

Chapter 2

The limitless concept: the new heritage paradigm and its relation to space

ROCÍO SILVA PÉREZ
VÍCTOR FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS
University of Seville

SUMMARY: I. THE METAMORPHOSIS OF HERITAGE. 1. *Starting point. 2. Towards determining stages in the relationship between heritage and space.* II. TERRITORY AS HERITAGE: KEYS TO UNDERSTANDING. 1. *Looking for another starting point.* III. SOME FINAL CONSIDERATIONS. IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND DOCUMENTATION. *References. Documents. Legislation.*

I. THE METAMORPHOSIS OF HERITAGE

Heritage: this ancient and beautiful word was originally linked to the family, to the economic and legal structures of a stable society rooted in space and time. It has been qualified by several adjectives (genetic, natural, historic...) that have turned it into a «nomadic» concept that, today, still follows a diverse and resounding path (Choay, online –original ed. of 1992–).

Heritage is neither natural nor eternal, but a social construct that appeared at the dawn of modernity as a kind of lay religion. It served to provide an aura of sacredness to speeches concerning identity, mainly of a national or regional nature, but also local, through representative relics that have some kind of metonymic relationship with the perceived cultural externality, on the time plane (the past, as a time beyond time, unreachable) of the supposedly indomitable, uncontaminated nature [...] and its genius and exceptionality (Prats, 2006: 72).

1. STARTING POINT

The succession of changes that have occurred in the heritage world has destabilised the foundations of an always diffuse concept, opening up new perspectives and providing new challenges, many of them still to be explored. This paper aims to take a step forward in this debate from the point of view of the spatial projection of cultural assets. It additionally aims to: a) establish the evolution of the relationship between heritage and space, and b) to outline a methodological procedure to study this type of asset from the perspective of the new heritage paradigms. To do so, we begin with the proposition that the legal recognition and guardianship of heritage has advanced from an initial consideration of watertight compartments (for both recognised assets, such as monuments, archaeological ruins, etc., and similar disciplines, such as history of art, architecture, etc.) towards a growing approximation, mixture and confusion (in all senses of the word) of natural and cultural heritage (which has also led to more complex approaches to heritage assets and transdisciplinary understandings).

Natural and cultural heritage resources have followed their own evolutionary paths. Natural heritage has gone from the evaluation of species (flora and fauna) to the identification of environmental values in territories (especially through laws on protected natural spaces; Gómez Mendoza, 1999) and to the heritage recognition of species and spaces (the Spanish Law 42/2007, of December 13th, on the Natural Heritage and Biodiversity is an example of the latter). The renovation of cultural heritage has been complex, affecting the bases of heritage status (from historic-artistic heritage to cultural heritage; Peñalba Llul, 2005); the chronology of the assets (widening the recognition of heritage to periods ever closer to the present); and the nature of the assets being protected, with the appearance of new types of heritage (ethnographic, industrial archaeology and public works, cultural landscapes, cultural itineraries, etc.). In other words, heritage has entered a period of crisis concerning the concepts of *historic* and *material*. Heritage is ever more legitimised by its identity, or bottom-up recognition, rather than by the traditional institutional top-down appreciations, even though the latter are still fundamental for identification and tutelage, which are continually being revised and criticised (Prats, 2012). If there is no history in heritage, since it is always an interpretation of the past from the present, and no materiality either, given that heritage is a social construct and resides in the mind not in the objects themselves, the heritage interest has become more anthropocentric than ever and is linked to present, living and continuously revised perceptions, whilst

admitting its different, sometimes fickle, character, depending on the culture that creates them (Muriel, 2016).

The criteria for the enhancement of heritage also change. The appreciation of cultural resources not only acquires relevance because of its present significance, but is also projected into the future. The antiquity value of classical heritage theories (Riegl, 1987 –original ed. of 1903–) loses its virtuality in ethnographic heritage, in cultural landscapes and routes and in contemporary assets. The aesthetic value is not applicable (or needs to be readapted) to the new heritage (Marchán Fiz, 2005), and the same happens with the *outstanding universal value* required by UNESCO of the assets that appear in the World Heritage List (criteria, authenticity, integrity) and to which emerging heritage has difficulties to adjust to. The conservation work on cultural heritage (such as restoration or rehabilitation; Noguera Giménez, 2002) lose all meaning and must be adapted to the new heritage: How can cultural landscape be restored? What is the meaning of rehabilitation applied to a cultural routes? How can complex and functional assets such as landscapes be protected? These are just some of the questions that arise and about which some debate is necessary.

There is a comprehensive literature about whom, how and on what heritage appropriation acts (Crespo, Losada & Martín, 2007; Prats, 2006). Two ways of achieving heritage status can be distinguished, with numerous interconnections between them: Top-down, when those that induce the recognition and enhancement of heritage are institutions (Besse, 2003); and bottom-up, when the heritage appropriation comes from civil society (Clark & Drury, 2002). This is, however, a largely unexplored path, particularly as far as the territorial projection of heritage status and its processes are concerned (Silva Pérez, 2016). In addition, the aims of recognition have also evolved. From an academic, aesthetic and conservationist intention, we have moved on to prioritise the use of heritage for economic ends and as an instrument of territorial development through its activation by touristic means, though not solely by this means (Ortega Valcárcel, 1997; Roch, 1997; Mata Olmo, 2008). Today, heritage is legitimised through its role as a factor of development and because its activation implicitly includes its relationship with the socio-economic impulse. There is abundant literature on the opportunities and undesired consequences of excessive touristic use on monumental areas and historic cities (Troitiño Vinuesa & Troitiño Torralba, 2010; Velasco González, 2009; Winter, 2010) as well as on the use for tourism of the ethnological and gastronomic heritage (Espitx, 2004; Fernández de Paz, 2006), on the protected natural spaces

(Pulido, 2003) and on the industrial heritage (Cañizares, 2010; Benito del Pozo, 2002). Other emerging types of heritage that maintain their vitality and their functionality (as is the case of the mainly agricultural cultural landscapes) resist public use. In any case, territory and heritage overlap and become confused, which is why it would seem opportune to establish some key ideas for the debate.

2. TOWARDS DETERMINING STAGES IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HERITAGE AND SPACE

In the construction of the contemporary theory of heritage, the proposal is to identify at least three stages with respect to the relationship between heritage and space (Table 1). These stages not only mark a special connection with space on the basis of heritage guardianship, but also suppose qualitative changes in the social appreciation and purpose of the heritage. However, this evolution should not be understood in a linear sense, but rather as a route along which one comes and goes, with more than one path, with overlappings and crossroads that sometimes offer a confused image of how heritage and space marry.

