

RA

restauro archeologico

Conoscenza, conservazione e valorizzazione
del patrimonio architettonico d'interesse archeologico
e di quello allo stato di rudere
**Rivista del Dipartimento di Architettura
dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze**

The knowledge, conservation, and valorization
of all endangered, neglected,
or ruined architectural structures.
**Journal of the Department of Architecture
University of Florence**

Architettura e
urbanistica Maya
special issue

2017



RA

restauro archeologico

Conoscenza, conservazione e valorizzazione
del patrimonio architettonico d'interesse archeologico
e di quello allo stato di rudere

**Rivista del Dipartimento di Architettura
dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze**

The knowledge, conservation, and valorization
of all endangered, neglected,
or ruined architectural structures.

**Journal of the Department of Architecture
University of Florence**



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
FIRENZE



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
FIRENZE

DIDA
DIPARTIMENTO DI
ARCHITETTURA

Editor in Chief

Roberto Sabelli
(Università degli Studi di Firenze)
roberto.sabelli@unifi.it

Managing Editor

Andrea Arrighetti
(Università degli Studi di Siena)

Guest Editor

Alessandro Merlo
(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Anno XXV numero speciale 2017
Registrazione Tribunale di Firenze
n. 5313 del 15.12.2003

ISSN 1724-9686 (print)
ISSN 2465-2377 (online)

Director

Saverio Mecca
(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL BOARD

Mariarosaria Barbera

(Direttore Generale del Parco
archeologico di Ostia Antica)

Philippe Bernardi

(Centre national de la recherche
scientifique, Aix-en-Provence)

Giovanna Bianchi

(Università degli Studi di Siena)

Susanna Caccia Gherardini

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Emma Cantisani

(Istituto per la Conservazione e la
Valorizzazione dei Beni Culturali | CNR)

Giuseppe Alberto Centauro

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Michele Coppola

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Maurizio De Vita

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Daniela Esposito

(Sapienza | Università di Roma)

Carlo Alberto Garzonio

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Luca Giorgi

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Alberto Grimoldi

(Politecnico di Milano)

Paolo Liverani

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Pietro Matracchi

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Alessandro Merlo

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Camilla Mileto

(Universitat Politècnica de València)

Gaspár Muñoz Cosme

(Universitat Politècnica de València)

Lorenzo Nigro

(Sapienza | Università di Roma)

José Manuel López Osorio

(Universidad de Málaga)

Andrea Pessina

(Soprintendente della SABAP per la città
metropolitana di Firenze e le province
di Pistoia e Prato)

Hamdan Taha

(Former Director General of Antiquities,
Palestinian Territory, Occupied)

Guido Vannini

(Università degli Studi di Firenze)

Fernando Vegas López-Manzanares

(Universitat Politècnica de València)

Cristina Vidal Lorenzo

(Universidad de Valencia)



Stampato su carta di pura cellulosa Fedrigoni X-Per



Cover photo

La Iglesia, Chichén Itzá
(Yucatán, México) 2015

Copyright: © The Author(s) 2017

This is an open access journal distributed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License
(CC BY-SA 4.0: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>).

graphic design

●●● didacommunicationlab

DIDA Dipartimento di Architettura
Università degli Studi di Firenze
via della Mattonaia, 14
50121 Firenze, Italy

published by

Firenze University Press
Università degli Studi di Firenze
Firenze University Press
Borgo Albizi, 28, 50122 Firenze, Italy
www.fupress.com

Indice

La ricerca nell'architettura Centroamericana <i>Alessandro Merlo</i>	4
La Acrópolis de La Blanca: un ejemplo singular de la arquitectura Maya <i>Gaspar Muñoz Cosme, Cristina Vidal Lorenzo</i>	12
Strumenti e metodi per la documentazione digitale degli scavi archeologici: La Blanca (Petén - Guatemala) <i>Alessandro Merlo, Andrea Aliperta, Riccardo Montuori</i>	26
El arco urbano en la arquitectura Maya <i>Laura Gilabert Sansalvador, Andrea Peiró Vitoria, Rosana Martínez Vanaclocha</i>	48
Arquitectura y urbanismo Maya a través de los grafitos <i>Núria Feliu Beltrán</i>	66
La doble piel de la arquitectura Maya: el estuco y el color <i>Maria Luisa Vázquez de Ágredos Pascual, Patricia Horcajada Campos</i>	84
Hacia la institucionalización de la conservación del patrimonio arquitectónico en el área Maya. La contrata de Copán <i>Nuria Matarredona Desantes</i>	98
Una proposta di lettura integrale della città maya antica: la morfologia urbana di Chinikihá e Palenque (Chiapas, Messico) nel periodo classico <i>Arianna Campiani</i>	114
Comalcalco la ciudad maya de ladrillos: descubriendo su pasado y la conservación de su futuro <i>Miriam Judith Gallegos Gómora, Ricardo Armijo Torres</i>	128
Conservación preventiva de elementos decorativos y recubrimientos arquitectónicos en sitios arqueológicos en el sur de México <i>Yareli Jáidar Benavides</i>	148
Tiempo, ritual y arquitectura Maya. Hacia una reflexión hermenéutica sobre espacios ceremoniales pre-coloniales y postcoloniales <i>Manuel May Castillo, Jmen Miguel Kan Chí</i>	164
The safeguarding of Mixed Sites: from recognition to enhancement con <i>appendice</i> Carta de Puebla. Conservación de Sitios Mixtos <i>Roberto Sabelli</i>	182

