Introduction

Preserving the ‘frozen image’ of a specific historical time, represented by intact cultural environments such as whole building complexes, quarters and park designs, has been a priority throughout the history of cultural heritage conservation. Italian Renaissance cities such as Florence, Venice and Pienza, the Gothic Quarter of the old city of Barcelona or the well-preserved medieval old town of Tallinn, Estonia, to mention a few, are all designated and protected because they are perceived as original, authentic and unique heritage places representing a distinct historical period (for a discussion of authenticity, see Viñas, 2002). For instance, in the heritage management history of the historic Røros Mining Town in Norway, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) stated that the priority was the care of a particular (idealized) historic cityscape that was to be preserved, and anything that could confuse that image was removed or redone to fit into this conservation strategy (Guttormsen & Fageraas, 2011). No doubt this type of heritage has created symbolic capital that is economically and socially sustainable (ibid).

On the other hand, the heritage management sector often specifies that cultural heritage that expresses historical fragmentation or relict that is temporal and undergoing transformation has less value as heritage (for an overview, see Guttormsen, 2020). This view corresponds to what is frequently referred to as the authorized heritage discourse (AHD; Smith, 2006), without denying the existence of local and diverse types of AHDs (Pendlebury, 2013; Skrede & Hølleland, 2018). There is now a burgeoning scholarly critique of viewing derelict landscapes from our not-so-distanced past as inferior to ‘archaic’ and ‘aesthetic’ ruins (e.g. Cowie & Heathcott, 2003; Edensor, 2005; High & Lewis, 2007). However, although our environments are constantly changing and most of the heritage that surrounds us has been affected by historical transformation, cultural heritage management practices are far more concerned about management and preventing change through preservation rather than valuing the transformative character of heritage and the principles of ‘curating decay’ (Pereira Roders & Hudson, 2012; Pereira Roders & Oers, 2013; DeSilvey, 2017). This springs from a conservation strategy wherein cultural heritage is perceived as static and immutable, as a closed container or glass showcase. This is sometimes also called a ‘bell jar’ protection strategy, where change is perceived as unwanted interventions against which heritage management must defend (Ruggles, 2012; for perspectives going beyond these dichotomies, see Taylor, 2015; Karlsson & Gustafsson, 2020; Gao & Jones, 2021). This chapter will explore the ‘responsive approach’ to heritage ‘sustainability’, which often implies ‘freezing’
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Heritage in time through a provocative lens – that of historical transformation or change as heritage value in itself (see Chapter 5 in this handbook). It will use case studies from a Scandinavian context, including buildings, urban historic environments and cultural landscapes, to demonstrate how continuity and change (or discontinuity) could be studied and assessed for heritage significance. The chapter uses the approach of ‘deep cities’ (Fouseki et al., 2020; NIKU.no., 2020) to unpack how continuity in historic environments is sustained or vanishes over time.

**Sustainability and sustainable development as concepts for change as heritage**

Sociologist Anthony Giddens has questioned the usefulness of the concept of ‘sustainable development’. He argues that the two verbs – to sustain and to develop – have somewhat contradictory meanings. In the linguistic sense, ‘sustainability’ implies continuity and balance, while ‘development’ implies dynamism and change (Giddens, 2011, pp. 60–61). He claims that this ambiguity may contribute to environmentalists being drawn to the sustainability side, whilst business people are drawn towards the (economic) development side (Andersen & Skrede, 2017, p. 583). Giddens also argues that ‘development’ can have at least two different meanings: development as economic growth, typically measured by growth in Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and development as the social process of taking people out of poverty (Giddens, 2011, p. 583). Giddens’ contextual framing is environmental politics and the necessity of sustaining natural resources; however, if we broaden the scope to include tangible and intangible heritage, the discussion becomes different. Undoubtedly, heritage is also torn between different priorities – social, cultural, environmental, economic and other – but it is doubtful that heritage can always be sustained by putting a ‘bell jar’ on it. Identifying, valuing and sustaining heritage is a social and cultural process that involves communication and meaning-making (Smith, 2006, p. 2). DeSilvey reflects on these processes of change and transformation:

> If memory is understood not as something that is deposited within material containers for safekeeping but as something that is “ignited in dialogue between mind and matter,” then it does not necessarily need to rely on a stable material form for its expression. In the interface between materiality and sociality, different agencies—discursive and practiced, textual and tactile—may contribute to the production of memory. Remembrance in this mode involves a willingness to accept the unsettling of our sense of ourselves as autonomous agents and to think instead about the work of assembling meaning as collaborating with an array of other materials, forces, and organisms.

