

Experts Meeting

Developing an Historic Thematic Framework to Assess the Significance of Twentieth-Century Cultural Heritage: An Initiative of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage

May 10-11, 2011

Meeting Report



The Getty Conservation Institute



Developing an Historic Thematic Framework to
Assess the Significance of Twentieth-Century Cultural
Heritage: An Initiative of the ICOMOS International
Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage

An Expert Meeting Hosted by the Getty Conservation Institute,
Los Angeles, CA, May 10-11, 2011

Susan Macdonald and Gail Ostergren

THE GETTY CONSERVATION INSTITUTE
LOS ANGELES

© 2011 J. Paul Getty Trust

The Getty Conservation Institute
1200 Getty Center Drive, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90049-1684
United States
Telephone 310 440-7325
Fax 310 440-7702
E-mail gciweb@getty.edu
www.getty.edu/conservation

The Getty Conservation Institute works internationally to advance conservation practice in the visual arts—broadly interpreted to include objects, collections, architecture, and sites. The GCI serves the conservation community through scientific research, education and training, model field projects, and the dissemination of the results of both its own work and the work of others in the field. In all its endeavors, the GCI focuses on the creation and delivery of knowledge that will benefit the professionals and organizations responsible for the conservation of the world's cultural heritage.

Cover:

Theme Building, Los Angeles International Airport, as seen in 2005.

Photo: Gail Ostergren, GCI

Developing an Historic Thematic Framework to Assess the Significance of Twentieth-Century Cultural Heritage

Background to the meeting

Internationally, professional and scholarly interest in the identification, conservation, and promotion of twentieth-century heritage places is growing, yet significant works of the era are underrepresented on heritage registers from local inventories to the World Heritage List. Presently, much of the world's heritage from this period is unrecognized or undervalued, and is thus at risk and in need of analysis and protection. This vulnerable situation can be attributed to a variety of factors. While heritage professionals and scholars have taken notice, general public awareness and appreciation has lagged. It can be difficult to overcome the perception that recent buildings and sites don't qualify as heritage, a notion that is reinforced by some national and local registers with the inclusion of age thresholds for listed structures. These thresholds typically range from thirty to fifty years from the time a building or site is constructed, sufficient time for many twentieth-century resources to fall into disrepair or to the wrecking ball. The use of experimental or new construction materials that have not aged well, less durable materials, and experimental construction techniques have further rendered twentieth-century heritage vulnerable to changes that may compromise its significance values. Add to this the sheer proliferation of twentieth-century structures and sites, and the need for a solid methodology for the identification, documentation, and listing of twentieth-century built cultural becomes apparent.

In a May 2009 draft proposal, the International Council on Monuments and Sites, International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage (ICOMOS ISC 20C) noted the lack of a “comprehensive or broad thematic study that moves beyond the framework of modern architecture.”¹ In July 2009, ISC 20C members agreed upon a process to develop a thematic framework study for use in assessing the significance of the broad spectrum of twentieth-century heritage places. The first step is the drafting of a framework outline that has the support of the committee's four representative organizations—ICOMOS, the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), the International Committee for Documentation of Buildings, Sites and Neighborhoods of the Modern Movement (DOCOMOMO), and the International Union of Architects (UIA)—and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)'s World Heritage Centre. An ISC 20C subcommittee was convened, including representatives from TICCIH, DOCOMOMO, and UIA, to conceptualize, manage, and review the development of such a framework. The final work will be provided for use by the representative organizations and the World Heritage Committee. This

1 ICOMOS ISC 20C Workshop, World Heritage Places of the 20th Century, Minutes, 7 July 2009, appendix b, n.p. <http://icomos-isc20c.org/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/isc20whworkshopminutes.pdf>.

framework will assist the World Heritage Committee in its consideration of nominations to the World Heritage List by facilitating their contextualization in relation to the history of the twentieth century and the comparative analysis of sites. It will also be useful in advancing the identification and protection of the undocumented legacy of the twentieth century at the local and national levels in places where a framework has not yet been developed.

In order to support this process, the Getty Conservation Institute organized and sponsored a two-day meeting in May 2011 that brought together ICOMOS ISC20 thematic framework subcommittee members and an international group of invitees who understand and have experience with thematic frameworks for heritage assessment, as well as expertise with a range of twentieth-century heritage types across a wide geographic span. Meeting participants included representatives from key organizations involved in the identification and conservation of significant twentieth-century heritage places. A representative from the World Heritage Centre (WHC) also attended in order to facilitate the integration of the work with the WHC's earlier efforts in this area and to ensure that the direction of the project would be consistent with the Centre's needs in relation to the listing process. A list of meeting participants is found in Appendix A.