The safeguarding of *Mixed Sites*: from recognition to enhancement

Roberto Sabelli

Dipartimento di Architettura
Università degli Studi di Firenze

opposite page

Fig. 4
Cobá, Quintana
Roo (México).
Maya ruins

Abstract

In recent years, speaking of Cultural Heritage, the use of the term 'mixed sites' is being increasingly used to indicate a site where there are more values worthy of protection; mostly, we refer to areas of great naturalistic importance where archaeological emergencies are present. However, it is evident that attributing the meaning of 'mixed site' almost exclusively to this particular quality of co-existence, does not give the full idea of the complexity of the existing cases. Many documents drawn up by the international scientific community, such as UNESCO declarations, address the problem yet many problems still remain unresolved. From March 10 to 12, 2016, the "*Primer congreso internacional sobre conservación de Sitios Mixtos*" (First International Congress on the conservation of Mixed-Sites), was held in Puebla (Mexico), with the participation of researchers from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Italy, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela. At the end of the congress a final document was drawn up, the *Puebla Charter*¹, which brings to the attention of the international community the peculiarity of these important cultural sites.

From March 10 to 12, 2016, on the occasion of the National Book Fair, the "*Primer congreso internacional sobre conservación de Sitios Mixtos*" (First International Congress on the conservation of Mixed-Sites), was held in Puebla (Mexico) – whose historical centre is listed as a UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Site. The Congress, organized by the Faculty of Architecture of the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP) and ICOMOS-México, included the participation of researchers from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Italy, Mexico, Spain and Venezuela. The contributions, in addition to highlighting the many problems connected to the conservation of complex cultural sites, underlined the critical elements which, although already partly addressed by the various international Conventions and Declarations which have taken place from the Seventies to the present – such as the 'Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage' (UNESCO, 1972), the 'Convention on the protection of the underwater cultural heritage' (UNESCO, 2001),

¹The 'Carta de Puebla' annexed to this article and presented in the Spanish original, was drafted at the conclusion of the Congress and written in its definitive form by Architect Andrés A. Sánchez Hernández of the BUAP.



the 'Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage' (UNESCO 2003) and the 'Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples' (UN, 2007)² – cannot be considered as fully resolved; especially due to the lack of homogeneous applicable instruments, mostly as a result of individual national safeguarding legislation, occasionally very lacking and often in opposition concerning the topic in question³. Furthermore, as can be deduced from the contributions presented at the Puebla Congress⁴ and from those of the study day devoted to research in Mesoamerican architecture, *'La ricerca nell'Architettura Mesoamericana'* (Firenze, 5/06/2015), research, safeguarding, conservation and valorisation activities are strictly dependent on the economic and financial resources of the individual States. In fact, whereas research activities can be undertaken by international groups as well, most of the safeguarding and conservation activities, as well as those concerning valorisation, are always undertaken by the State in which the site is located.⁵

In recent years, speaking of Cultural Heritage, the use of the term 'mixed sites' is being increasingly used to indicate a site where there are more values worthy of protection: "Properties shall be considered as 'mixed cultural and natural heritage' if they satisfy a part or the whole of the definitions of both cultural and natural heritage laid out in Articles 1 and 2 of the *Convention*"⁶. Mostly, we refer to areas of great naturalistic importance where archaeological emergencies are present. However, it is evident that attributing the meaning of 'mixed site' almost exclusively to this particular quality of coexistence, does not give the full idea of the complexity of the existing cases. To be more precise, we need to consider including a wider range of values whose coexistence in a single site would justify its denomination as a *mixed site*.

² Only to mentioned those which are referred to in this text.

³ It must be considered, however, that the 'value judgment' that is ascribable to a Heritage Site is based upon the cultural setting in which it was created, and that in which it is located in the present.

⁴ Cf. Morales Arizmendi, Sánchez, 2016.

⁵ The situation in Italy, although not even remotely comparable with that in Mesoamerica, is still worrying. In fact, the division of competencies between a central State which 'safeguards and conserves' and the local entity which 'valorises' is not positive in terms of a single and homogeneous policy, despite the 'State-Region framework agreements': "[...] In particular, through article 112 of the Code concerning Cultural and Landscape Heritage (Decree Law n.42/2004) it is possible to carry out agreements between the State, the Regions and other public entities present in the territory for the determination, even in sub-regional context, of plans for valorising cultural assets and defining common strategies and objectives" (Patera, Sorge, 2012, p. 79).

⁶ UNESCO 2016, Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 46, (WHC.16/01, 26 October 2016).

⁷ *National Historic Preservation Act* of 1966, Section 301, (9).



