



ICOMOSin SUOMEN OSASTO r.y.
ICOMOS Finska nationalkommittén r.f.
The ICOMOS Finnish National Committee

INTERPRETING SHARED HERITAGE THROUGH TIME

Editors
Uula Neitola
Margaretha Ehrström
Kirsti Kovanen



Interpreting Shared Heritage Through Time
seminar report

Eds. Uula Neitola, Margaretha Ehrström, Kirsti Kovanen

Publisher ICOMOS Finnish National Committee, Tieteiden talo, Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki

Lay out Uula Neitola

The seminar and the publication of the seminar report are supported by the National

Board of Antiquities and the Governing Body of Suomenlinna

translation *Gekko Design, Helsinki; Kristina Kölhi & Gareth Griffiths*

Seminar report

Attachment: Seminar Program

SEMINAR REPORT

ICOMOS Finland and the Governing Body of Suomenlinna held a joint international seminar “Interpreting Shared Heritage Through Time” on the island of Suomenlinna in Helsinki on June 8-9, 2018. The seminar was attended by experts with an interest in theoretical and practical issues of cultural heritage and conservation, as well as both international and local members of ICOMOS. The seminar invitation and programme are attached.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The seminar, its objectives and working format

The main focus of the seminar was on how participation has occurred in those places where time has created their intrinsic values as well as their tangible and intangible heritage over the course of history.

The theme of the seminar dealt with the meanings of place from the perspectives of how these have been interpreted and valued at various times, as well as the questions of who is making the interpretations and with what arguments. How are interpretations and values manifested in restoration, con-

servation, reconstruction and site maintenance – are all traces of history equally important? What is the spirit of the place and who defines it – the experts, visitors or perhaps even the inhabitants? What are the values inherent in the cultural heritage, and do they need to be updated?

The fortress islands of Suomenlinna, which can be regarded as a laboratory for cultural heritage, has undergone changes during the different historical periods of power politics; changes in purpose, ownership and management, becoming a tourist attraction, internationalized and accepted as a World Heritage Site. Suomenlinna is an integral part of the city of Helsinki and a recreational area for its inhabitants. It has its own distinct genius loci and identity.

From the point of view of cultural heritage – both tangible and intangible – the following question arises: Whose Suomenlinna is it? A shared cultural heritage is a common cultural heritage.

Among those participating in the seminar were international, national and local experts, members of ICOMOS’s national committees in Europe, as well as members of the International Scientific Committee on Shared Built Heritage from elsewhere

around the world.

The seminar presentations and workshops also contributed towards the ongoing work on the Suomenlinna Management Plan. Part of the expert perspective on the future visions for the Suomenlinna Management Plan involved creating an innovative atmosphere. It was understood as an open interaction with the Governing Body of Suomenlinna's various stakeholders, such as the residents, authorities, the City of Helsinki and various other operators on the islands. Any points of conflict were identified without ignoring the so-called otherness perspective.

The seminar was attended by 74 representatives from 20 countries. The seminar itself and the accompanying programme provided a good opportunity to promote networking among Finnish professionals and to share information on the common heritage within the context of identity, values and participatory processes.

The central questions posed in the seminar were: What is place and who determines it – experts, visitors or locals? What is the spirit of place, the “genius loci”? What are the cultural heritage values and cultural, economic and social benefits? Should values be updated? How can visitor flows be best utilized? How are the activities and interactions between stakeholders managed?

Furthermore, the seminar objectives were: to examine the Suomenlinna World Heritage Site, its visitors, history, uses, owners, governance and generated advice on the Management Plan; to discuss from different perspectives the stakeholders' involvement

in the restoration work; to establish guidelines for the balance between conservation, values and authenticity; and to participate from different perspectives in the diverse development of the Suomenlinna Management Plan.

Seminar opening session

The opening presentations emphasised the importance of Suomenlinna as a part of the world's cultural heritage and explored its temporal and geopolitical dimensions.

Ulla Räihä, director of the Governing Body of Suomenlinna, welcomed the participants, noting that good solutions can be found for Suomenlinna through open discussion and an interactive process with the many stakeholders.

Minna Silver, president of ICOMOS Finland, stated that the significance of place can be both collective and personal. Memory focuses and identifies place, which is why we share our heritage through our own experiences. Suomenlinna was originally built to serve innovation.

Grellan D. Rourke, vice-president of ICOMOS, represented the ICOMOS Europe group. He found the programme extremely interesting and hoped for a deeper understanding of the subject and issues of cultural heritage and the future of the location. He looked forward to interesting discussions, experiences and thoughts during the seminar.

Siegfried Enders, president of ICOMOS's International Scientific Committee on Shared

Built Heritage, stated in his welcoming speech that the Committee's main objective was to promote an integrated approach to conservation. This means revitalising historically valuable areas and landscapes, as well as utilizing the existing building stock and infrastructure to the extent that they are socially and economically feasible. According to Enders, the objective is also to raise awareness of the world heritage.

In his opening presentation titled "Time and Geopolitical Dimensions of Suomenlinna", Professor **Henrik Meinander** of the University of Helsinki, reviewed the history of Suomenlinna from its geopolitical context and its significance in the interactions between Russia and the West. In the 18th century, Finland's position was affected by Russia's continuing expansion westwards, administrative reforms and finally its accession to Russia. The geopolitical change affected Suomenlinna's status, as its defensive role now served its former enemy. In his presentation, Meinander also touched on Augustin Ehrensward, the builder of Suomenlinna, and the development of the mainland settlement into the city of Helsinki. The role of Suomenlinna also fluctuated during the First World War (1914-18), when towards the end of the war the Russian front line followed the so-called white and red lines of the Finnish Civil War.

