
FARO CONVENTION'S IMPLICATIONS FOR HERITAGE THEORY AND PRACTICE

PIRKOVIČ Jelka ¹

¹ Jelka Pirkovič, University of Ljubljana
<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-0692-0863>

ABSTRACT: The article examines the evolution of heritage management theory in Europe, focusing on the Faro Convention.

International heritage conventions stress integrated conservation, while the concept of heritage addresses preservation methods. The Faro Convention highlights the importance of heritage values to contemporary societies. Despite receiving only 25 ratifications from 46 Council of Europe member states, the Faro Convention principles significantly influence European heritage trends and beyond.

The Convention defines principles that connect heritage values, communities, and national policies. It requires state parties to articulate the public interest in integrated heritage conservation by identifying, studying, evaluating, protecting, conserving, and interpreting heritage. These processes should involve heritage communities as right-holders, representing a key innovation of the Convention.

Lastly, the Convention outlines tools for spatial planning and intervention, along with other themes, creating a solid foundation for democratising heritage policies.

KEY WORDS: Heritage communities, heritage rights, shared values, integrated conservation, citizens' participation

1. Introduction

Aristotle regarded political science as the highest form of science because it aims to achieve the greatest good for all citizens, particularly their happiness or eudaimonia.¹ What defines the core system of each science? It is its theory. In the margins of his philosophical discussions, Aristotle briefly mentioned this, warning that theory without practical application bears no fruit.² Even today, academic researchers engaged with theory must obtain feedback from practitioners. In contrast, practice reflects a theory, and, as Kurt Lewin pointed out, there is nothing more practical than a good theory.³

The Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention) is an international treaty rather than a theoretical treatise. However, the Convention provokes heritage researchers and professionals to reassess their doctrinal foundations and integrate the Faro principles into their theories and practices.

2. The political and doctrinal context

The nineties witnessed a new political reality in Europe: the dissolution of the Soviet bloc and the breakup of the former Yugoslavia, the latter of which was followed by violent armed conflicts. Changes also occurred in the heritage field, where heritage management underwent significant transformations. Previously, the focus was on individual monuments, primarily national symbols. Decisions were centralised at the state level, with experts solely responsible for heritage projects, and conservation was regarded as a specialised field.

Understanding heritage has expanded to include both tangible and intangible elements, historic landscapes, and cultural contexts. Heritage is increasingly associated with cultural diversity, vital to our collective identity. Simultaneously, heritage initiatives have become decentralised, allowing decisions to be made at regional and local levels. Community engagement has become central to heritage projects, as the success of these activities relies not only on the expertise of specialists but also on societal acceptance.

Simultaneously, new heritage doctrines gradually emerged from the 1970s into the 1990s, including public or community archaeology, new museology, critical regionalism in architecture and urban planning, and (critical) heritage studies or heritology, an emerging interdisciplinary field.

3. Council of Europe's turn-of-the-millennium concerns

In the late 1990s and at the beginning of 2000, the Council of Europe, a pan-European intergovernmental organisation, took preparatory steps to strengthen its founding mission of promoting democracy, the rule of law, and human rights across the continent. Policies related to cultural heritage were no exception. The political challenge lay in determining how heritage

¹ Aristotle (1999). *Nicomachean Ethics*. (Trans. Ross, V. D.) Kitchener: Batoche Books, p. 5.

² Ibidem, p. 25.

³ Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper & Row, p. 169 - Lewin's famous remark was directed towards the pitfalls of applied psychology, but its validity proves to be more general.

initiatives could foster a deeper understanding among European citizens, cultivate a sense of belonging, and enhance European identity.⁴ With this aim, in 1999, the Council of Europe launched a second heritage campaign titled *Europe, a Common Heritage*. The first campaign (1975) focused on European architectural heritage and resulted in the influential concept of integrated heritage conservation. In parallel with the events of the second campaign (1999-2000), expert consultations led to two publications: *Forward Planning* (2001) and *Dividing Lines, Connecting Lines* (2004). The latter responded to the 1998-2000 Member States' consultation to facilitate cross-border cooperation in areas with historically similar cultural heritage. However, the initiative failed due to political disagreements in southeastern Europe regarding which heritage belonged to specific nations.⁵

4. International legal texts paving the way for the Faro Convention

First, the United Nations *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948) and the *International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights* (1966) must be acknowledged. Article 27 of the former states: "Everyone has the right freely to participate in the community's cultural life, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits." The latter provides a more detailed elaboration of the specific cultural rights generally guaranteed by the Universal Declaration; however, the right to cultural heritage is not mentioned.

