Introduction (Compensation in Architecture and Archaeology – On Compensation as a Project, Method and Professional Practice)

INTRODUCTION

Athanasios Kouzelis, Magnus Rönn and Helena Teräväinen

This book aims to present a series of research articles discussing professional, methodological and theoretical aspects of compensation as a key concept in architecture and archaeology. Compensation is a concept that must be understood in its context for making sense. This statement is a fundamental starting point for the authors' contributions to this publication. Compensation may appear as outspoken demands as well as actions hidden in the design of projects, specified measures in planning processes and actions embedded in the transformation of areas with cultural values and architectural qualities. Thus, compensation can be expressed in several different ways depending on the context. The book presents a continuation of research activities on the key concept presented in a session called *Compensation in Architecture and Archaeology – On Compensation as a Concept, Method and Professional Practice* at the conference Widening Horizons, in connection with the EAA's annual meeting in Kiel, September 2021. The book presents a selection of seven contributions from the session. The articles have all been peer-reviewed after the conference, commented on and finally approved by the editors.

We start the discussion by looking back at history. A very early written conception of compensation can be found in the Code of Hammurabi.[1] This is a Babylonian legal text with 288 specific rules composed around 1755–1750 BC. Rule 232 demands compensation for ill-constructed buildings: *"If it ruin goods, he shall make compensation for all that has been ruined, and inasmuch as he did not construct properly this house which he built and it fell, he shall re-erect the house from his own means."*[2] Furthermore in 233: *"If a builder builds a house for someone, even though he has not yet completed it; if then the walls seem toppling, the builder must make the walls solid from his own means."*[3] Hammurabi's Code is the first known rule in establishing the concept of civil damages, whereby one must pay compensation for deficiency or destruction – a significant understanding of ethics and duty that has survived to our day. compensatory thinking is therefore a part of civilization and represents an idea of responsibility in the society, beyond individual and private interests.

Throughout history, the concept of compensation has in principle both a legal and an ethical purpose. As a concept, compensation was one of the important virtues in ancient Greek philosophy because of its association with moral education and behaviour. The concept provided the overall direction for how to restore improper behaviour by cultivating the virtues. In ancient times, the degree of compensation was determined as a means for the commonwealth, general welfare or public benefit in a society (Jokilehto, 1986). For instance, the accomplishment of a purpose leading to public benefits, such as the widening of a public road, imposed on public authorities a reasonable compensation for the deprivation of the property of the citizen affected.

By entering the Italian Renaissance and the establishment of the *"romantic restoration"*, although destruction and abuse of ancient monuments and sites had been continued, a mindset was gradually growing up that all historical objects of the Roman Empire should be carefully preserved as nostalgic remains of the past. In fact, this idea founded the compensatory attitude of the Italian Renaissance toward ancient monuments and their treatment. Ancient sculptures, triumphal arches, memorial columns, other monuments and works of art were preserved, protected, as well as restored and completed, in order to give them new actuality, new functions and new life, as a part and reference of present society.[2]

This approach was further developed in other European countries, where the maturing of historic consciousness developed after the events of the French Revolution. The desire for preserving and restoring heritage and cultural monuments became a widespread movement, especially in relation to mediaeval structures, so that the work had to be done more precisely by applying initial investigations of the history, architecture and material of the monuments. This kind of restoration was conducted by Sir George Gilbert Scott in England and Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc in France (Choay, 2007). Until the 19th century, the notion of cultural heritage was limited to antique and medieval buildings but due to the destructions of wars, awareness grew about the value of old buildings including vernacular architecture.

The history of architecture, as well as archaeological excavation, testifies to the use of compensation after the destruction of buildings and facilities with the aim, not only of restoration, but also of improving their construction and function. It is no coincidence that even in difficult economic circumstances the application of compensation had the potential to reconstruct values and

ideals. One example is the rebuilding of Dublin's city centre after the disaster of the May 1916 Easter Rising. Harold Kalman (2017) presents two well-known cases of destruction and reconstruction in Poland and Bosnia-Herzegovina: the old city in Warszawa and the bridge in Mostar. The 427-year-old Stari Most Bridge plunged into the waters of the Neretva River gorge in 1993. The destruction of the bridge was an attack on the cultural identity of Mostar. The city, encouraged by UNESCO and the international community was determined to restore the tangible evidence of their collective memory. In centuries past, Mostar had been a model of multi-cultural tolerance shared by Muslims, Christians and Jews. Only a decade after the attack, the bridge was rebuilt, and the adjacent Old City of Mostar restored. The reconstituted bridge and city were considered so important to global civilization that they were appointed by UNESCO as World Heritage Sites for their *"outstanding universal value"*.