The meeting goals were to gain consensus between TICCIH, DOCOMOMO, ICOMOS, UIA, and the WHC on the feasibility of developing a framework, to identify key historic themes for the twentieth century, to create an outline for the historic thematic framework that will guide the work of the consultant who will be engaged to draft the detailed document, and to discuss ways to advance this study.

The Meeting

In preparation for the meeting, the GCI reviewed a number of existing historic thematic frameworks, inventories, and registers, and drafted a background paper that provided an overview of how, where, and when these are used. This paper and the actual documents reviewed were distributed to participants in advance in order to build a foundation for the meeting discussions (see Appendix B for a list of documents distributed).

During the first morning of the meeting, a series of brief presentations by participants further elucidated the various approaches used to evaluate and identify twentieth-century cultural heritage by a number of nations and international organizations. These included:

- the Australian national historic themes framework, which identifies nine broad themes that can be adapted and applied regionally and locally, as well as state thematic frameworks;
- English Heritage's thematic approaches to listing twentieth-century heritage generally and the particular challenges related to postwar buildings and structures;
- TICCIH's thematic studies on industrial heritage;
- the Cultural Landscape Foundation's thematic approaches for the assessment of twentieth-century landscapes ;
- the International Union of Architects' Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage Repository website;
- the DOCOMOMO International Register of Modern Movement buildings and sites;

- challenges in identifying twentieth-century heritage in Latin America and the need to consider systems in addition to sites;
- The ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan for Twentieth-Century Heritage (2001) and survey of national and international scientific committees.

Following the presentations, participants were asked to identify two or three significant issues raised in the morning's discussions that could inform the process of developing a new thematic framework. These issues fell into roughly five categories: framework methodology, issues, themes and site types, expected outcomes, and assumptions for the purposes of this meeting (detailed below). The group determined that the thematic framework approach is valid, and that it is already widely used and understood. While recognizing that there will be challenges, participants also agreed that it is feasible to develop a framework for the twentieth-century broad enough to encompass the multitude of significantly different histories and site types throughout the world. The group emphasized that cultural heritage is a product of its time, place, and context. While there are specific phenomena that occurred almost universally during the twentieth century (such as mass migration or technological development), each was manifested in countless ways depending upon these factors. For the framework to be applicable both globally and locally, it must be flexible and adaptable enough to accommodate geographic, historical, and cultural diversity.

Based on the issues identified by participants and on research undertaken during the meeting planning phase, a number of additional assumptions were detailed that the group acknowledged as having importance to the development of the thematic framework, but that were beyond the scope of this meeting's discussions. The group grappled with the question of what constitutes twentieth-century heritage and whether it should be defined in a strictly temporal sense. It was agreed that some themes stretch back to earlier periods, while others emerged or became more predominant during the twentieth century. The group agreed that themes are broad, universal trends that run across time and space, while physical expressions such as architectural styles or building typologies may cross themes. For instance, heritage of the Modern Movement, despite its tremendous significance to twentieth-century cultural heritage, would be treated as an architectural trend that cuts across themes and would not itself rise to the level of an historic theme.

Participants agreed that the thematic framework should not focus solely on architecture, but should include other heritage types such as structures, archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, and urban areas. It should use already widely-applied attributes of significance, such as aesthetic, scientific, social and historical characteristics. It was acknowledged that the framework methodology emerges from Anglo-American heritage place management practice and that the twentieth-century framework must be developed with the concept of geocultural diversity—which also underpins the World Heritage system—at the fore.

This framework is proposed not only as a means of helping the World Heritage Centre in evaluating nominations submitted and in facilitating the identification of twentieth-century heritage places by governments around the world, but also as a means of advancing understanding of the significance of this heritage and ultimately its conservation at all levels. The group agreed that identification of heritage resources using an historic thematic framework methodology is the first stage of the conservation process. How identified places are then managed and conserved is of the utmost importance, but was beyond the scope of this meeting.

Having set out the meeting's scope and the general parameters of the twentieth-century framework, participants formed three working groups. Drawing upon the morning's discussions and relevant existing frameworks, they were charged with identifying broad, global issues and creating a possible structure for an international framework for use in the assessment of twentieth-century cultural heritage. Although each of the groups took a somewhat different approach to the framework, the commonalities were numerous, while the differences stimulated debate and further analysis.

Each group identified a series of "themes," "phenomena," or "drivers" around which the analysis of twentieth-century heritage sites could take place, among them communications, governance, mobility, science and technology, and culture (n.b.: the group as a whole did not settle upon terminology and there may be not-yet-fully-defined distinctions between themes, phenomena, and drivers. For the sake of simplicity, the term *theme* will be used here unless there is a clearly defined reason for using a different term). There was a significant amount of overlap between the themes identified by the three groups. Each of these themes was broad enough to encompass a wide range of subthemes. All three groups wrestled with the realization that few if any of the identified themes were exclusive to the twentieth century, but concluded that each was manifested in ways particular to the twentieth century and was thus valid. For instance, the role of governance is a theme that stretches across human history, but the bipolar politics of the Cold War era were a distinctly twentieth-century phenomenon.