Secondly, environmental issues should be mentioned, starting with the UN *Declaration on Environment and Development*⁶ (1992), which defines the right to sustainable development. Similarly, the *Aarhus Convention* defined the right to access information related to environmental issues and laid the foundation for a participative approach.⁷ The Council of Europe and the United Nations, each within their remits, defined the rights of national minorities and indigenous peoples, encompassing also their cultural rights.⁸

Another important principle, integrated conservation, has been part of the Council of Europe's efforts from the 1970s to the 1990s. It gained prominence in 1975 with the *Council of Europe's Charter of Architectural Heritage*. The Charter referenced integrated conservation as the foundation for collective European conservation policies. It further emphasises that adequate protection requires countries to go beyond promoting sensitive restoration techniques and providing suitable functions for restored monuments. To mitigate heritage risks, we must comprehensively restore historic urban and rural centres, incorporating these efforts into

⁴ For more detail on the process that preceded the 2005 Faro Convention, refer to: Pickard, R. (2002). *European Cultural Heritage: A Review of Policies and Practice* (Volume II). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

⁵ Ibidem, p. 15.

⁶ United Nations (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*.

⁷ NECE (1998). *Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters*. Aarhus.

⁸ For more details on the community's definitions in international legal texts, refer to: Urbinati, S. (2015). The Community Participation in International Law (123–140). In: *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Adell, N. et al. (eds.) Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

regional and urban planning. The Charter outlines the scope of integrated conservation through various legal, financial, administrative, and technical measures. It notably stresses the importance of raising awareness about the objectives and responsibilities of integrated conservation and ensuring public involvement in the decision-making process.

The *Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe*, adopted in Granada in 1985, embraced this concept and elevated it to an international legal standard. The Convention provides a more precise definition of integrated conservation than the Charter and expands its scope.

Protecting architectural heritage is a key goal in regional and urban planning. Monuments and certain buildings that, while not inherently significant, add value to the environment and influence the quality of life must be protected. When implementing protection measures, it is crucial to balance the conservation of the substance with the benefits of reusing heritage. Ensuring public access, including any necessary structural changes, should not harm the architectural and historical character of the surrounding heritage.

The *European Convention for the Protection of Archaeological Heritage*⁹ (1992) also applies the principle of integrated conservation to archaeological sites, requiring Member States to ensure that environmental impact assessments fully consider archaeological sites and their contexts. Conducting heritage impact assessments is an effective method for incorporating protection into all phases of development planning, including strategic planning, to achieve balanced outcomes, which tend to become more complex as plans become more detailed.

The *Council of Europe Landscape Convention*¹⁰ (2000, 2016) and the *UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding Intangible Heritage*¹¹ (2003) have directly influenced the Faro Convention. The latter sets an example of individuals and communities as holders of heritage rights, although it does not define what constitutes a community.¹² The former has enhanced our understanding of the landscape's role in human environments and quality of life. Its innovation resides in defining landscapes as areas perceived by people whose character results from the interaction of natural and/or human factors (Article 1). Consequently, people's perceptions and understanding of landscapes are crucial for their meaning, rather than those of politicians, landowners, or experts. The same applies to cultural landscapes as a heritage category.

We can conclude that the Granada and Valletta Conventions consolidated integrated heritage conservation. However, defining the right to heritage is essential for democratising heritage governance.

⁹ Council of Europe (1992). *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage* (Revised). Valetta.

¹⁰ Council of Europe (2000, 2016). *European Landscape Convention* - The original text was amended in 2016 to enable non-European countries and the European Union to join the Convention.

¹¹ UNESCO (2003). *Convention for the Safeguarding Intangible Heritage*. Paris.

¹² For more details on the community's definitions in international legal texts, refer to: Urbinati, S. (2015). The Community Participation in International Law (123–140). In: *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Adell, N. et al. (eds.) Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

5. The Faro Convention – establishing the new perspective

In crafting the new international legal instrument, the Cultural Heritage Committee and its experts intentionally embraced a fresh viewpoint on integrated heritage conservation.¹³ This new perspective highlights a people-centred approach while shifting away from a conventional object-focused lens. It begins with the values individuals attach to heritage, making them the foundation for its definition. As a result, heritage can no longer be viewed as a fixed and unchanging concept; instead, we acknowledge the various heritages defined and redefined by human experience and action.

