

CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 21ST CENTURY: TENDENCIES, CHALLENGES AND HOPES. EFFECTS ON MONUMENTAL RESTORATION

JOSÉ CASTILLO RUIZ*

Abstract: we must understand architectural restoration as an activity within the set of actions that made up the safeguarding of national heritage, so it is essential to turn to it when properly evaluating the tendencies in present time restoration. This is the task of our work. For this reason we have focused on those aspects in the safeguarding we consider more relevant now, for either being the signs that lead the future path (tendencies), or for constituting important challenges to overpass (challenges) or, finally, for generating illusion (hopes).

Key words: Historical Heritage. Protection. Listed Cultural Properties. Restoration. Citizen Engagement.

1. INTRODUCTION. THE LEGITIMACY OF THE CRITERIA FOR RESTORATION ESTABLISHED BY SAFEGUARDING

As Antoni González states, architectural restoration is a simultaneously technical, scientific, creative and social discipline¹, which explains the succession throughout history of so many theoretical and methodological alignments, as many as present times (in Cesari Brandi's words) have been recognized and judged in the monuments. However, this historical quality in restoration cannot be mistaken as autonomy or scientific independence (despite of its being a constant ambition), because restoration is but an evaluating and performing process on the contents and meanings of specific cultural properties, the architectural heritage (or the monuments), hence its contribution to this recognition cannot be detached from

* Professor of History of Art. University of Granada. jcastill@ugr.es

1 GONZÁLEZ MORENO-NAVARRO, A., *La restauración objetiva (método SCCM de restauración monumental)*, Barcelona, Diputación, 1999, p. 12.

that globally made by the monuments' proper discipline², the safeguarding of historical heritage³.

To clarify the principles, aims or drives that sustain monumental restoration in the first decades of the 21st century cannot be achieved without turning into those that characterize, in a general way, the safeguarding of cultural properties. However, it is very difficult to introduce in a briefly way a general scope of it, hence our option to focus on those aspects we consider more relevant today, for either being the signs that lead the future path (tendencies), or constituting important challenges to overpass (challenges) or, finally, generating illusion (hopes).

Before that, we want to mention a principle we consider absolute due to this interweaving and/or subordination of restoration to safeguarding: the legitimacy of the principles (intervention rules or criteria) instituted by the protection (compulsory regulations established in national and international levels) to architectural restoration. Those established in the different *Cartas del restauro*, as those incorporated in the different national legislations, should be obeyed not as the interferences of the legislator in any scientific field but as the establishment of a set of rules considered inherent to Historical Heritage Safeguarding. We mean principles such as authenticity, respect to historical truth or the need to pass cultural properties to future generations, and which have in restoration criteria such as the prohibition of reconstructions, distinction between the old and the new, defense of historical additions or the use of compatible materials, their technical transcription.

So, it is under the perspective of the defense of general interest (which is underlying in the principles of the safeguarding) that we must obey the restoration criteria legally set up, which, besides, allows citizens to claim for its fulfillment in those cases (unfortunately too many) in which the decisions made by professionals and institutions are clearly detrimental to the preservation of monument values.

2. TENDENCIES. THE NEW EMERGING (AND FRINGE) HERITAGES

The safeguarding of Historical Heritage is, besides a scientific practice, a discipline solidly laid down with a long historical development, which has been

2 CASTILLO RUIZ, J. "Los fundamentos de la protección: el efecto desintegrador producido por la consideración del patrimonio histórico como factor de desarrollo", in *Patrimonio Cultural y Derecho*, n.º 8, 2004, pp. 11-36.

3 We demand in this text the use of Historical Heritage, since we understand that the scope of tangible or intangible properties under the concept of culture (which justifies the general using of the term Cultural Heritage) perfectly fits the concept of history, even from a historic point of view (past or recent), which is the unavoidable essence of Heritage (be it called Historical or Cultural).

provided with a solid and stable theoretical, scientific and methodological corpus. However, as any other social disciplines, it is related to history, so its solidity and stability is not incompatible with changes or its evolution.

