

Cultural Heritage Concept, Genealogy and Contemporary Challenges

Juliana Forero
Liangping Hong

School of Architecture and Urban Planning
Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n16p75

Abstract

This document aims to analyze the genealogy of the concept of cultural heritage from the Middle Ages to the twenty-first century, to establish the reason why it is still necessary to review and reconceptualize the way to understand the cultural heritage, where the material and immaterial aspects mutually interact according to its socio-cultural functions. The impacts of the market economy over the cultural heritage definition and management after the second part of the twentieth century make evident why cultural heritage preservation has to be redirected and redefined. It has to involve not only the communities' perspective and interests, but also different cultural heritage dynamics and understandings out the Eurocentric perspective that still rules heritage issues.

Key words: Cultural Heritage, Heritage Preservation, Market of Culture, Socio-cultural Dimensions, Heritage Management.

Introduction

It is clear that the concept of cultural heritage refers to the set of assets inherited from the past and directly related with the identity and memory of a specific culture in a specific territory (Querol, 2010). However, when it comes to cultural heritage is difficult to explain and understand why and how the interaction between the identity, memory and territory becomes one of the most important issues of the everyday life of the people.

The historical context where the concept of cultural heritage was born, its transformation during the history, and the way it has been allocated in different cultures, have created a permanent confusion about the central object of the cultural heritage preservation: what gives the significance to the cultural heritage: is it the artifact or the subject? What does it has to be protected: the object or the social significance of the heritage?

The general anthropological definition for culture refers to the spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize the human groups; it includes knowledge, beliefs, customs or any other capabilities acquired by humans to interact with the environment. During the history of the cultural heritage, its cultural connotation has been substantially ignored, even after the twentieth century when the social function of the cultural heritage was recognized. Although many organizations and experts have elaborated more precise theories and definitions considering its historical, social, material and immaterial aspects, in the practice the cultural heritage preservation have been focused on its material, economical and political values, almost ignoring the community component.

On the other hand, the rules or procedures for the management of the cultural heritage determined by the UNESCO and national governments, among other international organizations, seem to be enough guides to work on cultural heritage preservation aspects. Although it is true that those organizations have done a lot of efforts to normalize, standardize and organize when, how and why should be protected the cultural heritage, since cultural heritage corresponds to a particular expression of a particular culture, those regulations cannot be applied as universal parameters.

It is necessary to review where and when those policies and regulations were created, what for and under which cultural perspective. The concept of cultural heritage was born in Europe, into a historical moment that corresponded to that continent's history. Then it became a concept to understand the cultural expressions of other cultures but it has always been understood under the "western" cultural perspective, which differs from Eastern, south American and African ones (Choay, 2007; Ballart & Tesserrast, 2005).

In addition, the cultural heritage preservation has become more and more influenced by its economical value. The market economy and the cultural industry seem to rule the cultural heritage preservation goals. It has created a big gap between the cultural communities' interests and the economical interests over the preservation of the heritage. This is totally contradictory not only with the concept but also with the social function that it is supposed to have and to be protecting: the cultural identity.

These are the reasons why many communities do not really understand what does the cultural heritage means, how to identify it, why does it have to be protected and how to do it. Even before the discourse of cultural heritage, the communities already knew and understood which the bases of their cultural identity are, but they do not understand the need to make cultural heritage inventories and why are they useful. Specially, since the communities do find their cultural expressions interaction between the material and immaterial fields, they do not really understand why the cultural heritage distinguishes material and immaterial aspects (E. Sanchez, 2011).

This document aims to analyze the genealogy of the concept of cultural heritage to finally establish why it is necessary to understand the cultural heritage in a much more comprehensive way where the material and immaterial aspects mutually interact. Their preservation should really involve the communities perspective and interests, even if they do not corresponds to the cultural heritage economical values and interests. This preservation processes should be more consistent while protecting the identity of a culture and a territory, not only for the immaterial cultural heritage, but also for the material one.

