pca

european journal of
postclassicalarchaeologies

volume 6/2016

pca

Post-Classical Archaeologies (PCA) is an independent, international, peer-reviewed journal devoted to the communication of post-classical research. PCA publishes a variety of manuscript types, including original research, discussions and review articles. Topics of interest include all subjects that relate to the science and practice of archaeology, particularly multidisciplinary research which use specialist methodologies, such as zooarchaeology, paleobotany, archaeometallurgy, archaeometry, spatial analysis, as well as other experimental methodologies applied to the archaeology of post-classical Europe.

Submission of a manuscript implies that the work has not been published before, that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere and that it has been approved by all co-authors. Each author must clear reproduction rights for any photos or illustration, credited to a third party that he wishes to use (including content found on the Internet). For more information about **ethics** (including plagiarism) and copyright practices and guidelines please visit the web site www.postclassical.it.

PCA is published once a year in May, starting in 2011. Manuscripts should be submitted to **editor@postclassical.it** in accordance to the guidelines for contributors in the webpage http://www.postclassical.it

Post-Classical Archaeologies's manuscript **review process** is rigorous and is intended to identify the strengths and weaknesses in each submitted manuscript, to determine which manuscripts are suitable for publication, and to work with the authors to improve their manuscript prior to publication.

This journal has the option to publish in **open access**. For information please visit the web site www.postclassical.it

How to **quote**: please use "PCA" as abbreviation and "Post-Classical Archaeologies" as full title.

Cover image: courtesy of Schaffhausen, Stadtbibliothek (Switzerland), Gen. 8, f. 271v – Klosterneuburger Evangelienwerk, retrieved from www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/sbs/0008/271v/0/Sequence-1030

"Post-Classical Archaeologies" was approved on 2015-05-13 according to ERIH PLUS criteria for inclusion. Classified A by ANVUR (Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del sistema Universitario e della Ricerca).

pca

european journal of
postclassicalarchaeologies

CONTENTS PAGES

EDITORIAL

*T*he sixth issue of PCA presents the material from two confer-ences held in different European countries last year.

The volume opens with some of the papers presented at The British School at Rome (April 2014) at a conference on The Recycling and Reuse of Materials during the Early Middle Ages. The meeting — organised by Alessandro Sebastiani (who has collaborated as guest editor for this section), Elena Chirico and Matteo Colombini — dealt mainly with productive structures related to the transformation of glass and metal in Italy (papers by Alessandro Sebastiani, Stefano Bertoldi, François-Dominique Deltenre and Lucia Orlandi). Other international experts have agreed to add their contributions to the subject: Robin Fleming on the reuse of construction material in early medieval graves, Sarah Paynter and Caroline Jackson offering a synthesis on the reuse of glass, and the team of Carmen Fernández-Ochoa in Spain presenting the early medieval productive structures at the villa of Veranes (Gijon). Two papers by Florin Curta and Michele Asolati, dealing with exchange in the Byzantine Mediterranean, have been published in the Variae *section.*

After the catastrophe of World War II, many international institutions were founded: the United Nations, UNESCO, the European Community. All these organizations are today immersed in a transitional phase in the systemic crisis which affects the entire Western world, a crisis to which the nihilist and relativist positions have contributed and which has (rightly) delegitimated the imperialism on which the West had built its dominant position. In this crisis, the recovery of shared historical memories is increasingly revealed as a central element in the defence of a rational world, which, although it may have abandoned the utopias of the 1900s, at least safeguards the principles of freedom and the pluralism of values. Today, there is wide debate, even among archaeologists, over how to present cultural heritage in a globalized society while nevertheless pre-

serving its multiple identities and cultures. The discussion of these matters was the purpose of the papers dedicated to the World Heritage List. This collection, guest edited by Margarita Díaz-Andreu, results from a workshop of the EU-project JPI—JHEP Heritage Values Network (H@V) held at the University of Barcelona in February 2015. The main question, summarized in the title of the paper by Díaz-Andreu, is whether the inclusion of social values and local communities in the management of cultural heritage is an impossible dream. Is it a utopian vision, typical of the historical processes which gave birth to the international organizations and their initiatives to hold back the spectre of a World War III? In many of these contributions, the watchwords still conform to this direction: the participation and involvement of stakeholders in the hope that local communities will be led to a positive valuation of assets and their public use.

The different directions of the debate move between the two poles of economic management and cultural enrichment of local communities. Too often, it is difficult to find a balance between touristic exploitation and a useful cultural proposal for local communities, as happened in the telling example of the Daming Palace in China, developed by Qian Gao, winner of the 2016 PCA young researcher award.

