以及“保护”作为社会进步工作的必要性。欧洲议会将这种保护和规划的结合,称为“综合保护”。但是,它依然是一套主要关注过程的原则。

因此,如何从保存的角度,将诸如“真实性”等核心概念运用于城市空间尺度上,就成了大问题。为了对变化中的城市进行保护,真实性就不能只着眼于单体建筑物和纪念物的完整性。这一点在针对《奈良文件》(《关于真实

been the renewed impetus for tall buildings during the 1990s and early 2000s (Short, 2007). As we document with UK examples below, the nature of urban WHS makes discussions over how much a site's OUV has been compromised particularly contentious and difficult to arbitrate over. As complex urban areas considerations of issues such as determining authenticity can be extremely nebulous and problematic.

Thus, urban WHS encompass parts of cities that generally have a heterogeneous character and scope for very different interpretations of heritage value. This in turn has implications for very different scenarios of future urban development. For example, does a history of architectural innovation leave a legacy warranting strict preservation or does it legitimate future bold innovation? Moreover, what techniques and criteria might be used to assess the legitimacy of different types of development? In short, there has been an increasing realisation that such sites need addressing as a distinct category with particular issues.

Authenticity, integrity and cultural value at the urban scale

A fundamental issue that underpins these anxieties about the management of urban WHS is the lack of a clear, internationally agreed set of conservation principles about how such places should be managed, and their authenticity defined and protected, comparable to long established principles of conservative repair which exist for a more traditional monumental heritage (Pendlebury, 1999, 2009).

As town planning activity extended across the historic city in the post-war period, intensified during the 1960s and reordered to a much more conservation-based approach following the rejection of architectural modernism, conser-

vation objectives increasingly had to be articulated at very different scales – at the level of a city, town, village or smaller area within these (see e.g. Larkham, 2003; Pendlebury, 2003). In addition to responses within individual countries, such as the legislation enabling the designation of conservation areas in the UK (the Civic Amenities Act, 1967), international bodies began to focus their concern and efforts on conservation at an urban scale. Two important international declarations were made in the mid-1970s; one by the Council of Europe, The Amsterdam Declaration (Council of Europe, 1975); the other by UNESCO from its meeting in Nairobi (UNESCO, 1976). Subsequently ICOMOS adopted the Washington Charter for historic towns and urban areas in 1987 (ICOMOS, 1987). All three statements echoed established ‘scientific’ principles, emphasising the importance of research and of sustaining authenticity. *All emphasised the importance of the integration between conservation and town planning at the urban scale, the significance of public opinion and support, and the need for works of conservation to be socially progressive.* This fusion of conservation and planning processes is what the Council of Europe terms ‘integrated conservation’. However, it is a set of principles which are principally concerned with process.

Thus, from a conservation perspective, how to translate core concepts such as ‘authenticity’ to the urban spatial scale remain problematic. In seeking to conserve an ever changing city, authenticity cannot just rest on the integrity of individual buildings and monuments. This was acknowledged during the discussions on the Nara Document (The Nara Document on Authenticity, ICOMOS, 1994), which recognised the need for urban areas to evolve and experience socio-cultural change (Assi, 2000). Conservation becomes not so much the protec-

性的奈良文件》，ICOMOS,1994)的探讨中获得认可，《奈良文件》认为城市地区需要演化并体验社会文化的变迁(Assi, 2000)。“保存”不再是针对建筑肌理的保护，而是城市管理过程中的关键要素。

2005年，通过在历史环境中结合当代建筑，提出了《维也纳备忘录》(“世界遗产与当代建筑—管理历史性城镇景观”，UNESCO, 2005)。这份备忘录关注以下原则：

- 历史性城镇景观的概念
- 了解当地的重要性
- 避免伪历史设计
- 新开发必须对历史元素直接影响要尽可能小
- 当代建筑应当与历史性城镇景观的价值相互补充
- 文化与视觉影响评估

这声明的观点并不激进。它引入了一个全新的，但尚未被定义的概念(历史性城镇景观)，扩展了传统保护的内涵(如关于建筑风格和主张的问题)，并重申了熟知的过程(如研究与评价的重要性)。

一份2006年的报告(世界遗产中心, 2006)指出10个潜在的发展压力将对遗产地完整性产生重大负面影响的欧洲城市，包括英国的伦敦塔和利物浦海上商城，针对城市提出的发展建议，UNESCO在近期也陆续委派专家到访下文所讨论的英国城市。在国际层面，城市管理的发展危机也在2009年德累斯顿易北河谷被世界遗产名录除名的同时达到顶点，该遗产是2004年才登录的。一切皆源于一个在建的大桥工程，该工程被视为对遗产地的“突出的普遍价值”会产生损害。该大桥横跨的山谷环境对整个城市而言是定义该遗产地突出普遍价值的关键所在。但令人不解的是，UNESCO仍然为该遗产新提名的留有余地，为此易北河谷将可能需要提供不同的“突出的普遍价值”案例(世界遗产委员会, 2009)。

UNESCO围绕“历史性城镇景观”的战略工作正在持续进行中。这个概念并未把城市当成“纪念物”，而是首先把城市看作人类居住的地方，所以这个概念结合了如街景、城市形态、功能性、真实性与完整性、场所精神与非物质价值等元素(Rodwell, 2008; Rodwell and van-Oers, 2007)。2008年ICOMOS的《魁北克宣言——场所精神的保存》(ICOMOS, 2008)试图把非物质文化遗产和物质场所中的无形概念(例如场所精神)结合起来。

因此，城市世界遗产经历的发展压力，进一步变成国际管理机构最关注的议题。对个别建议的关注，实质是对城市尺度下保护目标的本质的批判。UNESCO的目标是保持世界遗产地“突出普遍价值”的真实性与完整性。然而，这一切都是在城市不断演化的过程中进行的。再者，虽然某些城市景观元素相对更重要，但是，由不同时间点产生的不同元素所整合出来的杂乱全貌才是我们所要保存的。换句话说，管理城市世界遗产不仅是保存单体的构造

tion of architectural fabric but a key element in the processes of urban management.