Transformations of the Cultural Heritage Concept

The birth of the concept cultural heritage, as we understand it today, is a twentieth century social construction, but it was incubated since the fifteenth century. Even before the cultural heritage was in fact called cultural heritage, the monuments and works of art out of the daily life of the ordinary people, became the bases for what later would be cultural heritage. Only, until the second part of the twentieth century, the notion of the context was introduced and so, the second stage of the cultural heritage concept history started. Nevertheless, in the contemporary way of treatment, preservation and conservation of cultural heritage, is still present the perspective of the centuries before.

From the Middle Ages to the twenty-first century, passing through the Renaissance, Baroque Period, the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, there have been many

different perspectives of what have been understood as cultural heritage. Each of these western historical periods contributes to what is nowadays defining as cultural and historical heritage in a formal way (Querol, 2010; Macarrón, 2008). It is important to notice that the predominant history of the cultural heritage has never included the Eastern social and cultural processes related with the evolution of that concept during the history.

From the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment Period

During the Middle Ages the scholars considered the ancient world was impenetrable because of the big damages, destructions and modifications to its monuments, constructions and works of art. The ancient Visigoth Churches were first transformed into Mosques and then turned to Christian Churches and cathedrals (Macarrón, 2008). The religious icons, monuments and objects were substituted or repainted. Independently of the knowledge and value they had, those were immediately assimilated by the religious practices of the church in charge, without the establishments of any symbolic differences that this could have bring into a historical perspective. Preservation activities were just for a practical reutilization of the buildings or its parts (Choay, 2007).

Later, in the Renaissance Period the new vision of the universe, deity and the anthropocentric culture, along with the development of the sciences promote new ways to understand and treat the antique creations, buildings and works of art. The incipient taste of the Greco-Roman antiquities was a very important base for the cultural heritage concept construction (Ballart & Tresserras, 2005). However, the value of those antiques was not based on its historical relations; it was based on the exposition of a superior civilization that the Greek constructed (Choay, 2007).

The cultural heritage started to be link not only to the pleasure of the art itself, but also with the notion of prestige. Anyhow, the historical values of the objects were still not considering an argument for the preservation projects (Choay, 2007; Rivera, 2003). However, under the name of "antiques" the "historical monument" notion was born; Three centuries later the antiques were named historical monuments (Choay, 2007).

This term was also characterized by the origin of the Archeology and the collecting boom, caused by the Greco-Roman inheritance. Also, the discovery of the New World brought the firsts ethnological recompilations, folk objects and the "peculiar" indigenous productions (Macarrón, 2008). It contributed to the first conceptualization of the History as a discipline, and the art as an autonomous activity. Later the notion of historical monument linked the history and the art together (Choay 2007; Macarrón, 2008).

Into this context the antique buildings obtained a new value: they became the testimony of an ended past. The sculptors and architects started to be consider the ones that discover the classical art and the testimony of the "evidence of the great man" of the history.

The Renaissance conservation was full of contradictions. The destructions and reutilizations of the materials found in antique monuments and paintings were used to construct or decorate other places without any criteria. In this environment of grandeur and luxury aesthetic, but also plundering, measures and regulations became necessary for the preservation of the ancient buildings (Macarrón, 2008).

The Popes started to be in charge of the conservation of the antiques. Nevertheless, although the conservation processes were supposed to be modern and objective, those were full of plundering and crippling. The Popes who were showing interest in the conservation of the antique buildings were also involved into the Roma's devastation and its antiques. The historical

monuments never stopped of being used as supply portfolios of the new constructions of the Popes (Choay, 2007).

At the same time, during this period of the history the notion of museum also started to be shaped. Some authors argue that at that time the concept museum was used for the first time, others consider that this happened few centuries later. It is true that the collecting practices distinguish by its private and secular character, resulted in a variety of types of spaces and concepts for the treatment of the antique's collections, however that prefigured some of the future museums (Ballart & Tresserras, 2005; Choay, 2007).

Within Renaissance in Rome there were three principal perspectives around the cultural heritage: historical, artistic and one related with the conservation. Those contributed to the emergence of a new idea of what later was called historical monument. At this period it was still limited to a reduced audience composed by a minority of scholars, artists and princes (Choay, 2007).