Two of the groups approached themes as phenomena from which specific subthemes and uses flow. Each of the three groups sought to create a flexible model that recognized how themes might overlap or combine, envisioning a framework that is structured dynamically rather than as a static matrix. One group conceptualized the themes as a series of floating, overlapping "bubbles" that would combine to form subthemes leading to the identification of resources. For example, the theme of "technology and science" overlapping with "violence and war" would lead to the "military industrial complex" subtheme and related sites. The second group envisioned the framework as a sort of "Rubik's Cube®" with three concentric parts. The outermost ring housed the broadest themes, the middle ring contained trends specific to the twentieth century, and the innermost ring reflected typologies of use; these rings could be twisted to create a multitude of combinations. In this model, for instance, the broad theme of "mobility" plus the twentieth-century trend of consumerism leads to transportation sites such as airports.

The third group drew heavily on Canadian and Australian framework examples. They started from the concept of use and identified ten use categories (education; religion; commerce and industry; government and public activities; culture, recreation and leisure; transportation and communications; housing; health care; military activities; mixed used districts and communities), while viewing social, political, and economic conditions as drivers that affect what happened in each of the use categories. Using "education" as an example of a use category and applying the drivers, the group arrived at such subthemes as expansion and democratization of education, the growth of secular education, and universities as the home of social expression and protest.

Despite the differences in these conceptual approaches, meeting participants agreed that there was sufficient consensus and stimulus to take this exercise forward on the following day. The second morning, participants engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of such topics as the meaning of "modern" and the periodization

of the framework; the definitions of themes, drivers, and uses for the period; what if anything distinguishes the twentieth-century from earlier centuries; and the relationship of the framework to World Heritage criteria. This final point was especially important, as ISC 20C's ultimate goal is to develop a framework that can be used for the identification and evaluation of twentieth century cultural heritage sites for inscription on the World Heritage List, which also has applicability at national and regional levels.

In an effort to bring the previous day's three proposed frameworks into alignment, meeting participant Gordon Fulton provided further explication of the Canadian twentieth-century framework, which had heavily influenced the development of the third group's phenomena, drivers, and use-driven framework. In addition to the ten categories of use already described, the Canadian framework identifies a series of phenomena and drivers that inform those uses and represent the essence of the twentieth century, which was characterized in part by a significantly accelerated rate of change. Fulton noted that these drivers are specific to Canada and are focused on the built environment of the Modern era, not the entire twentieth century. Nonetheless, they could provide a starting point for a broader framework. The Canadian framework's general drivers encompass:

- improved communications (increasingly rapid and widespread dissemination of information);
- increased responsibilities of governments (government involvement in new areas);
- increased mobility;
- new ways of living, working, and relaxing (fundamentally different than in earlier periods);
- increased globalization, but also increased nationalism or regionalism.

Two additional drivers relate specifically to the built environment:

- rapid technological advances;
- new ways of expressing form and responding to functional demands.

Although some participants expressed reservations about certain aspects of the Canadian model—for example terminology, its applicability outside the industrialized world, and whether it adequately encompasses the darker aspects of history—the general concept of a framework based on uses and drivers, or themes, resonated with the group and was carried forth into the afternoon's exercise, which was designed to test these concepts and move the meeting's work beyond the realm of the theoretical and into the practical.

Three new working groups formed and were charged with testing the Canadian model by relating uses and drivers to actual places of national or international significance in different parts of the world. Additionally, the groups were asked to identify the applicable World Heritage criteria. The objective was to determine whether this model might capture the scope of twentieth-century resources and whether this could indeed be a workable methodology. Again each of the groups approached the exercise in a slightly different manner, with slightly differing results, but ultimately the similarities were numerous and there was significant consensus on the validity and adaptability of the model (see Appendix C for a post-meeting synthesis of the three test frameworks).

In general, the groups found much overlap between drivers and uses, while also recognizing an important distinction—uses are often derived from drivers. It was

determined that many resources could fall into multiple categories. For example, one group determined that the Manzanar War Relocation Center, where some ten thousand Japanese Americans were interned in California during World War II, could fall under both “increased responsibility of government” and “nationalism.” Similarly, it was agreed that multiple World Heritage criteria apply to many resources.