In 2005, the Vienna Memorandum (“World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape” UNESCO, 2005) was addressed at the integration of contemporary architecture into historic context. It focused on the following principles:

- Concept of historic urban landscape.
- Importance of understanding place.
- Avoid pseudo-historical design.
- New development should minimise direct impacts on historic elements.
- Contemporary architecture should be complementary to the values of the historic urban landscape.
- Cultural or Visual Impact Assessment.

This was not a radical statement. It introduced a new, but rather undefined concept (historic urban landscape), extended traditional conservation tropes (e.g. on issues of architectural style and assertion) and reiterated familiar processes (e.g. the importance of re-research and appraisal).

A 2006 report (World Heritage Centre, 2006) identified 10 sites in European cities where development pressure was considered to potentially have a significant affect on site integrity, including in the UK the Tower of London and Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City and there have been recent UNESCO missions to all the British cities discussed below as a result of concerns about development proposals. At an international level the developing crisis over urban management has reached an initial culmination in the de-listing of the Dresden Elbe Valley in 2009, having only been inscribed in 2004. This was triggered by an implemented bridge project deemed to be detrimental to

the OUV of the site. The bridge crosses a valley setting for the city that was considered critical in how the site’s OUV had been defined. Confusingly the UNESCO decision leaves open the possibility of a new nomination, which would presumably have to present a different case for OUV (World Heritage Committee, 2009).

Strategic work within UNESCO is on-going, mobilised around the concept of ‘historic urban landscapes’. Underpinned by a perception of the need to get away from thinking of cities as monuments and a need to see cities as first and foremost places where people live, this concept incorporates elements such as, for example, cityscape, urban morphology, functionality, authenticity and integrity, genius loci and intangible values (Rodwell, 2008; Rodwell and van-Oers, 2007). The 2008 ICOMOS Quebec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place (ICOMOS, 2008) sought to connect ideas of intangible heritage with non-tangible concepts of material place, such as genius loci, under the concept of spirit of place.

Thus the development pressures experienced by urban World Heritage Sites have increasingly become an issue preoccupying the international regulatory bodies. *Beneath the concern with individual proposals are critical issues over the nature of conservation objectives at the urban scale.* The objective for UNESCO is to sustain authenticity and integrity based on the defined OUV of a site. However, this is occurring within a context of constant urban evolution. Furthermore, although some elements of the urban landscape are more important than others, it is precisely the combination of different elements from different time-scales – the totality in all its messiness – that is the object of conservation. In other words, *management of the urban WHS becomes partly about conserving individual structures*

和文物，也涉及到对地方精神的判断，要将该地方作为一个发展变化中的整体，包含其过去、现在和未来。尽管我们很难去定义变化的程度和形式，但迎接变化是保护的根本需求。

世界遗产制度的从本质上依赖于通用框架下的地方管理，因此又加剧了其复杂程度。这种跨等级的本质带来了国际机构、国家政府、以及包括多所有方在内的不同地方声音对有关真实性到底在何处的多重观点。调和这些互相竞争的主张的日常责任就落到了城市治理机制的头上。这些机制及其决策人要负责制定更广泛的城市管理目标，包括同时实现发展、确保地方的经济活力与政治需求等。在这种情况下，城市当局很难特别关注“真实性”这样微妙且尚未清晰定义的概念。因此，国际管理机构与当地（国家）政府之间存在潜在冲突也是显而易见的。

本文节选自《城市》26(2009)349-358，可在以下网址下载原文：
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275109001061>

and artefacts, but also involves judgements about the spirit of place as a living entity from the past, in the present, and for the future. There is understood to be a fundamental need to embrace change, even if the extent and form of this change remains difficult to define.

This is further complicated by the nature of the WHS regime which depends upon the local management of a universalistic framework. This multi-scalar nature introduces multiple perspectives on where authenticity may lie, in terms of the international bodies, national governments and divergent local voices, including multiple owners. Day-to-day responsibility for reconciling these competing claims and for the management of urban WHS falls upon urban governance systems. These systems and their

decision-makers are responsible for much wider city-management goals, including simultaneously looking to achieve development, as part of the political imperative of securing the economic vitality of a locale. It would be surprising, in this context, if city authorities were especially concerned with highly nuanced and ill-defined considerations of such concepts as authenticity. The potential for conflict between the international regulatory bodies and local (and national) state parties is manifest.

This article is an excerpt from the original paper on the Cities 26 (2009) 349-358, and the full text could be downloaded at the following webpage:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275109001061>.

(上接第 43 页)

方案》将成为世界各地从业者们的一大参考点和资源。

承诺：各国、国家团体、赞助方、组织和其他合作方均作出承诺，通过进一步推动或支持实施，果敢地为世界指明前进的道路。请加入我们的《悉尼承诺》活动，作出你自己的承诺！

《悉尼承诺》是今后十年，我们为确保保护地可以被视作我们星球及未来一个最佳的投资对象，所能采纳的途径的基础。它将为我们的照亮用以获取、动员和利用一切社会部门的机遇，并使我们的以此彰显保护区对人类的巨大价值，极大地增强部门间的广泛合作，并是全球、地区和地方的政策实现全方位的变革，从而反映出保护区最重要的贡献。

《悉尼承诺》是各组织和个人评估其自身有关保护区的战略方向，及制定其各自个性化“承诺”的焦点所在。在回顾悉尼会议时，人们将认为《悉尼承诺》为激发未来行动和进步设定了一个全新的方向和挑战，从而保障保护区作为有效和高效解决世界上某些最具挑战性的发展目标所应有的地位。

本文摘录自 IUCN 官网：<http://www.iucn.org>

(continued on Page 43)

Promises: These are pledges by countries, groups of countries, funders, organizations and other partners to boldly chart the path forward for the world by stepping up or supporting accelerated implementation. Please join us in activating the Promise of Sydney now by making your own commitment!