The *National Historic Act* (USA, 1966) indicates the Cultural Park as “a definable area which is distinguished by historic resources and land related to such resources and which constitutes an interpretive, educational, and recreational resource for the public at large”⁷.

There are many aspects which must be taken into consideration for the study of complex contexts where there is a variety of resources which require understanding and safeguarding: from those of a historical-architectural nature to artistic, environmental, social and anthropological aspects.

The gravity and extension of the problems that are causing the progressive decay of the quality of the environment in which we live and the understanding of which science has made possible have determined, at the legal level and from the Seventies onward, an increase in environmental conservation instances, both at the national and international levels, which have favoured the expansion and parallel evolution of environmental law and cultural heritage law, which have incidentally had a significant influence on expanding the sphere of human rights formally safeguarded by international law [...] [*It is to these rights that refers. - Author's note -*] the need to conserve, safeguard, and hand down to future generations the testimonials to the past in their double meaning of historical element of the cultural identity of a people in a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society such as ours is in the present, and of a heritage that is common to all individuals (Pecoraro, 1997, pp. 291-292).

The cultural or natural values of a site, therefore, are no longer assessed in isolation, but together with its social, religious, spiritual, cultural, spatial and temporal contexts, without ascribing more value to one above any other.

[...] The third form of destruction of cultural heritage is the one that is car-

Fig. 1
Teotihuacán
(México) - the
Ciudadela, facing the
Pyramid of the Moon



next page

Fig. 2
ChichénItzá, Yucatán
(México) - El Caracol

ried out intentionally, generally with the purpose of inflicting damage on the human communities that reflect their own identity in the destroyed heritage (Lenzerini, 2008, p. 5).

The two branches of law, one concerning the environment and the other cultural heritage, although developed independently, have interacted with each other and with the discipline of human rights, determining since the Seventies a progressive evolution “in a clearly anthropocentric direction, [...] in consideration of the fact that the final recipients of the legislation developed and the beneficiaries of the behaviour to which the States are bound internationally, are the individuals”.

The various values ascribable to the *qualities* of the sites are undoubtedly related to the different geographical, historical, social and economic contexts throughout the various latitudes and longitudes of the globe.

The UNESCO convention of 1972⁸, although lacking in some aspects and presenting limits regarding the actual safeguarding actions – “the principle of the sovereignty of States is so strong that it often prevents the application of the regulations established by the Convention” (Sabelli, 1997, p. 144) – has surely highlighted the importance of establishing applicative instruments that include the needs related to safeguarding with those of expanding individual and collective rights, ascribing to them indivisibility and universality features, such as *human rights and property rights*⁹, which the international community has always been aware of.

Considering that, in view of the magnitude and gravity of the new dangers threatening them, it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, by the granting of collective assistance which, although not taking the place of action by the State concerned, will serve as an efficient complement thereto, (UNESCO Convention, 1972, *Preamble*, 5th Considering).

A confirmation of this awareness is present in the ‘Universal Declaration of the Rights of Peoples’ of Algiers from 1976:

- Every people has the right to speak its own language and preserve and develop its own culture, thereby contributing to the enrichment of the culture of mankind.
- Every people has the right to its artistic, historical and cultural wealth.
- Every people has the right not to have an alien culture imposed upon it.
- Every people has the right to the conservation, protection and improvement of its environment.

(Algiers Declaration, 1976, articles 13-16)¹⁰.

The Declaration of Algiers, signed by seventy-five ‘Non-aligned Countries’, not being an official document is not legally binding, yet it represents an important step forward in the determination of the ‘Universal Rights of Peoples’.

⁸ The 1972 UNESCO Convention (Paris, 16.11.1972), ‘Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage’, defines as Cultural and Natural Heritage (articles 1 and 2):

- *cultural heritage sites* are defined as monuments or groups of monuments that are exceptional from either the historical, artistic or scientific points of view;

- *natural sites* are defined as physical or biological formations with an extraordinary aesthetic or scientific value;

- *mixed sites* are the result of the combined actions of nature and man, preserve the memory of traditional ways of life and represent the link between nature and culture.

⁹ “These are cultural rights, but also rights to solidarity toward the third generation, such as the rights to the environment, to development, to a better quality of life, the so-called *property rights* inherent in the common world heritage, to be understood as rights of participation and individual or collective enjoyment of the said heritage, of which the right to the natural and cultural heritage, in terms of its protection and conservation, can be considered a direct consequence” (Pecoraro, 1997, p. 303).

¹⁰ ‘Universal Declaration of the Rights of Peoples’ (Algeri, 4/07/1976).

The 'Nara document on authenticity' of 1994¹¹ widens the spectrum of value judgements ascribable to cultural heritage to include the value of cultural identity, diversity and plurality as worthy of being protected as an irreplaceable resource for the whole of humanity.

Depending on the nature of the cultural heritage, its cultural context, and its evolution through time, authenticity judgements may be linked to the worth of a great variety of sources of information. Aspects of the sources may include form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors. The use of these sources permits elaboration of the specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of the cultural heritage being examined. (Nara Document, 1994, art. 13).