Previous international legal instruments have aimed to clarify essential issues and rules regarding conservation. A notable example is the UNESCO *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*¹⁴, commonly referred to as the Hague Convention. In contrast, the Faro Convention emphasises the significance of incorporating heritage concerns into conflict-prevention strategies. It acknowledges that the right to heritage is a vital aspect of human rights that merits attention during conflicts and disputes.¹⁵ Furthermore, the right to a specific interpretation of heritage should be preserved if it fosters peace and reconciliation. Ultimately, the Faro Convention seeks to elucidate the reasons for heritage preservation and the beneficiaries of such efforts, rather than focusing solely on conservation methods.

5.1 Faro Convention Principles

As mentioned, the Convention highlights the importance of tangible and intangible heritage aspects and values. To truly define heritage, it is essential to recognise the values that society considers significant. The Convention's text elaborates on this by indicating that values are assigned to specific phenomena, thereby identifying them as heritage. The phrase "attributing value to heritage" is used in these contexts. Furthermore, "value" is included in the Convention's title, suggesting that heritage value extends beyond intrinsic cultural significance. The value of heritage is substantial, reflecting its cultural, social, and economic advantages for communities.

A key innovation of the Faro Convention is that everyone has the right to cherish their chosen heritage, provided they respect the rights and freedoms of others. Notably, this is the first instance in which such rights have been explicitly applied to heritage.

¹³ Clark, K. (2001). From regulation to participation: cultural heritage, sustainable development and citizenship (103–112). In: *Forward Planning: The Function of Cultural Heritage in a Changing Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

¹⁴ UNESCO (1954). *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*. Hague.

¹⁵ Jakubowski, A. (2011). *The effects of state succession on cultural property: Ownership, control, protection*, p. 301. <https://doi.org/10.2870/08426>.

The Faro Convention highlights the link between heritage and cultural diversity as a fundamental principle. This connection is essential because heritage significantly influences the evolving arena of European society, enhancing its cultural diversity and identity. The UNESCO *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*¹⁶ complements this shift from another angle by mainly addressing trade policies that impact cultural diversity within cultural industries and audiovisual production. In contrast, the Faro Convention focuses more on leveraging heritage to foster social and economic well-being in societies.

While not explicitly stated, the Faro Convention effectively incorporates two additional principles that, if considered separately, may lead to tensions in contemporary society. The first principle is the idea of stability through identity. Heritage enables individuals to navigate a European social space characterised by increasing personal mobility and diminishing cultural anchors. Conversely, the exchange of people, knowledge, and ideas enhances mutual understanding and fosters international cooperation, which is a top priority of the Convention. Immovable heritage, firmly rooted in specific territories, represents social and economic assets. Acknowledging the multi-identity character of heritage challenges nationalistic viewpoints. Meanwhile, the flow of ideas, people, and skills makes the European- and indeed global- nature of heritage accessible for everyone to appreciate and comprehend.

5.2 Defining notions

As previously noted, the Faro Convention offers a comprehensive definition of heritage. This definition highlights the environmental aspect, acknowledging that human and natural influences on landscapes and the cultural environment are interconnected. It is essential to stress the mention of ownership: while an item may be regarded as the heritage of specific communities or interest groups, this does not diminish ownership rights. Nevertheless, limitations on these rights may be warranted in the public interest, corresponding to the value assigned to a specific heritage object.

The notion of heritage community closely aligns with the new perspective of the Faro Convention. These communities consist of large or small informal interest groups wishing to connect with specific heritage and ensure its transfer to future generations. Importantly, heritage communities are defined without regard to national or ethnic backgrounds. Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper defines the heritage community as: "a social formation which backs up the building of a heritage. It dissociates itself from an affirmation of the unity of heritage, identity, ethnicity and cultural belonging, to the benefit of a more open and complex model".¹⁷ Heritage communities may be geographically based or based on language, religion, shared humanist values, or historical ties. Unlike cultural communities, heritage communities are formed by shared cultural practices,

¹⁶ UNESCO (2005). *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Paris.