The meeting participants were of the opinion that the drivers and uses would need some modification in order to simplify the framework, making it more usable and ultimately more effective. They discussed whether the “uses” category could be eliminated, but concluded that this would make the leap from broad phenomena and drivers to specific cultural resources too great, and that the uses category is effective in modulating the process. Whatever drivers are ultimately employed, the group agreed that a brief explanation of how each is specific to the twentieth century must be included in the framework. It was posited, though not agreed, that if there is not in fact anything unique about the themes, phenomena, or drivers identified for the twentieth century, there is no reason to create a specialized framework for the era’s heritage places.

Over the course of the meeting, a number of concerns were repeatedly raised that should be kept in mind as the framework is developed. First and foremost, the objective is to create a framework that is globally relevant and diversely applicable. It is critical to ensure that the historical experiences of non-Western and nonindustrialized countries and regions are reflected, including such phenomena as the colonial experience and agricultural advances as an expression of modernization. Related to this is a concern for use of terminology that is as value neutral as possible, for instance avoiding such potentially culturally-loaded terms as “progress” or “improved.” The framework must also comfortably accommodate the identification of sites with troubled histories or the darker side of heritage.

The question of what constitutes “modern” heritage was persistently troublesome. As one participant queried at the outset, are we discussing Modernism, Modernity, or Modernization, and how do these differ in various parts of the world? Likewise the issue of whether to define the twentieth century in a rigidly chronological manner or to allow for more flexibility was vexing. Despite the fact that these two issues were set aside at the beginning of the meeting as “assumptions” outside of the scope of these discussions, participants returned to the topics repeatedly and raised examples from a variety of cultural contexts. The group acknowledged that there are multiple definitions of the beginning of modernity and agreed that most periodizations are largely arbitrary. ISC 20C has already recognized this in its decision to focus on a temporal definition of the twentieth century. It is important that the framework clearly explain how the period is defined and why. The group also agreed that this is work for a social historian or another specialist well-versed in the history of the twentieth century, and recommended that the work be reviewed by an international advisory body composed of members of ISC 20C, DOCOMOMO, TICCIH, UIA, WHC, and other similarly positioned organizations to avoid a single cultural perspective.

The representatives of ISC 20C present concluded that, based upon the outcomes of this meeting, the next logical step would be to commission a study by a leading authority on the twentieth century who will examine these themes/phenomena/drivers/uses at a more detailed and nuanced level, and begin to outline a framework for further consideration. This work should be concise and pithy rather than an exhaustive study of the twentieth century. The group agreed that for the

purposes of a brief, the framework's initial target audience is the World Heritage Committee, States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, and national and regional bodies responsible for the identification and protection of heritage places. The purpose of the framework is to support the contextual understanding of the twentieth century by recognizing the global drivers, using typological prompts (uses/functions) to aid in global comparisons, and to suggest examples that illustrate these.

Final Comments

At the conclusion of the meeting the participants agreed with the following:

- A framework of the type discussed is a valid and useful means to provide a context for understanding the heritage themes of the twentieth century.
- The framework will facilitate the identification and comparison of heritage across regions and internationally (part of the heritage assessment process).
- This framework can be a useful component of a toolkit for conserving twentieth-century cultural heritage. It can be used in the World Heritage nomination process, but also by nations to identify significant heritage places of the twentieth century.

The following future steps were identified:

- The GCI will prepare a summary matrix of the framework drivers and uses for post-meeting comment by participants and referral to the ISC 20C for further action (see Appendix C).
- The GCI will prepare a summary report from the meeting to be made available online, along with the background paper and a bibliography of material relating to thematic studies for twentieth-century heritage.
- The GCI will maintain the meeting WebEx site to facilitate the exchange of documents and information, and will include meeting participants' contact information there.
- The ISC 20C subcommittee will try to develop a toolkit of information.
- ISC 20C will scope out and circulate a brief for identifying a consultant to take this work to the next stage.
- ISC 20C will consider presenting this proposal to the ICOMOS General Assembly in November 2011 as part of its ongoing work plan.
- Participants will consider and identify appropriate professionals who could potentially undertake the next phase of work.
- Participants will submit their follow-up comments on the meeting in writing (one detailed response can be found in Appendix E).
- Participants are invited to participate further in the development of the framework. The TICCIH board may be interested in undertaking individual thematic components of such a study.

Tours/Site Visits

The two-day meeting program was supplemented by a series of site visits to give participants a sense of Los Angeles' vast and significant twentieth-century built heritage. A full-day, pre-meeting tour of iconic Los Angeles homes and locations established a sense of camaraderie amongst participants who had not met previously and set a congenial tone for the meeting itself. See Appendix D for a list of sites visited.