According to Meinander, Finnish democracy survived after the wars, mainly because the Soviet Union was unable to conquer Finland in a war. Suomenlinna had by the late 1920s lost its strategic importance, but

the island then became the base for the Coastal Regiment in 1918 followed by the Naval Academy in the 1920s. Furthermore, between 1921 and 1936, the Finnish Air Force's aircraft factory was also located on Suomenlinna. In 1925 Suomenlinna became the location of the air defence command, which later became a fixed anti-aircraft battery. During the Second World War also a Finnish submarine base was located there. After the Second World War, Suomenlinna's function has largely been to fulfil the objectives of tourism.

Session 1:

"Spirit of the Place and Participation"

Moderator: Petteri Takkula, Governing Body of Suomenlinna

The first session focused on the political and geopolitical phases of Suomenlinna, its changed uses, owners and governance. Suomenlinna is an acclaimed cultural attraction with over 500,000 international visitors each year. It is also a popular recreation area for the inhabitants of Helsinki and a home for some 800 residents. Suomenlinna's significance is acknowledged internationally as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

The session addressed the importance of site identification and identity. Also discussed were the values of cultural heritage, cultural, economic and social interests, the values of the place, the visitor flows and the activities of the different stakeholders and their interaction with the Governing Body of Suomenlinna.

Susan Jackson Stepowski, vice president of ICOMOS's International Scientific Committee on Shared Built Heritage, gave the key-note lecture "Interpreting Shared Heritage Over Time: Spirit of the Place and Participation". She noted how place-based events are becoming intangible, such as firework displays for the general public at the Sydney Opera House. Other examples were related to, for instance, the history of the Easter Islands, the Battle of Gallipoli in 1915 in which Australian soldiers took part and which now serves as a memorial site, and the historical statues of India, from which parts referring to colonialism have been removed.

Aura Kivilaakso, Senior Advisor in the Research Administration at the University of Helsinki, gave a presentation titled "Spirit of Place and Participation", in which she raised the question of how the authenticity of place affects the spirit of place. The spirit of place is formed in equal interaction with tangible and intangible elements of the place. Tangible values, on the one hand, consist of elements that are considered to be environmental characteristics. Intangible values, on the other hand, are lifestyles and stories linked to place. The spirit of the place includes the material environment, the local lifestyle and history, as well as stories about the place. The authentic environment is layered, alive and truthful. The creative process makes the environment "original", which is a key feature of the concept of authenticity.

According to Kivilaakso, such an authentic environment truly embodies the identity, traditions and values of the local community

Cultural authorities use their power when determining what cultural heritage should be preserved and presented in museums. In the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention, the concept of cultural heritage is tangible and static. The societal value of the cultural heritage was recognized by the Faro Convention of 2005. According to it, everyone can participate in the definition, protection, promotion and presentation of cultural heritage. The experience of participation means that the participants feel that they have been adequately informed about the matter. Inclusion, on the other hand, means that everyone has similar possibilities to participate. Ideally, operations should be conducted from bottom to top. Heritage is a social construction. The cultural heritage process involves discussions of values, choices and decisions. Controversies about cultural heritage tend to be based on the confrontation between different perspectives. Equality-based discussions are needed to create an open and understanding atmosphere.

In his presentation, **Mikko Aho**, Executive Director of the City of Helsinki's Urban Environment Division, emphasised the totality as well as regional cooperation. Strategic planning is important for the environment. It is important that the shared interests of Suomenlinna and Helsinki are unified as the city grows. Aho highlighted Suomenlinna as a physical environment with local services. Expertise, skills and, above all, financial resources are needed for development work. Suomenlinna will be maintained and deve-

loped in the City of Helsinki's plans. For the 800 inhabitants of Suomenlinna, the environment is a common heritage that includes events such as the civil war. Part of the identity for the locals is the area's military character. Tourism brings both cultural and economic benefits to Suomenlinna.

Stefan Wessman, a senior adviser at the Finnish Heritage Agency, commented on the importance of place at the macro level. He noted that many tourists think that Suomenlinna was built to protect Helsinki. The fortress existed, however, before Helsinki became the capital of Finland. The location of the fortress was chosen for providing shelter for the naval fleet, as well as direct access to the open sea. The enemy's approach would be easy to spot. The World Heritage Site of Suomenlinna is surrounded by a large buffer zone. Its maritime strategy is important in the management process of the site.

Ville Wäänänen, Managing Director of the company Fregatti, showed a video about Lonna Island, and a discussion ensued about its management and development. According to Wäänänen, the processing by society and the common heritage should be open to the inhabitants of Helsinki. The island of Lonna was for a long time in military use and thus closed to the public. It was therefore important that the island's historical buildings and surroundings were opened to the public. Lonna can offer visitors much more than just restaurants. Opened five years ago, it proved positive and meaningful for the spirit of the island that it was opened

in stages.