¹⁷ Dolff-Bonekämper, G. (ed.) (2004). *Dividing lines, connecting lines: Europe's cross-border heritage (Responses to violence in everyday life in a democratic society)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, p. 71.

beliefs, and organisation. Groups can establish their communities through cultural activities facilitated by community organisations and institutions, such as language schools, churches, and cultural agencies. These groups often aim to preserve their heritage and foster ethnic unity, but they can also emerge from shared interests of a different nature. For instance, a common interest in industrial heritage can unite a "heritage community," where members are linked solely by their shared heritage preferences. In short, the Faro Convention empowers communities to participate in decision-making as a form of direct democracy and to help shape policies and strategies concerning their local resources and the impact of those practices on the resilience of heritage communities.¹⁸ The authors of the cited paper propose a set of indicators to measure how cultural heritage supports a community in building resilience through social, environmental, economic, and governance innovation.¹⁹

The Council of Europe has largely championed the concept of Europe's common heritage. This term was first established in the *Statute of the Council of Europe*²⁰, where it was described as a collection of political principles that include human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. The Faro Convention builds on this notion, emphasising that Europe's common heritage encompasses all heritages that serve as sources of memory, togetherness, and identity for all Europeans, irrespective of whether they live on the European continent or beyond. The European Union has also adopted this term during the 2018 *European Year of Cultural Heritage*.²¹

5.3 Commitments for Member States in executing the Convention

The second and third sections of the Faro Convention outline the commitments expected from Member States after ratification.²² It is important to remember that the framework convention, like the Faro Convention, is generally less stringent for Member States than traditional conventions, as it sets out principles and broad action areas without imposing rigid obligations. Key areas addressed by the Faro Convention include:

¹⁸ Fabbriatti, K., Boissenin, L. & Citoni, M. (2020). Heritage Community Resilience: towards new approaches for urban resilience and sustainability. *City, Territory and Architecture* 7(17), pp. 4, 6. <https://cityterritoryarchitecture.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40410-020-00126-7>.

¹⁹ Ibidem.

²⁰ Council of Europe (1949). *Statute of the Council of Europe*. London.

²¹ Fiorentini, F., Hausler, K. & Jakubowski, A. (2021). Cultural heritage and European identity in European Union law and policy. In: *A Research Agenda for Heritage Planning: Perspectives from Europe*. Stegmeijer, E. & Veldpaus, L. (eds.) Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 100.

²² Only 25 of 46 Council of Europe Member States ratified the Faro Convention. Notably, Eastern and Southern countries dominate this count, which highlights differing expectations and needs among nations that once belonged to the socialist bloc and whose heritage faced the challenges of social transition (Pirkovič, J. (2009). Unpacking the convention into challenging actions for member states. In: *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, p. 23).

- heritage law and policies,
- heritage and dialogue,
- shared responsibility for heritage and public participation,
- heritage and knowledge.

Heritage laws and policies must first articulate the public interest, acknowledging where it may conflict with private interests and when it should take precedence. A principle of proportionality needs to be employed, as not all aspects can receive protection. Each nation should define the criteria for public interest in heritage conservation and translate these into protective measures. Additionally, state parties should express the public interest in integrated heritage conservation by identifying, studying, evaluating, protecting, conserving, and interpreting heritage. These processes should involve heritage communities as right-holders, representing a key innovation of the Convention.

The primary document guiding heritage policies should be a national heritage strategy that aims to improve the legal framework and administrative actions related to heritage while promoting heritage research, facilitating the mobility and exchange of individuals, knowledge, and ideas, supporting civil society initiatives, and, importantly, fostering connections between contemporary creativity and existing heritage. A shared European heritage strategy should also drive intergovernmental cooperation, which the Council of Europe recently established by adopting the *European heritage strategy for the 21st Century*²³ and through several follow-up activities to endorse strategic actions in individual Member States.²⁴

5.4 Communicating heritage through dialogue

Intercultural dialogue has gained importance within the Council of Europe and the European Union. Beyond the potential of heritage in preventing conflicts, facilitating reconciliation, and nurturing respect for others, the Faro Convention emphasises the need to integrate heritage approaches into education and lifelong learning as a foundation for dialogue. Member States are encouraged to develop intersectoral policies that promote intercultural and interfaith dialogue and mutual understanding of differences to prevent conflicts among diverse heritage communities. Among other initiatives, community-led inventorying, shared interpretation, and the promotion of local skills can enhance heritage-related knowledge.