The Promise of Sydney is the foundation for the pathways we can take to, over the next ten years, ensure that protected areas can be perceived as one of the best investments in our planet's, and our own future. It will illuminate the bright spots from which we can build to reach, engage and leverage all sectors of society, through which we can demonstrate the value of protected areas to humanity; significantly augment broad sectoral collaboration around protected

areas; and transform a full range of global, regional and local policies to reflect the essential contributions of protected areas.

The Promise of Sydney is the rallying point around which organizations and individuals will assess their own strategic direction in relation to protected areas, and around which they work out their own personalized "Promise". When looking back on Sydney, people will refer to the Promise of Sydney as setting a new direction and a challenge to spur future efforts and progress for ensuring the rightful place of protected areas as effective and efficient solutions to some of the world's most challenging development goals.

The article is taken from IUCN official website: <http://www.iucn.org>

“坚持活态保护 传承乡村文明”

——松阳县传统村落保护发展工作的主要做法

Insistence on Living Culture Protection, the Inheritance of Rural Civilizations
--The main strategy of Song Yang County Traditional Villages' Conservation and Development

图文供稿 / 松阳县人民政府 Article and figures offered by/ Song Yang County Government

近年来，松阳把传统村落保护发展摆在践行“绿水青山就是金山银山”的战略全局来推进，按照“保护为主、抢救第一、合理利用、加强管理”方针，以打造“古村落艺术创作胜地、民俗体验胜地、文化创作胜地”为目标，通过系统保护、民生为本、活态传承、机制创新，探索出一条传统村落保护发展之路。截至目前，全县保存较好的古村落有98个，入选中国传统村落名录50个，数量位居华东地区第一，全国第四，被《中国国家地理》杂志誉为“最后的江南秘境”，是中国传统村落保护发展示范县、中国传统村落保护利用试验区、“拯救老屋行动”项目整县推进试点县。2015年，该县依托传统村落资源，接待国内外游客247.48万人次，实现旅游收入11.43亿元，同比分别增长31.2%、40.9%，增幅均位于丽水全市第一。其主要做法是：

一、坚持系统保护，促进传统村落古韵长存。

一是坚持科学理念。围绕“活态保护、有机发展”原则，制定出台《关于加强历史文化村落保护利用打造“松阳古村落”品牌的实施意见》，编制《松阳县传统村落保护与发展总体规划》，把田园、山水、村落作为一个有机整体来规划、保护和建设，最大程度保护好自然生态底本和田园乡村风味。开展传统村落串点连线成片保护发展和主题化旅游线路规划研究，目前已编制完成30个中国传统村落保护发展详细规划。

二是坚持科学建设。先后成立传统村落保护发展专家委员会和文化研究会，负责传统村落的评估认定、规划评审、项目审查、技术指导、效果评估等工作，加强理论研究和学术研讨；开展传统建筑工匠普查与培训，建立传统建筑工匠名录，目前，全县共有木工、石工、泥工等293名；以把农村建设得更像农村为目标，项目建设坚持以最少、最自然、最不经意的人工干预，维持传统村落原生态的田园风光、原真的田园乡村风情和古朴沧桑的历史感。

三是抓实日常保护。开展传统村落和传统民居评估认定工作，对列入各级保护名录的80个传统村落和1042座传统建筑实施挂牌保护。每个传统村落由一名乡镇（街道）领导联系负责，建立村级保护小组和安全巡查队。对日常保护情况进行定期检查和年终考核，考核合格的，每个村补助日常保护经费1-5万元，



松阳横樟村 阙献荣摄

Heng Zhang Village, Song Yang County. photo by Que Xian Rong

A few years ago, Song Yang County adopted “Nature is the mountain of gold and silver mines” as its strategy to protect traditional villages. The strategy is based on the principles “protection, rescue, rational use and management” and aims to build “ancient villages for art creation, resorts for folk experiences and places for cultural creations”. Through the approach of system protection, livelihood orientation, living culture inheritance and mechanism innovation, the government explored a way of protecting and developing traditional villages. There are 98 well-preserved ancient villages, 50 of them have been included at some time in the Chinese Ancient Villages Director. This ranks Song Yang County 1st place in eastern China and 4th place through the whole Country for number of villages ever selected. Song Yang County is called “the last secret paradise in Jiangnan” by “China National Geography” magazine. It is one of the model counties of Chinese traditional village protection, one of the Chinese Traditional Village Protection and Utilization pilot areas, and one of the “Rescue the old houses” project’s pilot coun-

ties. In the year 2015, Song Yang County received up to 2,474,800 domestic and foreign tourists, the tourism revenue reached 1.143 billion yuan, and the increase of both tourists and tourism revenue ranked number one for areas under the jurisdiction of Lishui City. Here are the main strategies employed:

1. Adhere to the system to protect and promote traditional villages forever.

Firstly, Song Yang County adheres to scientific concepts. Based on the principle of “activated protection, organic development”, the government formulated “The practice advice of how to protect and reuse the historic cultural villages in Song Yang County”, edited “The master plan of village protection and development in Song Yang County”, based planning, protection and construction on the organic system of nature and the villages, and carried out research on thematic tourism planning for the cluster of traditional villages. Nowadays, nearly 30 detailed plans of traditional Chinese village protection and development have been written.



民宿改造——木香草堂
Reformation of B&B: Woody Cottage



四都乡西坑村
Xi Kent Village, Si Do Town



国家级非物质文化遗产——松阳高腔
National Intangible Heritage: Song Yang high tone

每幢传统建筑补助 500-2000 元。县财政每年安排 2000 万元资金用于保护发展工作。

二、坚持民生为本，推动传统村落永续发展。

一是优化人居环境。按照“一村一韵”要求，优先进行传统村落基础设施建设，投资重点实施农村生活污水治理和村庄环境整治。目前，全县保有的传统村落均已实现“路、水、电、讯”村村通，并实现村级便民服务中心全覆盖。同时，按照城乡一体化要求，积极推动公共服务配套设施建设。

二是推进传统民居改造。编制传统民居改造技术指南，坚持刚性控制、弹性引导原则，指导帮助村民改造传统民居。出台传统民居改造利用专项政策，鼓励村民在不破坏建筑外观前提下进行传统民居改造，对通过改造传统民居改善居住条件或发展乡村民宿、农家乐等特色经营的给予专项补助。目前该县累计有 13 个乡镇 24 个村 136 幢（156 户）开展民居改造，其中改造好后可用于民宿经营的有 114 幢（133 户），共有民宿接待床位 1400 张