There were several attacks against cultural property during the Second World War. One example is the destruction of the historic part of Warsaw in Poland. The old marketplace was surrounded by narrow stone and brick buildings. The city centre suffered during the German invasion in 1939, and, after the Warsaw Uprising in 1944, the retreating German Army almost destroyed the rest of the buildings. Before the war, the faculty of Warsaw Technical University had documented much of its architectural heritage. After the liberation, Polish authorities insisted on reconstructing the city core as an act of national pride. Everything was done to connect the present with the past, and UNESCO inscribed the Historic Centre of Warsaw on the World Heritage List, praising it as an outstanding example of a near-total reconstruction. The bridge in Mostar and the old city of Warsaw both fell victim to deliberate attacks for being symbols of social, cultural and national identity. Kalman (2017) notes that the destructions triggered international, strong reactions, many of them highly emotional. The responses from citizens, professionals and authorities represent a variety of methods of compensation, from retribution, intervention, prevention, documentation to reconstruction, commemoration and reconciliation.

COMPENSATION IN A CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT

Compensation comes from the Latin word *compensare*. The concept is used in the sense of compensating, indemnifying, balancing, settling, restoring and reaching a balance, etc. Their meanings have in common that there must be some sort of deficiency, lack, loss or damage that must be replaced.

Compensation for impact on heritage values due to development can, from this point of view, correspond to measures that aim to redress insufficiencies in spatial planning, recreate lost heritage values and/or repair damages on listed buildings with architectural qualities.

In the course of the history of culture, buildings and settlements are assigned meanings, which go beyond their purely physical substance. Damage and destruction have been met by reconstruction and restoration as testimonies to the value of compensation, and as a measure of the need to maintain and define the identity of cultural heritage.

Compensation as contemporary practice makes sense for professionals when sites are transformed and where important cultural values and architectural qualities are rearranged; so far, everybody can agree. How compensation for negative impact should be conducted, and the means used, are however highly contested issues in planning processes. There are different views on value and quality, depending on which professions engage in the transformation of land and environments. One controversial issue is whether cultural heritage values and architectural qualities are unique, fixed to a specific plot, or if they are mobile and can be redesigned at another site and in another form. Compensation and authenticity represent conflicting perspectives in this context. Architects, architectural conservators and archaeologists have different approaches to compensation as a key concept, method and professional practice. The contributions in the proceedings highlight some of these differences.

Tom Davies (2020) has consulted the Merriam-Webster dictionary on ideas connected to compensatory thinking. There are some differences in the understanding of compensation in Europe. *Mitigation* seems to be a more common concept than compensation when the transformation of heritage is addressed in England, as opposed to Sweden. Davies describes compensation as supplying something equivalent and to offsetting an error, defect or undesired effect. Synonyms for compensation in this sense may also include *"payment"* and *"remuneration"*. *"Mitigate"* in the Merriam-Webster dictionary means to become less harsh or hostile and to make things less severe or painful, offering alternatives such as alleviate (guilt), mollify (calm-down) and extenuate (excuse). The Merriam-Webster dictionary thus presents two contrasting meanings of the word compensate; the first is a monetary or financial compensation and the second a measure to restore injury, harm and loss.

In the Nordic countries, there are some differences between Sweden and Finland when it comes to compensation in the law and as a professional practice. In Finland, legislation on compensation is not concerned with the lost or threatened cultural heritage values in the built environment; only a couple of cases exist about compensation in the natural environment. Usually, compensatory issues have been managed more from the landowner's viewpoint, as for example when the implementation of local planning prevents the accustomed use of land. In Finland, the main means to conserve built cultural heritage is the town plan, which can require preservation or at least deny demolitions. Planning officers and cultural heritage administrators are struggling on different planning levels with owners and politicians, trying to conserve the cultural heritage values and to adjust new building projects in the environment.