In each stage, it is possible to identify the moment of consolidation, but almost all of them are still present in one form or another today. They are the best examples of how, in the heritage field, debates are rarely closed and ways of understanding heritage that have very different base, form and mission can co-exist.

Table 1. Contemporary evolution of the relation between heritage and space

Stage	Phase	Main resources valued	Main means of guardianship and management
Stage 1. Classic heritage	Phase I. The monument as a bubble (start of 19 th century)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Monuments – Archaeological sites – Museums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Legislation – Excavation and restoration projects
	Phase II. The monument and its circumstances: the surroundings (second half of the 19 th century)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Monuments and their surroundings – Monumental centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Legislation – Excavation and restoration projects
	Phase III The historic centres (end of 19 th century)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Historic centres – Historic sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Legislation – Excavation and restoration projects – Special protection plans
Stage 2. The heritage in the territory, end of the 19 th century		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Protected natural spaces (national parks, protected landscapes, reserves, regional natural parks, etc.) – Ecomuseums and territory museums – Heritage areas and cultural parks – Cultural routes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Legislation – Management plans for natural resources – Endogenous development projects – Ecomuseum director plans
Stage 3. The territory as heritage, second half of the 20 th century		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heritage or cultural landscapes – Historic urban landscapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Legislation – Territorial and city planning – Coordination plans with other policies that affect the territory

Source: Own elaboration.

A. The classic heritage

The notion of heritage during the Late Modern Period is controversial and shifting. Its most general meaning refers to inheritances and legacies, but also to the dynamics of social construct. The concept of heritage, as it is understood today, arose in the Early Modern Period due to the social advancement of the nationalist bourgeoisie and the beginning of the Modern State, of which it is a product and to which it is inescapably linked. It is at this time that it is also consolidated as a regulatory concept (Gabardón de la Banda, 2012) with a dual nature in so far as the administrations responsible for its management and the assets upon which it is projected are concerned: natural as opposed to cultural heritage. The former is identified with spaces that have little human intervention, in which man is hardly present at all and in which he is considered to be a dangerous agent (national parks, natural reserves, etc.); the latter, originally called historic-artistic heritage or treasure, concerns assets in which antiquity is the outstanding attribute: monuments and archaeological sites (Ballart, 2002). In both cases, we are dealing with isolated, protected places, and although they may be subject to very different ideas about restoration (from the stylistic ideas of Viollet-le-Duc to the archaeological ones of John Ruskin); they are rarely related to the character of the space in which they are set. A pictorial, environmental configuration could be demanded, but it was more a question of the projection of the monument in its most immediate surroundings than the recognition of the values of this same space.

This recognition of monumental heritage during the 19th century runs parallel to two fundamental yet apparently contradictory facts: the institutional appreciation of the artistic monuments and the scorn to which it was subjected during several of the revolutionary episodes of the 19th century as material expressions of the Old Order. To this, we also have to add the interior reform processes that, although they had notable precursors, became common in many European cities following the intervention of Baron Haussmann in Paris during the Second Empire. The destruction of the contexts in which the heritage had been conceived, as if its creation and values were completely independent from the place where it was situated, raised awareness of the heritage context as a dimension without which the monument could not be understood (González-Varas Ibáñez, 1999). Then, in the 20th century, the Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments of 1931 «...recommends that, in the construction of buildings, the character and external aspect of the cities in which they are to be erected should

be respected, especially in the neighbourhood of ancient monuments ...» (paragraph III).

The appreciation of historic centres as heritage spaces is a decisive step from the spatial point of view and is derived from their consideration, initially, as areas of protection for monuments. The very denomination *monumental centres* clearly expresses the origin and intention. Some of the contributions at the end of the 19th century already pointed in this direction, although there are deeper reflections with more powerful planning contents, such as the work of Camillo Sitte (1921, original ed. of 1889) and later that of Lewis Mumford (1966, original ed. of 1961), which serve as precedents, among others, to what will be one of the most intense debates during the second half of the 20th century and which is still unfinished: the identification, tutelage and management of historic centres. Nevertheless, the most recognised and quoted document, still not officially surpassed concerning heritage (despite the attempt made with the drawing up of the Charter of Krakow in 2000), the Venice Charter (International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964) does not specifically cite these spaces, but it does, using a more generic formula, refer to *historic sites*. Neither does it define them, it simply points out that the «sites of monuments must be the object of special care in order to safeguard their integrity and ensure that they are cleared and presented in a seemly manner» (paragraph 14). However, the 1960s brought about a qualitative change, where the oldest spaces in the cities (normally the preindustrial city) are no longer simply places where monuments are protected, they take on their own values. This can be clearly seen in the Gubbio Charter (1960), whose main objective was to offer methods and justifications to avoid the destruction of these urban spaces, a destruction which had, since the 19th century, been based on their bad hygienic and environmental conditions. This Charter brings with it a new culture of urban valuation based on history and morphology, but which also includes other values, especially functional and social ones. In fact, the very broad Italian school, with its zenith in the 1970s, is well known for developing a powerful and progressive theory centred on the experiences of Bologna and other Italian towns (Cervellati, 1977; Franchini, 2010). The UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (Nairobi Recommendation, 1976) includes a large part of this debate and, although through an attenuated ideological dimension, raises the triple necessity for the morphological, functional and social tutelage of historic centres.

From the 1980s onwards, the globalised post-fordist city takes up the debate of the Italian and European cities, although the change in scale weakens their social content and assumes, in practice, a classification by themes of the oldest and most emblematic areas of the city in favour of their consumption as an international tourist attraction. It is in this context that the International Charter on the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington Charter, 1987) appeared, created by ICOMOS, which has been an important reference for almost a quarter of a century and which, in some way still is, given that the Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas, also created by ICOMOS, are only an update in 2011 of the abovementioned document. From the spatial point of view, the Charter «...concerns historic urban areas, large and small, including cities, towns and historic centres or quarters, together with their natural and man-made environments». The document does not aim to restrict itself to an urban scale or to a particular type or area of the city, using its *historic character* as the basic reference point. Forms and functions are the values that should be conserved and it trusts in city planning as the public means by which the objectives and management methods will be materialised (Manero, 2009). The Valletta Principles aim to fit the Washington Charter into the framework of globalisation and the new discourse of the governance and «... express a greater awareness of the issue of historic heritage on a regional scale rather than just confined to urban areas; of intangible values such as continuity and identity; of traditional land use; the role of public space in communal interactions, and of other socio-economic factors such as integration and environmental factors» (Preamble). This document thus advances in the same direction as the majority in the heritage debate, giving greater weight to intangible questions and those concerning the landscape (see below the comments concerning HUL or «historic urban landscape»).