Direct involvement is often difficult in a globalized and multicultural society that has lost its historical roots. Most of the contributions consider that a proper balance can be found between global strategies promoted by UNESCO, based on the decalogue of general principles under which to file an application for protected sites, and the feeling and evaluation expressed by the local community (the focus of Torgrim Sneve Guttorsen, Joel Taylor, Grete Swensen on Heritage Routes and Matthias Maluck and Gian Pietro Brogiolo on organizational proposals in the interventions).

Also related to the subject of cultural heritage and the public is the project section of this issue, a homage the Poggibonsi Archeodromo. A project developed in recent years by the team of Marco Valenti (University of Siena), this is a unique living archaeological park recreated from archaeological evidence, presenting the life of an early medieval village, an initiative that clearly demonstrates the social and economic benefits of good practices in public archaeology in Italy.

Finally, the retrospect section, which addresses the history of early medieval archaeology in different European countries, is this year devoted to the fascinating recent history of early medieval Archaeology in Russia, with an extensive study by Nadezhda Platonova (St Peterburg).

Introduction to the Dossier
"World Heritage and the Public"

This dossier is one of the outcomes of the third and final workshop of the European JPI–JHEP Heritage Values Network (H@V) project (www.heritagevalues.net/), partly financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness through an "I+D+i Orientada a los retos de la sociedad" project entitled "La Red de los Valores del Patrimonio" (Ref PCIN-2013-036). This workshop was held at the University of Barcelona from 19 to 21 February 2015. The three-day event, inaugurated by Joan Pluma, then the General Director of Archives, Libraries, Museums and Heritage of the Government of Catalonia (Generalitat de Catalunya), included a combination of papers, round tables, activities, discussions and debates. The discussion topic was "Heritage Values and the Public" and it was attended by a multi-disciplinary group of more than fifty established professionals and student volunteers. From the five discussion lines during the workshop – Inclusivity; Participatory and Sustainable Heritage; Virtual Heritage, Heritage Values and the Public; Tourism; and World Heritage (WH) – this dossier is a compilation of a selection of the contributions to the last of these.

The first article deals with how public participation has been regulated in World Heritage. Authored by Díaz-Andreu, it opens with a review of the steps taken towards increasing the consideration of local communities in heritage management. These have included a series of commissions, WH Committee meetings and declarations. Special attention is paid to the changes made to the Operational Guidelines throughout the last two decades. These began in 1995, when the suggestion for local community participation in the nomination of WH properties was added. Another key change, encouraging the engagement of local communities in WH management, was made in 2008. An examination of how the recommendations given in the Operational Guidelines are implemented in practice is, however, not as satisfactory

as expected. The analysis of the three rock art properties in Spain — World Heritage properties 310, 874 and 866 — indicates that procedures are only now beginning to change and are still far from the spirit of the discussions that led to the modifications of the guidelines in the first place.

Ethnographic approaches are used by Qian Gao in the second article in the dossier to examine the impact of World Heritage designation on local communities, and how the views held by these local communities on a particular site are influenced by the way its tourism commercialisation has been planned. Using the Daming Palace in China as a case study, the fieldwork undertaken for this research included in-depth interviews, participant observation, and casual conversations, which allowed a series of themes affecting social values to be identified. The results showed general support for the tourism development of archaeological sites. However, this came together with some criticism of the project, mainly related to the business model applied, characterised by a large involvement of private investment. The tension over what should be prioritised in the transformation of an archaeological site into a tourist attraction is the main finding of Gao's research, with the strain between the social and economic values being the most controversial.

Gao's article is followed by Georgios Alexopoulos and Kalliopi Fouseki's study exploring the challenges arising from the confrontation between universal and local values, which they analyse in the case of Mount Athos in Greece. The inscription as World Heritage of a property from which women are barred calls into question the contradictory uses of the concept of human rights. Thus, the right of the members of a monastic order to define its rules conflicts with those of women to access a cultural site considered to be of universal importance. In the case of World Heritage one could go even further and wonder whether such a property, which was included on the list in 1988, follows the recommendations made, as discussed above, in the 2008 Operational Guidelines.

Guttormsen, Taylor and Swensen look at transnational properties and raise questions on whether such properties achieve what they intend: to create a shared cultural heritage which is inclusive to all peoples. By looking at a series of case studies — the Santiago de Compostela Pilgrim Route, the European Route of Industrial Heritage, and the Silk Roads WH properties — they made a series of criticisms. A key one refers to the sanitisation of history, which is clearly convenient for the commercial rhetoric that allows these sites to be sustainable, although not necessarily inclusive. They argue that the heritagisation of past peoples' movement in space has, in contrast to what was intended, become a

resource for the legitimation of present-day geopolitical ideologies and established cultural-political connections.