三是注重业态培育。依托丰富的原生态村落资源和深厚的农耕文化底蕴，鼓励村民、社会资本以入股、捐资、投资、合作开发等方式，参与传统村落保护发展。目前，该县已推出 8 条艺术创作线路，建成章山、沿坑岭头、李坑等一批“画家村”、“民宿村”、“摄影村”、“运动休闲村”。目前，该县共发展农家乐和乡村民宿 135 家，2015 年农家乐共接待游客 121.63 万人次，年直接营业收入 5711.35 万元，同比分别增长 41.69% 和 66.26%。

三、坚持活态传承，延续传统村落文化根脉。

一是弘扬传统文化精髓。传承优秀传统文化基因，发挥礼序家规、乡规民约的教化作用。编制传统村落乡土教材，在中小学校开设传统村落文化选修课，开展国学经典教育。目前，

Secondly, the county adheres to scientific construction. The government founded the Traditional Villages Protection and Development Committee of Experts and the Committee of Cultural Studies, who are responsible for the assessment of villages, planning reviews, project reviews, technical guidance, impact assessments, and enhancing academic research. The government carried out training projects for traditional craftsmen bringing the list of total craftsmen to 293. The aim of this part of the plan is to preserve the villages, to lower impacts, and to protect the original look and history of the villages.

Thirdly, the county implements daily protection. The government carried out assessment works on traditional villages and residences. They put 80 traditional villages and 1042 traditional buildings on the public protection list. The protection of each village is led by a street leader, responsible for the establishment of protection teams and safety teams. The government runs a yearly assessment of protected villages, if the villages pass the assessment, each of them can receive a 1 to 5 million yuan subsidy and a 500 to 2000 yuan subsidy for every single building. Every year the government of the Song Yang County spend 20 million yuan on village protection and development.

2. Insistence on livelihood, promotion of sustainable development in traditional villages.

Firstly, the county optimizes the living environment. According to the requirements of the “one village, one

rhyme” policy, the government prioritized infrastructure construction in traditional villages, and invested in the implementation of rural sewage treatment and environmental regulations. Currently, the traditional villages in the county have a full coverage of “road, water, electricity, telecommunications and service centers”. Meanwhile, according to the requirements of urban-rural integration, the public service facilities have been actively promoted.

Secondly, the county promotes the transformation of traditional houses. The government edited the technical guidelines of transformation of traditional houses based on the principle “rigid control, elastic guidance”, guiding the villagers towards protecting and transforming the traditional houses without damaging the exterior of the buildings. Currently there are 13 townships and 24 villages with 156 transformed units in residential areas, including 133 units which can be used for Bed & Breakfasts.

Thirdly, the county pays attention to tourism cultivation. Relying on the rich village resources and cultural heritages, the government encouraged villagers and stakeholders to participate in the development and protection of traditional villages by donating, investing and cooperating. Presently, the county has planned 8 artistic creation tourism routes, and a number of “artists’ villages”, “Bed & Breakfast villages”, “photographic villages”, and “sports villages”.

3. Insistence on inheriting living culture, continuation of the cultural roots of traditional villages.

各中小学开设地方传统文化课程 7 个，涉及 5 所学校、4500 余名学生。

二是大力挖掘传承村落民俗文化。全面开展传统村落物质和非物质文化遗产普查，建立系统详尽的文字、图片和音像档案，编辑出版《松阳村居录》、《松古村语》等书籍，开通“松阳古村落”专题网站。建立“乡乡有节会、月月有活动”的民俗文化展演机制，复活“竹溪摆祭”、“平脚成人礼”等民俗节会 60 余台。

三是探索建设全县域农耕博物馆。采取化整为零的方式，按照“县级中心馆—乡镇街道主题馆—村级展示馆”的三级网络架构模式，充分利用古民居、祠堂、文化礼堂等文化建筑，建设具有展陈体验的全县域农耕博物馆。目前，已完成松阳生态（乡村）博物馆群总体规划案的编制，初步建成县级中心馆 1 个，非遗展演中心 1 个，村级主题展示馆 22 个。

四、坚持机制创新，激活传统村落发展活力。

一是引导社会资本参与保护利用。支持和鼓励社会资本以捐资、投资、合作开发等方式有序参与传统村落保护利用。对投资额 1000 万元以上的项目，参照相关文件给予奖补；对利用历史文化村落创建国家 3A、4A、5A 旅游景区的，分别一次性给予 50 万元、150 万元、1000 万元的奖励。目前已先后与北京绿十字文化传媒中心、新潮集团股份有限公司等倡导旅游生活方式的高端团队达成合作协议，建成了云上平田、过云山居、麒麟山居、松泰大院等一批精品民宿示范项目。

二是激发村民创造活力。通过政府引导，鼓励村民回乡创业、以投工投劳等方式共同参与乡村建设。村民通过适度有序改造利用民居，发展乡村民宿、农家乐、民间工艺作坊、茶馆等特色经营，按不同改造标准，每平方米分别补助 180 元、120 元和 80 元；经检查评估合格的，每年给予省级以上文保单位补助 2000 元、县级文保单位补助 1000 元、县级文保点补助 800 元、其他挂牌保护的历史文化建筑每幢补助 500 元；被认定为农家乐特色村（点）、星级农家乐经营户（点）的，同时享受相关扶持政策。

三是加强乡村组织建设。出台了《田园乡村惠农担保互助社管理办法》，加强农村基层组织以及金融互助社、农家乐协会等农村专业合作组织建设，提高农民的组织化程度。截至目前，该县累计建立 53 家担保互助组织，提供贷款担保 498 笔 1.06 亿元。

Firstly, the county carried out the essence of traditional culture. Cultural traditions passed down through generations teach people the local rules of a community. The government also prepared traditional culture electives for primary and secondary schools, to enhance Chinese classical education. At present, 5 schools offer local traditional culture courses and more than 4,500 students are involved.