The safeguarding scope where we find a further degree of evolution and innovation is the concept of Historical Heritage, which, following a constant line throughout its history does not stop enlarging itself, giving room to new values or unlisted properties. Nowadays, there are two aspects that better define this evolution of the concept of Historical Heritage:

- *The merging or interrelation of heritage categories of different nature and value (natural and cultural, material and intangible properties) in a given territorial area.* In order to formulate and typify this merging of patrimonial masses, different concepts are being established. Some concepts, the fewer, with the holistic intention of identifying the set of properties to be listed: here we may use concepts such as Heritage (without adjectives), territorial heritage⁴ and, to a lesser extent, landscape⁵. And other concepts, the more, to include new kinds of regional properties, such as Cultural Landscape (and the derivations that, typified in some way, emerge: Historical Urban Landscape, Rural Landscape, Industrial Landscape), Cultural Route, Heritage Zone, Historical Site, etc.
- *The acknowledgement of new values and kinds of properties.* Although the number of values incorporated to Historical Heritage in the last years is quite large (landscape, industrial, technological, linguistic, audiovisual, etc), the following two groups are the most relevant in this important expansion of values and properties: Intangible Heritage, whose powerful rush into the field of protection may be regarded as a real revolution of unknown effects on the basis of Historical Heritage. And properties related to human activities: to the already accepted Industrial Heritage we must add many others in progress of legal establishment: Agrarian, Mining, Education, Military and

4 It is in the administrative and historiographic fields (not so often in international legislation) that we find many reflections and proposals on these concepts. We underline in this respect: ORTEGA VALCÁRCCEL, J., “El patrimonio territorial: El territorio como recurso cultural y económico”, in *Ciudades: Revista del Instituto Universitario de Urbanística de la Universidad de Valladolid*, n.º 4, 1998, p. 33-48; MARTÍNEZ YÁÑEZ, C., “Patrimonialización del territorio y territorialización del patrimonio”, in *Cuadernos de Arte de la Universidad de Granada*, n.º 39, 2008, p. 251-266; ÁLVAREZ MORA, A., (Dir.), *Patrimonio y Territorio*, Valladolid, Instituto de Urbanística de la Universidad, 1998; VERDUGO SANTOS, J., “El territorio como fundamento de una nueva retórica de los bienes culturales”, in *PH, Boletín del Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico*, 53, 2005, p. 95.

5 I would like to mention two editions out of the large bibliography in this field: ZOIDO NARANJO, F., “El paisaje un concepto útil para relacionar estética, ética y política”, in *Scripta Nova*, Vol. XVI, n.º 407, July 10th 2012, pp. 1-19. Available in <http://www.ub.es/geocrit/sn/sn-407.htm> (consulting date July 22nd 2013) and MATA OLMO, R., “La dimensión patrimonial del paisaje. Una mirada desde los espacios rurales”, in MADERUELO, J., (Dir.), *Paisaje y Patrimonio*, Madrid, CDAN, Abada Editores, 2010, p. 31-73.

University Heritage⁶, etc. Although to a lesser extent, the consequences in the safeguarding derived from the incorporation of these properties will also be important.

One of the most clearly noted effects of these tendencies in the evolution of the concept of Historical Heritage is the confusion and controversy generated around the criteria used to list a given property. This confusion proceeds in different ways:

— In the regional dimension⁷. The increasingly important inclusion of the regional dimension of the Historical Heritage is posing many questions about the criteria used for its formal identification and valuation, a confusion extending into protection itself. We can identify many problematic situations.

The first one is the confrontation generated between the vague model of protection (and heritage recognition) established by the instruments for regional planning (guaranteed by the 2000 European Landscape Convention)⁸, and the model derived from Historical Heritage laws, based on the listing of particular regional properties by entities such as Cultural Landscape or, in the case of Andalucía, the Heritage Zones, and, generally speaking, to the maximum protective level, Cultural property (Bien de Interés Cultural).