This results in the need to "determine the authenticity and value judgements of the cultural heritage not on fixed criteria but rather on a variety of sources of information regarding not only the form and content, but also the use, function, the traditions, the place, the spirit" (Knowels, 2000).

The International Charter on Conservation of Krakow of 2000, during the drafting undertaken at the final session under the meaningful title of '*Cultural Heritage as the Foundation and the Development of Civilisation*', established that these values can change through time, in relation to the communities who live in the places in question and who from time to time specify the heritage through various moments in history¹².

In 2001, UNESCO ratified the principle according to which cultural heritage is representation as well as identity, diversity and pluralism, and is a function of time and space.

Cultural diversity: the common heritage of humanity - Culture takes diverse forms across time and space. This diversity is embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the identities of the groups and societies making up humankind. As a source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations. (UNESCO Declaration, 2001, art.1)¹³.

Considering, therefore, all potential values that may play a part in qualifying a cultural site, we cannot but agree on the fact that the term *heritage* is by definition 'undefined'¹⁴. This in fact includes, in addition to the material site, also the intangible heritage, within which we can identify references to the spiritual and social sphere, as well as to the popular and traditional heritage linked to them¹⁵.

together with the classic monumental sites, whether historical or archaeological, and to their contexts, it is necessary to consider as worthy of conservation and eventually of musealisation, also *cultural itineraries*, including commercial streets, roads of pilgrimage or immigration, *cultural landscapes* linked to specific human situations, *associative sites*, linked to myths,

¹¹ 'Nara International Conference on Authenticity in relation to the Convention on World Heritage', upon invitation from the Japanese Government's Agency for Cultural Affairs of the Prefecture of Nara, in collaboration with UNESCO, ICCROM and ICOMOS (Nara, 1-6 /11/1994).

¹² Cf. The International Charter on Conservation of Krakow (Krakow, 23-25/10/2000), Preamble. The Charter includes the following definitions:

- a. Heritage is that complex of man's works in which a community recognises its particular and specific values and with which it identifies. Identification and specification of heritage is therefore a process related to the choice of values.
- b. Monument: A monument is an entity identified as a bearers of worth and forming a support to memory. In it, memory recognises aspects that are pertinent to human deeds and thoughts, associated with the historic time line. This may still be within our reach.
- c. Authenticity means the sum of substantial, historically ascertained characteristics; from the original up to the current state, as an outcome of the various transformations that have occurred over time.
- d. Identity is understood as the common reference of both present values generated in the sphere of a community and past values identified in its authenticity.
- e. Conservation: Conservation is the complex of attitudes of a community that contributes to making the heritage and its monuments endure. Conservation is achieved with reference to the significance of the entity, with its associated values.
- f. Restoration: Restoration is an operation directed on a heritage property, aiming at the conservation of its authenticity and its appropriation by the community.
- g. Project and restoration: The project, resulting from the choice of conservation policies, is the process through which conservation of the built heritage and landscape is carried out.

¹³ 'Universal Declaration on cultural diversity' adopted unanimously during the 31st session of the General Conference of UNESCO (Paris, 2/11/2001).

¹⁴ Cf. Lumley, 1994.

¹⁵ Cf. 'Convention for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage', UNESCO (Paris, 17/10/2003), in particular articles 1 and 2 cc.1-3.







legends or literature, and finally *places of memory*, linked to historical events (Tricoli, Sposito, 2004, p. 12).

Thus, in the light of a more complete and complex attribution of values that qualify the cultural site or asset, the action activated for its 'safeguarding'¹⁶ includes, first of all, its identification and subsequently compliance with, and all necessary interventions for its protection, conservation, re-organisation, restoration, maintenance and revitalising¹⁷. In this process, all activities must collaborate to an action on the cultural heritage which, if not understood as a "sterile absorbing of resources", heritage being in itself a fundamental resource for the progress of humanity, must be carried out through a dynamic and interdisciplinary planning process for the development of the areas in question¹⁸. In a policy for harmonising planning and development tools for a territory also urban culture, through its tools, "must act, especially as a mediator between the forces that administer the safeguarding and those that carry about the transformation, ensuring that both forces coexist without obstructing or destructing each other, but rather set as their common aim to contribute to seeking a new historical dimension for man" (Samonà 1958, p. 15).

The conservation of the culture property may therefore become an essential part of the revolution that will replace man and his environment at the centre of the society and allow him to find again the awareness of his main purpose that is to protect the tangible and intangible values inside our heritage, the 'spirit of place', thus satisfying the three requests (historical, aesthetic, psychological) (Genovese, 2011, p. 254).