Although the historic centres derived their protection from city planning, they are currently an amortised concept from the theoretical point of view. On the one hand, there is the abovementioned crisis of the term *historic* and, by extension, that of the *historic character* of a space. If one admits that history is always the appropriation of the past by the most rabid present, all the meaning and value of heritage, even that of the historic cities, arise from how today's societies understand their past in the urban space. In western cities, to be historical ceased to be identified with the preindustrial city a long time ago. A neighbourhood or building with heritage values may have been

built only a few decades before. In other words, it could be said that the historic centres do not exist; since all the urban neighbourhoods have some kind of historic dimension and that the truly historic urban dimension is more than the sum of the parts of the different neighbourhoods. The historic centres, as the oldest neighbourhoods, usually possess a thicker heritage layer, but this does not mean that the historic references from even the most recent neighbourhoods do not count. Never more than today has it been so difficult to draw a line on the urban map to differentiate the historic from what is not. The term *historic centre* is still being used to contain the spaces that should be protected, but from the conceptual point of view, it has burst its seams and has, as shall be seen later, new methods with which to understand the cultural dimension of the city.

B. Heritage in the territory

Table 1 proposes an intermediate stage, or stage 2, in which the recognition surpasses the scale of the historic centres to take on the territory as its reference. The crux of this paradigmatic change affecting all the forms of heritage concerns the displacement of the focus of attention from the object (the cultural asset) to the subject that creates, recreates and enjoys it (the heritage status agent). From this perspective, implicit in the citation from Prats that opened this chapter, the heritage value does not reside in the assets themselves, but in the intentions (of all kinds: cultural, social, economic, etc.) projected upon them and the strategies of the actors who, physically or symbolically, appropriate them. The differences between natural and cultural heritage, or between material and immaterial heritage, although operative, lose their analytical virtuality. If heritage is concerned with the assignation of values, all heritage is cultural and it also has an immaterial character. As for social construction, heritage is subject to changes and is more easily understood as a process rather than as a static reality. The process is not linear, but travels in zigzags and is often even reversible: that which enjoys social and institutional consideration may lose it, in which case the process would be one of loss of heritage status (see below). The aspirations and strategies of the agents who assign values to heritage do not necessarily coincide. Furthermore, while appreciation for certain assets is encouraged, agents also actively encourage neglect and disdain for others.

When considering heritage as part of the territory, it is not by chance that the oldest examples are from the protection of nature or that they are

also in America. It is sufficient to remember that the territorial policy of protected natural spaces was born in the USA in 1872 with the creation of the Yellowstone National Park, though there had been precedents, and that its management became consolidated from 1916 onwards with the National Park Service Organic Act, which conceives the set of parks as a system. This initiative gave rise, over the decades, to the appearance of similar proposals in almost every country in the world. In any case, it should be pointed out that, in the beginning, spaces with scarce human presence were protected, spaces with an enormous predominance of natural values. On being introduced to Europe, especially, the concept of national park progressively incorporated values linked to a human presence: the French regional natural parks from the 1960s, for instance, or later, the Spanish national parks. «A regional natural park is a rural, inhabited territory, recognised at a national level for its strong, but fragile, heritage and landscape value, that is organised around a concerted sustainable development project, founded on the protection and enhancement of its heritage» (Parcs Naturels Régionaux, 2012: 5). The renovation of heritage from the end of the 19th century thus proceeds, despite quickly being contaminated by cultural values, from nature and from countries which, at least from the heritage point of view, were considered almost peripheral (the USA, Canada, Australia, Scandinavian countries), since the theories of Camillo Boito or Gustavo Giovannoni concerning monuments and their conservation were still at the gravitational centre of the discourse on cultural heritage in Europe and it was to remain that way at least until the mid 20th century. In other words, an exterior wave overlaps the internal evolution of European cultural heritage. As it becomes imbued with the cultural theories, it generates a new paradigm which can no longer consider heritage without its setting within the territory (including the society that lives there). At the same time, it cannot ignore the presence of this resource in development proposals. In fact, it should not be forgotten that, during the middle decades of the 20th century, in Ibero-America and other areas that are also peripheral in the world socio-economic and cultural order, interesting experiences occur concerning eco-development based on endogenous resources. Outstanding among these are the cultural and the natural, as they precede and set the foundation for what will come to be called sustainable development and which is set down in writing in the *Brundtland Report* (Brundtland & Khalid, 1987), as well as in the Rio Summit of 1992 (Grubb, 1993).

For the rapprochement between cultural and natural heritage, the work of UNESCO in two initiatives that almost coincide in time

is fundamental. On the one hand, the Man and Biosphere Programme MAB (1971), although this has precedents from the previous decade, which «proposes an interdisciplinary research and capacity promotion agenda focused on the ecological, social and economic dimensions of the loss of biodiversity and its reduction» (UNESCO, undated, on line). This programme assumes that the protection of the biosphere as the planet's generic heritage cannot be assumed without human presence. Since 1976, and beginning with this initiative, the Biosphere Reserve Network is created. These are «areas of terrestrial, coastal or marine ecosystems internationally recognised within the framework of the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB)» (UNESCO, 1996: 1). On the other hand, the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) and the World Heritage List implemented from it since 1978, point in the same direction. These references are more important for the cascade of declarations of protection zones with natural values all over the planet, than for the number of recognised assets. The incorporation of the human species into natural heritage involves a broadening of its meaning from «natural spaces» to «territories with natural values». This is not only a semantic nuance, as it affects the assets that possess the values: geological formations as well as fauna and botanic species, in the first case, to which we can add the populating structures, the land use (agrarian or other types) and the cultural components in the second case. Thus, the change from space to territory affects figures with clearly natural roots, such as the *geoparks*, begun once more in 1999 under the auspices of UNESCO.

Also in the 1970s, the interpretation of heritage was connected to a new form of understanding and transmitting it, more closely related with industrial archaeology and public works and, in particular, with the ethnological expressions. This turned into the figure of the ecomuseums. In this case, the protagonism of its conceptualisation happened in Europe, to be exact in France, with the figures of Georges Henry Rivière (1993) and Hugues Michet de Varine-Bohan (1979). «Ecomuseums are local-territorial development projects that see the whole territory as a museum, where territory is understood as a cultural product» (Barbero Franco, 2011: 73). Different paradigms with a territorial projection come together within them: sustainability, local development, tourism and the new vocations attributed to heritage. Heritage, territory and local society become the basic references, recipes for recuperating the socio-economic pulse, especially in areas whose traditional activities collapsed with the socio-economic restructuring

of the 1970s (mining, textile industry, etc.). What is interesting from this proposal is its link to local decisions and to assets which, although they are related with economic sectors in crisis (traditional agriculture, certain economic sectors, etc.), possessed highly authentic witnesses, and this augured well for success in a globalising, urban world with homogenising tendencies as far as the cultural is concerned.