Years later, during the Baroque Period the European scholars did not stop enriching the notion of antiques. They explored new places with vestige in Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor making an inventory of the ruins in Rome and Greece. They created the category "National Antiques" and the conservation of painting, sculptures and antique objects was institutionalized, preparing the subsequent architectural monuments concept. All of these actions constituted an enormous effort for the conceptualization and inventory of the antiques. The experts dedicated to these processes of meticulous and patient investigations were called "Antique Dealer".

For the antique dealers the bases of the testimony of the history were the collections of material productions of the civilization. The historical buildings became a very important tool for them. The monuments of the architecture became particularly rich sources of information (Choay, 2007).

The concept of "National Antiques" opened a new field to inventory. The professional specialization for the antiques' conservation and restoration became activities with its own character, accompanied by research, experimentation and theoretical and practical discussions. The museums and the academies were created (Macarrón, 2008). The Enlightenment antique dealers started to distinguish between the real monuments and figurative monuments. For them what matter were the object itself and not its destiny.

Further, the Enlightenment scholars brought up the natural sciences approach for the analysis of the antiques: they propose the same controllable type of description and so reliable, which gave the antique dealers its prominence during this period. It also brought another important characteristic of this time related with the treatment and conception of the later called cultural heritage: the dependence over the illustrators, not the painters; the first ones were supposed to be more precise, the second ones had other techniques that could not guarantee the precision of the antique's descriptions (Choay, 2007).

The democratization of the knowledge that characterized the Enlightenment was also related with the antiques treatment and understanding (Choay, 2007). The ideal of the democratization of knowledge and making it accessible to everyone was done by the replacement of the documents to the real objects. It was done through the model of museums and literature of arts. Nonetheless, for the historical monuments it was the starting of a predatory fragmentation, which were used to enrich the private and public collections, not the democratization process. This gave an incentive to a form of leisure that still did not have the name of tourism, but that had an effect on the conservation of historical buildings.

French Revolution

The French Revolution contribution to the historical buildings and monuments preservation history was the step from the theory to the action. The abstract iconographic conservation of the antique dealers became real and practical, with the bases for the legal and technical devices for its preservation.

These contributions were possible because of two main factors: 1. Was the first time the historical buildings, monuments and antiques of the clergy, the Crown and the emigrants were transfer to the Nation. 2. The new ideology of government: from this time it was not only about the conservation of an object, it was also about the wealth and the diversity that the Nation has, it was about the national responsibility of its conservation (Choay, 2007; Macarrón, 2008).

These treasures given to the Nation had economical value to designate which should be this value, the metaphor of heritage was immediately adopted. The key terms used were: inheritance, heritage, succession, patrimony and conservation. Terms that transformed national antique's status. The antiques turned to exchange values, in material possessions that had to be preserve and kept to prevent a financial crisis.

Nevertheless, the knowledge about the heritage was still exclusively in hands of the minority, the role of the antique dealers and its conservative perspective still ruled. Besides, the knowledge and the perspective around the national art, the criteria for the selection and the technique to treat the historical constructed architecture and works of art still were not done. The immovable goods (churches, castles, residences, etc.) presented also other kind of problems that the revolutionists were not prepared to solve: 1. the commissions did not have technical and economical infrastructure for the maintenance of the buildings; 2. it was necessary to bring new uses for the buildings that have lost their original destiny. The demolition of some historical buildings during that time was the way to express the rejection of clergy, monarchy and feudalism powers, values and emblems already obsolete (Choay, 2007).

During that period, the historical monuments were liberated from any ideological or stylistic restriction. From that time its theoretical or virtual corpus covers not only the Greco-roman antiques that were already recognized as historical monuments, but also the national antiques (Celtics, intermediary or Gothic) and the classic and neoclassic architectural constructions. Also some specific values were given to the historical monuments: national, cognitive, economical and artistic (Choay 2007; Macarrón, 2008).

After 1989 all the elements required for an authentic conservation of historical heritage policy seem to be collected. The creation of term "historical monument" became the corpus for the inventory and the legal devices. The concept of heritage was affected for a strong economical connotation that contributed to its ambivalence. At the same time, the notion of historical monument was still imprecise for a great majority of people during some decades. Further, the history of the architecture was still almost nonexistent, and either, there were no analysis criteria that will allowed the systematic treatment required for the buildings that had to be conserved (Choay, 2007).