Secondly, the county promotes and inherits the village's folklore. The government carried out a comprehensive survey about traditional villages' tangible and intangible cultural heritage to establish a database of detailed texts, images and videos. They aimed to publish "The memory of Song Yang habitants" and "The story of Song Yang ancient villages", and to start the website "The Ancient Village in Song Yang". The government also makes sure there are activities, festivals and performances every season in every village.

Thirdly, the government plans to build agricultural museums throughout the whole county. The government would follow a 3 level concept for a network of "county-level centre, street-level thematic exhibition center, village-level exhibition center". They are using ancient houses, ancestral cultural halls and other buildings to build the agricultural museums with an interactive exhibition. So far, the Master Plan of Song Yang Ecology (Village) Museum has led to the creation of one county-level center, one intangible heritage exhibition center and 22 village-level exhibition centers.

4. Insistence on innovation of mechanisms, activation of the development vitality of traditional villages.

Firstly, the government encourages stakeholders to donate, invest, and cooperate for the development, participation, protection and utilization of traditional villages. Projects which require over 10 million yuan in investments will receive a government subsidy according to regulations. The projects which lead to a national 3A, 4A and 5A scenic attraction, will receive a one-time grant of 500,000 yuan, 1.5 million yuan and 10 million yuan respectively. The government of Song Yang County has signed agreements with the Beijing Green Cross Media Center, the New Lake Group Co. Ltd. and other organizations to build the first series of Bed & Breakfast demonstration projects.

Secondly, the government stimulates the creativity of the villagers. The government encourages villagers to return to their hometowns for business and work, and to participate in re-construction. Villagers transform their residences into creative industries, and receive support through a government subsidy.

Thirdly, the county strengthens the rural organization. The government introduced the "Management Approach for Mutually-Beneficial Organization for Farmers", enhanced the village's basic organization, and strengthened the organization of farmers. So far, the county has established 53 mutually-beneficial organizations and has provided 498 loans totaling 106 million yuan.

IUCN 世界公园大会

IUCN World Parks Congress

IUCN 世界公园大会每十年举办一次，是一个具有里程碑意义的以保护区为对象的全球性论坛。论坛将世界上保护区管理领域最具影响力的人士齐聚一堂，共同制定今后十年的全球议程。

自 1962 年在美国西雅图举办首届大会以来，世界公园大会已广泛影响了全世界对保护区体系的看法。历届会议也影响并追踪着我们对保护区在保护生物多样性及可持续发展中所发挥的作用的观点的发展。每届大会对全球范围内的保护政策都是至关重要的，提出了全球所面临的挑战和机遇，设立起标准以保证保护区的有效性，同时也成为之后十年灵感和创新的一大来源。

IUCN 世界公园大会自 1962 年起每隔十年举办一次，已举办了六届会议。

- 1962: 以联合国保护区名录为目标的代表性体系的界定和标准;
- 1972: 生态系统的保护与世界遗产和湿地公约的起源;
- 1982: 可持续发展中的保护地及保护地的发展支持;
- 1992: 全球变革和保护地; 保护地类型及管理的有效性;
- 2003: 治理、可持续的财务、能力发展、陆地景观和海洋景观的关联性、公平和惠益;
- **2014: 公园、人类、行星: 激励方案。**

最近的一次世界公园大会是 2014 年 11 月 12 至 19 日在澳大利亚悉尼举办的。随着可持续发展及地球自然资源可持续利用问题的不断凸显，2014 年的 IUCN 世界公园大会在确保保护区推动解决上述问题方面发挥了关键作用。大会的最终目标是要把公园和保护区坚定地置于更广泛的经济和社区福祉目标之内。因此，大会的主题最终确定为：**公园、人类、行星：激励方案。**

公园——重视和保护自然

2014 年世界公园大会**加强了政策和行动方面的努力**来进一步扩大、连接和更好地管理公园及保护区，从而覆盖所有在生物多样性和生态系统服务方面具有重要性的区域。

人类——对自然的利用实行有效和公平地治理

2014 年世界公园大会**促进了公园和保护区的公平的治理**，从而赋予社区（包括原住民）权力进行参与并从中受惠。

行星——部署基于自然的解决方案来应对全球挑战

2014 年世界公园大会探索并推动了公园和保护区作为应对全球挑战的自然方法，这些挑战包括：气候变化、水和粮食安全、健康和绿色经济等。

The IUCN World Parks Congress is a landmark global forum on protected areas held every ten years. As the world's most influential gathering of people involved in protected area management, it sets the global agenda for the following decade.

Since its first staging in 1962 in Seattle, USA, the World Parks Congress has substantially influenced the way in which the world has viewed systems of protected areas. The series of Congresses has influenced and tracked perspectives on the role of PAs in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. Each Congress has been vital to conservation policy worldwide, addressing global challenges and opportunities, establishing standards to ensure that protected areas are effective, and being a source of inspiration and innovation for the decade that follows.

The IUCN World Parks Congress has been convened six times at ten year intervals since 1962.

- 1962: definitions and standards for representative systems leading to the UN list of PAs;
- 1972: conservation of ecosystems, genesis of World Heritage and Wetlands Conventions;
- 1982: PAs in sustainable development, development assistance in PAs
- 1992: Global change and PAs; PA categories and management effectiveness;
- 2003: Governance, sustainable finance, capacity development, linkages in the landscape and seascape, equity and benefit sharing.

• 2014: *Parks, People, Planet: Inspiring Solutions.*

The most recent IUCN World Parks Congress was taken place during 12 - 19 November 2014 in Sydney, Australia. As challenges in sustainable development and sustainable use of the earth's natural resources accelerate, the 2014 IUCN World Parks Congress played a key role in ensuring that protected areas can contribute towards addressing them. The ultimate aim of the Congress was to position parks and protected areas firmly within broader goals of economic and community wellbeing. The theme of the Congress had therefore been selected as *Parks, People Planet: Inspiring Solutions.*

PARKS – Valuing and conserving nature

The WPC 2014 *strengthened policy and action commitments* for the expansion, connectivity and better management of parks and protected areas to cover all areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services.