The second one, is the difficulty we find to delimit the regional listed properties. Although this delimitation should not pose major problems, from the point of view of the regional cultural evaluation, the imposition of a sharp and powerful protection program derived from the listing as Asset of Cultural Interest imply to reconsider the criteria in order to minimize the listing effects, reducing the limits to their maximum, which means to subvert the essence of regional properties.

6 We would like to contribute, as an example, the definition of Agrarian Heritage we have elaborated in the Pago Project (being us its main researchers) and established in the so called Charter of Baeza on Agrarian Heritage. "Agrarian Heritage consists on the set of natural and cultural, material and intangible properties, generated by or used for the agrarian activity throughout its history. From this definition on the number and variety of goods which may be considered Agrarian Heritage is very ample. We may distinguish—following the traditional classification of properties used in the heritage regulations— between movable properties (tools and implements used for farming, transportation, storage and production of cattle and harvests, documents and bibliographic objects, etc), singular immovable property (building elements considered in a singular way: farmhouses, orchards, centers for agrarian transformation, barns, fences, threshing floors, etc), lineal immovable property (landscapes, rural settlements, irrigation systems, singular rural ecosystems, livestock trails, roads, etc), intangible culture (linguistics, belief, rituals, festivities, knowledge, gastronomy and culinary culture, handicraft techniques, living treasures, etc.) and general heritage (local varieties of crops, native animal breeds, soils, seeds, vegetation, wild animals, etc)". CASTILLO RUIZ, J., (dir.), *La Carta de Baeza sobre Patrimonio Agrario*, Sevilla, UNIA, 2013 (published).

7 CASTILLO RUIZ, J., "La dimensión territorial del Patrimonio Histórico", in CASTILLO RUIZ, J., CEJUDO GARCÍA, E. y ORTEGA RUIZ, A. (eds.), *Patrimonio histórico y desarrollo territorial*, Sevilla, UNIA, 2009, p. 26-48.

8 ZOIDO NARANJO, F., "El paisaje y su utilidad para la ordenación del territorio", in ZOIDO, F. y VENEGAS, C. (coord.), *Paisaje y Ordenación del Territorio*, Sevilla, Consejería de Obras Públicas y Transportes y Fundación Duques de Soria, 2002.

The last controversial question related to this regional dimension is the confusion between regional properties with a safeguarding and objective character, and properties with an instrumental and relevant character. It usually happens to cultural tracks or regional heritage management, where the listing depends on *ad hoc* issues (property, tourist resources, political party in power, urban pressure, etc), and are generally linked to the creation of cultural tourism products or management systems economically or politically viable.

- In the temporal dimension. One of the ways to expand the concept of Historical Heritage is through the increasing approach of its boundaries to the present. This is the case of industrial heritage, contemporary architecture and, above all, of all heritages linked to popular culture or those considered living treasures (including those before mentioned). In this case, its unavoidable constant reenactments in present times throw great confusion into the temporal limits of Historical Heritage. Once the abstract but very objective (and legally secured) limits of antiquity has been overcome (50, 60 or 100 years), it is essential that other limits are established in order to objectify the heritage practice. From our point of view the criteria to clarify these temporal limits should be the following:
 - Distinction between past and present⁹. There must be a significant rupture between the original context of the property and the present time. This rupture may be of a very different kind: to abandon or to radically change its use, functional, material, or technological obsolescence, irreversible modification of the urban or legal situation, definite loss of the associated ideological connotations, etc.
 - The existence of serious danger of destruction or deterioration.
 - Social recognition of the property's relevance.
 - The compliance to the ethic principles of today we will further comment.
- In the ethical dimension. Up to the bursting of Intangible Cultural Heritage, the Historical Heritage was determined by two factors that did not allow to express historical or ethical judgments: the past condition (which subdued the History qualification to the relativity of the historical time in which the property took place) and its prevailing tangible nature (which reduced its evaluation to material, technical or artistic criteria). However, with the emergence of intangible properties, together with many others that are stretching

9 As Françoise Choay states, the Historical Heritage is "...made up of the continuous accumulation of a variety of objects grouped according to their common belonging to the past". CHOAY, F., *Alegoría del Patrimonio*. Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 2007, p. 7

the limits of Historical Heritage, this ethical dimension appears under many other dimensions. We underline the most important ones:

- Acknowledgement for cultural diversity¹⁰. Although it is actually a development in the already acknowledged cultural rights, the international society wishes in this case to defend cultures and social groups threatened by social, economic and cultural globalization, hence its ethical attitude.
- Defense of sustainable development. In this sense, the attitude towards those cultural properties related to human activities with a great environmental impact is very interesting and controversial. Should mining, industrial, agrarian or fishing practices (infrastructures as well) that suppose a serious environmental impact or damage be protected? In the case of Agrarian Heritage, this issue has been very controversial in the proceedings of the Charter of Baeza on Agrarian Heritage, due to the confrontation in the rural world between traditional practices (defended by agroecology) and those set up after the so called Green Revolution. We have finally chosen the principles that sustain traditional customs as values for agrarian heritage (and which come into force in a sustainable and dynamic use of natural resources, in a respectful adaptation to environment and, finally, in low environmental troubles) and open the door to any other property that, linked to industrialized agriculture, may be a major contribution to the history of culture or human science (machinery, genetically-modified varieties, crop and irrigation systems, etc).
- Deplorable historical events. The need to pay homage to all people who suffered the terrible events of the Second World War and the Nazi horror has given way to the appearance throughout Europe of different initiatives (museums, interpretation centers, listing of sites, etc.)¹¹ with the unequivocal aim of both rejection of the events and claiming for the victims (ethical attitude). The pedagogic aim of not repeating the past has to be added to the previous one. In the Spanish case, this situation has also arisen but with an important difference: the recovering of historical memory related to the Civil War and Franco's dictatorship is based on (in addition to the acknowledgement of those who suffered violence or persecution, which is the main aim) the withdrawal from the public buildings and spaces of all those symbols and monuments "...of

10 The most important reference in this respect is the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, where cultural diversity is regarded Common Heritage of Mankind

11 See POULOT, D., "Le musée d'histoire de la France : une culture nationale en voie de disparition?", in *e-rpb. Revista electrónica de Patrimonio Histórico*, n.º 2, june 2008. (<http://www.revistadepatrimonio.es/revistas/numero2/institucionespatrimonio/estudios/articulo.php>). (Consulted on July 15th, 2013).

exaltation, personal or collective, of the military uprising, of the Civil War and the Dictatorship's repression"¹². Although these ethical issues are justified in the heritage field for being historical events and historical properties still alive today (once again the problem of time limits commented above), the danger of this attitude is that it may be used as alibi for its stretching out to other past events (no longer active nowadays), whose revision may cause serious heritage problems. The instances are many. In the Spanish case, to mention a few: the lost of the religious and resistance-against-Muslims condition in the Camino de Santiago, the exaltation of the Spanish nationalism in the popular uprising against the French invasion, the concealment or revision of the discovery and occupation of America, etc.

- Regarding the fundamental rights of man and animals. One of the most important issues in the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage is the restriction established in the definition of Intangible Heritage, when noting that “for the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development”. If we add to this the consensus reached in the previous meetings¹³ to exclude any reference to religion, we find that ethical (and religious) principles become a first order factor in heritage listing, so it becomes inevitable their stretching into Intangible Heritage (and, why not, into the Cultural Heritage). Besides, another problem that might arise between the community that holds the element (to which UNESCO acknowledges total legitimacy and responsibility, to the extent of stating its decision to list it or not to) and the rest of citizens (perhaps belonging to the same group) who may notice in these listed practices attitudes, behaviors or values contrary to the present human rights (and animal rights, which are not listed in the Convention). The main instance in Spain is bullfighting¹⁴, but there are

12 “Law 52/2007, 26th December, that recognizes and amplifies rights in favor of those who suffered persecution or violence in the civil war and dictatorship. Art. 15”.

13 BRUGMAN, F., “La Convención para la salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial”, in CARRERA DÍAZ, G. y DIETZ, G. (coords.), *Patrimonio Inmaterial y gestión de la diversidad*, PH Cuadernos n.º 17, Sevilla, IAPH, Consejería de Cultura de la Junta de Andalucía, 2005, p. 62.