In Sweden, compared to Finland, there seems to be a stronger distinction between compensation as measures and actions in a planning process on the one hand and, on the other hand, financial compensation by demands for protection from authorities. These two understandings of compensation appear in the transformation of areas with cultural values and architectural qualities and depend on the type of involved interests. If a property owner is affected by a decision of a public agency, then it is regarded as a *"single interest"* that should be compensated by monetary means, according to the *Planning and Building Act* and the *Historic Environment Act*. A typical example is when a property owner is prohibited from demolishing a building through a detailed development plan that requires its preservation, because of its heritage value and architectural qualities, or by listing historical buildings for protection. In such a case, the public decision-maker may be obliged to compensate the property owner financially. Contrary to *"single interest", "public interest"* represents the common good. If the transformation of a site may damage heritage values or risks the loss of architectural qualities considered to be of interest for citizens and a common utility to the community, then the developer is held responsible for compensation. In this case, the demand for restoration is not a question of monetary compensation, but rather an issue of replacing lost values and adding qualities to the affected site. This calls for compensatory measures in detailed development plans, even if the key actors may use other words for describing their problem-solving actions. The actual outcome is compensation for transforming the environment and getting access to the site for exploitation. Being able to complete a planning assignment with an approved detailed plan is seen as a sign of professionalism

in planning departments. At the same time, the developer gains easier access to the site by providing compensatory measures in the planning phase.

Compensatory measures may also depend on the need for approval from governmental agencies according to the *Environmental Code* or the developer's willingness to get access to the site by *voluntary agreements*. The planning departments in the city of Gothenburg prefer compensatory actions in detailed development plans through voluntary agreements.[4] The city has published guidelines to support compensatory action. A closer examination of compensation as public interest and common utility for citizens shows two perspectives. First, we have a top-down strategy for the implementation of compensatory regulations, defined by the law and executed through public authorities and governmental agencies. Secondly, there is a bottom-up approach in the planning process driven by companies, professionals and planners at municipalities. The top-down perspective is typical for *ecological compensation* promoted in national guidelines by governmental agencies, such as The Swedish Environmental Protection Agency and County Administrative Boards. *Cultural heritage compensation* represents a bottom-up strategy, developed as a professional practice in planning processes to produce an approved, detailed development plan for alterations.

There are no guidelines from governmental agencies when it comes to cultural heritage compensation. In Sweden, the national agency for cultural heritage has no clear opinions on this matter. They hesitate about whether losses of cultural values can be restored, and they provide no guidelines. The National Board of Housing, Building and Planning in Sweden, as well as the County Administrative Boards, only promote ecological compensation on their homepages. Cultural heritage compensation is made invisible on a national and a regional level by governmental agencies, which is a disturbing fact.

The existence of values and qualities is acknowledged in practice by compensatory measures in planning. The actions presuppose that there is justified criticism of the exploitation that cannot be ignored by the city's and municipality's planning departments. Consequently, compensation is embedded with conflicting standpoints – dislike, demand for changes and alternative solutions to obtaining approvals. This is the case, even if heritage values and architectural qualities basically are seen as something positive. A detailed development plan containing cultural heritage compensation can therefore combine exploitation with preservation.

If power is in balance, the final and detailed development plan will probably have a certain number of desirable characteristics, depending on the key actors that are responsible for cultural heritage. It seems appealing from an ethical point of view to safeguard properties and keep values and qualities that otherwise would have been lost through the exploitation. In this perspective, compensatory measures in the transformation of sites can be seen simultaneously as an attractive way of securing access to plots by developers and as a way to re-create qualities and add values to the area. Cultural heritage compensation represents a new paradigm in the transformation of sites with an old history. In this planning paradigm, the developer should compensate for damage and loss due to public interest and the common good. Cultural values and architectural qualities are resources of society that need to be taken care of.