²³ Council of Europe (2017). *Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century* (CM/Rec(2017)1), <https://rm.coe.int/european-heritage-strategy-for-the-21st-century-strategy-21-full-text/16808ae270>.

²⁴ Such Member State efforts are directly encouraged by the Council of Europe. Refer to *Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century* (Recommendation 2017, Methodology guidance, Factsheets, Good practices collection etc.) <https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/strategy-21>.

5.5 Democratisation of heritage

An essential initiative of the Faro Convention is to promote shared responsibility for heritage and public participation. Shared responsibility means ensuring everyone has the right to access, interpret, and conserve heritage rather than making these activities the privilege of heritage authorities alone.

Notably, Patrice Meyer-Bisch, a key contributor to drafting the Faro Convention, expounded on the principle of interdependence concerning the right to heritage, a crucial component of cultural rights. He highlighted how the right to heritage is interlinked with the rights to education, communication, decent work and housing.²⁵

For Member States to achieve this ambitious aim, it is crucial to disseminate knowledge about heritage widely, encourage public discussions on essential heritage issues, and make heritage assets as accessible as possible. Doing so will enable heritage to play a significant role in fostering a culture of citizenship within individual countries and across Europe.

To fulfil the goals of the Convention, it is crucial to promote collective efforts among all partners involved in heritage initiatives, including public authorities, specialists, property owners, investors, the business community, and civil society. The importance of public authorities in sharing responsibilities is evident. They must consider the needs of other partners and eliminate legal and practical barriers to collaboration. Notably, the Faro Convention elevates the essence of the *Portorož Declaration on the Role of Voluntary Organisations in Cultural Heritage*²⁶, adopted by cultural heritage ministers at the 5th Council of Europe Ministerial Conference in Slovenia, to an international legal standard. The declaration stresses the need to empower heritage non-governmental organisations to assert their rights in heritage matters.²⁷ Furthermore, the Faro Convention's significance for civil society parallels the Aarhus Convention. It encourages Member States to recognise heritage NGOs as partners in heritage activities and as constructive critics of cultural heritage policies.

5.6 Spatial planning instruments

The Faro Convention promotes the integration of heritage issues into planning tools, particularly in development planning (encompassing both economic and social aspects), spatial (land-use) planning, and development interventions. The purpose of these tools is to maximise the utilisation of cultural heritage as a pathway to sustainable development.

²⁵ Meyer-Bisch, P. (2024). Leçons apprises avec le déploiement des droits culturels. *Nectart* 20 (3), pp. 24-26. <https://doi.org/10.3917/nect.020.0028>.

²⁶ Council of Europe (2001). *Portorož Declaration on the Role of Voluntary Organisations in Cultural Heritage*. Portorož.

²⁷ *The Faro Way: enhanced participation in cultural heritage* (Council of Europe and European Commission programme. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/the-faro-way>.

When development proposals arise, a heritage impact assessment is necessary to determine the direct and indirect effects on heritage. Heritage authorities must thoroughly evaluate these impacts. Their assessment should encompass the direct demolition or alteration of specific heritage elements alongside the indirect impacts on their character, which include visual degradation, air pollution, fluctuations in the water table, vibrations, traffic, similar stressors, and ecological harm. It is essential to acknowledge that heritage impacts can arise without visible heritage elements within the development area, since development activities may interfere with undiscovered archaeological sites or heritage elements in adjacent locations. Conducting the heritage impact assessment during the early phases of development planning can guide the selection of development sites or help to establish buffer zones around heritage sites. However, if the proposed development poses a greater significance than the heritage features, it is crucial to formulate mitigation strategies to reduce or address adverse effects on heritage. Notably, the Faro Convention has adopted the philosophy of heritage impact assessment, initially created for environmental matters and later applied to archaeological heritage (as seen in the Valetta Convention), to encompass heritage broadly, which is essential for the sustainable utilisation of heritage resources.

An essential aspect of planning is the integrated conservation of both natural and cultural heritage. While these interests may seem to conflict, this perceived opposition is superficial, especially when we acknowledge the interconnectedness of human actions and natural forces within the cultural context and its components. Moreover, it is crucial to honour modern contributions to future heritage. What we create today will become the heritage of tomorrow, and we must uphold quality standards in contemporary designs that align with the principles established in the *European Landscape Convention*.²⁸

Priority is placed on key intervention tools that promote the sustainable, long-term management of heritage resources. These tools involve comprehensive support for ongoing heritage maintenance, the implementation of technical standards tailored to the unique characteristics of heritage, fostering the regular use of traditional materials, techniques, and skills (while also weighing the thoughtful integration of new technologies), and establishing professional qualifications and accreditation systems grounded in quality training and ethical standards in heritage conservation and presentation to avoid distortions.