14 Despite the large amount of public shows—in addition to bullfighting—involving bulls in Spain (whose epitome may be the Toro de la Vega in Tordesillas, Valladolid), the main conflict in Spain arose with the prohibition of bullfighting in Catalonia (in force from January 1st 2012). This provoked the listing of bullfighting as a Cultural Property in other communities such as Madrid, Castilla la Mancha, or Murcia. The most interesting aspect of this may be its ideological orientation, since analyzing the content of these acts we only find a glib declaration of principles of scarce law effects on the properties (not

many other examples related to equality¹⁵, cultural diversity¹⁶, childhood, environment or religious freedom.

3. CHALLENGES

Historical Heritage has many challenges to face regarding safeguarding, beginning with the first one, that of guaranteeing the conservation (above all for the increasing range that has lately acquired). Of all these, we would like to focus on one related to the very essence of Historical Heritage which Victor Hugo masterly stated in 1852 in his pamphlet on the safeguard of the Monuments, *War against the Demolishers*. He said that “...there are two things in a building: its use and its beauty. Its use belongs to its owner and its beauty to everybody...to destroy it is then to overcome a right”¹⁷. With these words (legally translated by Giannini into the concept of divided property¹⁸), a basic principle on protection is set up: the necessity to harmonize the private interest and the general interest underlying in any kind of cultural property. For us, this difficult coexistence between the collective, the social, the general and the particular is yet one of the main challenges Cultural Heritage faces today whose solution (or normal development) is very complex. Among other reasons because of the multiple dimensions this relationship has. We are going to make reference to some of them:

— *The main one, from our point of view, the physical and intellectual public access to heritage.* Guaranteed by the Spanish Constitution (art. 46) and sanctioned and developed by all laws on Historical Heritage in Spain, its practical application is residual and, even more serious, ignored and, so, unclaimed by both citizens and administrations. The right to a free public

specified) that made up the listed Cultural Property. To this respect see: HURTADO GONZÁLEZ, L., “Cuestiones competenciales sobre la fiesta de los toros: a propósito de su posible declaración legal como bien de interés cultural”, in *Administración de Andalucía. Revista Andaluza de Administración Pública*, n.º 83, 2012, pp. 13-47.

15 The most interesting to us is the long conflict regarding the celebration of the Alarde de Hondarribia (Guipúzcoa), where women have legally managed their right to participate in the parades (in the mixed company of Jaizkibel) despite their neighbors’ rejection, offensively manifested every year by all kind of ways (black umbrellas, Mickey Mouse masks, garbage bags, etc). We might add many other cases such as the Easter brotherhoods (where female participation is bad considered), performances such as the Misteri d’Elx, where the female roles are performed by men, etc.

16 The most interesting example is the Moors and Christians festivity, spread along the Spanish Levante, where the Christian victory is sometimes festooned with unnecessary and cruel humiliations to the defeated. We may also mention the commemoration in Granada every 2nd of January of the Capture of Granada by the Catholic Monarchs.

17 HUGO, V., “Guerre aux démolisseurs”, in *Revue de Deux Mondes*, 1 March, 1832, p. 26 Available in: <http://www.revuedesdeuxmondes.fr/user/details.php?author=HUGO&subject=&title=&month1=1&year1=1829&month2=7&year2=2013&content=&code=28148>. (Consulted on 30th July 2013).

18 GIANNINI, M. S., “I beni culturali”, in *Rivista Trimestrale di Diritto Pubblico*, anno XXVI, 1976, p. 3-38.

visit contained in the Spanish legislation should appear in the frontispiece of every public safeguarding institution.