Session 2: Participation in Conservation Activities

Moderator: Tuija Lind, Governing Body of Suomenlinna

This session focused on the participants in conservation and restoration – who they are – as well as recognising the local spirit and the identity of the “Genius loci”. The session considered whether it is possible to conserve the spirit of place, how to create a good and fruitful dialogue between experts and users, how to resolve conflicts between experts and laypersons, the limits to intervention and use, how the place has been identified over time, with what arguments and by whom, how this is reflected on the renovation, preservation, reconstruction and maintenance, and whether all historical traces and evidence are of equal value.

Mikko Lindqvist, architect in the Cultural Heritage Team at the Helsinki City Museum, gave a presentation titled “The History of Helsinki's 20th century working-class districts – Evaluation and preservation”. His presentation was based on the City of Helsinki planning authorities' preparation work for updating the environmental plan for the Helsinki city centre. The current plans date from the 1970s and 1980s and determine the level of protection of buildings in these areas. From the point of view of building preservation, the plans are not accurate, and the pressures for change also require an overview of the development plans. The Helsinki

City Museum is responsible for preserving the cultural and historical buildings and environments in the city plans.

The northern working-class areas of Helsinki were first established at the turn of the 20th century, when the city grew rapidly. The urban areas, houses and blocks of flats were built at low cost; the prevailing house type was a 1-2-storey wooden building. The working-class city grew at the edge of the city. The city authority purchased the land rapidly in order to prevent unregulated growth. The way in which buildings are currently protected in these areas is based on local construction, as defined in the mid-1980s. Technically, the buildings may be replaced, but the construction of the new building would render the measures economically unviable.

In some notable areas, building regulations from the 1920s for taller buildings produced urban neighbourhoods with significant harmonious urban park consisting of Nordic classical architecture. There is an obvious need to update detailed plans as building protection does not include, for example, architecture from the 1920s and 1930s. Elements of the area's early urbanism still exist. An urbanism of poor quality wooden buildings has survived in certain areas where the city plans and wooden buildings are interdependent. The working-class housing situation has determined the patterns of living in homes.

The industrial past and working-class areas are an integral part of the history and form of the city of Helsinki. Traces of the original

landscape, industrial use and gradual urbanization are being passed on to the present day. When looking at the history of the area, one can interpret it as a multilayered urban space. Instead of seeing working-class areas as urban expansions, they should rather be seen as the margins of the city that have developed new shapes and meanings over time. Conservation plans should take into consideration the current urban-like historic urban landscapes.

Mikko Härö, Director of Department of the Cultural Environment Services at the Finnish Heritage Agency, raised the issue of the Faro Convention, which was due to come into effect in Finland on September 1, 2018. The convention will be able to cover all relevant aspects of participation at the policy level. Härö posed the question of whose cultural heritage will be served by the inception of the convention, since cultural heritage is first and foremost also a political matter.

At its best, the Faro Convention encourages us to recognize the values and important contents of places. Regarding participation in cultural heritage policy, there are three important elements: first, an open and democratic state and broad civic participation; second, the strong tradition of societies and NGOs supporting local heritage work; third, the prevailing land use and building legislation.

In his presentation, architect **Sakari Mentu** commented on the spirit of the place, which he stated was a suggestive concept. This means that also everything new must be included. At the same time, the identification

of places has become more complex over time. The first generations of restoration in the early 20th century did not use such methods when examining buildings, because for them conveying the message was more important. The protection of wooden towns in the 1960s turned building conservation into a political issue.

The importance of communication cannot be overstated; it is not just about what one does, but also why one does it. You have to make yourself and your work comprehensible. In conclusion Mentu quoted the Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings from 1877: "Show no pretension of other art, and otherwise resist all tampering with either fabric or ornament as it stands."

In her presentation, **Riin Alatalu** of ICOMOS Estonia discussed the social fabric of cultural heritage. Estonia has a more complex history than Finland in terms of protecting cultural heritage. The foundation of cultural heritage is based, on the one hand, on the nationalist movement and, on the other hand, the attentiveness of experts. It has been the task of cultural heritage professionals to deal with political prejudices and decision-making processes. As early as the 1920s, professionals in the cultural field in Estonia began listening to locals on building heritage issues, and protected, for example, buildings of the German aristocracy, even though ordinary people disliked them. The protection of the cultural heritage continued also during the Soviet era, and the value of the built heritage was recognized in the

1980s. From the 1990s, also the Soviet-era architecture came under the protection of the cultural heritage. The idea of protecting cultural heritage has largely been based on the fact that conservation work has been carried out in defiance of public opinion, often by protecting sites that were not appreciated by ordinary people at the time.

Ari Bungers, owner of LAB Architects, Helsinki, gave comments on Suomenlinna from the residents' point of view. Suomenlinna is a World Heritage Site, but also a home for some 800 inhabitants, ranging from children to pensioners. The Governing Body of Suomenlinna has a significant opportunity to show responsible leadership that respects continuity in the lives and habits of the residents of the island. Suomenlinna has a strong community of residents and activists, and it is important to have a sense of continuity when it comes to the maintenance of dwellings or the levels of the rents of properties. Quite a few residents now feel that money is spent on supporting tourism and running the Governing Body of Suomenlinna rather than supporting residents and the maintenance of housing. Residents do not even have access to a minimum of common areas or space for a children's pop band or even a small gym, which was closed at the same time as the rents increased. It should be remembered that the Governing Body of Suomenlinna manages the entire historic fortress that is part of Helsinki and its archipelago. There is a lot of work to be done, and sometimes mistakes are highlighted more than the general good. Bungers stated that

the Governing Body of Suomenlinna often talks to residents and nowadays also listens to the residents more than it has in the past.