Appendix A: Meeting Participants

Invitees

Charles Birnbaum, founder and president, The Cultural Landscape Foundation, USA

Roger Bowdler, head of designation, English Heritage

Louise Cox, president, International Union of Architects, France

Gordon Fulton, retired, director of Historical Services, Parks Canada

Stephen Hughes, representative, International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage, and director of projects, Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales

Susan Marsden, historian in private practice, member of Professional Historians Association, Australia

Leo Schmidt, professor of architectural conservation, Brandenburg University of Technology at Cottbus, Germany

Hugo Segawa, representative, DOCOMOMO, and professor, University of São Paulo, Brazil

France Vanlaethem, representative, International Committee for Documentation of Buildings, Sites and Neighborhoods of the Modern Movement, and associate professor, UQAM Design School, Canada

Ron Van Oers, program specialist for culture, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, France

ICOMOS ISC 20C Committee Members

Sheridan Burke, president, ICOMOS ISC 20C, and partner, Godden Mackay Logan Pty Ltd, Australia

Chris Madrid French, member, ICOMOS ISC 20C, and director, Modernism + Recent Past Program, National Trust for Historic Preservation, USA

Kyle Normandin, secretary general, ICOMOS ISC 20C and associate principal, Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, USA

Getty Staff

Jeff Cody, senior project specialist, Education, GCI

Wim de Wit, head, Department of Architecture and Modern Art, Getty Research Institute

Susan Macdonald, vice president, ICOMOS ISC 20C, and head, Field Projects, Getty Conservation Institute

Luann Manning, senior project coordinator, Field Projects, GCI

Gail Ostergren, research associate, Field Projects, GCI

Appendix B: Background Documents

NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

Australian Heritage Commission. 2001. *Australian Historic Themes: A Framework for Use in Heritage Assessment and Management*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. <http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/ahc/publications/commission/books/pubs/australian-historic-themes.pdf> (accessed 11 October 2011).

Conceived as a national framework consisting of broad, general themes, it can easily incorporate state, regional, and local themes so that it is applicable to heritage places at all levels of significance; use of the national framework facilitates comparison of places identified with particular themes from different parts of Australia.

Bronson, Susan. 1997. *Built Heritage of the Modern Era: Overview, Framework for Analysis, and Criteria for Evaluation*. [Ottawa]: Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada.

This report surveys approaches to analysis of the built heritage of the modern era (defined as roughly 1930-1975) at the local, national, and international levels. In addition, it proposes a framework approach and preliminary criteria for evaluation of modern-era resources that are significant at the national level.

Parks Canada. 2000. "Thematic Framework." In *National Historic Sites of Canada System Plan*. [Ottawa]: Parks Canada. <http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/r/system-reseau/sites-lieux1.aspx> (accessed 11 October 2011).

The Canadian national historic sites thematic framework is presented here both graphically and in text format. It is organized around five principal themes with a series of subthemes.

Parks Canada. 2001. *National Historic Sites of Canada System Plan: Commemorating Canada's Built Heritage of the Modern Era*. Ottawa: Parks Canada.

This booklet is a summary of Susan Bronson's report *Built Heritage of the Modern Era*.

United States, National Park Service. [n.d.]. National Historic Landmarks Program Theme Studies website. <http://www.nps.gov/nhl/themes/themes.htm> (accessed 11 October 2011).

The National Park Service theme studies provide a mechanism for the comparative analysis of properties associated with important themes in American history for use in the identification and nomination of national historic landmarks.

United States, National Park Service. 1994. *Revision of the National Park Service's Thematic Framework*. Washington, D.C.: NPS. <http://www.nps.gov/history/history/hisnps/NPSthinking/thematic.htm> (accessed 11 October 2011).

The framework was devised to facilitate the evaluation of significance of resources for listing at the national level, for assessing how well important themes are represented within the National Park System, and for enhancement of interpretive programs at existing NPS facilities. Its applicability is not limited to the federal level; it can be applied or adapted for use at all levels of significance.

INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

ICOMOS Thematic Studies for the World Heritage Convention website. <http://www.icomos.org/studies/> (accessed 11 October 2011).

As an advisory body to the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS, in collaboration with other organizations including TICCIH (see above), has prepared a number of thematic studies to aid in the evaluation of potential World Heritage listings. None are specific to twentieth-century heritage.

TICCIH. 2008. *TICCIH and the World Heritage List: A Strategy for Advising on Industrial and Technical Cultural Properties*. Terrassa, Spain: TICCIH. http://www.mnactec.cat/ticcih/docs/1223389619_ticcih_icomos_proposal2008.pdf (accessed 11 October 2011).

As of 2008, TICCIH and ICOMOS had jointly published five thematic studies on aspects of the technological and industrial heritage, two categories consistently under-represented on the World Heritage List. This document proposes a process for moving forward with industry-based thematic studies using the following framework.