Industrial Revolution

The industrial revolution divided the society history and its context in two parts: before and after. It happened also with the concept of cultural heritage and its components.

During the nineteenth century was introduced the new status for the antiques, referred to the hierarchy of the historical monuments' values, its space-time surroundings, its legal status and its technical treatment. The industrial era contributed to reverse the values attributed to the historical monuments giving the prevailing aesthetic values, while virtually it was given the universal meaning to the historical monuments concept. The decade of 1820 breaks with the antiques and the French revolution perspective (Choay, 2007; Macarrón, 2008).

The antique dealers were replaced by the art historians, who consider the antique architecture the object of a systematic investigation, paying attention to its chronology, technique, morphology, genesis, sources; as well as its decorations, frescos, sculptures, glassworks and iconography. The historical monuments and buildings became counterpoint of the natural, rural or urban panorama, and its value were based on contrast with the landscape (Choay, 2007; Macarrón, 2008).

The historical monuments were assigned to the past. They became a past that no longer stays in the present as it has no future. This crack time inscribed the historical monuments into the infinitive past. The industry replaced the art. The architecture history was divided into two categories: traditional architecture and modern architecture. Since then the architecture became the link between the past and the identity of a society, the domestic architecture and the urban complexes started to be recognized as historical architecture. The architecture started to be an active integrant of a new monument: the antique urban complex (Choay, 2007).

The historical monuments became an obstacle for the modernization and its demolition became a need for the new urbanization processes. The maintenance of the antique buildings was almost forgotten. In the nineteenth century the preservation and conservation of the heritage to be efficient needed the creation and recognition of the preservation law and conservation as a discipline (Choay, 2007).

Since the conservation and restoration of the historical buildings required specific knowledge, the nineteenth century invented the "architects of the historical monuments". They were educated for the understanding of art history, construction history and the scientific and technical terms related to the materials (Choay, 2007; Macarrón, 2008).

Twentieth Century

The most important contribution of the twentieth century to the cultural heritage concept was the inclusion of the social function of the cultural heritage as one of the categories of analysis. The historical monument started to be treated as a social and philosophical object. The monument was linked not only the history but also to the interpretation of the history its socio-identity processes.

The historical monument and the monument concepts started to be distinguished. The historical monument was defined according to its historical values, which made possible its inventory and nomenclature, recognizing two new values: remembrance and contemporaneity.

During the articulation of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, the historical monuments conservation reached the status of discipline. Later, in 1931 was celebrated the First Historical Monuments International Conference, opening the debate about the historical monuments and the city relationship. After this meeting the Athens Charter was elaborated, bringing up very new conceptions about the historical monuments. Nevertheless, these conceptions received a limited diffusion as the participants of this forum were only European countries (Choay, 2007). Still, nowadays one of the most important problems for the cultural heritage preservation is that the international laws are based on the European legal system, without including other

traditions (IAPH, 2003). In other words, the cultural heritage issues are still understood under a Eurocentric perspective.

However, until the decade of the 1960's the conservation of the historical monuments was still focused only in the big religious and civil buildings. After that decade, the historical monuments constitute just one part more of the historical heritage that a society has constructed (Choay, 2007). During the 1960's the cultural heritage concept was reformulated to be based on the concept of culture, it means the history as the only category to understand the heritage was replaced by other one much more complex and that changed the nature and the sense of the cultural heritage (IAPH, 2003).

Since the culture category identifies the way the individuals and groups live, what a human been is, what it was, what have been forgotten and what would it be, during the decades of the 1960's and 1970's, the heritage stopped being only related to individual buildings and started to include groups of buildings and urban fabric: blocks and neighborhoods, villages, complete cities and even sets of cities (Choay, 2007; IAPH, 2003; Unesco, 2011). The industrial archaeology and the Modern Movement architecture also became part of the memory related to the cultural heritage, as well as the notion of cultural landscape, recognizing the interaction of a community with its environment (Rivera, 2003).

During the second part of the twentieth century the conservation of the cultural heritage some other changes occurred. The notion of cultural and artistic heritage was included as well as the notion of natural heritage. Also, were consolidated the international organization for the preservation of the heritage and along with it, the regulations for the cultural heritage preservation in national and international levels were increased.