(DeSilvey, 2017, p. 14)

She adds that we ‘must forget in order to remain present, forget in order not to die, forget in order to remain faithful’, and that we should ‘look beyond loss to conceive other ways of understanding and acknowledging material change’ (DeSilvey, 2017, p. 5; see also DeSilvey & Harrison, 2020). Personal and collective memories are sensitive to historical transformation and become activated when societal changes and changes in our daily life routines make a past seem alien, like ‘a foreign country’ (Lowenthal, 1985). Changes are immaterialized in the present as something lost, absent and disappeared, as
well as materialized in things, practices and places from the past that are decayed, abandoned and fragmented. A past can haunt us, like the ghostly post-Soviet heritage similar to a film-still from Andrei Tarkovsky’s *The Stalker* (Wood, 2015). The philosophical and theoretical universe from which perceptions of change as a heritage value spring has many sources, from Japanese *wabi-sabi* (侘寂) aesthetics and Derrida’s ‘hauntology’ to Schumpeter’s theory of ‘creative destruction’ and Foucault’s concept of ‘heterotopia’ (for an overview, see Sterling, 2017; Guttormsen, 2020).

Furthering this argument, when going from ‘valuating’ to ‘enabling’ various conceptualizations of change as heritage, value would be an asset as a complex planning tool (for a processual approach to ‘valuate’ and ‘enable’, see DIVE analysis in Swensen & Berg, 2020; see also Guttormsen, 2020, p. 35). Dissolution, collage, palimpsest and stratigraphy are all concepts of change (see Table 3.2 in Guttormsen, 2020, p. 50). While dissolution, as a heritage concept with aesthetic qualities, is associated with decay and ruins and extracts the character of an abandoned place, collage resembles the metaphors of bricolage and brecciation as a heritage value, extracting the character of a place with a mixture of elements in which issues of temporality are collapsed or compressed into a collection of things or elements that are not necessarily interrelated but become ‘fused together and form a whole’ (Bartolini, 2014, p. 523). Palimpsest, on the other hand, is defined by the ‘rewriting’ of cultural expressions, the transparency of various traces from the past remaining visible, now mixed in with the new, where temporality is, metaphorically speaking, a kind of flattened time pushed up against the windshield of a speeding car. Places affected by palimpsest can also be identified as giving a feeling of visualized absence of the past, the negative imprint of something which is not here anymore, like the shadows of a demolished building on the walls of a neighbouring building. The concept of stratigraphy resembles palimpsest as it entails layering, but it defines more specific sequences and linear successions of time as a colourful sandwich of compact material history. Dissolution, collage, palimpsest and stratigraphy are concepts of change as heritage value that, each in its own way, are recognizable by their definition of heritage places as abandoned, mixed, rewritten or layered. Thus, if we do not – like Giddens – look upon continuity and balance as concepts in contrast to dynamism and change, we may open a space for creative exploration of what heritage is and what we can do with it. In nature management, ‘conservation’ is generally associated with the protection of natural resources, while ‘preservation’ is associated with the proper use of natural resources (National Park Service, 2020). This distinction corresponds to the difference between non-use and sustainable use, respectively, where sustainability does not equal putting a ‘bell jar’ on heritage.

In what follows, we will provide three examples of a form of heritage management that enables heritage to be both sustained and developed in different ways. The first example is the royal tombs at Roskilde Cathedral, Denmark. Almost 40 Danish kings and queens are buried in this cathedral. And yet, they are continually extending the burial chapels to provide space for new monarchs when they die, perfectly demonstrating that continuity and change are two sides of the same coin. Thereafter, we will provide an example of a ruin in Oslo, describing how it has been integrated into a new building structure in contradiction to the argument that ruins are ‘spaces of waste that contain nothing, or nothing of value’ (cf. Edensor, 2005, p. 7). Finally, we will delve into a more or less unplanned case of decay and discuss how it was dealt with and made more sustainable.
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Three domains of change as a heritage value

We will take the theoretical and conceptual perspectives further by exemplifying three epistemologically and sociologically based organizational domains where change as a heritage value plays a significant role in the design of places. We are borrowing three familiar concepts from change theory (systems theory) – developmental, transitional and transformational change – to understand the relationships of change and sustainability in various heritage management practices (Marshak, 1993; Davis et al., 2006). We use change theory as an opportunity to theorize about what change entails as a strategic heritage approach to change management. In this way, we will also be able to define how change is an active social component in the organization of the practices that take place through the uses of heritage.