The ecomuseums evolved over the 1980s and 1990s in two ways: the territory museums (open museums, historic territories, etc.) and cultural parks (also with other denominations, such as that of heritage areas). The former usually introduce a strategic and sustainability component that did not exist, or was much less important, into the ecomuseums (Padró Werner, 2002); while the latter are based on new legal figures that start to recognise the heritage complexity of certain geographical areas. The territory museums maintain the interpretation of the territory as a means of transmission for assets and knowledge, while also incorporating the territory and the society in which the heritage is situated as a changing context to which the heritage must know how to adapt (Miró, 2001). They continue to support the protagonism of the local people and identities, but they also stress the need to improve formation and planning in order to achieve better levels of local development. In other words, it can be stated that, over the last decades of the 20th and the first of the 21st centuries, the management of these spaces became professionalised and tried to establish a product, using this word intentionally, in order to, besides achieving self-esteem for the territories, satisfy an ever more specialised tourist demand, with an awareness not so much of the destination's exotic nature, but of living conditions that intellectually enrich them.

The cultural parks, for their part, and without passing necessarily through the framework of planning, have been identified and legally protected from top to bottom (which does not mean that many of them did not previously have a local movement to reaffirm their heritage). In Spain, these legal figures do not find a place in the Law 16/1985, of June 25th, on Spain's Historic Heritage; yet they do find a place in some autonomous regions that possess responsibility for culture. There is no general correspondence and the names are varied, yet the pioneers should be mentioned: the *cultural parks* of Aragón, territories that contain «relevant elements of cultural heritage, integrated within a physical framework of singular landscape and/or ecological value» (art. 1 of the Law 12/1997, of December 3rd, on the Cultural Parks of Aragón), or other figures, such as the *heritage areas* of Andalusia,

which are «...those territories or spaces that make up a heritage ensemble, diverse and complementary, consisting of diachronic assets representative of human evolution, possessing a use and enjoyment value for the community and, where appropriate, landscape and environmental values» (art. 26, point 8 of the Law 14/2007, of November 26th on the Historic Heritage of Andalusia), which can also evolve into cultural parks when they possess a governing body. In this sense, it can be stated that the administrations have advanced in a complex and haphazard way, in an attempt to incorporate parameters of understanding which are more or less parallel to those of the natural parks and which can cause confusion in the territories in which they must now apply another protection figure with hardly any precedents and difficult management, once they have begun to understand the meaning of a natural park or similar figure.

Finally, the cultural routes are a state-of-the-art heritage concept in the territory in which aspects linked to the classic view (identification of monuments, protection of surroundings, etc.) are combined; while, at the same time, their management is connected to the symbolic dimension of the landscapes and spaces they cross (Fernández Salinas, 2013). ICOMOS defines them as any «route of communication, be it land, water, or some other type, which is physically delimited and is also characterised by having its own specific dynamic and historic functionality to serve a specific and well-determined purpose, which... must arise from and reflect interactive movements of people, as well as multi-dimensional, continuous, and reciprocal exchanges of goods, ideas, knowledge and values between peoples, countries, regions or continents over significant periods of time [...having] thereby promoted a cross-fertilization of the affected cultures in space and time», (International Charter on Cultural Routes, Icomos, 2008). The Charter offers contents that concern an important number of universal routes (The Silk Road, the Spanish Camino Real and the Manila Galleons, etc.). It does not include, however, other typologies, generically called *historic ways*, and which, as they do not comply with some of the requisites (Route 66 in the USA, for instance) do not fit into these principles. The cultural routes cross and unite different territories and, in some way, match or exceed the condition of the heritage assets that will be analysed in the following section. However, at the same time, the complexity of their management often reduces them to simple territorial corridors, as happens with the Way of Saint James or the Qhapan Ñan (or Inca Trail), both on the World Heritage List. The cultural routes are thus heritage assets in the space, which create

territories, but which are not the territories in themselves, at least from the current perspective of their protection and activation.

II. TERRITORY AS HERITAGE: KEYS TO UNDERSTANDING

1. LOOKING FOR ANOTHER STARTING POINT

The changes in the heritage field have modified the relationship between heritage and territory (Stage 3 of Table 1; Manero Miguel & García Cuesta, 2016). From being a stage upon which assets are located, the territory has acquired protagonism and heritage character as a substantive category. Heritage territories differ in their cultural significance and morphological configurations: undefined forms (or needing prior demarcation) in the heritage landscapes; radio-concentric forms to include the urban hinterland in the historic urban landscapes, etc. Although these meanings and configurations vary, all heritage territories share a series of properties seldom seen in conventional heritage; they are: a) the extension, extremely variable but much larger than conventional cultural assets; b) different material and immaterial consistency (built-up spaces, spaces modified for their economic use, spaces that have been little changed, symbolic places, etc.); c) the dominant territorial properties upon which their basic cultural attributes rest (dominantly urban, rural or natural heritage territories); their vitality and diversity (reflected in the relevance of ethnological values); and their functional multiplicity, difficult to manage from the perspective of a concept that has arisen to distinguish territories that, in many cases, have lost their original functionality.

Heritage territories are hybrid assets and require a kind of story that other assets do not need (Calderón Calderón & García Cuesta, 2016). Their legal definitions revolve around the cultural meaning of the figures that they represent (Table 1); however, they elude or they do not delve sufficiently into their territorial meanings. How should the borders be defined? What is the heritage part of them? How can the heritage parts be articulated one with another and become integrated with the territory? All this impels innovative methodological proposals to be devised for which the following premises are set out:

- Heritage territories are complex and complete cultural assets. Heritage values reside together within them (in their different forms: natural, monumental, ethnological, industrial archaeology, etc.) and become integrated within a territorial

whole, where the value of the whole is always greater than the sum of the parts. At the same time, paradoxically, not all the parts of the whole have a cultural value and they often may not even have special aesthetic qualities.

- The complexity of territorial heritage assets belongs to both heritage and territory. Both facets should be considered for analytical purposes and each one, individually, constitutes a compendium of time and space.
- In the case of the territorial facet, this implies its analytical breakdown into its different spatial (natural structures, land use, populating units, communication routes, etc.) and temporal (created at different historical moments) layers.
- Not everything in these heritage territories has a heritage value, as already mentioned. The heritage value falls to the vectors of heritage status (Silva Pérez & Fernández Salinas, 2017), which are material and immaterial attributes upon which the social and institutional identification operates with the heritage territory. The vectors of heritage status are very diverse in their material and immaterial consistency. A waterfall or other element of a special natural value can act as such; as can a church lost in the countryside or wedged in the middle of the urban fabric; certain symbolic or commemorative spaces (hermitages and feasting places); or immaterial elements related with the popular culture (gastronomy, folkloric expressions, religious manifestations), etc.
- The fact that such assets act as heritage vectors lies more in the ever changing appreciations of the agents who attribute such values, rather than in the assets themselves. The identification of the heritage vectors is inextricably linked to the heritage status processes; hence their abovementioned consideration as compendiums of space and time.