The last decades of the twentieth century were characterized by the cultural sustainability emerging needs. With it, the cultural heritage became an important tool for the development processes and policies all around the world. It was taken as a tool for the social, cultural and economical development, and at the same time, as a social cohesion instrument. What it the cultural heritage also became an important resource for the identity territorialisation into a globalization process (IAPH, 2003).

However, the theoretical and practical research about the relation between sustainable development and cultural heritage is still short (Van Der Hammen, Lulle & Palacio, 2009). Most of the emphasis about are focus on technical issues related with the degradation or damage that the urban cultural heritage can suffer from the climate change or other phenomenon related, or related to sustainable tourism. Other investigation, in spite of recognizing the cultural heritage as a social well-being, reduce the cultural heritage to the built heritage, and the method use to identify and preserve it reduce the cultural heritage to a list of monuments, buildings and conservation areas (Tweed & Sutherland, 2007).

On the other hand, along the first half of the twentieth century in a postwar world and decolonization period, the UNESCO and other international organizations started to work for the recognition of the variety of cultural identities, practices and traditions, to finally declare Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003). Nevertheless, it brought a radical division between the material and immaterial component of the cultural heritage, and with it its identification became confusing for the communities. This division also corresponded to the Eurocentric understanding of the cultural heritage, where the buildings, monuments and works of art seem to be a part of the human being experiences in the space, in the history and in the memory and identity of the heritage (Choay, 2007; Ballart & Tesserras, 2005).

As a result, the Spirit of the Place perspective for the comprehension of the cultural heritage started to emerge, trying to understand the heritage from an integral perspective without dividing or classifying the heritage and involving the community into the cultural heritage preservation practices. Although the Spirit of the Place has not been theorized in depth, it started to be developed and applied through some international conventions, charters and declaration inspired on the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (1979) This has been the only cultural heritage category approximation to the different cultures realities, besides the western ones.

The Invention of the Urban Heritage

Why did the urban heritage have to wait so long to be equally considered as a conservation objet nondeductible from the historical monuments? There are two principal reasons: 1. The city definition and the framework for its study were not so clear until the twentieth century. 2. The absence of cartographic documents before the nineteenth century and the difficulty to find archives related to the production and transformations of the urban space in the time. In the same context, the history of architecture forgot about the city and its historical expressions (Choay, 2007; Macarrón, 2008).

The conversion of the city as an object of historical knowledge was caused by the transformation of the urban space during the French Revolution. The notion Urban Heritage came up into the adverse context of the urbanization. The historical city was conceived as a strange object, fragile and valuable for the art and the history, and as the same objects for exhibitions in the museums, so the experts considered it had to be taken out of the life circuit. As a consequence it brought a big contradiction: while the historical city is transformed in historical, the city loses its historicity (Choay, 2007).

How to conserve and take out of the life circuit those historical urban fragments without depriving them of its activities and habitants? This problem was set out after the II world war.

Gustavo Giovannoni was the first one who talked about urban heritage. He was the first who gave the antique urban complexes value of use and value of museum, integrating them into a general conception of territorial planning. This implied a new model of conservation of the historical urban complexes for the history, for the art and for the present (Choay, 2007).

Under this approach the historical city itself became a monument, but at the same time a living fabric. Giovanonni funded the doctrine of the restoration and conservation of the urban heritage, resumed in three principles: the urban heritage has to be integrated to the urban, local, regional plan. 2. The historical monument concept is not only related to a single and isolated building. It corresponded to urban dialectic and cannot be disconnected from that; also, for the first time it was recognized the spirit (historical) of the places, materialized in the special configurations. 3. The urban heritage requires procedures for its preservation and restoration as the monuments does.

Cultural Industry and the Cultural Heritage

The second part of the twentieth century was characterized by the emergence of the cultural industry. Edgar Morin defined the modern times culture according to the Mass Culture phenomenon, where the peoples behaviors homogenization is the principal social process, based on the consumerism and pragmatism. In this context, the cultural heritage is an object for use and consumption (Ballart & Tesserras, 2005).