Valuing developmental change: the royal tombs at Roskilde Cathedral, Denmark

Developmental ‘change builds on the past and leads to better performance over time, e.g., better teamwork’ (Marshak, 1993, p. 8). Transferred to the organizing principles of heritage management, developmental change would characterize a form of heritage management that recognizes the need to make improvements to an existing situation. It is a change that shows continuity, but at the same time accepts change as part of the processes that define and develop heritage places over time. Developmental change involves a planned or intended change, usually taking place through institutional practices, wherein historical roots are linked to a utopian future.

An illustrative example of developmental change as a specific heritage strategy is Roskilde Cathedral (Danish: Roskilde Domkirke, a UNESCO World Heritage Site) in the city of Roskilde on the island of Zealand (Sjælland) in eastern Denmark (UNESCO, 1995). Since the cathedral was constructed during the 12th and 13th centuries, its architecture shows 800 years of European architectural styles and incorporates both Gothic and Romanesque architectural features. The cathedral is the official royal burial church of Danish monarchs from the early period of the Danish (and Danish-Norwegian) medieval kingdom to the present. As such, it has been significantly extended and altered over the centuries to accommodate a considerable number of burial chapels, and the many added chapels show different architectural styles.

Almost 40 Danish kings and queens have been buried in Roskilde Cathedral, dating back to Sweyn II in 1076 and possibly even to the great king Harald Bluetooth in 986. Changes have been made inside the cathedral, and new building complexes and burial chapels have been added to make room for the royal tombs. The grave practices also point to the future. Since 2003, the sculptor Bjørn Nørgaard has, on commission of Queen Margrethe II (born 1940), been designing the Queen’s tomb in the cathedral, which is now ready and waiting (Figure 2.1). Named ‘Sarkofag’, or ‘sarcophagus’, the tomb features a transparent, rounded capsule in cast glass holding two supine figures mounted on pillars topped with silver elephant heads (Figure 2.2). St. Birgitta’s Chapel in the cathedral has been restored to house the tomb of Queen Margrethe II, thus confirming how developmental changes manifested by the temporality of the place are legitimizing the linkage of the Danish royal family and kingdom from a mythical past to an infinite future.
Figure 2.1 The tomb cover, which will hide the tomb until Margrethe’s death.
Source: Photo by Keld Navntoft. © The Royal Danish House.

Figure 2.2 The artist Bjørn Nørgaard’s sepulchral monument, which will be the tomb of Queen Margrethe II of Denmark when she dies.
Source: Photo by Keld Navntoft. © The Royal Danish House.
The example from Roskilde Cathedral illustrates an organizational principle that enables intended historical continuity based on developmental change as a heritage value, where new forms of heritage within a common context are added with the prospect of shaping future heritage. The Roskilde example refers to a royal succession that points to the future based on various historical time expressions that have also changed over time. Since heritage is a cultural and social process, a ‘bell jar’ approach would not have worked in this case. One could, of course, embalm the bodies of the dead, but one can do nothing about the inevitable fact that future monarchs will also pass away. Thus, the Roskilde example demonstrates that to ‘sustain’ also implies to ‘develop’. The memory of the royals must be continued within Roskilde Cathedral’s changing conditions, which indicates that this heritage project, from a sustainable heritage management perspective, is not an attempt to freeze time. Rather, such a combination of sustainability and development can be an organic solution when dealing with tangible and intangible heritage. The memory of the royals is sustained and developed with the design of new intergenerational tombs.

Valuing transitional change: a ruin wall from a prison in downtown Oslo, Norway

Transitional change (involving, providing or consisting of the passage, movement or change from one state, condition, subject, place, etc., to another, see Marshak, 1993, p. 8) characterizes an organization of heritage management that recognizes the need to implement a completely new course of action. There are a number of examples of such a heritage strategy, especially in urban planning, such as through ruin conservation based on fragmented anecdotal evidence. Ruin conservation also largely includes situations where fragments are implemented in new building designs, as is often the case in ‘deep cities’. An example of this type of ruin conservation in a Norwegian context is the so-called Tukthusmuren (prison wall) in Oslo.