The methodological transfer of these approaches to heritage territories contributes to a first characterisation methodology shown in Table 2, which can be applied to any territory, not only heritage territories. Thus, the space helps to identify the heritage vectors and their physical presence on the map (immaterial heritage is also often projected in simple cartographic realities), resulting in territories with variable densities (areas with a high, medium or low heritage density). It should be pointed out that, in any case, the determination of density is always relative and mostly depends on the methods established to

register the heritage vectors. It is not, therefore, pertinent to compare the heritage density of Florence with that of Gardaya, in the Sahara desert of Algeria, with their respective territorial environments, among other reasons, because a smaller heritage density does not mean a lesser territorial heritage value.

Table 2. **Time and space as a reference to identify heritage vectors and agents**

Space: the heritage vectors	Time: the heritage status processes
Determining the heritage density with respect to the presence and distribution of the vectors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Areas of high/medium/low heritage density. 	Determining the heritage intensity with respect to the number and character of the agents involved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Areas of high/medium/low heritage intensity
Determining the heritage specialisation/diversification with respect to the types of vector: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Specialised heritage areas (monumental, intangible heritage, etc.) – Diversified heritage areas 	Determining the appropriation dynamics with respect to the stage of the process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Areas without heritage status/with incipient heritage status/mature heritage status/in the process of removing heritage status

Source: Silva Pérez & Fernández Salinas, 2017: 140.

A similar reasoning is that which is related to the specialisation of the heritage vectors. The fact that a territory has a monotony, or high degree of specialisation, in a heritage vector (caves with prehistoric paintings, livestock trails, historic centres, etc.), for instance Menorca and its Talayotic culture, does not mean that it has less value than others with greater diversity, such as the Bay of Naples, in which the variety of heritage vectors is enormous.

The application of the time variable to the heritage vectors leads to the identification of agents and their changes in perception and the assignation of values to the said vectors. It is not, therefore, a question of there being many social sectors involved, but that those that do exist, whether they are only a few or many, should have a good awareness of the cultural values of their heritage vectors. Once more, it should be added that low intensity (for instance, a decommissioned mining area in which the population does not assign any values to the inheritance of the said activity) does not mean that it is not

potentially an interesting territory from the heritage point of view. In order to elaborate on this, we have to add the appropriation dynamics of these agents or, which is basically the same, the determination of the phase of the heritage status process in a territory. So there will be territories with no heritage status or, on the contrary, territories where there is heritage status. This process, based on their vectors, can be incipient, mature or in the process of losing heritage status. Heritage appreciation is not a straight road with no turning back. On the other hand, the social dynamics, the academic and intellectual interests, as well as other events difficult to gauge (crises, catastrophes, economic opportunities, etc.), turn heritage status processes into a journey where future stages are difficult to predict. In any case, if it is assumed that heritage status processes depend on the criteria and the whims of societies over time, a more open and less dogmatic attitude will also be adopted towards what society may consider to be heritage in the future. If not, think about what both the popular classes and the 19th century intellectuals might have thought of the current effort to conserve chimneys and other elements of our industrial archaeology.

Table 2 shows the references that inspire a useful methodology for identifying and locating, within heritage territories, those attributes (the heritage vectors) that certain agents at a given moment give to cultural value. Upon this basis, it also helps to discern what to protect and with whom to debate the general process of its activation. In other words, and taking into account the time variable, it also provides ideas about how to manage heritage territories during these changes.

Which type of heritage territories are the protagonists of the debate? The approach in this work is that, at the current moment, such a consideration can only be applied to heritage landscapes. We would also add, but with many doubts, a rather immature and somewhat confused concept, that of historic urban landscapes (Table 3).

Table 3. Some definitions concerning heritage landscapes

Heritage or cultural landscapes	<p>The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention:</p> <p>«Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the “combined works of nature and of man” designated in Article 1 of the <i>Convention</i>. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal» (World Heritage Committee, 1992)</p>
	<p>National Plan for Cultural Landscapes:</p> <p>«The result of the interaction over time between people and the natural environment, whose expression is a territory perceived and valued for its cultural qualities, the product of a process and the foundation of a community’s identity» (Spanish Institute of Cultural Heritage, 2012)</p>
Historic urban landscapes	<p>Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscapes:</p> <p>«The historic urban landscape is the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting» (UNESCO, 2011)</p>

Source: Noted in each citation.

Heritage landscapes, or cultural landscapes in the terminology of UNESCO, are the type of heritage territory which is currently the object of a major debate (Sabaté Bel, 2004). However, such is the rhythm of paradigm change that the concepts quickly become obsolete. To this must be added the difficulty of finding references with a broad international recognition; in fact, heritage landscapes do not have an international charter, when there are over a hundred of these documents on the most varied heritage typologies (archaeological, historic centres, gardens and historic sites, etc.). The appearance of the European Landscape Convention, without focusing on heritage landscapes and created solely for the countries of the Council of Europe, has steered its understanding towards the sphere of the perception: landscape «means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors» (European Landscape Convention, art. 1, point a). Thus, the definition incorporated by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee

has become outdated, among other questions because it establishes the existence of relict (or fossil) landscapes when they are physically anchored in the past; whilst, on taking social perception as a reference, if this evolves, as it always does, it means that today a landscape, even though it may not have been materially transformed, may be considered in a completely different light. For example, an abandoned industrial landscape could be qualified as a relict in the consideration of the UNESCO body; however, on the basis of how industrial heritage has gained in value, the perception that exists socially will be very different from that held fifty years ago. Consequently, we cannot speak of a landscape anchored in the past, since perceptions have updated their values. In this respect, such definitions as that of the Cultural Landscape Plan of the Spanish Cultural Heritage Institute are more interesting (see Table 3). In this definition, the inclusion of perception enhances a more up-to-date conceptualisation. In any case, the application of the contents of Table 2 allow us to establish a mechanism to characterise the cultural dimension of landscapes and, in particular, to identify what must be protected in them and what must be managed, together with the rest of the elements it is made up of, in order to maintain their values. This task is especially complex in a context where the landscapes mainly depend on the activities that have sustained their inhabitants and where the global socio-economic changes, to say nothing of the community commitments in the case of the EU, make it even harder to accept the international commitments as well as manage the changes without losing these values.