PEOPLE – Effective and equitable governance of nature's use

The WPC 2014 *fostered the equitable governance* of parks and protected areas to empower communities (including indigenous peoples) to become involved and to benefit.

PLANET – Deploying nature-based solutions to global challenges

The WPC 2014 explored and promoted parks and protected areas as natural solutions to global challenges such as climate change, food and water security, health and a green economy.

《悉尼承诺》

来自 170 个国家的 6000 余名参与者在澳大利亚悉尼举办的 2014 年 IUCN 世界公园大会上相聚。我们认可一直以来拥有着我们所相会的这片土地的所有者，我们赞扬通过尊重和自然的保护区方式来应对这颗星球所面临的挑战，同时惠及人类健康和繁荣的大量方法。我们承认让人类社会和自然的关系回归平衡是十分必要的，我们也承认生态系统及其生命的多样性是我们自身存在、我们的文化和精神身份、经济以及福祉的全力支撑。

此次大会不仅对我们正面临的挑战进行了考量，还考察了世界各地的创新领袖们正如何寻找并实施着保护区的解决方案来应对从气候变化到经济衰退的广泛的挑战的。

通过吸取来自政府、国际组织、社区、民间社会领袖和原住民最为大胆创新的想法，《悉尼承诺》的四大要点集中体现了世界旅游大会的成果。这些要点——包括：一份我们所希望看到的未来的核心**远景**、一套解决世界上某些最难捉摸的挑战的**创新方法**、为人类、保护区和我们的星球推动该场变革的一系列**承诺**，以及证明该变革事实上是我们可以企及的一系列**解决方案**——共同代表了有本届大会审议得出的十年变革的方向和蓝图。《悉尼承诺》最初由一位负责大会筹备工作的青年领袖提出，是一次有意地与此类活动通常所做的宣言和行动纲领相区别的努力。《悉尼承诺》代表了当下我们将对自己的孩子所做的承诺，也代表了我们对于光明未来的信念。

《悉尼承诺》的内容包括：

一份远景：该远景反映出我们在今后十年需要的变革的一整套高水平的抱负和建议，从而推动公园、人类和星球保护和发展目标的实施。

变革的 12 类创新方法：这些文件反映出我们为实现在保护区在决策、实践、政策、能力和财务方面最深刻的变革所能采取的一些大胆措施。这些创新方法按 12 类活动的趋势和交叉性主题进行起草，将提供最具创新性的应对保护区内各类世界性挑战的解决方案，包括实现保护目标、应对气候变化、改善健康和福祉、支持人类生命、协调发展问题、提升治理的多样性和质量、尊重原住民和传统知识及文化、激励新的一代、世界遗产和海洋保护，以及能力建设的方法和新的社会契约。为了会后的实施过程，大会期间已就上述主题进行了讨论和修正。

解决方案：这份《激励保护区解决方案的概要》突显了人类为克服妨碍其自身和保护区稳定的障碍而发明的若干最振奋人心的解决方法。这些“亮点”因其具有的双赢效应而格外鼓舞人心。贡献你自己的方法！在 IUCN 及其委员会和成员的支持下，《极力保护区解决

(下转第 38 页)

The Promise of Sydney

Over 6000 participants from over 170 countries met at the IUCN World Parks Congress 2014 in Sydney, Australia. Acknowledging the traditional owners of the land where we met, we celebrated an enormous variety of inspiring ways of addressing the challenges facing the planet, through protected area approaches that respect and conserve nature, while benefitting human health and prosperity. We recognized that rebalancing the relationship between human society and nature is essential, and that ecosystems and their variety of life fully support our existence, cultural and spiritual identity, economies and well-being.

The Congress took stock of not just what is challenging us, but how innovative leaders in every corner of the world are finding and implementing protected area solutions to a wide range of challenges, from climate change to economic recessions.

Captured from the boldest thinking of governments, international organisations, communities, civil society leaders and indigenous peoples, the four pillars of the Promise of Sydney collectively represent the outcomes of the World Parks Congress. These pillars – a core *Vision* for the future we want to see, a set of *Innovative Approaches* to solving some of the world's most elusive challenges, *commitments* to advancing this change for people, protected areas and the planet, and *solutions* that provide evidence that this change is in fact within our reach – collectively represent the direction and blueprint for a decade of change that emanate from the deliberations of this World Parks Congress. Originally proposed by a youth leader in the preparations for Congress, The Promise of Sydney is a deliberate step away from the usual declaration and action plan so familiar to these events. The Promise of Sydney is at once

representative of the promise we will make to our children and our belief in a promising future for all.

The Promise of Sydney encompasses:

A Vision: This Vision reflects a set of high-level aspirations and recommendations for the change we need in the coming decade to enhance implementation of conservation and development goals for parks, people and the planet.

Twelve Innovative Approaches to transformative change: These documents reflect the bold steps we can take to achieve the greatest transformations in decision-making, practice, policy, capacity and financing for protected areas. Drafted by twelve Streams and Cross-Cutting Themes of activity, these Innovative Approaches will source the most innovative solutions within protected areas to the world's challenges in Achieving conservation goals, Responding to climate change, Improving health and well-being, Supporting human life, Reconciling development challenges, enhancing the diversity and quality of governance, respecting indigenous and traditional knowledge and culture, Inspiring a new generation, World Heritage, Marine conservation – as well as approaches in Capacity development and a New social compact. These have been debated and revised during the World Parks Congress for implementation post-Congress.

Solutions: This Panorama of Inspiring Protected Area Solutions spotlights some of the most exciting solutions invented by people to overcome obstacles to the stability of people and protected areas. These “bright spots” are inspiring because they are win-win. Contribute your own solution! IPAS will serve as a reference point and resource for practitioners around the world, supported by IUCN, its Commissions and members.