6. Conclusion

Let us examine our assertion in the article's title, emphasising the Faro Convention's significance for heritage theory and practice. With this in mind, we should reflect on the points elaborated upon below.

In these challenging times, safeguarding and enriching heritage is increasingly vital for the values of democracy, the rule of law, human rights and fostering identity through shared knowledge and collective memories. Scholar articles published in the last decades certify that the Faro principles

²⁸ Council of Europe (2000). *European Landscape Convention*. Florence.

resonate not only in European regions, cities²⁹, heritage communities³⁰, and expert discourses³¹ but also regardless of whether the state authorities comply with the Convention, which applies also to non-signatory and non-European countries.³² Such testimonies demonstrate that the practicalities of Faro's principles enhance the quality of life at the local level. Ultimately, public and expert acceptance is the strongest evidence of Faro's relevance as the beacon of sustainable heritage management.

Over the past fifty years, conservation has evolved from focusing on individual monuments to encompassing heritage sites and historic landscapes. It has shifted from isolated conservation plans to integrating conservation into development planning.

As experts, we should consider all categories and types of heritage, particularly the intangible aspects of heritage places and landscapes, along with the stories and memories embedded in them.³³

Heritage experts are the first to recognise heritage as a valuable asset for our societies. At the same time, we need to comprehend the broad spectrum of values and identify which segments of society are our "natural" allies.

This situation necessitates a crucial adjustment of our theoretical premises. Heritological theory serves as an interdisciplinary foundation in heritage studies, primarily connected to the humanities

²⁹ *The Geneva Declaration - Human Rights and Cultural Heritage: Committed Cities Working Together* (2018) was signed by city authorities of Geneva (Switzerland), Strasbourg (France), Timbuktu (Mali), Mosul (Iraq), Diyarbakir (Turkey), Lund (Sweden), Vienne (France) and Erbil (Iraq) to protect the collective memory against the degradation and destruction of values as the many dimensions that make up cultural heritage. <https://www.geneve.ch/actualites/protection-droits-humains-patrimoine-culturel-villes-signent-declaration-geneve>.

³⁰ For a compilation of good practice examples refer to publications available at the Faro Convention Tools webpage: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-in-action>.

³¹ Let us mention only two recent publications that address the importance of the Faro Convention for implementing participatory heritage governance and heritage rights at the global stage: International Law Association (2022). *Participation in Global Cultural Heritage Governance: Lisbon Conference Final Report*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4220401; Vadi, V. (2023). *Cultural Heritage in International Economic Law*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill/Nijhoff, <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/86581/9789004347823.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

³² Bold, J. (2013). Sustaining Heritage in South-East Europe: Working with the Council of Europe, 2003–10. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* 4(1), 75–86; Zagato, L. (2015). The notion of "Heritage Community in the Council of Europe's Faro Convention: Its Impact on the European legal framework (141–168). In: *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Adell, N. et al. (eds.) Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen; Bold, J. & Pickard, R. (eds.) (2018). *An Integrated Approach To Cultural Heritage: The Council of Europe's Technical Cooperation and Consultancy Programme*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing; Zhao, Xiaoxin, Chen, Jinliu, Li, Jiayi, Wang, Haoqi, Zhang, Xinyu & Yu, Fangshu (2025). Unravelling the renewal priority of urban heritage communities via macro-micro dimensional assessment: A case study of Nanjing City, China. *Sustainable Cities and Societies* 124 (4).

³³ Schofield, J. (2015). Forget About 'Heritage': Place, Ethics and the Faro Convention. In: *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. Ireland, T. & Schofield, J. (eds.) New York, Heidelberg, Dordrecht, London: Springer, p. 208.

while incorporating perspectives from both social and natural sciences. A notion of heritage that disregards its link to communities and individuals may miss important contemporary and future heritage issues. To comprehend the rationale behind heritage's existence, we must reflect on the public good it provides—in other words, its societal value.