As for historic urban landscapes, it has been pointed out that this concept is still confused and not very mature. It was not originally conceived as a cultural landscape in the line mentioned above, although it does incorporate landscape aspects applied to urban environments beyond the historic centres and, in addition, has no coherent conceptualisation of the landscape as its base (in which case, it could also be said, for instance, of historical rural landscapes). The appearance of this concept has generated more expectations and desires than rigorous methods of analysis, however much the UNESCO's World Heritage Centre has been working in this field through the determination, among others, of Francesco Bandarin (2014). The debate arose in the Memorandum of Vienna (UNESCO, 2005), when faced with the necessity to respond to the growing need to clarify the incorporation of today's architecture in the historic centres. The result was a document, the UNESCO's Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape (2011), which is a «proposal that has generated a

notable polemic and which, in our opinion, hides not a few dangers» (Azkárate & Azpeitia, 2016: 219). In fact, on incorporating such a term as landscape, when in reality what is being referred to is an urban space that transcends the traditional historic centres, criticisms concerning a possible greater permissiveness and commercialisation of the historic cities must be added. As for positive aspects, it should be pointed out that it raises a historic consideration of the city beyond the historical structures. However, in spite of the attempts to apply a methodology in accordance with this proposal from the World Heritage Centre (Institute of Historic Heritage of Andalusia, undated), nowadays, more than of a concept, they speak of historic urban landscapes as a new way to focus heritage on the city, in the widest sense of the word, as a methodological and operational framework, but one without a reliable epistemological corpus.

III. SOME FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Territory has to follow a long and tortuous path in the process to be considered a heritage asset. In this work, the proposal is to understand this process as having three phases: a first phase, in which the heritage is legitimised for itself and remains autistic with respect to its insertion within the territory; a second phase, in which the heritage value is transferred from the object to the subject and which coincides with the consideration of it in the territory in which it is situated, ultimately contributing to its development; and a third phase, in which the territory is no longer conceived as heritage in itself, forcing a new, complex paradigm difficult to understand.

The relation between heritage and territory is progressively becoming more intense, but not more systematic or clear for all that. The assumption of the importance of the space in which the cultural assets are inserted has been a constant since it was first glimpsed at the end of the 19th century. Yet even at the start of the 21st century, different or even contradictory paradigms remain, in both the legal and tutelage aspects and activation and management, and these paradigms take away some of the potential from heritage as a socio-economic and identity resource.

The understanding of heritage within the territory has become more settled over the 20th century, and although the precedents proceed from the world of natural heritage, they only become customary in the second half of that century when, on the one hand, the protagonism of

heritage passes from the object to the subject and its purpose becomes not only an element of cultural reference but also a resource to define development models. From the end of the 20th century, the territory becomes a heritage reference of itself, and not only as a container of heritage elements. This change, still in full debate and not assumed by the regulations concerning the legal recognition and tutelage of heritage, opens up a new paradigm in which time and space, as basic elements in heritage status processes, and territorial heritage vectors, which coexist with other elements that have no heritage value, offer a dynamic view, in perspective, of how human beings assign cultural values to space and how the latter, at the same time, develops into heritage territories, complete and complex units, whose heritage value, besides being more than the sum of the parts, expresses its character in its complexity and points to the keys to determining the environmental and socio-economic development strategies. To do so, it is necessary to take into account the fact that the social assignation of values to these territories is selective and subject to changes and new trends.

Heritage territories do not enjoy an easy transfer to the previous heritage paradigms, with which they inevitably have to coexist; so they need an argument that is unnecessary, or at least not in the same way as in other types of cultural assets. Today, the only concept that adapts to the presented considerations on heritage territory is heritage landscapes. This does not mean that in the future there will not be new ways to understand the territorial dimension of heritage, which will be added on to and overlap with, or even surpass, the current perspective on landscapes, which in turn is far from being monolithic and commonly accepted, given that heritage landscapes are also in the full heat of debate. In any case, the landscape allows us to bring together and to consider jointly the artificial division between natural and cultural heritage and to reorient the identification, protection and management policies of heritage in their territorial dimension, among other reasons, beyond the conceptual dimension, in order to avoid generating the confusion and rejection of the local bases; those that perceive these denominations (when not their own initiative) as an imposition from above that will have a difficult assimilation, especially when the environmental and cultural administrations of the same territory are often not able to coordinate adequately the management of their heritage resources.

The new paradigm of heritage thus points to the probability of this concept being limitless, and that it can thus assume continuous reinvention. However, this question should not be seen as a hindrance

to the recognition, tutelage and activation of heritage, but the opposite. In its changing and elusive character resides also its capacity to adapt to the new perceptions, which are the ones that assign the cultural values and social requirements, which may and should be complied with. As long as it is understood that heritage is a construct resulting from the inevitable human pattern of assigning values, or meta values, to the world in which we live, more criteria to be avoided will be obtained, not only their spurious manipulation, but also their degradation as a basic resource with which to better understand and defend ourselves in a globalised world, as well as to create reasons to raise our local self-esteem. Only in this way can we also understand that to set limits to the concept of heritage is to set limits to the human capacity to create symbols and to recreate identities; something which is, of course, completely unrealistic.

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND DOCUMENTATION

REFERENCES

- ASOCIACIÓN PARA LA INTERPRETACIÓN DEL PATRIMONIO: *La AIP*, s.f.
Recovered from <http://www.interpretaciondelpatrimonio.com/la-aip>
- AZKÁRATE, A. & AZPEITIA, A.: «Paisajes urbanos históricos. ¿Paradigma o subterfugio?», In JURKOVIC, M. & CHAVARRÍA, A. (eds.): *Alla ricerca di un passato complesso. Contributi in onore di Gian Pietro Brogiolo per il suo settantesimo compleanno*. Zagreb-Motovun (Croacia): International Research Center for Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Motovun, University of Zagreb, 2016, pp. 219-238. Recovered from http://www.catedraunesco.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Azkarate_GPB70_04-22.pdf
- BALLART, J.: *El patrimonio histórico arqueológico. Valor y uso*. Barcelona. Ariel, 2002.
- BARBERO FRANCO, A. M. *La gestión del patrimonio histórico como instrumento para un desarrollo sostenible. Un caso práctico: el proyecto de desarrollo local «Os Ambientes do Ar»*. Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca, 2011.
- BENITO DEL POZO, P.: «Patrimonio industrial y cultura del territorio». *Boletín de la A.G.E.*, n.º 34, 2002, pp. 213-227. Recovered from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/660076.pdf>
- BESSE, J.-M.: «Le paysage entre le politique et le vernaculaire. Réflexions à partir de John Brinckerhoff Jackson», *Arches. Association Roumaine*

des Chercheurs Francophones en Sciences Humaines, n.º 3, 2003, pp. 9-27.
Recovered from de <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00113275/document>