The historic Tukthus quarter (Tukthuskvartalet) from the 18th century covered two blocks between Storgata and Torggata streets in central Oslo and was entirely reserved for the prison’s activities. During the 1930s, the prison property was gradually separated and the buildings were demolished. When the main building was demolished in 1938, an era of about 200 years of use as a prison site was finally over. Only parts of the prison walls remained, fragmented parts of a large building complex which, with its ruin-like appearance, yielded an anecdotal storytelling materiality that concealed a monumental and dark past in the middle of the city. In 2000, some new buildings were completed, with the restored ruins of the prison wall as part of the new architecture. The wall was integrated into the new structures as part of a restaurant, as traces in the asphalt over a road and through a new large office building and police station. When observing the wall today, it becomes obvious that the new quarterly plan differs from the original quadrature of the prison complex (Guttormsen & Simon, 2018).

This example illustrates a planning situation that is common in today’s society. That is the adaptive reuse of fragments of buildings and infrastructure from past societies found at archaeological excavations or above-ground buildings that have been partially demolished for new purposes. Ruins are, as waste in the circular economy, a reusable resource that may be both economically and environmentally sustainable. Contrary to the Danish case, the sustainable management of the ruins...
of Tukthuset is not about sustaining an intergenerational memory of monarchs. This was a vernacular site in need of being managed one way or another. One solution could have been to put a ‘bell jar’ on it, making it into a heritage site ‘frozen’ in time as an ‘aestheticized’ and ‘romanticized’ fragment of the past. Putting a ‘bell jar’ on every ruin would probably not be feasible, but we often use this strategy in cases where ruins are ascribed significant heritage values. One example is the enormous glass hall erected above the ruins of the medieval cathedral of Hamar in south-central Norway (Eriksen, 2007, p. 15), where ‘the architect has enveloped the ruins in a large vacumous space’ (Schnipper, 2015). However, most ruins are (more) vernacular, such as Tukthuset. In such cases, we can try to bring about a transitional change for the site, preserving the old, parallel to developing new structures on or in prolongation of the ruins. In this way, we could also potentially, by highlighting differences by means of palimpsest and stratigraphy, direct attention to fragments of heritage that would otherwise have remained unrecognized. Thus, a transitional approach to heritage management may, in such cases, be a sustainable management of heritage. We are sustaining the ruin and integrating it into something new. Such a transitional change both sustains and develops heritage, indicating that heritage is both ‘deep’ and contemporary. Whereas developmental change is defining changes within the same historical tracks by showing continuity, transitional change will find totally new tracks and create a new direction compared to previous uses and functions. The Tukthuset case, for instance, demonstrates a totally new function where the transition from being a prison (dark heritage) in the past becomes a newly designed restaurant (the dark heritage is hidden and purified by becoming something totally different with this new function).

Valuing transformational change: the Røros UNESCO industrial toxic mining landscape, Norway

Transformational change refers to the transfiguration from one state of being to a fundamentally different state of being. It connotes a marked change in form, nature or appearance; a process by which one figure, expression or function is converted into another one of similar value (Marshak, 1993, p. 8). Transformational change constitutes the third domain of change in terms of heritage values we believe express heritage management practices. Transformational change happens when a process or ‘norm’ creates itself as a result of the destruction of the existing mode and assumes its own shape. You can refine the conservation strategy as it develops, but it is usually random, unintentional and unplanned. Transformational change entails valuing heritage as a process and a transient character. Thus, heritage is like a verb, actively doing and in motion. This is heritage of incremental decay and decomposition caused by natural processes (e.g. climate change) and the absence of human intervention.

Transformation is usually considered a threat, as expressed by Kaslegard (2011) in a heritage management report about heritage and climate change: ‘Even though ruins and buildings are exposed to the same types of physical decay, ruins can be even more vulnerable because they lack a protective roof’ (p. 24). Management strategies that value decay are, therefore, normally not talked about or considered acceptable, but they do occur to a large extent, especially under conservation conditions where it is difficult to maintain the status quo due to the scale, type and importance of the heritage, or where
the location poses a risk of destruction that is beyond human control. Typical places are shady industrial ruins in abandoned areas and of large scale making their conservation through restoration a difficult task. In Norway, there is cultural heritage from the 20th-century mining operations on Svalbard, the mining operations at Røros and the Circumference from the 17th to 20th centuries, with the latter protected as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and both constituting heritage values where change is associated with decay, decomposition and toxic waste (UNESCO, 2010, see Figure 2.3).