Session 3:

Participation and Values – Whose values?

Moderator: Anu Ahoniemi, Governing Body of Suomenlinna

The session examined the current meaning of “genius loci” from the point of view of the rights of the so-called everyman. The shared cultural heritage also emphasises the right to heritage, equality and transparency. But how is the heritage recognized so that new users or owners can become part of it? How can visitors be part of a place? What is the role of experts? How could participatory engagement be achieved?

Architect **Netta Böök** from ICOMOS Finland was the first to address the session topic in her keynote lecture, illustrated through the example of the village of Kurkijoki in Russia, which is located in a territory that Finland ceded to the Soviet Union in 1941 and again in 1944. Kurkijoki was the old centre of a prospering and thoroughly Finnish agrarian community that had its own agricultural schools and other institutes, and a number of significant buildings designed by Finnish architects. Böök followed the process that has turned the heritage of Kurkijoki village into shared heritage, and how it is reflected in actions on both official and less official levels.

After being ceded to the Soviet Union, the population and politico-economic system of

Kurkijoki underwent complete change. The key issue was how to utilize the potential of the territory within the framework of the Soviet planned economy. Kurkijoki was designated to serve as the centre of a state farm, the *sovkhos*. Buildings from the pre-war era were utilised purposefully and adapted to the needs of Soviet society.

The inhabitants that resettled in Kurkijoki originated mainly from more southern territories of the Soviet Union, and many of them had lost their homes in the war. They were persuaded to “move to Finland” with promises of getting their own houses and state subsidies to start a new life. In the 1960s, as part of the nationwide visions, Kurkijoki was to be developed into a densely built semi-urban settlement with services such as daycare centres, health centres, shops, libraries, clubs, house of culture, and dwellings with modern amenities in type-planned low-rise houses.

Nevertheless, adaptation to the Finnish countryside was hardly easy. Many of the incomers felt rootless. They had to adjust to half-foreign circumstances and to an unfamiliar building tradition in a northern environment and with no one to show them how to master it, or how to make the soil grow potatoes. Disquieting stories about Finns materializing out of the blue were common; despite being an area closed off to foreigners, some Kurkijoki-born Finns surreptitiously visited their previous homeland.

The move away from the communist system in 1991 led to economic depression in Kurkijoki. The property of the *sovkhos* was

privatized but proved unsuccessful in the market economy. The repair and maintenance of buildings, which had previously been the responsibility of the state, was no longer carried out. At the same time, Finns initiated nostalgic cross-border journeys to the ceded territories and the Russian archives were opened even to foreigners. In the post-communist spirit of the 1990s, the research of the history, including architectural history, was encouraged, which contributed to the formation of a wider perspective of history.

It can be argued that the reassessment of pre-war heritage was a self-evident result of this process. A few sites were protected by law as architectural heritage, and there were local initiatives to renovate and refurbish buildings from the pre-war era. In 1997, the village of Kurkijoki was included in the list of *historical villages* in Russia, and later, after an inventory and assessment of the built heritage, the central areas of Kurkijoki were proposed to receive a protection status. Yet, due to the language barrier and lack of resources, the Russian researchers focused rather narrowly on the physical appearance of Kurkijoki and its heritage, ignoring most of the cultural and architectural history and issues of provenance from Finnish sources or in collaboration with Finns.

A crucial issue is how to get people take interest and become engaged in heritage issues. In Kurkijoki, the key person is the present director of the local history centre in Kurkijoki, Marina Petrova. Despite meagre resources, the museum keeps raising

local awareness of the history and present situation of the place by means of exhibitions, camps and seminars. Petrova is also attempting to establish Finnish-Russian cooperation in the field of research, and she speaks for the preservation of the historical milieu and the nature. She has managed to encourage local stakeholders to participate in cooperation projects, such as the maintenance of old Finnish graveyards, and persuade Finns to write letters to the authorities of the Republic of Karelia to express support for the protection and protective town planning of Kurkijoki. Consequently, the church hill and old graveyard have now been recognized as heritage sites. Optimistic and determined persons that work for these issues on a concrete level are indispensable.

Marina Petrova, director of the Kurkijoki history centre, has played an important role in promoting the village's recovery and in establishing a museum. Since the people in the area mainly speak Russian, learning the Finnish language was important for Petrova in exploring the village's national and historical connections. The museum of local history puts artefacts from the Finnish era on display in exhibitions. The pre-war period is an important part of the museum as it tells the history of the settlement of the area. Finnish architects have been consulted in the protection and restoration of buildings and, for example, Arka Architects has been involved in the implementation of the conservation. New buildings should follow the pre-war models. Kurkijoki is very important for the people of the area, whose lives

balance between the past and the present.

In his presentation, **Jean-Francois Lagneau** of ICOMOS France (through a simultaneous translation by senior lecturer Risto Pitkänen) delivered greetings from Benjamin Mouton, stating how ICOMOS France has contributed to local participation in the protection of cultural heritage. Human dignity cannot be alienated from the cultural heritage; from the point of view of humanism, all people are equal. The legacy must not be turned into a caricature. The local population should, in principle, be proud of their cultural heritage. Participation had been the subject of an international conference “Heritage and Democracy” organized by ICOMOS France in 2016.