In conclusion, we can assert that the Faro Convention provides tools for effectively integrating new theoretical principles into heritage practice.

Bibliography

- Aristotle (1999). *Nicomachean Ethics*. (Trans. Ross, V. D.) Kitchener: Batoche Books.
- Bold, J. (2013). Sustaining Heritage in South-East Europe: Working with the Council of Europe, 2003–10. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 4(1), 75–86.
- Bold, J. & Pickard, R. (eds.) (2018). *An Integrated Approach To Cultural Heritage: The Council of Europe's Technical Cooperation and Consultancy Programme*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Clark, K. (2001). From regulation to participation: cultural heritage, sustainable development and citizenship (103–112). In: *Forward Planning: The Function of Cultural Heritage in a Changing Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Council of Europe (2000, 2016). *European Landscape Convention*.
- Council of Europe (1992). *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage* (Revised). Valetta.
- Council of Europe (2005). *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. Faro.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Portorož Declaration on the Role of Voluntary Organisations in Cultural Heritage*. Portorož.
- Council of Europe (2017). *Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century* (CM/Rec(2017)1), <https://rm.coe.int/european-heritage-strategy-for-the-21st-century-strategy-21-full-text/16808ae270>.
- Council of Europe (1949). *Statute of the Council of Europe*. London.
- Danakas, A. (2019). *The Constitutional Regulation of the Protection of the Hellenic Cultural Heritage and the Content of the Relevant Human Right*. (Master thesis). Thessaloniki: International Hellenic University, <https://core.ac.uk/download/236205585.pdf>.
- Dolff-Bonekämper, G. (ed.) (2004). *Dividing lines, connecting lines: Europe's cross-border heritage (Responses to violence in everyday life in a democratic society)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Dolff-Bonekämper, G. (2009). The social and spatial frameworks of heritage: What is new in the Faro Convention? (69–74). In: *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Fabbricatti, K., Boissenin, L. & Citoni, M. (2020). Heritage Community Resilience: towards new approaches for urban resilience and sustainability. *City, Territory and Architecture* 7 (17), 1–20. <https://cityterritoryarchitecture.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40410-020-00126-7>.
- Fiorentini, F., Hausler, K. & Jakubowski, A. (2021). Cultural heritage and European identity in European Union law and policy (99–111). In: *A Research Agenda for Heritage Planning: Perspectives from Europe*. Stegmeijer, E. & Veldpaus, L. (eds.) Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- International Law Association (2022). *Participation in Global Cultural Heritage Governance: Lisbon Conference Final Report*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4220401.
- Jakubowski, A. (2011). *The effects of state succession on cultural property: Ownership, control, protection*. <https://doi.org/10.2870/08426>.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Meyer-Bisch, P. (2024). Leçons apprises avec le déploiement des droits culturels. *Nectart*, 20 (3), 28-37. <https://doi.org/10.3917/nect.020.0028>.
- NECE (1998). *Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters*. Aarhus.
- Pickard, R. (2002). *European Cultural Heritage: A Review of Policies and Practice* (Volume II). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Pirkovič, J. (2009). Unpacking the convention into challenging actions for member states (23-27). In: *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Schofield, J. (2015). Forget About 'Heritage': Place, Ethics and the Faro Convention (197-209). In: *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*. Ireland, T. & Schofield, J. (eds.) New York, Heidelberg, Dordrecht, London: Springer.
- UNESCO (1954). *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*. Hague.
- UNESCO (2005). *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Paris.
- UNESCO (2003). *Convention for the Safeguarding Intangible Heritage*. Paris.
- United Nations (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*.
- Urbinati, S. (2015). The Community Participation in International Law (123-140). In: *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Adell, N. et al. (eds.) Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Vadi, V. (2023). *Cultural Heritage in International Economic Law*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill|Nijhoff, <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/86581/9789004347823.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.
- Zagato, L. (2015). The notion of "Heritage Community in the Council of Europe's Faro Convention: Its Impact on the European legal framework (141-168). In: *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice*. Adell, N. et al. (eds.) Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Zhao, Xiaoxin, Chen, Jinliu, Li, Jiayi, Wang, Haoqi, Zhang, Xinyu & Yu, Fangshu (2025). Unravelling the renewal priority of urban heritage communities via macro-micro dimensional assessment: A case study of Nanjing City, China. *Sustainable Cities and Societies* 124 (4).