A careful reading of the texts from the 1972 UNESCO convention and the 1976 UNESCO recommendations, highlights how those who drafted them wanted to call the attention not only to the universally acknowledged need to safeguard cultural sites from material decay, but also on the responsibility of conserving their 'function' and 'meaning', being as they are the habitat of 'historical memory'¹⁹.



opposite page

Fig. 3
Tulum, Quintana
Roo (México) -
Templo del Dios
del Viento

Fig. 5
Cobá, Quintana
Roo (México) -
colored decoration
of the Maya ruins

¹⁶ "Considering that the existing international conventions, recommendations and resolutions concerning cultural and natural property demonstrate the importance, for all the peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable property, to whatever people it may belong" (Convention UNESCO 1972, Preamble, third 'Consideration').

¹⁷ "Safeguarding shall be taken to mean the identification, protection, conservation, restoration, renovation, maintenance and revitalization of historic or traditional areas and their environment" (UNESCO, Recommendation concerning the safeguarding and contemporary role of historic areas (Nairobi, 26/11/1976, art. 1 (c)).

¹⁸ Cf. Mucci, 1997, p. 270.

¹⁹ Probably adapting to the provisions of the said 'National Historic Preservation Act', in the article 'Preservation or historic preservation' (§ 300315), among the necessary actions for 'conservation' it includes, already in 1966:

"(1) identification, evaluation, recordation, documentation, curation, acquisition, protection, management, rehabilitation, restoration, stabilization, maintenance, research, interpretation, and conservation; (2) education and training regarding the foregoing activities; or (3) any combination of the foregoing activities".

Fig. 6
Cobá, Quintana Roo
(México) - forest, view
from the Maya ruins

Fig. 7
Cobá, Quintana Roo
(México) - view of the lake

opposite page

Fig. 8
Uxmal - view of ruins in
the forest from the
Gran Piramide



²⁰ 'United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples', Resolution 61/295 (107th plenary meeting 13 September 2007), adopted by the General Assembly [without reference to a Main Committee (A/61/L.67 and Add.1)].

²¹ 'In present days will open the 72nd Regular Session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA 72, 19-25 September 2017). The General Debate will focus on the theme, 'Focusing on People: Striving for Peace and a Decent Life for All on a Sustainable Planet'.

Heritage, according to the first section of article I of the 2003 UNESCO Convention, confers to the collectivity a 'sense of identity and continuity (in time, in other words 'historical'). The dimension of memory ('historical') evoked by the text of the Convention derives from the concept of tangible cultural heritage of 1972. (Ciminelli, 2008, p. 107).

Regarding these universal policies another important text is the 'United Nations Declaration on the rights of Indigenous Peoples' of 2007, which affirms that:

Indigenous peoples have the right to practise and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature (UN Resolution, 61/295)²⁰.

In the light of the complexity involved in the safeguarding of cultural heritage, and considering the difficulty of drafting common documents that do not contradict individual national legislations, the 'Carta de Puebla' – whose text is annexed below in the Spanish original – is aimed especially at calling the attention of the international community to the enormous problems related to safeguarding the historical and natural heritage of mankind from the perspective of sustainable development.

Sustainability should be kept in mind²¹ if we wish to safeguard – in accordance with the so-called 'rule of equilibrium' – the three dimensions of development, environmental, economic and social, with all their interconnections, so that the resulting development is liveable, feasible and fair.





Bibliographical references

Ciminelli M.L. 2008, *Salvaguardia del patrimonio culturale immateriale e possibili effetti collaterali: etnomimesi ed etnogenesi*, in *Le identità culturali nei recenti strumenti UNESCO. Un approccio nuovo alla costruzione della pace?*, ed. L. Zagato, CEDAM, Padova, pp. 99-122.

Genovese R.A. 2011, *Management of heritage and culture of tourism*, in *The image of heritage, changing perception, permanent responsibilities* (proceedings of the international conference of ICOMOS – International scientific committee for the theory and the philosophy of conservation and restoration, 6-8 March 2009 Florence, Italy), eds. A. Tomaszewski, S. Giometti, Polistampa, Firenze, pp. 249-255.

Knowles A. 2000, *E il restauro è progettato. Dopo Atene e Venezia, Cracovia*, «Trieste Contemporanea», n. 6/7, <<http://www.triestecomtemporanea.it/pag4.htm>> (09/17).

Lorenzi R. 2006, *Dal bel paesaggio alla paesaggistica. Dal godimento personale del paesaggio allo strumento di conoscenza del territorio*, in *Restauro del paesaggio e sostenibilità*, eds. S. Van Riel, M. Semprini, Firenze, pp. 21-36.

Lenzerini F. 2008, *La distruzione intenzionale del patrimonio culturale come strumento di umiliazione dell'identità dei popoli*, in *Le identità culturali nei recenti strumenti UNESCO. Un approccio nuovo alla costruzione della pace?*, ed. L. Zagato, CEDAM, Padova, pp. 3-25.

Lumley R. 1994, *The debate on heritage reviewed*, in *Towards the museum of the future: new European perspectives, museums: new visions, new approaches series*, eds. R. Miles, L. Zavala, Routledge, London, pp. 57-69.

Morales Arizmendi M. y Sánchez Hernández A.A. (eds.) 2016, *Patrimonio de sitios mixtos. Estudios de casos e intervenciones*, BUAP Fomento Editorial, Puebla.