Helka Ketonen, Cultural Director at the Finnish Association for Rural Culture and Education, introduced the association’s activities and environmental work. Environmental education is a joint programme of the association’s educational and cultural work, which takes the form, for instance, of activities enhancing rural livelihoods and cooperation between rural and urban areas. In terms of content, this includes village development, coaching community operations, promoting local food production, and cultural and artistic activities. Current activities and projects stem from the local people themselves and nature, landscape and cultural heritage, as well as the identity of the place, in both villages and cities. Ketonen presented, among other things, Päivi Raivio’s “Tunne+Tila” [Feeling+Space] environmental installation, activities in Old Rauma,

Korkeasaari Zoo in Helsinki, and underwater art. The association aims to help find answers to questions about what constitutes a good and valuable living environment, how to deepen the relationship with the environment through art and culture, what memories and values are associated with the built and natural environments, and how to create a memorable place from a lifeless intermediary space or fallow land.

Anu Ahoniemi, representing the Governing Body of Suomenlinna, introduced the Suomenlinna Management Plan, the participatory project and the principles of sustainable tourism. Over the past 20 years, annual visitor numbers on Suomenlinna have grown from 600,000 to 1 million. At the same time, the type of visitor has changed. In the past, visitors were mostly local city inhabitants, who would spend their summer days on the fortress island, but nowadays most of the visitors are from abroad. The Management Plan sets out guidelines for the future of Suomenlinna. The process is based on the understanding of the present state. Sustainable tourism aims to minimize the negative effects of tourism and to maximize the positive ones. The Governing Body of Suomenlinna strives to take sustainability and sustainable practices into account in all its activities and requires them also from other stakeholders. The aim is for the participation process to be transformed into shared goals that encourage people to become involved in future actions.

Workshops

Session 4:

Thematic Forums and Discussion Papers

Workshop 1: Balancing between uses/life and the values upon which the protection/authenticity is based

Moderator: architect **Mia Perkkiö**

Rapporteur: **Uula Neitola**

The workshop led to a constructive discussion and positive consensus about risks and key issues in conservation that help in pre-empting problematic situations. Risks and threats are in many respects recognized and monitored.

Bénédicte Selfslagh, President of ICOMOS Belgium, opened the discussion and presented the key terms of the workshop: balance, tensions, values and participation. In her presentation she referred to experts' responsibility regarding the guiding principle of the Faro Convention, which is to respect others. Much of the cultural heritage is living heritage that people use – although in old buildings, for example, there was originally no electricity. It is largely a question of how the heritage remains heritage. Conflicts arise because it is difficult to deal with the many layers of history. Suomenlinna is a good example of well-preserved strata, although most people focus on just one stage. One should be aware of all concepts, not just the local or nationally overlapping ones.

Authenticity is linked to the ideas of communities and values. Tensions can arise

between national and international values, perspectives change, and the choice of narrative creates something new, but the previous generation should not directly be condemned. Values are changing and the debate between experts and stakeholders is completely the wrong debate. The place and its context should be observed as if through the eyes of Sherlock Holmes, thus leading to the conclusion that they are indeed man-made. In many countries, the protection of cultural heritage is diminishing; this is linked on the one hand to changes in use and lifestyles, and on the other hand to changes in values.

In his presentation, **Grellan D. Rourke** raised the issue of the strain from visitors to the site. He welcomed the fact that sustainable development is very popular today and has a long history. The right means should be found for a dialogue between the experts and the community. The ICOMOS Europe group has worked with the EU to bring together financial support and cultural heritage, but it also requires experts participating in the work with the EU. Therefore, Rourke believes that we need to develop various forms of engagement and to consider what stakeholders are saying, because the Suomenlinna Management Plan is based on their ideas. Nor can we know how values will change over the span of a decade.

Tamás Fejérdy of ICOMOS Hungary highlighted sustainable development and the maintenance of development. We should think rationally when working together with politicians. Fejérdy mentioned the need for good preparatory work even in the midst of

haste, which requires the use of experts. It takes time to research and discuss with locals. Unfortunately, however, it is ultimately not the voice of the majority that has the decision-making power. The locals should also understand that the experts do not live in an ivory tower, and that they too are normal people. Most locals want to change the ethics; they should be involved in creating the management plan, as sometimes they know best how to keep the heritage alive.

Marcus Bengtsson of ICOMOS Sweden agreed with Fejérdy and said that the public sector has a different approach to the notion of authenticity. Authenticity needs to be emphasised and discussed with locals. Nicholas Long, a member of the ICOMOS International Committee on Energy and Sustainability, concurred as well and emphasised that the perceptions and attitudes of the locals often differ from those of experts.

In commenting on the workshop, **Tuija Lind** of the Governing Body of Suomenlinna stated that Suomenlinna has 800 inhabitants and one million visitors each year. Locals may sometimes feel as if they are living in a zoo. The visitors' centre (Suomenlinna Centre) took 30 years to build. It took many years for the island's landscape to be better understood. The erosion caused by tourism is quite extensive; for example, paths have had to be built on the ridges of the fortress. Fences have been built to secure the private areas belonging to the locals. There should be guidelines for the visitors, so as to prevent the erosion of tourism from escalating.