- BRUNDTLAND, G.H. & KHALID, M.: *Our common future*. New York (U.S.A.): United Nations, 1987.
- BANDARIN, F.: *El paisaje urbano histórico*. Madrid: Abada, 2014.
- CALDERÓN CALDERÓN, B. & GARCÍA CUESTA, J.L.: «Patrimonio y territorio en España, fundamentos y estrategias para la gestión de la cultura territorial», In MANERO MIGUEL, F. & GARCÍA CUESTA, J.L. (eds.): *Patrimonio cultural y desarrollo territorial*, 2016. Cizur Menor: Thomson Reuters/ Aranzadi, pp. 51-105.
- CAÑIZARES, C.: «El patrimonio industrial. Un recurso del territorio y un componente del paisaje», In *Patrimonio industrial y Paisaje*. Gijón: TICCIH-España y CICEES, 2010, pp. 497-503.
- CERVELLATI, P.L. Y MILIARI, M. *I centri storici*. Florencia (Italia), Le Guide Guaraldi, 1977.
- CHOAY, F.: «Alegoría del patrimonio», *Cuatro Cuadernos. Escritos sobre Arquitectura y Patrimonio*, undated –original ed. of 1992–, online. Recovered from <https://cuatrocuadernos.files.wordpress.com/2015/10/i-07-alegorc3ada-del-patrimonio.pdf>.
- CIARDINI, F. Y PALINI, P.: *Los centros históricos. Política urbanística y programas de actuación*. Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 1978.
- CLARK, K. Y DRURY, P. «Du monument au citoyen: Les fonctions du patrimoine culturel dans une Europe en évolution». *Fonctions du patrimoine culturel dans une Europe en changement*. Estrasburgo: Conseil de l'Europe, 2002, pp. 119-124.
- CRESPO, C., LOSADA, F. Y MARTÍN, A.: *Patrimonio, políticas culturales y participación ciudadana*. Buenos Aires (Argentina), Antropofagia, 2007.
- ESPEITX, E.: «Patrimonio alimentario y turismo. Una relación singular», *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, vol. 2 (2), 2004, 193-213. Recovered from <http://www.pasosonline.org/Publicados/2204/PS040204.pdf>
- FERNÁNDEZ DE PAZ, E.: «De tesoro ilustrado a recurso turístico: el cambiante significado del patrimonio cultural», *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, vol. 4 (1), 2006, pp. 1-12. Recovered <http://www.pasosonline.org/Publicados/4106/PASOS07.pdf#page=12>
- FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS, V.: «De dónde y hacia dónde. Perspectivas y premisas para el entendimiento de los itinerarios culturales», *Biblio*

- 3W. *Revista Bibliográfica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*, vol. XVIII (1.028), online, 2013. Recovered from <http://www.ub.edu/geocrit/b3w-1028.htm>
- FRANCHINI, L.M.: *La nuova questione dei centri storici in Italia Una ricognizione: nella letteratura, nelle politiche urbanistiche, nei progetti*. Milán (Italia), Facoltà di Architettura e Società, 2010. Recovered from https://www.politesi.polimi.it/bitstream/10589/4081/1/2010_10_Franchina.pdf
- GABARDÓN DE LA BANDA, J.F.: *La construcción del patrimonio monumental como bien de interés público en el seno de los derechos patrimoniales del Estado liberal y su proyección en el ordenamiento español*. Sevilla, Universidad de Sevilla (PhD thesis), 2012. Recovered from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/tesis?codigo=54133>
- GÓMEZ MENDOZA, J.: «Paisajes y espacios naturales protegidos en España», *Boletín de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, n.º 34-35. 1999, pp. 131-152.
- GONZÁLEZ VARAS-IBÁÑEZ, I.: *Conservación de bienes culturales. Teoría, historia, principios y normas*. Madrid, Cátedra, 1999.
- GRUBB, M.: *The Earth Summit agreements: a guide and assessment; an analysis of the Rio'92 UN Conference on Environment and Development*. London (United Kingdom): Earthscan, 1993.
- INSTITUTO ANDALUZ DEL PATRIMONIO HISTÓRICO: *Guía del paisaje histórico de Sevilla. Resumen*. Seville: Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico, s.f. Recovered from http://www.iaph.es/export/sites/default/galerias/patrimonio-cultural/documentos/gestion-informacion/guia_paisaje_historico_urbano_sevilla_resumen.pdf
- MANERO MIGUEL, F.: «De la protección selectiva a la recuperación de los espacios urbanos en situación crítica: las áreas de rehabilitación integrada en Castilla y León», *Polígonos*, n.º 19. 2009, pp. 95-118. Recovered from <http://revistas.unileon.es/ojs/index.php/poligonos/article/view/74/56>
- MANERO MIGUEL, F. Y GARCÍA CUESTA, J.L.: «Cultura, patrimonio y territorio», In MANERO MIGUEL, F. & GARCÍA CUESTA, J.L. (coords.): *Patrimonio cultural y desarrollo territorial*, 2016. Cizur Menor: Thomson Reuters/ Aranzadi, pp. 17-20.
- MARCHÁN FIZ, S.: *Real-virtual en la estética y la teoría de las artes*. Barcelona: Paidós, 2005.

- MATA OLMO, R.: «El paisaje, patrimonio y recurso para el desarrollo territorial sostenible: Conocimiento y acción pública», *Arbor, Ciencia, Pensamiento y Cultura*, n.º 729. 2008, pp. 155-172.
- MIRÓ, M.: «Museo abierto y territorio museo, nuevos conceptos para la interpretación territorial del patrimonio cultural», *Raining Stones. Interpretar el Patrimonio*, 2001. Recuperado de <https://manelmiro.com/2009/07/01/museo-abierto-y-territorio-museo-nuevos-conceptos-para-la-interpretacion-territorial-del-patrimonio-cultural/>
- MUMFORD, L.: *La ciudad en la historia*. Buenos Aires, Infinito, 1966 (original ed. of 1961).
- MURIEL, D.: «El modelo patrimonial. El patrimonio cultural como emergencia tardomoderna», *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, n.º 14 (1), 2016, pp. 181-192. Recovered from <http://www.pasosonline.org/articulos/download/file?fid=57.893>
- NOGUERA GIMÉNEZ, J.F.: «La conservación del patrimonio arquitectónico. Debates heredados del siglo XX», *Ars Longa. Cuadernos de Arte*, n.º 11, 2008, pp. 107-123. Recovered from <http://roderic.uv.es/bitstream/handle/10550/28204/107-123.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- ORTEGA VALCÁRCCEL, J.: «El patrimonio territorial. El territorio como recurso cultural y económico», *Ciudades. Revista del Instituto Universitario de Urbanística de la Universidad de Valladolid*, n.º 4, 1998, pp. 33-48.
- PADRÓ WERNER, J.: «Territorio y gestión creativa del patrimonio cultural y natural», *Abaco. Revista de Cultura y Ciencias Sociales*, n.º 34. 2002, pp. 55-60.
- PARCS NATURELS RÉGIONAUX DE FRANCE: *Questions-rèponses sur les Parcs naturels régionaux*, París: Parcs Naturels Régionaux de France. Recovered from <http://comebackgraphic.com/fb/pnr/questionsreponsesparcsnaturelsregionaux/>
- PEÑALBA LLUL, J.: «Evolución del concepto y de la significación social del patrimonio cultural», *Arte, Individuo y Sociedad*, n.º 17. 2005, pp. 175-204.
- PRATS, L.: «La mercantilización del patrimonio. Entre la economía turística y las representaciones identitarias», *PH Boletín del Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico*, n.º 58. 2006, pp. 72-80.
- PRATS, L.: «El patrimonio en tiempo de crisis», *Revista Andaluza de Antropología*, n.º 2. 2012, pp. 68-85. Recovered from <http://www.revistaandaluzadeantropologia.org/uploads/raa/n2/lprats.pdf>