In this context, the market of the culture made the cultural heritage one more of its objects for use and consume. The heritage became part of the regular consumer demand of the contemporary societies, as well as part of education, leisure and tourism. The recognition of the cultural heritage as a resource brought much more extended conscious of its richness but also of its vulnerability.

In this context, the occidental values became the contributors to the ecumenical cultural heritage practices. This expansion was symbolized by the "Convention Concerning the Preservation of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage" adopted by UNESCO in 1972 (Choay, 2007), which define the cultural heritage according to the western classification of the antiques and architecture recognized centuries before only in Europe: monuments, groups of buildings and sites. In this convention the heritage can be recognize when it is "*of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science*". But, who define these "universal values"? Where are located the recognized academies of history, arts and sciences?. Under this light, who define what is and what is not cultural heritage?

Whit this convention the universal system of thought and western values on cultural heritage issues were proclaimed. Since that convention, the relation between the cultural industry and the cultural heritage started to be also characterized by the universalization of the western – European values system all around the world. The monument, the historical city and the urban and architectural heritage express the way the western societies have assumed its own temporal and identity relationship (Choay, 2007).

On the same line, the cultural industry and cultural consume took up again the big knowledge democratization project inherit from the Enlightenment Period, based on the eradication of the differences and its most representative phenomenon the historical monuments audience. The privileges of enjoyment and leisure time, and its correlative, cultural tourism became the most significant mass culture consumer's call (Choay, 2007; Ballart & Tesserras, 2005).

The monuments and the historical heritage acquire a double status: first as knowledge and pleasure works dispensing available to everyone; and also as cultural manufactured product, packed and spread due to its consume. Thanks to the cultural industry, the cultural heritage value becomes also an economical value (Choay, 2007). Now purpose for the cultural and historical heritage preservation is directly related to the private and public sector incomes growth.

With it, the new trends on cultural heritage are composed by its valorization and its integration to the contemporary life. The valorization trend is not referring any more to the values of the heritage itself. Refer to the values of the heritage capital gain. Off course the importance of the monument is still taken into account, but mainly the economical connotation leads its valorization. This new trend is now under the profitability signal, which has been developed with the aim to valorize the cultural heritage: conservation and restoration, staging, animation and modernization of the heritage into a valuable exchange and its presentation (Choay, 2007; Ballart & Tesserras, 2005).

The integration in the contemporary trends refers to the reutilization of the places. This is one of the most audacious and difficult ways for cultural heritage valorization. It is about the reintroduction of the monument into the live circuit uses of the city. The industrial and preindustrial architecture, the cities and historic areas are part of this process. The social value of the historic cities and areas developed into real state and touristic interests, which with difficulty can correspond to any social aspect.

Since then, the re-appropriation and revalorization of the historic cities and historic city areas have become the flag of many nations. But this covers a lot of interventions over the cultural heritage to make it a cultural consumable product. In other words, though the cultural heritage

discourse the city is reused for economical benefits. The industry of cultural consume have prepared the procedures of packing of the historic centers and historical complexes ready for the cultural consume. The city is put on stage: illuminate, clean and makeup for its media image. The historical cities and historic areas of the city are full of graphics signage and guidance, but also of colorful stereotypes like alleys, squares, paved and tiled walkways in an antique style, etc. Besides, there are outdoor leisure stereotype places like coffee shops, art crafts shops and restaurants, among others. All of these things to improve the economical benefits of the cultural heritage through the cultural tourism (Choay, 2007; Ballar, 2005).

The government's laws and conventions for the preservation of the cultural heritage are justified by the economical inputs of the cultural activities related to the heritage. This situation became a subject for discussion not only in national level, but also in an international level. Since the second part of the twentieth century international organizations like OEA, UNESCO, European Council, ICOMOS, OMT, among others, through conventions, charters and laws, s recognized the economical value of the cultural heritage. These documents highlight the evolution of the cultural heritage concept during the last sixty years which have been expanded but also link more and more to the economical interest of the market, still based under the western- European logic (IAPH, 2003).

Cultural Heritage new needs and challenges

In the history of the cultural heritage, the cultural notion and its social function may have been included into the cultural heritage discourses but not into its practices. Nowadays there are more and more conventions, charters and declarations where the socio-cultural aspects of the heritage are recognized, but at the same time those regulations also give priority not only to the material but also to the economical value of the heritage, which place the communities' interests apart.