Workshops 2+4: Whose places? and Landscape, seascape and setting

Moderator: **Margaretha Ehrström**

Rapporteur: **Leo Lindroos**.

The workshop focused on the interpretation of the place, its themes and time span. Nowadays we want to embellish the facts of history with anecdotes and stories, thus making the experience of a place more personal. Places have become more people-centred, they are lived through people. Architectural and material values alone are not enough in order to experience a place. More recent periods in the history of Suomenlinna, such as the historic period when it functioned as a prison camp, are presented as part of its chronology because it raises questions and emotions.

The vegetation of the fortress area was discussed in the workshop as part of the island's overall appearance, but, for example, trees were not originally a part of the fortress. The workshop also raised the issue of festivities as part of the island's identity, and place-based celebrations in particular should be favoured. It was pointed out, for example, that medieval sites often turn into venues for role-playing games that can be used to highlight, for instance, a particular event or period. The interpretation of events of the past, however, can easily lead to the interpretation itself being viewed as historical truth.

Deirdre McDermott, vice-president of the ICOMOS Advisory Committee, presented in her paper the case study of the small town

of Gort, in Co. Galway, Ireland, where students explored the mental mapping of the town's housing and unemployment crisis. According to McDermott, participants in the study were asked to identify the attributes of their town by walking around with maps, looking and using Kevin Lynch's 'mental mapping' techniques developed in the 1970s, to record how they identify and relate to their town and its attributes. As another example, she mentioned the island of Omey, a former monastery island on the "Wild Atlantic Way", which has attracted many tourists and is suffering degradation due to the lack of a management strategy as well as coastal erosion. The exposure and subsequent official mass excavation of medieval and 19th century bones as well as the failure to publish promised reports, or to progress re-interment of the bones over a 30-year period, has alienated the local community.

In her presentation, **Gráinne Shaffrey**, president of ICOMOS Ireland, firstly addressed the general theme of 'seascapes' and presented approaches taken at Dun Laoghaire Harbour, a 19th century harbour of international heritage importance which a diverse range of stakeholders and users involved. She discussed the development of a Harbour heritage management plan prepared as part of a wider development masterplan. She then presented a current case study relating to the national monument in Moore Street, Dublin which illustrates how heritage can become highly political and conservation priorities can be affected as a consequence.

Workshop 3: Diversity of forms in inclusive interpretation and presentation

Moderator: **Milla Öystilä**

Rapporteur: **Kirsti Kovanen**.

The workshop discussed what the word "interpretation" would be in Finnish. Experts have come to the conclusion that well-established practices have not yet been understood in this context and that the Finnish word "interpretaatio" would best describe its meaning and function. The workshop sought to find answers as to why a visitor would want to know about interpretation and how they would use the information after leaving the site. In cultural heritage sites, interpretation is concerned with telling people about cultural heritage through good stories. Interpretation is a powerful means of communication that allows visitors to learn about the meanings and relationships of cultural heritage. Planning the interpretation in a balanced way for the purposes of the tourism industry is not a simple task. It is at the same time a communication process, a tool and an attitude.

The participants discussed the nature of interpretation and agreed that it was always about stories, and that, for example, ghost stories or stories about horrifying things, such as those presented on the guided tour of Suomenlinna, were the most evocative. The "tricks of the trade" are related to the question of how to hook the audience. One must remember, however, that the audience changes over time. The target groups and visitor profiles will also change; on Suomen-

linna it is changing from domestic visitors to foreign ones. Instead of chronology, the emphasis is on themes.

Ezequiel Pinto Guillaume of ICOMOS Sweden presented the Bomarsund – Prästö area on the Åland islands, where archaeological sites were recorded for the planning of new roads. He emphasised the modern methods of analysis and planning utilised in this particular case. The research had repercussions not only for the physical remains but also on ethical issues – at what stages and on what subjects can stories be told? The method also demonstrates the shift from remains and artefacts to the relationships between remains that have occurred more generally in recent research.

The participants noted that it is easy to talk about the Russian history, Russian ownership and Finnish ownership of Åland while attending a seminar on Suomenlinna. It is accepted that nationalist perspectives exist and that much progress has been made in recent years in interpreting this topic in Finland and on Suomenlinna.

Milla Öystilä, tourism specialist at the Governing Body of Suomenlinna, showed how interpretation has evolved on Suomenlinna. During a period of 20 years, there has been a tremendous change in the target groups: from local day visitors to the present visitors and people who want to know more about the site. 57% of visitors come from abroad and 30% from the Helsinki metropolitan area. Among them are also immigrants participating in excursions, although there is not yet much information on this particular

visitor profile. Beer aficionados as visitors have become something of an urban legend on Suomenlinna.

Öystilä also explained how interpretation has developed for Suomenlinna in response to factors regarding various operational areas: visitor feedback, results of visitor surveys, the integration of site objectives – such as the declaration of World Heritage values – a sustainable tourism strategy and management plan, expert comments and research, as well as immediate responses to the operational environment.

Closing discussion and results

In summarizing the seminar discussions, one can note that many things are changing in our world, media, stories, and target groups, and that they, in turn, are changing the world. Good practices are constantly being adopted. Managing visits is a key issue – whether to limit, regulate, or increase the number of visitors to a site. This issue is no longer being actively addressed on Suomenlinna, which is reflected in the fact that no general target has been set for the number of visitors, although a target has existed previously – it was an objective during a transitional period. The goal of the administration is to try to extend the duration of visits and increase the number of visitors to the museum.