A further example of the way in which public participation is implemented in World Heritage nominations is provided by Matthias Maluck in the ensuing article. The author explains that, despite UNESCO's best intentions, the old practices have hardly changed and consequently the integration of local communities into the nomination process is far from complete. Contrasting with this situation, the author explains what actions have been implemented in the nomination process in which he is currently involved, that of the "Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe" transnational serial nomination for World Heritage. This includes the archaeological sites of Gokstad, Oseberg and Borre (Norway), Jelling (Denmark) and Danevirke and Hedeby (Germany). He argues that the inclusion of local community participation in municipal planning in relation to land-use plans and urban plans is the way in which UNESCO's wishes can be put into operation. In the "Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe", public participation has been put into action through workshops and other meetings, as well as public hearings. Maluck ends his article by suggesting that the participation of communities in the nomination process has increased the level of protection for these sites.

The next author, Dennis Rodwell, contrasts community and World Heritage values arguing that the common perception held of local communities by heritage specialists is to consider them a threat to the authenticity of WH properties. In his view this indicates that changes are needed in how heritage and values are defined. Through a series of examples, he shows that the museological approach, so fashionable in the 1950s and 60s, led to a sanitisation of these monuments. In their management, only the artistic and historical values of heritage properties were considered and, as a consequence, local communities living in or around the sites, or using them for trade or other purposes, were asked to abandon the area. This had the effect of restricting their use, which has limited the willingness of potential patrons to invest in their restoration and maintenance. He maintains that the word "heritage" should include some of the semantic field of the French term "*patrimoine*", which implies collective inheritance passed down through generations, and an essential element is that it remains useful for the community. The term "community value", in turn, should incorporate the sense of place, belonging and well-being. He also wonders about who should be considered an expert and suggests that the term "stakeholder" should be subdivided into three major types: direct users, indirect users and influential actors (including government and academics). Rodwell ends his article proposing that human residents

should be included in the way authenticity and integrity are defined.

The dossier ends with Gian Pietro Brogiolo's critical analysis of the UNESCO network "The Longobards in Italy. Places of Power (568-774 A.D.)". He first describes the long and complex process that took place between 1996 and 2011 and that led to its inclusion as Property 1318 on the UNESCO World Heritage List. The author argues that the minimal input of experts in the process, limited only to their collaboration in an exhibition first shown in 2000, led to inaccurate and even incorrect information being included in the documentation submitted to UNESCO. Silenced in it were the data on the complexities identified by experts in the interpretation of the sites, which even challenge their classification as Longobard. Partly to blame for this was the choice of a professional journalist and expert in cultural and socio-economic development projects to draw up the project. Nevertheless, Brogiolo admits that academics' usual lack of skill in writing texts other than academic papers partly explains why this happened. The examination of how the city of Brescia got involved in the nomination process is used as an excuse to highlight the many complexities of these processes in practice.

Margarita Díaz-Andreu
Guest editor

dossier

Social values and the participation of local communities in World Heritage: a dream too far?

MARGARITA DÍAZ-ANDREU   ICREA, University of Barcelona, c/ Montalegre 6, 08001, Barcelona. m.diaz-andreu@ub.edu

This article assesses the degree of implementation of two of the requirements in the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Committee: the participation of local communities in the nomination and management of World Heritage properties. It begins by looking at the historical background of participatory and bottom-up approaches to heritage management in the context of international institutions, and particularly that of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee. The examination of one particular case study, rock art properties in Spain, is then undertaken. It will be argued that there is an apparent mismatch between the letter of the different agreements and what is being achieved for the three properties considered. It will be suggested that better systems of monitoring and evaluation are needed to ensure that local communities are actually being taken into account in World Heritage sites.
Keywords: World Heritage, local communities, participation, Operational Guidelines, Spain, rock art

Questo articolo valuta il grado di implementazione di due dei requisiti indicati nelle Linee Guida Opertive del World Heritage Committee: la partecipazione delle comunità locali nel processo di nomination e nella gestione delle proprietà UNESCO. Il testo comincia tracciando il contesto storico degli approcci partecipativi e bottom-up nella gestione del patrimonio, nello scenario delle istituzioni internazionali e in particolare dell'UNESCO, e continua prendendo poi in esame i siti UNESCO dell'arte rupestre in Spagna. Emergerà che c'è un'apparente incompatibilità tra cio che è scritto negli accordi e quanto si è raggiunto nelle proprietà considerate. Pertanto, si suggerirà che sono necessari migliori sistemi di monitoraggio per assicurare che le comunità locali siano veramente prese in considerazione nei siti Patrimonio nell'Umanità.
Parole chiave: Patrmonio dell'Umanità, comunità locali, partecipazione, Linee Guida Operative, Spagna, arte rupestre