Besides, since the cultural industry, directly or indirectly, represents an important part of the countries income, the valorization of the cultural heritage became an important corporation. Nonetheless, there are clear sides and negative effects over the cultural heritage: the exclusion of the socio-cultural dimensions of the cultural heritage, like for example the exclusion of the residents and along with it their traditional and daily activities. According to the cultural industry, how does the urban heritage should be understood? Where are the places for the traditional residential activities and the community services (small commerce, schools, medical centers, etc)? When the social demand is a priority?

All of these circumstances and gaps between the theory and the practice of the cultural heritage concept and its regulations show how necessary it is to reconceptualize and reevaluate the heritage concept. It is imperative to generate new definition, regulations and conventions with non-Eurocentric and socially sustainable perspectives. In other words, it is time to look at the ways the cultural heritage has been understood, practice and developed in other cultures different from the European ones, to construct more democratic and multicultural understandings of such a cultural category.

The concept of cultural heritage should become a way to recognize the processes of social cohesion and cultural identity consolidation of the communities and the communities' interests for the understanding of the management and performance of cultural and social development processes, according to each culture's particularity. This would bring new challenges: the capacity for the design of new cultural heritage management models that could include a comprehensive and inclusive understanding of the cultural heritage, which in the practice really involves the social

and cultural functions. Although over the last decades new appreciations of the cultural heritage have emerged, the traditional model established since the Enlightenment Period is still ruling.

The new models for cultural heritage management have to represent the contemporary society, not only the economical dimensions, but mostly the social and cultural. These models have to preserve and interpret the cultural significance of the place where the cultural heritage is present, its aesthetic, historical, social and spiritual values, as well as the community of the place and their continuous daily life. And the most important, is time to recognize the particularities of the culture and the identity without having the western economic and cultural system values as the only lenses for understanding the cultural heritage.

References

- Aguirre, Amanor. (2008). "Nuevas ideas de arte y cultura para nuevas perspectivas en la difusión del patrimonio". En: Aguirre, Amanol, Olaila Fontal, Bernard Darras & René Rickenmann. *El acceso al patrimonio cultural. Retos y debates* (pag. 67-118). Navarra: Universidad Pública Navarra.
- Ballart Hernández, Josep & Jordi Juan i Tresserras. (2005). *Gestión del Patrimonio Cultural*. Madrid: Ariel.
- Choay, Françoise. (2007). *Alegoría del patrimonio*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gill.
- Fontal, Olaia. (2008). "Hacia una educación artística patrimonial". En: Aguirre, Imanol, Olaia Fontal, Bernard Darras & René Rickenma. *El acceso al patrimonio cultural. Retos y debates* (pag. 31- 66). Navarra: Universidad Pública de Navarra.
- IAPH - Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico. (2003). *Repertorio de textos internacionales del patrimonio histórico*. Sevilla: Junta de Anda Lucía – Consejería de Cultura- Editorial Comares.
- Macarrón, Ana. *Conservación del patrimonio cultural: criterios y normativas*. Editorial Síntesis. Madrid, 2008.
- Querol, María Ángeles. (2010). *Manual de gestión del patrimonio*. Madrid: Akal.
- Rivera Blanco, Javier. (2003). *Nuevas tendencias en la identificación y conservación del patrimonio*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Tweed, Christopher and Margaret Sutherland. (2007). *Built Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Urban Development*. United Kingdom: School of Planning, Architecture and Civil Engineering, Queen's University Belfast.
- UNESCO
(1972) "Convention Concerning the Preservation of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage" Adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session Paris, 16 November 1972. Obtained on Internet in October 16th, 2011 from the UNESCO official Web Page: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext>
(2011). List of World Heritage Sites. Obtained on Internet in October 16th, 2011 from the UNESCO official Web Page: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>
- Van Der Hammen, María Clara , Thierry Lulle y Dolly Cristina Palacio. (2009) "La construcción del patrimonio como lugar: un estudio de caso en Bogotá". En. *Revista Antípoda*. No. 8, 61-85.