Mucci F. 1997, *La valorizzazione del patrimonio mondiale culturale e naturale: significato e strumento di una tutela sostenibile*, in *La protezione del patrimonio mondiale culturale e naturale a venticinque anni dalla convenzione UNESCO*, ed. M.C. Ciciriello, Editoriale Scientifica, Napoli, pp. 269-290.

Patera A. y Sorge E. 2012, *La tutela integrata del patrimonio antico volterrano*, in *Mura etrusche di Volterra: conservazione e valorizzazione*, ed. R. Sabelli, La Grafica Pisana, Bientina (PI), pp. 79-80.

Pecoraro M.L. 1997, *Uomo, natura e cultura e la convenzione del 1972 sul patrimonio mondiale*, in *La protezione del patrimonio mondiale culturale e natu-*

rale a venticinque anni dalla convenzione UNESCO, ed. M.C. Ciciriello, Editoriale Scientifica, Napoli, pp. 291-317.

Sabelli D. 1997, *La convenzione sul patrimonio mondiale: limiti giuridico-politici*, in *La protezione del patrimonio mondiale culturale e naturale a venticinque anni dalla convenzione UNESCO*, ed. M.C. Ciciriello, Editoriale Scientifica, Napoli, pp. 143-178.

Sabelli R. y Sorge E. 2013, *Conservazione integrata e valorizzazione del patrimonio archeologico diffuso a Volterra*, in *Conservazione e valorizzazione dei siti archeologici, approcci scientifici e problemi di metodo* (Bressanone, 9-12 July 2013), vol. 1, Edizioni Arcadia Ricerche, Venezia, pp. 741-752.

Samonà G. 1958, *Relazione di apertura del VI convegno dell'I.N.U.*, in *Difesa e valorizzazione del paesaggio urbano e rurale* (atti del VI Convegno Nazionale di Urbanistica, Lucca 9-11/11/1957), INU, Roma, pp. 13-24.

Ruggeri Tricoli M.C. y Sposito C. 2004, *I siti archeologici. Dalla definizione del valore alla protezione della materia*, Palermo.

Wells P.S. 1991, *Presenting the past: a conference series aimed at public education*, in *Protecting the past*, eds. G.S. Smith y J.E. Ehrenhard, CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 181-185.

Carta de Puebla¹

Conservación de Sitios Mixtos

Puebla, Puebla (México), 10, 11 y 12 de marzo de 2016

Preámbulo

Resultado del Primer Congreso Internacional sobre Conservación de Sitios Mixtos — organizado en el marco de la Feria Nacional del Libro de la Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP), el ICOMOS-México y la BUAP, a través de la Facultad de Arquitectura, con sede en el Complejo Cultural Universitario de la BUAP, en Puebla, México — con la presencia de trabajos de Argentina, Brasil, Colombia, Cuba, España, Italia, Guatemala, Ecuador, México y Venezuela. Se concluye que, además de ser el primero en tratar diversos aspectos, muchos de ellos novedosos, refleja la evolución del concepto de lo patrimonial sobre un tema que, aunque ya había sido iniciado por la UNESCO desde las definiciones expuestas por la convención de 1972 sobre la “protección del patrimonio mundial cultural y natural” y “las conjugaciones temáticas y patrimoniales”, no ha sido ampliamente divulgado en el marco de las comunidades especializadas.

Además de los valores naturales y culturales, en los sitios mixtos destaca, sin la menor duda, el gran valor ecológico e histórico-cultural que documenta la unidad de ‘cultura’ y ‘natura’ que enfatiza la acción del hombre en la naturaleza. Reflejo de adaptar, transformar y vincular lugares endémicos o inducidos como testimonio de la presencia humana, es evidente que se encuentra inmerso en un contexto amplio, definido por su complejidad y congruente con el hecho de que la naturaleza es el marco básico de toda actividad humana.

Actualmente, los patrimonios mixtos son la prueba contundente de un valor universal para comprender la historia de la aventura humana, así como los procesos complejos de participación del hombre, como acciones primitivas o estratificadas en conjuntos de diversos orígenes, periodos, sociedades y civilizaciones en general. Asimismo, representan los valores primigenios que deben reconocerse, incluso antes de la lectura de aquellos del conjunto considerado como paisaje, pues desde su arqueología o de otros conjuntos de orígenes diversos, permiten mantener el equilibrio entre factores ambientales y simbólico-referenciales con valor documen-

¹ La Carta de Puebla, redactada al final del Congreso (Puebla, 10-12 marzo 2016), es presentada en su borrador final por M. en Arq. Andrés A. Sánchez Hdez de BUAP.M.

tal. Es preciso hacer énfasis en que la realidad es multidimensional, compleja, articulada en un proceso continuo de desarrollo, con agentes y tendencias a veces evidentes y otras imperceptibles, por ello es importante desde el punto de vista cultural, monumental, emocional, estratigráfico, etc., y permite cualquier análisis, así como la necesidad de un estudio interdisciplinario, tanto en el tratado del paisaje natural y construido, como en su divulgación.