COMPENSATORY MEASURES AS WICKED PROBLEMS

The challenge in transformation lies in seeing the future in the planning documents and finding out how identified heritage values and architectural qualities should be safeguarded in a proper way. Planning has a future-oriented context and is accompanied by a lack of certainty. Designing cultural heritage compensation may therefore be seen as a *"wicked problem"* in the transformation of built environments, filled with uncertainty about the outcome (Rittel &Webber, 1973). Anders Larsson (2020) notes that the mitigation hierarchy in the environmental code (avoid, minimize, restore and compensate) is a strategy that might operate for *ecological compensation* if there is an obvious link between damage and measure. However, this is not the case for exploitation in areas with cultural heritage values. The mitigation hierarchy as an overall strategy for compensation must be criticized. The mitigation hierarchy favours tangible properties and clearly defined damage to nature, at the expense of aspects of intangible heritage, such as narratives and memories.

In the fields of archaeology and architecture, the mitigation hierarchy has several limitations when it comes to compensation for alterations. In these cases, there is seldom a clear connection between compensatory measures, identified cultural values and architectural qualities of the site, reported impact in terms of a positive or a negative outcome and the actual damage because of the exploitation. In addition, historical buildings and architectural design can be described differently by professionals. Values and qualities are not isolated facts in the built environment. Instead, they produce various meanings in societies. The concepts have a floating character and a signifi-

cant scope for interpretation in processes of transformation. Archaeologists, antiquarians and architects understand, interpret and apply concepts for cultural value and architectural quality differently, based on their specialized competencies, education and professional traditions.

The impact of developments on cultural values and architectural qualities is part of a power play in planning that makes the reporting vary. Developers and hired consultants have an interest in the described positive effects of the transformation and exaggerate the potential benefit to citizens and the environment. Negative consequences are downsized or made invisible to minimize criticism from key actors. The approval of the detailed development plan is one of the main objectives of the planning department. How has the alteration been evaluated? How has exploitation been balanced with cultural value and architectural quality in the area? The effect of demolition and new buildings does not stop at the plot boundaries. The cityscape is also changing beyond the actual site. The tangible cultural heritage is a focus in this kind of transformation. Frank Matero (2006) states that every attempt to position compensation within the larger conservation discourse must acknowledge the three basic constructs of cultural artefacts: form, fabric and function. They all are tied together; however, depending on the situation, professionals can choose several compensatory strategies that either privilege one of the three categories or balance them in search of a whole. This may give a kind of direction for compensatory measures when the tangible cultural heritage is subject to alteration.

The idea of *"wicked problems"* challenges every analysis attempting to find the best compensatory measures to restore cultural heritage values and architectural qualities. The mitigation hierarchy is not suitable as the foundation for heritage compensation. A more creative approach needs to be developed. Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber (1973) describe wicked problems as ill-defined issues that have unique causes and solutions. For this reason, there is (1) no definitive formulation of a wicked problem; (2) solutions to wicked problems are not true-or-false, but good-or-bad, right-or-wrong; (3) a generally accepted test of a solution to a wicked problem is missing; (4) the solution is a 'one-shot operation'; (5) solutions do not have a set of well-described set of permissible steps that may be incorporated into the plan; (6) every wicked problem is essentially unique; (7) they can be considered as a symptom of another problem; (8) they can be explained in numerous ways; and (9) the choice of explanation determines the nature of the problem's resolution.

In a detailed development plan proposal, there are usually several possible compensatory actions that may be considered as appropriate responses to the damage to a site. This is a wicked problem. Since there are many different solutions to compensating for negative effects, the planned proposal will be marked by uncertainty. This represents a fundamentally unfixed point that will remain in an architectural and planning project until it has been implemented. We can be convinced, but do not know for sure, that the proposed compensatory measure improves, protects and safeguards heritage values and architectural qualities in a future-oriented planning process.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

The peer-reviewed contributions from the 2021 session on compensation in the conference *Widening Horizons*, are divided into two sections. The first section contains four contributions that discuss compensatory thinking in planning processes.