(continued on Page 38)

方芽 - 科邦国家公园

Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park

遗产类型：自然遗产

所在地区：越南

入选年份：2015

遴选标准：(viii)(ix)(x)

Category: Natural Heritage

Location: Vietnam

Date of Inscription: 2015

Criteria: (viii)(ix)(x)



方芽—科邦国家公园占地 85,754 公顷，于 2003 年载入世界遗产名录。扩展后，该遗产地面积将达到 126,236 公顷（同比增长 46%）与老挝人民民主共和国的欣纳姆依自然保护区相接。公园内有喀斯特高原地貌与热带雨林，多样化的地质特征和壮观的风貌，还有众多岩洞和地下河流。这里有为数众多的特有物种，体现了丰富的生态多样性。该遗产地的扩展保护了一套更完整的生态系统，为该地区的汇水盆地提供了额外的保护，这些盆地对保护当地喀斯特地貌的完整性至关重要。

喀斯特地形发展的过程，包括地下河流的形成以及各种洞穴：乾洞、梯田洞穴、悬浮洞穴、树状洞穴以及交叉洞穴的生成。方芽洞穴，长度超过 44.5 公里，其可以深入探索 1500 公尺的旅游船，是整个系统中最著名的一环。韩松洞，在 2009 年首度被发现，被相信容纳了全世界最大的洞穴走廊。

数量庞大的动植物品种也在该国家公园中被发现：超过 800 种脊椎动物纪录在案，包含 154 种哺乳类，117 种爬虫类，58 种两栖类，314 种鸟类以及 170 种鱼类。该遗产由於完整的森林覆盖率，生物多样性令人印象深刻，尽管某些物种的现存数量并不乐观。

方芽—科邦国家公园因符合标准 (viii)、(ix) 和 (x) 于 2015 年被列入世界遗产名录：

标准 (viii)： 方芽—科邦国家公园是一片大面积切割高原的一部分，包含方芽、科邦和欣纳姆依的喀斯特地形。石灰岩并没有连贯，而是镶嵌了页岩和砂岩，因此形成与众不同的地貌。公园里的洞穴遗留了不同阶段的废弃古老走廊，展现出按顺序排列的事件，地下河流路线变化的证据，融蚀方式的改变，以及沉积物和巨型洞窟的再融蚀，和不寻常的特征—例如陆上叠层石。在石灰岩地形的表面，有一系列突出的自然景观，从地势险峻的山脉与高原，到巨大的灰岩盆地等。在这个古老、成熟的喀斯特系统发展过程中，可以观察到至少一次地质热液活动的证据。2009 年首次被发现的韩松洞，若以直径和连续性来说，可能容纳了全世界最大的洞穴走廊。方芽—科邦是最完整、最独特的东南亚复合式喀斯特地形之一，对于了解此区域的地质学、地形学和地质编年史有重要的贡献。

Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park is located in the middle of the Annamite Mountain Range in Quang Binh province, Viet Nam, and shares its boundary with the Hin Namno Nature Reserve in the Lao PDR to the west. The property comprises an area of 123,326 ha and contains terrestrial and aquatic habitats, primary and secondary forest, sites of natural regeneration, tropical dense forests and savanna and is rich in large, often spectacular and scientifically significant caves.

The property contains and protects over 104 km of caves and underground rivers making it one of the most outstanding limestone karst ecosystems in the world. The karst formation has evolved since the Palaeozoic period (some 400 million years ago) and as such is the oldest major karst area in Asia. Subject to massive tectonic changes, the karst landscape is extremely complex, comprising a series of rock types that are interbedded in complex ways and with many geomorphic features. The karst landscape is not only complex but also ancient, with high geodiversity and geomorphic features of considerable significance.

The karst formation process has led to the creation of not only underground rivers but also a variety of cave types including: dry caves, terraced caves, suspended caves, dendritic caves and intersecting caves. With a length of over 44.5 km the Phong Nha cave is the most famous of the system with tour boats able to penetrate inside to a distance of 1,500 m. The Son Doong Cave, first explored in 2009, is believed to contain the world's largest cave passage in terms of diameter and continuity.

A large number of faunal and floral

species occur within the property with over 800 vertebrate species recorded comprising 154 mammals, 117 reptiles, 58 amphibians, 314 birds and 170 fish. The property clearly has impressive levels of biodiversity within its intact forest cover, notwithstanding some gaps in knowledge of the population status of some species.

Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2015 under criteria (viii), (ix) and (x).

Criterion (viii): Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park is part of a larger dissected plateau, which encompasses the Phong Nha, Ke Bang and Hin Namno karsts. The limestone is not continuous and demonstrates complex interbedding with shales and sandstones. This has led to a particularly distinctive topography. The caves demonstrate a discrete sequence of events, leaving behind different levels of ancient abandoned passages; evidence of major changes in the routes of underground rivers; changes in the solutional regime; deposition and later re-solution of giant speleothems and unusual features such as sub-aerial stromatolites. On the surface, there is a striking series of natural landscapes, ranging from deeply dissected ranges and plateaux to an immense polje. There is evidence of at least one period of hydrothermal activity in the evolution of this ancient mature karst system. The Son Doong Cave, first explored in 2009, could contain the world's largest cave passage in terms of diameter and continuity. The plateau is one of the finest and most distinctive examples of a



标准 (ix) : 方芽—科邦国家公园由复合式石灰岩景观组成, 包含大洞穴和地下河流。该遗产地包括亚洲最古老和最大的喀斯特构造之一, 并拥有不同于其他石灰岩喀斯特景观的地质、气候、水文和生态条件。其洞穴生态系统和栖息地, 由于高度的特有性和洞穴物种表现出的适应力而独树一帜。该遗产地也包含印度支那地区喀斯特地形中, 相对来说最大、最完整的潮湿森林之一, 森林覆盖率达到 94%, 其中 84% 被认定为原始林。再者, 该遗产地保护了北安南山脉雨林和安南山脉湿润森林优先生态区等全球重要生态系统。