REGIONAL, LOCAL, AND OTHER FRAMEWORKS

Heritage Council of New South Wales. 2001. New South Wales Historical Themes table. Parramatta NSW: Heritage Council of New South Wales. <http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/themes2006.pdf> (accessed 11 October 2011).

This table demonstrates how New South Wales expanded upon the Australian National Themes to create more detailed state themes and identify associated property types. This is a straightforward, graphic depiction of how a thematic framework can work at various levels of government.

Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources. 2010. Citywide Historic Context Statement Resource Guide. Los Angeles: Office of Historic Resources.

This document was created to guide the work of heritage professionals who have volunteered to research and write the individual theme statements for a citywide context statement. Sections 1-3 (pp. 1-9) of this guide are most relevant to a general understanding of the context statement. This document is unpublished.

Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources. 2011. SurveyLA Historic Context Statement Outline. Los Angeles: Office of Historic Resources.

Using the Multi Property Documentation approach developed by the National Park Service, the city is developing a citywide historic context statement around a series of contexts and themes identified by a committee comprised of experts in Los Angeles history, drawn from both academia and the preservation profession. This document is unpublished.

Marsden, Susan, with Carol Cosgrove and Robyn Taylor. 2005. *Twentieth-century Heritage Survey, Stage 1: Post Second World War (1946-1959)*. Keswick, SA: Department for Environment and Heritage. <http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/>

[Heritage/Conserving_celebrating_our_heritage/Conservation_information](#) (accessed 01 November 2011).

This document sets out the principal themes and events characterizing South Australia's development and history in the immediate postwar era. Themes were developed by adapting existing frameworks, consulting with historians and heritage staff, and reviewing historical evidence and published histories. (*See also*: Bell, Peter, Cosgrove, Carol, Marsden, Susan, and Justin McCarthy. 2008. *Twentieth-Century Heritage Survey-Stage Two: 1928-1945*. [two volumes] Keswick, South Australia: Department for Environment and Heritage, which was not distributed to meeting participants but is available at the website above).

RELATED DOCUMENTS

Harwood, Elain, and English Heritage. 1996. *Something Worth Keeping? Post-war Architecture in England*. London: English Heritage.

This publication was issued in conjunction with a series of three 1996 exhibitions on the subject of postwar architecture. It is organized around a series of headings that describe building types and programmatic needs, architectural styles, and geographic locations. Several related volumes are not listed here.

Jukilehto, Jukka, Henry Clere, Susan Denyer, and Michael Petzet. *The World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps—an Action Plan for the Future*. 2005. Paris: ICOMOS. <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/activities/documents/activity-590-1.pdf> (accessed 11 October 2011).

At the request of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS analyzed the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List to determine the list's representativeness. Three approaches were used: typological framework analysis, chronological-regional framework analysis, and thematic framework analysis. Properties currently on the World Heritage List were related to the principal themes and subthemes as a means of quantifying its representativeness.

New South Wales Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning. 1996. "History and Heritage: The Use of Historical Context and Themes in Heritage Assessment." In *New South Wales Heritage Manual*. Parramatta NSW: NSW Heritage Office.

This chapter from the *New South Wales Heritage Manual* provides an accessible explanation of the use of themes in the heritage assessment process, as well as the relationship between local, regional, and state themes.

Sherfy, Marcella, and W. Ray Luce. Rev. 1998. *National Register Bulletin: Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that have Achieved Significance within the Past Fifty Years*. Washington D.C.: National Park Service. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb22/> (accessed 11 October 2011).

As a general rule, the United States National Register criteria use an age threshold of fifty years to establish eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. This publication is intended to assist in the evaluation and nomination of more recent resources that appear to be exceptional and provides guidance in the preparation of National Register statements of significance.

Van Oers, R. and S. Haraguchi, eds. 2003. *Identification and Documentation of Modern Heritage: World Heritage Papers 5*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre. http://s.unesco.org/documents/publi_wh_papers_05_en.pdf (accessed 11 October 2011).

This publication provides a conceptual framework for the identification, documentation, and promotion of nineteenth- and twentieth-century built heritage, which is underrepresented on the World Heritage List. It compiles thirteen position papers cover themes that encompass important nineteenth- and twentieth-century social, cultural, economic, and spatial trends, which are embodied in the built environment.

INVENTORY WEBSITES

DOCOMOMO International Register web page. http://www.docomomo.com/com/momo_register.htm (accessed 11 October 2011).

The DOCOMOMO International Register was established in 1992 to document significant examples of modern movement buildings, sites, ensembles and neighborhoods, and landscapes.

DOCMOMO US Register website. <http://docomomo-us.org/register> (accessed 11 October 2011).