Helena Teräväinen opens the discussion with a contribution called *"Discussion on Authenticity and the Identity of a Place: How to apply the compensatory method and resolve interpretations on cultural heritage in a case study."* She presents a critical case of how an old canteen building, in a historically important industrial site in the city of Lapua in Finland, has been managed in the transformation of the area. In the revitalization of the Old Paukku site, compensation proved to be an unspoken practice in the planning process. The first town plan from 1994 for re-using Old Paukku indicated the importance of the cultural heritage and the need for conservation. However, no individual buildings on the site were identified until the alteration plan in 2009, after the cultural heritage values were very clearly recognized to be significant at the national level. In the article, the fate of the canteen building at the site is used as an informative case. Two concepts – compensation and authenticity – are at the centre of the study, representing conflicting interests in the transformation of Old Paukku. Teräväinen asks whether it is possible to compensate authenticity, partly or completely. Can one historical building be replaced by another building, without the loss of cultural values and architectural qualities of the site?

Two buildings, both a hundred years old, are set to compete at Old Paukku. In 2020, the town planning office in Lapua presented a revised plan for the industrial site. The museum authorities accepted to replace the canteen building with a wooden school. The Canteen would lose its authenticity because it

needed renovation. The Canteen was regarded as being in a bad condition and too many parts had to be replaced. The lost identity of place is not discussed by the museum and the town planning office. In this case, Teräväinen finds compensatory thinking to be an inappropriate practice. Moving another old building into Old Paukku as a replacement for the canteen building, as presented in the planning document, is not satisfactory compensation according to international thinking on authenticity. The loss of identity, expressed as a cultural value and architectural quality, is not compensated by moving an old wooden school building onto the site in place of the Canteen.

"Architecture and Compensation: Renewal and Expansion of the City Library in Gothenburg through a Detailed Development Plan" by Magnus Rönn is the second contribution. He examines the 2008 expansion of the City Library of Gothenburg. It is a combined planning and architectural project in the centre of the city, in an area of national heritage interest assigned by the Swedish National Heritage Board. The architectural project was a parallel commission, with four architectural firms designing a new space for the City Library on the site. The planning project was to produce a detailed development plan that made it possible for the builder to implement the winning proposal. This was the main purpose. Preservation and exploitation are two obvious interests in the transformation and that need to be coordinated in the planning and architectural projects. In his contribution, Rönn shows how the City Planning Office used compensatory thinking in a problem-solving manner to implement the winning design from the parallel commission.

The transformation of the area of national heritage gained approval from the County Administrative Board. Critique was rejected. For the City Planning Office, the rebuilding and expansion of the City Library became an approved renewal of cultural values and architectural qualities of the urban space. The loss of this typical example of modernist architecture, well integrated into the surroundings, was compensated by four measures, which made the alteration acceptable: 1) Architectural qualities in the original interior were restored; 2) Two sculptures that were removed because of the expansion were given new placements, one close to the extended library and the other in a park in the city centre; 3) The plan description was completed during planning processes with new knowledge about the cultural values of the site, including qualities in the architecture and urban design; 4) The planning regulations provided regulations protecting the new design, indoors as well as outdoors. These compensatory measures thus made the transformation possible.

"Heritage Compensation in Changing Environments: The Case of the West Link Infrastructure Project, Gothenburg" by Maitri Dore is the third contribution to the book. In this study, Gothenburg is also a geographical context for the discussion. The West Link is a huge infrastructural project in the city run by the Swedish Transport Administration, a governmental agency, and has a strong impact on the acknowledged cultural heritage in the city of Gothenburg. Dore wants to understand how compensation is expressed when cultural heritage is facing this large urban development in Gothenburg. She uses the West Link train tunnel to characterize compensation as storytelling, through actions in the planning process by two public actors: The City's cultural administration and the Swedish Transport Administration. These actors understand compensation differently in connection to affected sites; however, they both propose storytelling as a response to the negative impact on cultural heritage, caused by the large infrastructure project.

Swedish Transport Administration prefer the word *"strengthening"* instead of *"compensation"*, when describing their measures. It sounds more positive. The compensatory proposal in the infrastructure project is to link nine sites along the West Link route, highlighting the narratives of the city's 400-year-history through archaeological remains, technology and exhibition displays. The City's cultural administration argues for a wide-ranging action for storytelling, not fixed to the sites. Dore concludes that compensation for cultural heritage damage can take the form of storytelling, expressed by exposing archaeological elements from the construction sites, combined with architecture, art and digital methods. This approach to compensation needs to be further developed. The West Link case raises theoretical and methodological questions. In the end, Dore finds cultural heritage compensation fruitful, as it throws into focus the nature of alteration in cultural environments, when projects are inserted into them, and the need to assess this change in a critical manner.