Un sitio mixto puede ser definido, de manera inicial, por procesos estratigráficos estructurados a lo largo de siglos, periodos sociales, etc., porque su estudio se convierte en una metodología de investigación que documenta las acciones de defensa para su conservación, lo que permite adentrarse en los valores objetivos del conocimiento de la variedad de aspectos tan diversos como la producción cultural y los procesos endémicos que la naturaleza imprimió a estos lugares. Asimismo, permite adentrarse en los factores insertados por el propio hombre al sembrar plantas de otras regiones por cuestiones estéticas, que con el paso de los años, en muchas ocasiones llegan a formar parte del conjunto. Sin embargo, la endemia es fundamental en la conservación del sitio, y se aprecia como parte de ecosistemas donde existen variadas especies que desde hace mucho tiempo forman parte del ciclo vital.

Aunque estén siendo interpretados desde diversas disciplinas, es fundamental enmarcar, metodológicamente, la unidad integrativa de sus valores objetivos y subjetivos como condición indispensable para poder interpretar el conjunto y su complejidad.

Exitosos son, sin duda, los trabajos de prospección e intervención presentados por diversos arqueólogos en las zonas urbanas, como la ponencia magistral de apertura sobre los caminos para instalar la ciudad del saber, y sobre los estudios de caso de sitios mixtos en necrópolis de gran significación, por ejemplo con el tema de la zona arqueológica de Tikal (Guatemala), el primer lugar reconocido como sitio mixto inscrito en la lista de la UNESCO en el mundo, que representa el vívido ejemplo de protección en esa sintonía de valores y cualidades de lo natural y cultural.

No solo podemos apreciar los sitios mixtos relacionados con los conjuntos de origen arqueológico-prehispánico, sino también con otro tipo de vinculación arqueológica, como el patrimonio industrial de diversos lugares y formas de industria, por ejemplo, fábricas y conjuntos textiles, zonas mineras y agroalimentarias, como el caso de El río Uruguay: *companytowns*, en la ruta de la carne, la Mina Dos Estrellas, en Tlalpujahua, Michoacán o el Real de Catorce en San Luis Potosí en México, entre muchos otros. Estos espacios industriales no son ajenos a la región natural y las condiciones actualmente patrimoniales, donde se expone la mejor respuesta de protección para el patrimonio industrial; son evidencia de la cultura del hierro, inseparable de la naturaleza. Ejemplos destacados en Europa son los de Noruega, Francia y Reino Unido, principalmente en New Larnak, Escocia, que son singulares por su importancia para la historia de la Revolución Industrial y sus derivaciones sociales de la utopía e historia de la industria-

lización, como los casos de Ironbridge, George, unido al agua y el río que cruza Le Creusot, en Francia.

Igualmente, un sitio mixto expone una polivalencia de asociaciones entre lo complejo de lo natural y cultural, muchas veces con vinculaciones desarrolladas como acciones, por ejemplo, el uso de los bosques maderables en regiones mexicanas u otros casos análogos donde aquellos que suministran la materia prima son fuentes ineludibles de sentido ecológico, que debe administrarse y ser fuente de insumo para restituir, de ser necesario, obras culturales. Un par de ejemplos son Nueva Galicia en México y Cuauhtinchán en Puebla, dentro de un contexto de evidencias paleontológicas, prehispánicas y virreinales de inicios de la evangelización hasta el siglo XVII, en un ambiente natural que fue reflejado magníficamente por los *tlacuilo*s en códices o mapas que aún se conservan y que reflejan los primeros años del virreinato. Del mismo modo, los valores con la diversidad endémica de fauna y flora, como en lugares de Venezuela, y otros sitios selváticos, desérticos, semidesérticos, etcétera; pero que son parte de la diversidad ambiental.

Identificación y acercamiento a sus valores

El tema de los sitios mixtos es fundamental para conocer los valores de un conjunto en el ámbito de lo urbano y lo rural, muchos de los cuales pueden estar en condiciones arqueológicas — como necrópolis heredadas de sociedades pasadas — cuya conservación es necesaria para el conocimiento de la historia del hombre y sus procesos culturales. Del mismo modo, pueden existir en conjugación de valores como ciudades vivas cuyo patrimonio natural y cultural, en el mejor de los casos, se encuentra en proceso de conservación o en uno de degradación severa por la falta de un cuidado adecuado.

El estudio serio de los sitios mixtos permite hacer una interpretación objetiva para conocer, mediante la interdisciplina, los aspectos tangibles e intangibles del conjunto *a priori*, incluso para interpretar a un paisaje cultural. Es el resumen de las diversas actividades del hombre a favor, o en contra, de las acciones de la naturaleza y como clara conjugación de valores que, aunque pueden ser subjetivos en la interpretación del sentido histórico de un mismo paisaje, siempre dependen de factores como la estación, la hora, el lugar, la interpretación, la disciplina y la formación del sujeto, entre otros. El paisaje depende de la interpretación de lo que es relevante de manera natural, así como de la participación del hombre para conservar esa grandiosidad ambiental o, incluso, para depredarla. Algunos de estos lugares son insoslayables por la belleza de su integridad, antigüedad, autenticidad, etc., y son motivo de gustos y coincidencias en el reconocimiento colectivo.