- PULIDO, J.I.: «Turismo de naturaleza y sostenibilidad», *A Distancia*, n.º 21 (1). 2003, pp. 32-46.
- RIEGL, A.: *El culto moderno a los monumentos. Caracteres y origen*. Madrid, Visor, 1987, (original ed. of 1903).
- RIVIERE, G.H.: *La museología. Caracteres y origen*. Madrid, Akal, 1993.
- ROCH PEÑA, F.: «El territorio como recurso», *Ciudades. Revista del Instituto Universitario de Urbanística de la Universidad de Valladolid*, n.º 4, 1998, pp. 73-94.
- SABATÉ BEL, J.: «Paisajes culturales. El patrimonio como recurso básico para un nuevo modelo de desarrollo». *Urban*, n.º 9, 2004, pp. 8-29. Recovered from <http://polired.upm.es/index.php/urban/article/view/380/380>
- SILVA PÉREZ, R. Y FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS, V.: «El nuevo paradigma del patrimonio y su consideración con los paisajes. Conceptos, métodos y perspectivas», *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, n.º 63 (1), 2017 pp. 129-151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5565/rev/dag.344>
- SILVA PÉREZ, R.: «Landscape, heritage and territory. Some notes from the Spanish geographic perspective», In SPANISH COMMITTEE INTERNATIONAL GEOGRAPHICAL UNION (COORD.): «*Crisis, gobalization and social and territorial imbalances in Spain*». *Spanish Contribution to 33re IGC Beijing 2016*. Madrid: Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles, Instituto Geográfico Nacional & Gobierno de España, 2016, pp. 54-62.
- SITTE, C.: *Construcción de ciudades según principios artísticos*. Barcelona: Canosa, 1921 (original ed. of 1889).
- TROITIÑO VINUESA, M.A. & TROITIÑO TORRALBA, L.: «Patrimonio y turismo. Una complementariedad necesaria en un contexto de uso responsable del patrimonio y la cualificación de la visita», *Patrimonio Cultural de España*, n.º 3, 2010, pp. 89-107.
- VARINE-BOHAN, H.M.: «Le musée peut tuer ou... faire vivre», *Technique et Architecture*, n.º 326, 1979, pp. 82-83.
- UNESCO: *Reservas de biosfera. La Estrategia de Sevilla y el Marco Estatutario de la Red Mundial*. París: Unesco, 1996. Recovered from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001038/103849sb.pdf>
- VELASCO GONZÁLEZ, M.: «Gestión turística del patrimonio cultural. Enfoques para un desarrollo sostenible del turismo cultural», *Cuadernos de Turismo*, n.º 4, 2009, pp. 237-253. Recovered from <http://revistas.um.es/turismo/article/view/70121>

WINTER, T.: «Heritage tourism: the dawn of a new era?», In LAVADI, S. Y LONG, C. (eds.): *Heritage and Globalisation*, 2010. Londres: Taylor & Francis, pp. 117-129.

DOCUMENTS

COMITÉ DEL PATRIMONIO MUNDIAL: Guía Operativa para la Implementación de la Convención del Patrimonio Mundial, 1992. Recovered from <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide05-es.pdf>

CONSEJO DE EUROPA: Convenio Europeo del Paisaje, Florencia, Consejo de Europa, 2000. Recovered from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016802f3fbd>

ICOMOS: Carta Internacional para la Conservación de Ciudades Históricas y Áreas Urbanas Históricas (Carta de Washington 1987). Recovered from https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/towns_sp.pdf

ICOMOS: Carta de Itinerarios Culturales, 2008. Recovered from http://www.icomos.org/charters/culturalroutes_sp.pdf

ICOMOS: Principios de La Valeta para la salvaguardia y gestión de las poblaciones y áreas urbanas históricas, 2011. Recovered from http://www.culturante.pt/fotos/editor2/2011-principios_de_la_valette_para_a_salvaguarda_e_gestao_de_cidades_e_conjuntos_urbanos_historicos-icomos.pdf

INSTITUTO ESPAÑOL DEL PATRIMONIO CULTURAL: Plan Nacional de Paisaje Cultural, 2012. Recovered from http://ipce.mcu.es/pdfs/PLAN_NACIONAL_PAISAJE_CULTURAL.pdf

PRIMERA CONFERENCIA INTERNACIONAL DE ARQUITECTOS Y TÉCNICOS DE MONUMENTOS HISTÓRICOS: Carta de Atenas para la Restauración de Monumentos Históricas, 1931. Recovered from http://ipce.mcu.es/pdfs/1931_Carta_Atenas.pdf

UNESCO: Memorandum de Viena sobre el Patrimonio Mundial y la Arquitectura Contemporánea. Gestión del Paisaje Histórico Urbano, 2005. Recovered from <http://conservacion.inah.gob.mx/normativa/wp-content/uploads/Documento34.pdf>

UNESCO: Recomendación sobre el Paisaje Urbano Histórico, 2011. Recovered from http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL_ID=48857&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

UNESCO: Recomendación relativa a la Salvaguardia de los Conjuntos Históricos o Tradicionales y su Función en la Vida Contemporánea (Recomendación de Nairobi), 1976. Recovered from http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL_ID=13133&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

LEGISLATION

Ley 12/1997, de 3 de diciembre, de Parques Culturales de Aragón. Recovered from <http://benasque.aragob.es/cgi-bin/EBOA/BRSCGI?CMD=VEROBJ&MLKOB=586168333030>

Ley 14/2007, de 26 de noviembre, del Patrimonio Histórico de Andalucía. Recovered from <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/boja/2007/248/1>

Ley 42/2007, de 13 de diciembre, del Patrimonio Natural y de la Biodiversidad. Recovered from <https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2007-21490>