Other examples of built heritage on Danish shores are gradually disappearing due to coastal erosion and flooding, and the choice is either to relocate the heritage or to let it go and appreciate the transformational value of ‘ruinification’ as a process of a vanishing heritage (Wienberg, 2014). Equally relevant examples are the remote and outdated places and landscapes bearing Soviet heritage in a rapidly transforming post-socialist society (Litchfield, 2014), forgotten locations such as an outdoor cinema in the Sinai Peninsula, Egypt (Kikkas, 2020), and urban public places in New York City that are no longer in use (Sollis, 2013). Elements of decay are evident when the material heritage is kept as it is, or more precisely by not doing any preservation and instead valuing decay, putrefaction and fragmentation as a (post-) preservation practice (DeSilvey, 2017).

The dimension of transformational change as heritage value is also underestimated from a sustainability perspective. For instance, Sollis (2013) seeks a discussion about what is being preserved and what is gradually disappearing, about what represents our anxieties about and hopes for the sustainability of our society. In such a discussion,
heritage becomes an educational tool that nourishes the intellectual capital that promotes socially and culturally sustainable societies. When transformational change is valued, sustainable development is not necessarily a ‘tool’, but rather a way of coming to terms with and accepting natural decay. From derelict sites, there will arise new structures and activities that are organic and of social and cultural relevance. Nature and humans will reclaim wasteland and develop new functions and practices. In the literature on sustainability, a distinction between ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ sustainability has emerged (Neumayer, 2010). Proponents of the former argue that renewable resources must not be drawn down faster than they can be renewed. This corresponds to viewing heritage as a non-renewable resource (Brattli, 2009, p. 24). The latter approach, however, allows that certain resources can be depleted as long as they can be substituted by others. These somewhat different understandings of sustainability have been referred to as the non-substitutable and the substitutability paradigms, respectively (Neumayer, 2010, pp. 20–21; Skrede & Berg, 2019, p. 87). If we view heritage as a renewable and constantly changing resource, its nature would be transformational and substitutional. No society has surrounded itself with as many heritage sites and objects as modern Western societies (Holtorf, 1998, p. 2). That does not mean, however, that we should demolish buildings or remove ruins if there are good reasons to preserve them; rather, we should value change as intrinsic to heritage. Heritage management should ‘actively and responsibly’ renew the past in our time (Holtorf, 1998, p. 5). This includes considering how we can understand the needs of future generations that are not necessarily concurrent with our own (Taylor, 2013, p. 5).

Conclusions

In this chapter, we have advanced three main points. First, although for some heritage management professionals the best form of conservation would be a ‘bell jar’ approach, protecting heritage from change based on, for example, the appearance of authenticity and a specific time period considered valuable, it turns out that, in practice, even a ‘bell jar’ strategy involves effecting significant changes to maintain the status quo. This critique has a hermeneutic dimension. It questions the extent to which conservation practices represent a historical transformation that strengthens the ‘true authentic’ place. It further questions whether conservation efforts should be seen as the idealization of a place that is far removed from historical reality, which is continually changing and being shaped by historical transformation, not least during continuous ‘heritagization’ processes. Viewed from this social constructionist perspective, heritage sites appear authentic not because they are inherently authentic but because they are constructed as such in terms of points of view, beliefs, perspectives or powers (see also Guttormsen & Fageraas, 2011, pp. 447–448).

Second, we address the need for a new theoretical and methodological reservoir to approach heritage under change as a prosperous value. In nature heritage management, it is accepted that nature can both be a system (ecosystem) and consist of values that are constantly changing. But when it comes to cultural heritage, there is more opposition to such a view. We have provided insight into key theoretical approaches to management practices and thereby put forth systematic ways of organizing the uses of heritage, which is analytically illustrated by three types of change – developmental, transitional and transformational – which in turn opens up for exploring the premises and consequences for very different approaches in the heritage management’s strategies to change
management. Thus, we have shown that although heritage management may associate change with threats and the negative effects caused by a lack of conservation measures, we are surrounded with a vast amount of heritage that is continuously under change. We have shown that heritage management practices have various ways of handling change as a heritage value, even when change is not articulated or desired.