- *The distortion provoked—in relation to this harmonization between public and private— by the consideration (almost indisputable since undisputed) of Historical Heritage as a development factor.* This is contribution to the starting out of every kind of initiatives to improve Historical Heritage (tracks, interpretation centers, accommodation into hostel services of relevant historic buildings, urban planning, etc). The supposed interest achieved by these initiatives (working places and wealth generation) is legitimating performances of dubious heritage validity, which supposes a confrontation to public interest (and collective right) inserted in the necessity to preserve cultural properties. No doubt we are facing a very harmful confrontation (and supplanting) of general interests for the safeguarding of Historical Heritage.
- *The outburst of an intermediate level between general and private interests, that of community's or social group's.* The link with the society, or local population, where the property is located has always been taken into account by Historical Heritage. Nevertheless, Intangible Cultural Heritage entails the recognition of rights to local governments or social groups which have customary generated the listed heritage. These rights are yet to be formally defined, although a way is being opened in relation to intellectual property, which is being explored in a context very close to cultivated biodiversity. In this late case, the acknowledgement of the intellectual property of farmers, local communities and native cultures to traditional knowledge associated to local diversity and native breeds¹⁹, and, hence, the rights to their commercial exploitation.
- Less concerned (theoretically, but not personally) about a growing tendency (above all in Mediterranean countries, and specially increased now by the economical crises) that raises the social alarm. *We are referring to privatization (whether definite, by means of selling, or temporal, by leasing) of public cultural properties*²⁰. If the coordination between both general and

19 In addition to the acknowledgement of these rights in the *Convention on Biological Diversity* (UN, 1992) or the *International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* (FAO, 2011), there is an *Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources* created by the *World Intellectual Property Organization* (WIPO) to analyze and regulate everything related to property rights of traditional knowledge associated to plant and genetic resources. In the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, the UNESCO acknowledged the right of groups and communities (which are not defined) to their heritage (in fact, the criteria to declare what is and what is not heritage depends on them, not on parameters that evaluate them on a comparative basis), but does not acknowledge the right to intellectual property on them, being the Government's responsibility to safeguard the heritage.

20 It is in Italy where this fact raised earlier and in a more virulent way. See CAPELLI, R., *Politique e poetiche per l'arte*, Milano, Electa, 2002 y SETTIS, S., Italia S.p.A., *L'assalto al patrimonio culturale*, Torino, Einaudi, 2002.

private interests (articulated on the basis of the obvious preponderance of general interest) were effective, the public or private condition of the holder would be irrelevant. The evident failure of this coordination is what causes alarm in the population (and among professionals), since a property from public administrations is less likely to comply with its social function.

- And a last question. It is unacceptable that restrictions upon the property right imposed to particulars, which derived from the listing (no matter the degree) of their property as Historical Heritage, should be unfailingly observed by them (and by society in general) as an illegitimate interference deserving compensation by public administrations. This kind of “cultural exception” should be eradicated since these limitations are similar to (and sometimes less burdensome to owners) those imposed by different reasons (alimentary control, citizen security, road safety, rights at work, environmental respect...), to any other good (a house, a car, a discotheque, a farm...) which respond to the principle, sanctioned in our Constitution, of the property’s social function.

4. HOPES

We believe, although it might sound somehow illusory, that Historical Heritage cherishes and gives a lot of encouraging hopes. We can underline some of them confined to our country. These are the following:

One of them is *the richness, variety, diversity, relevance and territorial balance of the Spanish Historical Heritage*. This allows the development of activities of different range and scope on cultural properties, which turns them into a very important cultural, social, economic, educative stream, very present in the ordinary dynamics of society. To this, we have to add a very satisfactory conservation degree of these properties.

Another one is the huge development under the democratic period of Historical Heritage, increasing significantly the listing of properties as well as the number of actions developed on them (and multiplying the funding as well). The importance of Historical Heritage in the assimilation by the Spanish society into the Estado de las Autonomías²¹ should be mentioned.

But above all, the main hope, for us, is people, citizenship. Despite the low degree of awareness of Historical Heritage in Spain, in the last few years we are witnessing an organization and mobilization of people in favor of Heritage (its

21 See: CASTILLO RUIZ, J., “La defensa y conservación del Patrimonio heredado”, in RICO, F., GRACIA, J., y BONET, A. (eds.), *Literatura y Bellas Artes. Colección España siglo XXI*. Vol. 5, Madrid, Editorial Biblioteca Nueva, Instituto de España, Fundación Sistema, 2009, p. 450-490.