The discussions and programme that emerged from the seminar were carried out within the framework of the Faro Convention. The Convention emphasises important

aspects of cultural heritage because they relate to human rights and democracy. They promote a broader understanding of cultural heritage and its relationship with communities and society. The Convention encourages us to recognize that artefacts and places in themselves are not important for the cultural heritage. They are important because of the meanings and uses that people attach to them and for the values they represent. The framework provided a good guideline for the seminar, as each presentation complemented the related themes.

The Governing Body of Suomenlinna felt that the seminar proved useful for their work. **Kirsti Kovanen** of ICOMOS Finland emphasised that participation is a requirement of the law, where there are often difficulties in the implementation of various processes. The perceived problem was that often well-founded discussions could not be taken further. That is why the ideas and findings that emerged from the workshops, and in particular in the closing discussion, spoke in favour of user-friendliness, diversity of presentation, and comprehensive consideration of the various stakeholders. The key advice that the seminar workgroups considered regarding the Suomenlinna Management Plan consisted primarily of the importance of work that is visible from the outside. According to the closing panel discussion, the Management Plan should not take a static form, but rather be a dynamic system that undergoes change, is reflected in its environment, and responds to the requirements of time. In particular, communication

and participation – where dialogue between stakeholders is central to sustainable development – were seen as important in its implementation. Other issues considered important were the development of accessibility and its integration into the development of technology. Maintaining and developing monitoring systems will, at its best, alert people of current problems before they emerge.

The closing discussions provided advice to the process of formulating the Governing Body of Suomenlinna's Management Plan. The current Management Plan is one link in the long chain of the management of Suomenlinna. The current work on the Suomenlinna Management Plan takes into account earlier plans that outlined the management and use of Suomenlinna as well as changes in society. The Management Plan is undertaken as a process together with stakeholders. At this stage of the work, a sort of road map is used as a stimulus and tool for discussion, the content of which evolves as the work progresses. The present situation and its context have been outlined as totalities, on the basis of which the future will be planned. The totalities are formed on the basis of feedback from the previous Management Plan. In order to develop the working process for the Management Plan, several different kinds of workshop have been organised on Suomenlinna, which have been both targeted and comprehensive. In the closing discussions it was considered a positive thing if all parties could be involved in a process where the emphasis is put on cyclic

participation. The plan was to be usable for everyone, so at least a page in it should be reserved for masons and carpenters, for example. The work should not only be about collecting opinions, but also about people constructing and envisioning Suomenlinna as a more comprehensive environment. The data collected must be analysed and following the analysis there must be a stage where priorities are set for the work.

The seminar participants considered the walking tour of Suomenlinna particularly successful; one that, on the one hand, illustrates the storytelling and, on the other hand, strengthens the site's special features, such as the proximity of the sea and its residents. It was felt that the tour covered the entire common heritage, but that attention should be paid to whether all significant people and issues were covered, and whether perhaps some parts had been emphasised more than others.

Petteri Takkula, Development Manager at the Governing Body of Suomenlinna, pointed out that history does not come to a standstill, and that new meanings are created through new approaches. Suomenlinna's target group is divided into subgroups that need particular targeted communications in the appropriate media. The process in formulating the Governing Body of Suomenlinna's Management Plan aims to take into consideration multiple ways of presenting information, thus enriching the working methods and implementation. New research and new stories can easily be integrated into the presentation. As a good example,

Takkula mentioned the Bomarsund island project, which from a historical point of view stretched from Finland and Russia to Sweden. In order for the Governing Body of Suomenlinna's Management Plan to become a process, roundtable discussions are needed with various stakeholders, including ICOMOS and various user groups.



ICOMOSin SUOMEN OSASTO r.y.
ICOMOS Finska nationalkommittén r.f.
The ICOMOS Finnish National Committee

Welcome to the International Seminar in Suomenlinna, 8 – 9 June 2018!

INTERPRETING SHARED HERITAGE THROUGH TIME

ICOMOS Finnish National Committee and the Governing Body of Suomenlinna invite those interested in the theoretical and practical issues of heritage and conservation to participate in the international seminar that will be held in Suomenlinna. The seminar discusses how participation has been realised in places and sites, where time has created tangible and intangible heritage over several historic periods. Participatory processes, value assessments and the heritage itself are discussed in lectures and workshops in a 2-day seminar. The maintenance of Suomenlinna offers a close example on how the spirit and identity of place can be identified when different cultures and times that the place has lived through, offer a variety of participants, views and values. The seminar is part of the joint ICOMOS Europe Group and International Scientific Committee on Shared Built Heritage meeting programs.