"Save what can be saved and tell the story: Balancing damage to industrial heritage by architectural interpretation" by Urban Nilsson is the fourth contribution. He uses an assignment to investigate and discuss compensation as a professional practice. A historically important industrial site – Lövholmen – was going to be developed and renewed in the assignment. Lövholmen is a large industrial area, close to the city of Stockholm, owned by private companies. The industrial remains on the site are from 1889 to the 1940s. The transformation of the site involved the preservation of those strategic

parts with cultural values by adding new qualities. Compensation in this case operates between the preservation of physical remains on the site and interpretative storytelling through architecture, design and art.

Seeing the industrial site as a physical document became a starting point for a group of consultants in the development of compensatory measures – a new layer of interpretation of the environment. The consultants wanted to make visitors, landowners and end-users comprehend the history of the site and the role its companies have played in a regional, national and international context. In this case, design ideas and design elements have been assessed in the assignment, according to Nilsson, as a method of compensation for the visualization and interpretation of cultural values and architectural qualities. The compensatory actions in this planning process are summarized in terms of: (a) identifying heritage values and qualities at the site; (b) investigating possibilities and conflicting interests; as well as (c) adding new perspectives, stories and art to the site. The relations between the objectives for transformation identified damage, need for protection and demand for reconstruction of values and quality; these are changing simultaneously in the assignment. The planning process has also been time-consuming; compensatory measures were developed as a multidisciplinary response in a creative process to the impact on the cultural environment at the site. However, the actual outcome is still uncertain.

The second section includes three contributions discussing compensation in archaeology, landscape architecture and resource management.

Susanna Bortolotto, Nelly Cattaneo and Serena Massa present an article called *"Heritage values and contemporary cultural landscape in Adulis"*. This is the fifth contribution. The site of Adulis is in Eritrea on the shore of the Red Sea, connected to ancient, international maritime and regional terrestrial routes. The geographic position made it possible for Adulis to become a flourishing port on the Horn of Africa between the 3rd century BC and the 7th century AD. Since 2011, an ongoing, international Eritrean-Italian archaeological research project has aimed at the rediscovery, study and valorisation of the archaeological remains of the ancient town, with the intention to create an archaeological park. This has been done through attention to the local agronomic knowledge on the site, a strategic asset in planning the park for sustainable development.

One critical question put forward by Bortolotto, Cattaneo and Massa in the article focusses on mitigation/compensatory measures that may prevent the loss of cultural values triggered by a change in a cultural environment. Starting from the term heritage and the understanding of local cultural values, the authors approach the concept of compensation. Mitigation is addressed as a process of restoring damages to values and loss of qualities in a specific area of transformation. In this case, the development of an Archaeological Park in Adulis, a site of international interest for researchers as well as worldwide travellers because of its cultural heritage and therefore threatened by a tourism-based economy. Cultural values at the site have been identified through attitudes and characteristics involved in the archaeological project and the different meanings that Adulis has in the local community. The western *"authorized"* discourse on heritage values proved to be a limitation that needed to be overcome. The long-term research activity and the collaboration with the local parties became a primary contribution in promoting appropriate compensatory measures.

"The Open-Air Archaeological Museum as a model for cultural compensation" by Athanasios Kouzelis is the sixth contribution. The aim of the article is to show a specific approach in which citizens gain accessibility to historical sites. The archaeological heritage is a material record of human activities that provides knowledge of the past, interpreted in a contemporary context for a future-oriented understanding. From this point of view, Kouzelis finds the open-air museum may be both a tool, a model and a space for exhibition, providing knowledge of the past and cultural novelty. The recording of data concerning perceptions of archaeological heritage can operate as a strategy for the utilization of historical ideas embedded in architectural qualities and cultural values. Among the cases from Greek antiquity in the article, there are marketplaces, stadiums, theatres, palaestras, gymnasiums, processional streets and cemeteries. These monuments are accessible values for citizens in the environment in which they belong and for the functions which they historically create.