Se puede hablar de sitios mixtos con diversos orígenes arqueológicos, históricos y virreinales en el caso de los lugares americanos, pero es imposible hacerlo sin analizar sus condiciones de forma urbana, su tipología o estratigrafía, y muchos de ellos están relacionados con lo natural, lo cual se

aprecia como parte de adaptaciones simbólicas, estéticas y funcionales a lugares naturales.

Después de reconocer los valores del sitio, se pueden comprender los paisajes culturales que tienen interpretaciones religiosas, lo que ha llevado a definirlos como en Florencia (ICOMOS, *The Florence Declaration*, 2014), al llamarlos *paisajes espirituales*. También, se puede hablar de *paisajes documentales, emocionales y estratigráficos*, y según la actitud subjetiva del sujeto cognoscente, se pueden derivar interpretaciones establecidas por los referentes históricos, sociales y emocionales, en general, del estado de ánimo que promueve la hora del día y estación, entre otras cosas.

Conservación

En los últimos años, hemos visto diversos acercamientos a un tema que refleja condiciones puntualmente disciplinares acerca de los paisajes culturales. Por esta razón, las diversas intervenciones deben reunir los criterios básicos ya establecidos y de consenso señalados en varios documentos y autores: considerar su reversibilidad, dejar marca de la intervención o época para evitar falsos históricos que soslayen o confundan la lectura documental aplicable al valor arqueológico de edificios-ciudades habitadas, ya que estas, así como los 'testimonios simbólico-referenciales' cuentan con un valor documental.

Un primer acercamiento al reconocimiento de los valores de un conjunto es la objetividad con que se pueden reconocer aspectos fundamentales como traza, interrelaciones, conjugaciones históricas con forma urbana, emplazamientos o asociaciones históricas y religiosas; todas, en general, documentales de los sitios, en intrínseca vinculación con los valores naturalmente definidos como resultado de los procesos climático-ambientales y de adaptación colectiva donde florecen las etapas histórico-culturales en los diversos periodos.

Una estrategia de conservación de los sitios mixtos es la interacción de valores patrimoniales que han trascendido de generaciones pasadas con nuestra aportación social y arquitectónica contemporánea, en un contexto de convivencia con la naturaleza. Las edificaciones que han trascendido en el tiempo son valiosas por los recursos constructivos que les han permitido mantener su estabilidad, pero también porque evidencian procesos históricos con valores estéticos, simbólicos, culturales, sociales y filosóficos, que son valiosos por ser los antecedentes de nuestra propia identidad actual. La interacción entre el hombre actual y los valores de los sitios mixtos debe cambiar de un simple concepto de turista depredador a una convivencia-intercambio participativo de la cultura de los sitios naturales y construidos, históricos y contemporáneos; que nuestra actualidad conviva con nuestra propia identidad histórica, regional y mundial.

Con base en ello, es necesario promover su adecuada intervención en lo urbano y rural, en lo arqueológico y en lo habitable, vía conservación y restauración, respetando los preceptos ya difundidos y de consenso generalizado de los fundamentos promovidos por el ICOMOS en la Carta de Ve-

necia de 1964, recientemente revisada ante sus cincuenta años, donde se consideran aspectos básicos para la conservación, como el respeto a la sustancia auténtica, la marca de época y la anastilosis, indispensables para estimar el valor stratigráfico de los monumentos y aplicables a los sitios. Del mismo modo, aquellos promovidos por la Carta de los Jardines Históricos de Florencia de 1982 y la Carta de Nara de 1994 'sobre la autenticidad', acerca de asociaciones y valores relativos a los materiales, formas, etc., e incluso a los valores culturales; la Carta de Ename de 2004, para la interpretación de lugares pertenecientes al patrimonio cultural, entre otras que dan cuenta de las singularidades de lo cultural y lo natural.

Eventos como este que vivimos en estos dos días, de grandes aportaciones y reflexiones acerca del patrimonio natural y construido, permiten llamar la atención a pobladores y autoridades para incrementar la sensibilidad sobre los procesos culturales y sus valores tangibles e intangibles, y para desarrollar aún más el compromiso de su conservación. Hay que tomar en cuenta que conservar no es sinónimo de detener los procesos, ya que la identidad es un concepto inacabado, vivo y en constante transformación que nos pertenece a todos, y todos tenemos el derecho de deleitarnos con su vivencia, la responsabilidad de conservarlo y exigir su respeto. Finalmente, no hay que olvidar vivir nuestra cultura con los rasgos históricos sobresalientes del pasado, combinados con nuestra actualidad contemporánea, reconociendo que las condiciones sociales y naturales son cambiantes y nosotros, sin lugar a dudas, estamos creando también hechos sobresalientes.

Puebla, Puebla (México), March 12, 2016



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
FIRENZE