Venue Tenaille von Fersen and other places in Suomenlinna



Seminar Program

Friday 8 June

8.20 – 8.35 Ferry to Suomenlinna from Helsinki market place

8.40 – 9.50 Guided walking tours in Suomenlinna in English and in French guided by the Ehrensverd Society

Registration and coffee at Tenaille v. Fersen

10.15 – 11.00 Opening session of the seminar

Welcome by Ulla Räihä, director of the Suomenlinna Governing Body, Minna Silver, president of ICOMOS Finland, and Grellan D. Rourke, vice-president of ICOMOS, Siegfried Enders, president of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Shared Built Heritage

Time and Geopolitical Dimensions of Suomenlinna, introductory lecture by prof. Henrik Meinander

11.00 - 12.15 Session 1 Spirit of the Place and Participation

Moderated by Petteri Takkula

This session focuses on the site, its political and geopolitical phases, on the changed uses, owners and governance. Suomenlinna is today an acclaimed cultural attraction with more than 500,000 international visitors annually. It is also a popular recreation resort for the people of the city of Helsinki and a home for some 800 residents. Its significance is acknowledged internationally with the inscription onto the World Heritage List.

The questions for finding answers are: What is the spirit of the place and who identifies it, experts, visitors or local inhabitants? What are the values and benefits (cultural, economic, social) of heritage and who reaps the rewards? Should the values be updated? How do you present the place? How can the visitor flows be turned into advantage? And how can action and interaction between different stakeholders be managed?

Whose Suomenlinna? Key-note lecture by Ms Susan Jackson Stepowski tbc

Spirit of place and participation. Key-note lecture by Ms Aura Kivilaakso PhD

Comments Mr Mikko Aho from Helsinki City administration, by Mr Ville Wäänänen from Fregatti Oy, an enterprise in Suomenlinna, and by Mr Stefan Wessman, focal point for World Heritage in Finland

12.15 – 13.45 Lunch in Valimo

13.45 – 15.00 Session 2 Participation in Conservation Activities

Moderated by Ms Tuija Lind, architect

This session focuses on the participants in restoration – who they are – and on the identification of local spirit or ”genius loci” over time. The questions are: can one conserve the spirit? How can a good and fruitful dialogue be created between experts and users? The places for experts and amateurs/non experts – how can the conflicts be solved, what are the limits for interventions and use? How has the place been identified over time, who have identified and with what arguments? How do they reflect the restoration, conservation, reconstruction and maintenance activities? Are all historic traces and evidence of equal importance?

Participation and conservation, key-note lecture by Mr Mikko Lindqvist

Comments by Mr Janne Prokkola from the City Planning Office, by Mikko Härö from the national heritage authority and by Ms Riin Alatalu from ICOMOS Estonia

15.00 – 15.30 Coffee

15.30 – 17.00 Session 3 Participation and Values - Whose values?

Moderated by Ms Anu Ahoniemi

This session will focus on the meaning of "genius loci" today and on the rights of the everyman. It challenges to finding answers to questions: As everybody's heritage stresses the right to heritage, equality and openness, how does one identify heritage so that new users/ owners can become part of it? How can the visitors be part of the place? What is the role of experts? How could a participatory engagement be achieved?

Participation and values, key note lecture by Ms Netta Böök

Comments by the stakeholders and examples on participatory processes: by Mr Ari Bungers from the inhabitants in Suomenlinna, by Ms Anu Ahoniemi from the Governing Body of Suomenlinna, by Jean-Francois Lagneau from ICOMOS France, and by Ms Helka Ketonen, Maaseudun Sivistysliitto

17.40 or 18.20 ferries to the city centre from the Suomenlinna ferry landing

19.30 – 21.00 Reception, venue Alvar Aalto Studio, Tiilimäki 20

Saturday 9 June 2018

8.20 ferry to Suomenlinna from the market place

Venue: Pajasali (and further Tynnyrintekijän huone and C40)

9.00 – 12.00 Session 4 Thematic discussion groups and discussion papers

1. *Balancing between uses/life and the values that the protection/authenticity is based on*, moderated by Ms Miia Perkkiö, PhD, rapporteur Mr Uula Neitola

Discussion papers by Mr Alexander Kudrjavzev, Ms Irina Kudrjavzeva, Ms Susan Jackson Stepowski, and Ms Bénédicte Selfslagh

3. *Diversity of forms in inclusive interpretation and presentation*, moderated by Ms Milla Öystilä, rapporteur Ms Kirsti Kovanen, architect

Discussion paper by Mr Ezequiel Pinto-Guillaume

4. + 2. *Whose places? and Landscape, seascape and setting* Moderated by Ms Margaretha Ehrström, rapporteur Mr Leo Lindroos

Discussion papers by Ms Deirdre McDermott and Ms Grainne Shaffrey

12.00 – 13.30 Lunch at Bastion bistro

13.30 – 15.00 Concluding discussion on the group work – thematic groups present their work, conclusions and comments by Grellan D. Rourke, and Sue Jackson Stepowski. Moderator Minna Silver

15.00 – 17.00 Drinks in Bastion Bistro

Ferries to the city centre from Suomenlinna ferry landing at 17.30, 17.45, 18.00, 18.20, etc.

Practical information

Registration is required by **30 May 2018**. It is managed through the web link <https://link.webropolsurveys.com/S/860B9706F6FF3F02>

The registration fee 50 eur is paid at the registration desk open in Tenaille von Fersen on 8 June. The fee includes lectures, guided tours, lunches and drinks mentioned in the seminar and meeting program. Please look for program updates at www.icomos.fi. The proceedings of the seminar will also be published on the website www.icomos.fi later in 2018.





Interpreting Shared Heritage Through Time seminar report



ICOMOSin SUOMEN OSASTO r.y.
ICOMOS Finska nationalkommittén r.f.
The ICOMOS Finnish National Committee