标准 (x) : 该遗产境内生物多样性极高, 包含超过 2700 种维管束植物与超过 800 种脊椎动物。几种全球濒危物种也可以在这里被找到: 133 种植物与 104 种脊椎动物曾被报告出没于此, 包括一些大型哺乳类, 例如濒临绝种的大赤鹿, 云豹, 和极度濒危的中南大羚。此区「区域特有」的层级很高, 尤其是洞穴系统。此外, 预估有超过 400 种越南特有种植物, 和 38 种安南山脉特有种动物在此被发现。科学纪录上几种崭新的物种也在近年被发现, 包括洞穴蝎子、鱼类、爬虫类、蛇和乌龟; 更多新物种仍待被发现。很重要的是, 四种面临绝种的特有种灵长类动物生活在遗产区内: 海亭叶猴 (越南与老挝人民民主共和国特有种, 特别出没在喀斯特森林); 黑色海亭叶猴, 有时也被认为是另一种品种; 红臀叶猴; 以及全球幸存数量最多的白颊长臂猿。📍

更多详细内容请参阅网址: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/951/>
 图片均来源于网络。

complex karst landform in South-east Asia and the property is of great importance for enhancing our understanding of the geologic, geomorphic and geo-chronological history of the region.

Criterion (ix): Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park consists of a complex limestone landscape, which includes very large caves and underground rivers. The property includes karst formations which are some of the oldest and largest in Asia, and it has geological, climatic, hydrographic and ecological conditions which are distinct from other limestone karst landscapes. Its cave ecosystems and habitats are unique with high levels of endemism and adaptations displayed by cave-dependent species. The property constitutes one of the largest remaining areas of relatively intact moist forest on karst in Indochina, with a forest cover estimated to reach 94%, of which 84% is thought to be primary forest. Furthermore, the property protects globally significant ecosystems within the Northern Annamites Rainforests and Annamite Range Moist Forests priority ecoregions.

Criterion (x): A high level of biodiversity is found within the property, with over 2,700 species of vascular plants and over 800 vertebrate species. Several globally threatened

species are also present: 133 plant species and 104 vertebrate species have been reported, including several large mammals such as the endangered Large-antlered Muntjac, Clouded Leopard, and the critically endangered Saola. The level of endemism is high, especially in the cave systems. Furthermore, it is estimated that over 400 plant species endemic to Viet Nam are found within the property, as well as 38 animal species endemic to the Annamite range. Several new species to science have recently been found, including cave scorpions, fish, lizards, snakes and turtles, and more species are likely to be discovered. Importantly, four threatened primate taxa endemic to the Annamites are found within the property: the Hatinh Langur (specialised in karst forest and endemic to Viet Nam and the People's Democratic Republic of Lao), the black form of the Hatinh Langur, sometimes considered as a separate species, the Red-shanked Douc Langur, and the largest remaining population of White-cheeked Gibbon.

For more information, please refer to the webpage: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/951/>

The photos are from the Internet.

百济遗址区 Baekje Historic Areas

遗产类型：文化遗产

所在地区：大韩民国

入选年份：2015

遴选标准：(ii)(iii)

这片遗址位于韩国中西部山区，包括八个建于公元 475—660 年的考古遗址，如公山城，宋山里皇陵，雄镇（现称公州），扶苏山城，关北里行政楼群，内城城墙，泗比（现称夫余），王宫里和益山上的弥勒寺。所有这些遗迹都展现了朝鲜半岛上最早的三个王国（公元前十八世纪——公元 660 年）之一——百济王朝后期的状况，这一时期这里正处于朝鲜、中国和日本等东亚古国之间技术、宗教、文化和艺术交流的必经之路上。

百济遗址区因符合标准 (ii) 和 (iii) 于 2015 年被列入世界遗产名录：

标准 (ii)：百济遗址的考古遗迹跟建筑物，展现了韩国古王朝与中国、日本之间的交流，以及建筑技术和佛教的传播。

标准 (iii)：王朝首都的环境、佛教寺庙、墓地、建筑特徵和百济遗址的石制宝塔，见证了百济王朝独特的文化、宗教与艺术。

更多详细内容请参阅网址：
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1477/>
封面封底图片均来源于网络。

whc.unesco.org



Category: Cultural Heritage

Location: Republic of Korea

Date of Inscription: 2015

Criteria: (ii)(iii)

Located in the mountainous mid-western region of the Republic of Korea, the remains of three capital cities collectively represent the later period of the Baekje Kingdom as it reached its peak in terms of cultural development involving frequent communication with neighbouring regions. The Baekje lasted 700 years from 18 BCE to 660 CE and was one of the three earliest kingdoms on the Korean peninsula. The Baekje Historic Areas serial property comprises eight archaeological sites dating from 475-660 CE including the Gong-sanseong fortress and royal tombs at Songsan-ri related to the Ungjin capital Gongju; the Archaeological Site in Gwanbuk-ri and Busosanseong Fortress, Jeongnimsa Temple Site, royal tombs in Neungsan-ri and Naseong city wall related to the Sabi capital Buyeo; the Archaeological Site in Wanggung-ri and the Mireuksa Temple Site in Iksan related to the secondary Sabi capital. Together these sites testify to the adoption by the Baekje of Chinese principles of city planning, construction technology, arts and religion; their refinement by the Baekje and subsequent distribution to Japan and East Asia.

Criterion (ii): The archaeological sites and architecture of the Baekje Historic Areas exhibit the interchange between the ancient East Asian kingdoms in Korea, China and Japan in the development of construction techniques and the spread of Buddhism.

Criterion (iii): The setting of the capital cities, Buddhist temples and tombs, architectural features and stone pagodas of the Baekje Historic Areas contribute in forming exceptional testimony to the unique culture, religion and artistry of the kingdom of Baekje.

For more information, please refer to the webpage: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1477/>

All the cover photos are from the Internet.



联合国教科文组织亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究中心（秘书处）
World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region under the Auspices of UNESCO (Secretariat)

地址：中国上海四平路 1239 号同济大学文远楼 3 层，200092

Address: 3F Wen Yuan Building, Tongji University, 1239 Siping Road, Shanghai 200092, P.R. China

电话 (Tel) : 0086 21 65987687

网址 (URL) : <http://www.whitr-ap.org>

传真 (Fax) : 0086 21 65982058

电子邮件 (Email) : whitr.ap.secretariat@yahoo.com