The DOCOMOMO US register is an online database of modern movement sites and buildings in the United States that parallels the goal of the International Register.

TICCIH International Inventory of World Industrial Heritage website. <http://www.mnactec.cat/ticcih/inventory.php> (accessed 11 October 2011).

The TICCIH International Inventory documents significant industrial heritage sites worldwide. For each listed site, data includes (as available) site name, location, contact info and web link, a description and significance statement, and a Google maps aerial image and GPS coordinates.

UIA XXth Century Architectural Heritage Repository website. <http://www.archi.fr/UIA/> (accessed 11 October 2011).

A web-based index of architecture that exemplifies twentieth-century architectural history. Data provided for inventoried site includes such information as a photo, designer's name, use, stylistic affiliation, condition, protection status, and links to external sources of additional information.

UNESCO Modern Heritage Programme web page. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/modernheritage> (accessed 2 November 2011).

A listing of modern heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List is included along with other information about UNESCO's efforts to identify, document, and promote the built heritage of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Appendix C: Summary Document: A Draft Framework for Understanding the Significance of Twentieth-Century Heritage

Phenomena or Themes (political, social, economic, cultural and environmental)	Uses / Subthemes	Examples of World or National Significance	World Heritage Criteria
Technological and scientific development	• Health	The Salk Institute (USA)	Not on WHL
	• Telecommunications	Varberg Radio Station (Sweden)	ii, iv
	• Defense	Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site (Marshall Islands)	iv, vi
	• Industry, mining and manufacturing	Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex in Essen (Germany)	ii, iii
	• Energy production	Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant (Ukraine) Snowy Mountains Hydro-electric Scheme (Australia)	Not on WHL Not on WHL
	• Space	Kennedy Space Center (USA)	Not on WHL
The role of government and changing approaches to governance (big government, colonialism, democracy, totalitarianism, communism, welfare state)	• War and defense	Defence Line of Amsterdam (Netherlands) Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Japan) Auschwitz Birkenau German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (Poland) Berlin Wall remains (Germany) Manzanar War Relocation Center (USA) Changi WWII POW camp (Singapore)	ii, iv, v vi vi Not on WHL Not on WHL Not on WHL
	• Education	Central University City Campus of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (Mexico) Hertfordshire county schools (England)	i, ii, iv Not on WHL
	• Public health	Paimio Sanatorium (Finland) Zonnestraal Sanatorium (Netherlands) Alexander Fleming Laboratory Museum, St. Mary's Hospital (England)	Not on WHL Not on WHL Not on WHL
	• Public housing	Berlin Modernism Housing Estates (Germany) Unité d'habitation (France)	ii, iv Not on WHL

Phenomena or Themes (political, social, economic, cultural and environmental)	Uses / Subthemes	Examples of World or National Significance	World Heritage Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipal facilities 	Stockholm Public Library, (Sweden) Town halls, baby health centers (British Commonwealth nations)	Not on WHL Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned cities and new towns 	White City of Tel Aviv (Israel) Asmara (Eritrea)	ii, iv Not on WHL
	Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colonialism Democracy/self governance 	New Delhi (India) Brasilia (Brazil) Chandigarh (India)	Not on WHL i, iv Not on WHL
Globalization and glocalization* *A melding of the words globalization and local, glocalization refers to the adaptation of global influences to local conditions. The term was popularized by sociologist Roland Robertson.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport (cars, air, canals, ports, bridges) 	TWA Terminal, JFK airport (USA) Panama Canal (Panama)	Not on WHL Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commerce 	Royal Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens (Australia) World's Fair sites (worldwide)	ii Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migration 	Angel Island Immigration Station (USA) Farnsworth House (USA)	Not on WHL Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International institutions 	United Nations Headquarters (USA) World Bank Headquarters (USA) Olympic stadiums (worldwide)	Not on WHL Not on WHL Not on WHL
Increased mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure/transport and communication 	Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus, formerly Victoria Terminus (India) Golden Gate Bridge (USA) Lingotto Fiat Factory (Italy) Arroyo Seco Parkway (USA)	ii, iv Not on WHL Not on WHL Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suburban development 	Letchworth Garden City (England)	Not on WHL
Culture and society (new social and cultural forms): New ways of living, working and relaxing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural institutions and museums 	Sydney Opera House (Australia) Guggenheim Museum (USA)	i Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sport and recreation 	Centennial Hall in Wrocław (Poland) Palazzetto dello Sport, Rome (Italy)	i, ii, iv Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban regeneration and beautification 	Baltimore waterfront redevelopment (USA)	Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entertainment and popular culture 	Hollywood entertainment district (USA) Disneyland (USA)	Not on WHL Not on WHL
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Religious sites and memorials 	Skogskyrkogården (Sweden) Notre Dame du Haut, Ronchamp (France)	ii, iv Not on WHL