Heritage) which makes us cherish hopes for its right conservation and safeguarding in the future. In this sense, the information given by the first poll made in Spain about Historical Heritage promoted by Fundación Caja Madrid is very revealing. Out of the many conclusions²², I would like to highlight those referring to the high degree of public awareness regarding the need to conserve and preserve Heritage, the general opinion that public administrations are responsible for the preservation of Historical Heritage, or the more than acceptable citizen involvement in its conservation.

In addition to this data, from our particular analysis of the Spanish heritage situation through the Observatory for the Spanish Historical Heritage (OPHE)²³ we conclude that there is a motive for hope, first for the proliferation of all kinds of associations (above all in the local scope), second, for the quick citizen response (through social platforms) every time an aggression to cultural properties is made and, finally, for the increasing professionalization and capacity of these citizen movements, manifested in legal actions²⁴.

This does not mean that there are no contradictions, limitations, deficiencies and mistakes in relation to public involvement in Historical Heritage. We would like to analyze some questions in this regard:

The first of them is that referring to *the legitimacy of public involvement*. Specifically to the identification of social groups or citizens that have legitimacy to participate, claim, enjoy or take advantage of the Historical Heritage.

In this sense, an inalienable principle of Historical Heritage is its condition of property of general interest, which refers to everybody (despite their culture or nationality) being the safeguarding of Heritage. In addition to this unquestionable principle, cultural properties have many other dimensions (national, regional, local, etc) and, above all, many social and economic effects, resulting therefore in the diversification and differentiation of the involved people according to the dimension or effect we point out. Therefore, taking general interest as the starting point, we should aim at the harmonization of all different social dimensions. How-

22 MORATE MARTÍN, G., (dir.), *Conocimiento y percepción del Patrimonio Histórico en la sociedad española*, Madrid, Caja Madrid, 2012.

23 http://www.ophe.es/index.php?option=com_wrapper&view=wrapper&Itemid=69. (Consulted on 30th July, 2013).

24 For us, the main symbol of this new era of social involvement is the social movement that arose around the demolition of the Cabanyal district in Valencia. The diversity of actions, the national and international relevance of its demands, the variety of the groups implied (resident and non-resident), the strength and endurance of the legal actions and its success (among others, the first declaration as dispossession by the central government of a heritage action promoted by an Autonomous Community) are some of the many reasons that explain the exemplariness of this movement See: HERRERO GARCÍA, L.F., y SOLDEVILLA LIAÑO, M., "La plataforma Salvem El Cabanyal: doce años de lucha ciudadana", in *e-rpb. Revista electrónica de Patrimonio Histórico*, n.º 6, June 2010. Available in: <http://www.revistadepatrimonio.es/revistas/numero6/iniciativas/experiencias/articulo.php>. (Consulted on 30th July, 2013).

ever, there are many conflictive points. One of them is that of the role the implied population should play (owners, residents, workers, users, etc) in the protection, especially as Properties of Cultural Interest, of listed cultural properties. From our point of view, the leadership of the population should be strong (its active and continuous participation must be guaranteed) but not determinant, not even exclusive, above all in the listing process. Despite the backfire effect of the listings on the affected population, we cannot forget these are made in order to safeguard the cultural values of general interest properties, which have to transcend the particular interest of the citizens.

Social involvement in Historical Heritage lacks also a major *participation of young people* in citizen movements (in contrast with the situation in Environment or in any other social field). One of the reasons that explain this situation (in addition to the poor and inadequate presence of heritage subjects in education curriculums) is the excessive link of citizen defense actions (above all, the associations) with conservationist past, knowledge and targets. If we want to achieve a larger involvement of young people, we should incorporate to these citizen organizations some aspects such as sustainable development, social integration, cultural diversity, fight against globalization and speculation, authenticity, nature concern, etc. All subjects very close to life expectations of young people that we find in many safeguarding activities: house rehabilitation in historical centers, defense of buildings and spaces threatened by urban speculation, defense of the sustainable development program included in rural heritage, etc.