This brings us to our third point, and main conclusion, which is that heritage characterized by change (e.g. fragmented anecdotal traces) is a heritage value with significant potential as a sustainable resource. It could be argued that the focus on change as a heritage value in planning would involve the absence of holistic preservation strategies that opens for greater fragmentation and more reduction in the value of historic environments, which in turn give a green light to speculative entrepreneurs where short-term economic profit takes precedence over long-term sustainable strategies (Guttormsen, 2020, p. 51). In handling change as a value, one enters a political field where caution regarding why and how to protect must be clearly articulated. To reject conservation ideologies as reactionary or to refuse to consider their potential would be a poor utilization of the grand diversity of heritage resources that could benefit society. We have argued that the terms ‘sustain’ and ‘develop’ are not necessarily contradictory. Sustainability as a concept does not have to imply preserving status quo, as sustainable ‘development’ involves managing change in ways in which heritage is used as a resource for future generations. In as much as heritage is a social and cultural process, it is dynamic and constantly developing. We need to deal with heritage as something organic, not as a static entity. A sustainable use of heritage can involve developmental, transitional and transformative approaches, sustaining the material and immaterial remnants of the past, in parallel to managing and developing heritage on behalf of future generations.

We will conclude by outlining new areas for the next decade of research in the field of sustainable heritage, all of which emphasize change as a heritage value. First of all, with ever-increasing urban population growth, valuing change as a heritage value will have a tremendous impact on urban planning and design. It will benefit society to use heritage as part of future planning. Such an approach allows cities to grow and include parts of the past into city planning instead of sealing off the city (the ‘bell jar’ protection) from the past. Considering how much materiality is affected by change and the types of heritage that are removed because they are considered to be of little value, it is unjustifiable from a sustainability perspective to ignore change as a heritage value. In addition, a people-centred approach and the use of digital tools to create good places based on change as a heritage value will be essential in well-developed change management. In planning new research, it will be vital to develop and implement theories and methods that will yield new input for preservation ideology.

Another field of research that will become increasingly relevant is how to deal with heritage from war turmoil and falling regimes, such as the heritage from the aforementioned post-Soviet societies, which is often associated with decay, petrification, absence and transformation. Just as with the large industrial heritage landscapes that were exemplified earlier, a number of challenges arise with regard to curating decay because the changes are so sweeping and extensive from one society to another. At the same time, the willingness to preserve can stand in contradiction to differing attitudes about the (painful) heritage of falling regimes.

A characteristic of heritage places and landscapes that are decayed, abandoned and fragmented is that they appeal to aesthetic and emotional experiences associated with poetic reflection on the changes of life and the perishable, to that which is transient...
and associated with clues from the past, death and the afterlife. Emotional and affective aspects of (vanishing) heritage are significant elements of social and psychological life (cf. Smith, 2020). Memorization relates to both the ‘permanence and absence’ of landscapes (Castañeda López & Vela Cossío, 2020), and heritage is as much about ‘feelings’ as about ‘material structures’. What has been referred to as the ‘emotionalization’ of culture and social life (Bondi, 2005; Bille & Simonsen, 2019) is, therefore, highly relevant for heritages studies, and the already established interest in the affective and emotional dimension of heritage should be continued.

In the majority of academic literature on sustainable development, there are primarily three forms of sustainability: environmental, social and economic. However, there are scholars who have argued the benefits of including a fourth dimension of sustainability, namely ‘cultural’ (e.g. Hawkes, 2001; Dessein et al., 2015; Skrede, 2016; Throsby, 2017; Skrede & Berg, 2019). Undoubtedly, heritage serves as an economic asset and plays a role in environmental policies. Heritage also brings about social well-being, belonging and place identity; however, without being inscribed into a fourfold sustainability model, heritage may run the risk of being subsumed by other priorities (Skrede & Berg, 2019, p. 87). We have tried to demonstrate how cultural considerations tie in with debates on sustainable development; however, there is still a need to shed light on this topic in heritage and change management.

Notes

1 *The Stalker* is a 1979 Soviet science fiction art film directed by Andrei Tarkovsky. The film represents

   a post-Soviet and post-industrial genre of photography which seeks to document sites of decay and abandonment [...] Stalker’s characters move through poetically-charged landscapes of industrial ruins and resurgent nature, with Tarkovsky’s camera often lingering on abandoned artifacts and apparently contaminated landscapes. This imagery simultaneously inaugurated and transcended a so-called “ruin porn” aesthetic that similarly features industrial ruins, abandonment, architectural decay, and urban failure.

   (Madson, 2019)

2 See www.deepcities.eu for information on the newly begun research project ‘Curating Sustainable URBAin Transformations through HERItage’ [CURBATHERI], running between 2020 and 2022 (NIKU.no. 2020).
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