Phenomena or Themes (political, social, economic, cultural and environmental)	Uses / Subthemes	Examples of World or National Significance	World Heritage Criteria
	• Tourism facilities	Ahwahnee Hotel, Yosemite National Park (USA)	Not on WHL
	• Housing	Tugendhat Villa in Brno (Czech Republic) Luis Barragán House and Studio (Mexico) Barbican Centre (England)	ii, iv i, ii Not on WHL
Increased social and environmental activism	• Commemorative sites	Lincoln Memorial (USA)	Not on WHL
	• Human/civil rights sites	Robben Island (South Africa) China's Long March sites (China) Little Rock Central High School (USA)	iii, vi Not on WHL Not on WHL
	• National parks	Grand Canyon National Park (USA)	vii, viii, ix, x (natural site)

World Heritage criteria for the selection of cultural heritage properties

- i. to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;
- ii. to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;
- iii. to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;
- iv. to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
- v. to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
- vi. to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria)

Appendix D: Site Visits

Site	Architect	Date
Eames House (Case Study House no. 8)	Charles and Ray Eames	1949
Harvey Residence	John Lautner	1950
Ennis Brown House	Frank Lloyd Wright	1924
Los Angeles Union Station	John and Donald Parkinson	1939
Olvera Street	Various	Ca. 1931
Stahl House (Case Study House no. 22)	Pierre Koenig	1950
Scantlin House (now Getty Trustee House)	Harry Gesner	1966

Appendix E: Post-Meeting Comments from Participant Gordon Fulton

[In his cover email of 6 June 2011, Fulton described the following as a “concept in progress” in which he “tried to rationalize all the material we developed, putting it into a hierarchy and clarifying some of the thinking.”]

The built heritage of the Modern era is generally examined in terms of three broad phenomena: *social* (includes economic and political considerations), *aesthetic* (includes function as well as form) and *technological*, to use DOCOMOMO terminology.

More precisely, the built heritage of the 20th century was strongly influenced by changing social, economic and political conditions; new ways of expressing form and responding to functional demands; and rapid technological advances.

These phenomena were influenced by many drivers. In terms of the *social* phenomena, three key drivers may be considered of particular relevance to the built environment of the 20th century (note: these drivers are all interrelated):

Social Phenomena

Key Drivers of Particular Relevance to the Built Environment of the 20th Century

Improving communications and mobility leading to the increasingly rapid and widespread dissemination of information to individuals

Resulting in:

- raised expectations for a better future
- increased exposure to new trends and possibilities
- growing faith in a future untethered to the past
- widespread desire for new ways of living, working and relaxing (including a “fresh start”; a dwelling as a “machine for living in”; “car culture”; etc.)

Changing approaches to governance and government leading to a wide range of global, national and local endeavours to govern

Resulting in:

- increased emphasis on developing the physical and social infrastructure for civil society
- increased intervention in the economy and employment
- growing involvement in the everyday lives of individuals
- implementation of a broad spectrum of socio-political movements [through peaceful or violent means]

Increasing globalization and “glocalization” leading to the rapid emergence of widespread global integration, and of a local and national reaction against this integration

Resulting in:

- increased tendency toward a universal “world culture”
- increased interest in maintaining a diversity of cultural expressions
- quickening pace in the global convergence of economies
- growing emphasis on local, national and regional sovereignty
- increased social and environmental activism

Aesthetic Phenomena

New ways of expressing form and responding to functional demands leading to new approaches to history, a widespread adoption of universality of form—as well as a rejection of universality—and new relationships between form and function in the built environment

Resulting in:

- abstract rather than literal historical references
- a new aesthetic, demanded by new technologies and social precepts, that was not rooted in a specific place or culture
- a new aesthetic *that was* anchored in a specific place or culture
- changes in programming, layout and design that were driven by advances in science and technology (e.g., hospitals)
- integration of art and architecture
- integration with, or ignoring, the landscape and context

Technological Phenomena

Rapid technological advances leading to a dramatic transformation in the design, production and assembly of buildings, ensembles and sites

Resulting in:

- introduction of new materials, especially mass-produced and non-traditional materials
- introduction of new construction techniques and structural engineering advances
- more specialized building systems such as air-conditioning, heating, ventilation and lighting
- new expectations for life cycle, particularly for a deliberately limited lifespan
- improvements in urban, inter-urban and extra-urban transportation

Uses/Subthemes

- Education
- Religion
- Commerce and industry
- Government and public activities
- Culture, recreation and leisure
- Transportation and communication
- Housing
- Health care
- Military activities
- Mixed-use, districts and complexes



The Getty Conservation Institute



ICOMOS