Kouzelis concludes that management of the preservation and regeneration of archaeological sites is important for the development of the compensatory process. It inspires and provides a framework for approaches to architectural and design praxis as a source of cultural compensation. Research on such management may focus on the utility of the invested resources in which losses in the architectural and cultural heritage are met. The open-air museum

has an outdoor archaeological site allowing access to the space, in contrast to the closed form of a museum. However, it is not just a matter of giving proper examples of cultural heritage compensation. The function of compensation is interwoven with utility and common good. According to Kouzelis, it serves to correct damage or loss to cultural property of the people, promoting through its restoration the cultivation of values in conjunction with their future feasibility.

"Narratives of fish, trade and coastal communities: Use and resource management as a tool for heritage and environment compensation", by Tom Davies and Anja Standal, is the final and seventh contribution in the book. The authors investigate the intrinsic relationship between the tangible and intangible in cultural heritage. The research findings are based on two case studies of Norwegian coastal localities. The two investigations discuss the UNESCO World Heritage Site of the Vega Archipelago and the village of Ytre-Standal, Hjørundfjorden, both in Northwest Norway. The study of the Vega Archipelago focusses on the natural and cultural heritage. The examination of Ytre-Standal village looks at the parameters for exploitation of resources, as a foundation for developing cultural compensation and resource management.

Davies and Standal show in the two cases how intangible heritage is closely linked to living conditions, and that the environment in a coastal location can be considered to comprise cultural records of tacit knowledge. The heritage management at Vega demonstrates the difficulties of going beyond stabilization and consolidation. The authors address how both cultural data and tacit knowledge need to be repeated and allowed to evolve in the context of resource management. The case of Ytre-Standal suggests that there is information available in local sources. This kind of resource can be read as tacit knowledge, of importance to both resource management and the development of compensation. Davies and Standal see the aim of compensation to *"provide a better understanding of cultural heritage in the communities"*. Compensation may also be used to inform about the impact, and to give input to the management of its sustainable future. At the end of the article, the author proposes a strategy for combining value-sets from biodiversity and cultural heritage, with guidance from Norwegian legislation and global objectives. The aim of the approach is to support the ongoing work to appoint Vega as an outstanding cultural landscape.

REFERENCES

Choay, F. (2007). L'allégorie du patrimoine. In Plevoets, B., Van Cleempoel, K. (2012). *Adaptive Reuse as a Strategy towards Conservation of Cultural Heritage: A Survey of 19th and 20th Century Theories,* IE International Conference, Reinventing Architecture and Interiors: the past, the present and the future, Ravensbourne.

Davis, T. (2020). Defining new values for Cavemen and finding the Human in Heritage, in (Eds) Rönn and Grahn Danielson, *Cultural Heritage Compensation: Approaches to Transformation of sites vid Cultural Values and Architectural Qualities.* Gothenburg; Kulturlandskapet and Chalmers University of Technology.

Environmental Code, (Miljöbalk) 1998:808.

Historic Environment Act, (Kulturmiljölag) 1988:950.

Jokilehto, J. (1986). *A History of Architectural Conservation: The Contribution of English, French, German and Italian Thought Towards an International Approach to The Conservation of Cultural Property.* England: The University of York.

Kalman, H. (2017). Destruction, mitigation and reconciliation of cultural heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 23:6.*

Larsson, A. (2020). Place logic rather than Project logic: Landscape Observations as regional coordinators of large-scale project and compensatory measures, in (Eds) Rönn and Grahn Danielson, *Cultural Heritage Compensation: Approaches to Transformation of sites vid Cultural Values and Architectural Qualities.* Gothenburg; Kulturlandskapet and Chalmers University of Technology.

Matero, F. (2006). Loss, Compensation and Authenticity in Architectural *Conservation. Journal of Architectural Conservation, No 12:1.*

Planning- and Building Act, (Plan- och bygglag) 2010:900.

NOTES

1 See: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Code_of_Hammurabi

2 See: https://avalon.law.yale.edu/ancient/hamframe.asp

3 Ibid.

4 https://goteborg.se/wps/wcm/connect/a97a8afc-ed01-4f23-b26b-2e6ee1e203b9/OPA_Kompatgarder_natur_rekreation.pdf?MOD=AJPERES