5. EFFECTS ON HERITAGE RESTORATION

The need to integrate restoration into the safeguarding process makes all these tendencies, challenges and hopes to be repeated in the field of restoration, what justifies or explains criteria or attitudes related to the intervention on the materiality of cultural properties. To point some of them:

The inadequate balance between the extension of the concept Historical Restoration, especially immovable properties, and the formulation of the restoration criteria. In the last years, as stated in many chapters of this book, Architecture has put its eyes on the buildings with memory, the preexisting ones, carrying out projects which are aesthetically and symbolically very brilliant, due to the free and unconditional use of the building's cultural keys²⁵. In most of the cases, these "beating" buildings use to become part of the new emerging or fringe heritages that in the last decades have showed up into Historical Heritage. This situation

²⁵ Out of the many examples to be analyzed in this book, it is the transformation of the building in the old Mediodía Electric Station made by Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron into Madrid's Caixaforum that we consider the most representative

motivates, somehow, the questioning of the criteria of restoration, due to the effective capacity to generate new urban or regional symbols, difficult to refute by any discipline or safeguarding principle. It is urgent to clarify concepts, deactivate confusing strategies, and invalidate pseudoscientific attitudes.

Restoration is a very defined and stated practice, with very contrasted and assimilated methodological requirements which cannot be obliterated when it comes to historical buildings. Very different are the architectural projects on immovable historical properties whose listing status are not established (i.e. they are not listed or they are in a summary way). This cannot be mistaken as restoration, despite its attempt to appropriate its high scientific and cultural meaning. But this does not imply its invalidation either, because most times those projects allow advancing in the heritage construction, not as much of the property as the heritage category of property (industrial, agrarian, etc.) to which it belongs.

The translation to restoration of the effects of the new productive purposes of safeguarding. The main focus of safeguarding to generate income favors the resources, projects and wishes to be directed mostly towards the development of activities related to virtual and real recreations (food, historical events, ways of living, etc), due to their high capacity to increase the enjoyment (and so the interest) of visitors and tourists of heritage sites. Most of these are management activities which do not require a straight action on the property, but they are so powerful that the scientific method, restoration, cannot obviate their social power and dimension. Of course, it is not crazy to state that there is a clear correspondence between these performances and recreations of monuments or historical sites and the less and less repressed and reviled acceptance of the reconstruction of monuments (real and legal as well) by restoration.

The difficult incorporation of public engagement in the process of restoration. Antoni González has largely demonstrated throughout his long and brilliant career as the SPAL director of the Barcelona Diputació that citizen involvement in the restoration process is, besides needful, feasible and very profitable. But citizen involvement is not always possible or profitable for the designing of the intervention, causing important troubles. We should take into consideration different aspects: restoration requires a high degree of technical, historical and scientific knowledge, which restricts its full understanding. Society clearly chooses those kind of interventions related to reconstruction and setting²⁶, which makes it difficult to understand the conservationist models. There is also a rejection on behalf of the citizens of the incorporation of contemporary materials and forms into the historical buildings and sites, which does not necessarily revert to more conserva-

²⁶ Despite the different historical and cultural context in which was stated, Riegl's reasoning to explain this compelling desire is still valid: newness artistic value. RIEGL, A., *El culto moderno a los monumentos Caracteres y origen*. Madrid, Visor, 1987.

tionism, despite its being the most accepted idea. All this makes it difficult to keep the balance between scientific and technical requirements, the legitimate role of the culture administration (responsible of the general interest to be respected in every intervention) and the feeling of the citizens. Of course, the solution is not to underestimate public opinion, but to generate a system of constant explanation and participation of society, in the line of the objective restoration already experienced and reinforced by the discovery of the “open for repairs” of the Vitoria’s Cathedral²⁷.

27 LASAGABASTER, I., “La restauración democrática. La Catedral de Santa María de Vitoria”, in HENARES CUÉLLAR, I., (ed.), *La protección del Patrimonio Histórico en la España democrática*, Granada, Universidad, Caja Madrid, 2010, pp. 183-214.