Introduction

Heritage was first institutionalised in the 19th century with the emergence of state, regional and local heritage offices responsible for

the protection, study and preservation of heritage for future generations. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Riegl's essay on "The modern cult of monuments" (Riegl 1903) was the first to provide a reasoning behind these tasks in terms of values. For the president of the Austrian Central Commission for the Investigation and Conservation of Artistic and Historic Monuments, Aloïs Riegl (1858-1905), two values were key: the aesthetic and the historical, of which the latter had pre-eminence. At that time the process of deciding what was valuable was exclusively managed by experts (in conjunction with politicians), a practice that continued unchanged after the range of values was widened in the first decades of the same century to include anthropological and natural values. The values of cultural heritage were seen as unchanging and universally intrinsic, but after World War II this idea was increasingly undermined. It has been argued that a key factor in this process was the cultural revolution of the 1960s and the communications revolution of the 1980s (Pereira 2007, p. 15). One of the most important changes, which began about sixty years ago, has been how the public is perceived: no longer exclusively as users and passive elements in heritage management, but as stakeholders who should play an active part in it. Today we are witnessing a shift from regulation to participation, and World Heritage has not been immune to this process. This article will start analysing the steps that the World Heritage Committee has given towards public participation. After having identified the regulations agreed to encourage public participation (mainly in the form of changes to the Operational Guidelines), their degree of implementation will be assessed using the three World Heritage rock art properties in Spain as a case study.

1. World Heritage, heritage values and public participation

Egypt's decision to build the Aswan Dam in the 1960s prompted an international campaign directed by UNESCO to protect the heritage of Abu Simbel and other temples and sites in the Nile Valley. This international effort led to the movement that resulted in the proclamation of UNESCO's World Heritage Convention in 1972. To begin with the values prioritised in the convention, in the form of Outstanding Universal Values (OUV), coincided with those favoured by Riegl, i.e. historic and artistic values. According to Article 1, cultural heritage was defined as monuments and groups of buildings "which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science", and also sites "which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic,

ethnological or anthropological point of view". Social values were only implied in the convention, as can be seen by the fact that the term "community", in its social meaning (i.e. not as international community, which was mentioned three times) was only mentioned once (UNESCO 1972). Despite this, as early as 1976 UNESCO adopted a "Recommendation on Participation by the People at Large in Cultural Life and their Contribution to It", in which it was stated that:

> participation by the greatest possible number of people and associations in a wide variety of cultural activities of their own free choice is essential to the development of the basic human values and dignity of the individual, (…) access by the people at large to cultural values can be assured only if social and economic conditions are created that will enable them not only to enjoy the benefits of culture, but also to take an active part in overall cultural life and in the process of cultural development.
> (UNESCO 1976)

During the 1980s participative approaches with a focus on regional development began to receive attention in the heritage field (Albert 2012, p. 3). In 1987 the Brundtland UN Commission published *Our Common Future*, which encouraged a bottom-up approach to the sustainable management of environmental resources, with cultural resources being linked to this. A similar recommendation came from the 1992 Rio World Congress on Sustainable Development, through its Agenda 21 action plan (Deegan 2012, pp. 77-78). Related to these discussions, the idea of "participation" finally reached the World Heritage Committee. The initiative came from the field of natural heritage management in the context of discussions about landscapes, as it was argued that they should not be considered as humanless, devoid of the communities living in them, but that the people of those communities should be co-responsible for them. The debates on this issue resulted in the involvement of local communities in the nomination process being made compulsory after the revision of the WH Operational Guidelines in 1995. As the new text put it:

> Participation of local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the site
> (Extract from the Report of the Rapporteur of the 19th Session of the World Heritage Committee (Berlin, 1995, WHC-95/ CONF.203/16 in Rössler 2012, p. 27)).

The movement towards the recognition of local communities continued to develop and expand and came to be considered as important in both natural and cultural heritage. Its impact on the latter was mainly felt from the turn of the millennium. An important event in this process was the organisation of a World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Forum during the 24th World Heritage Committee meeting in Cairns (Australia) in December 2000. In this forum disquiet about the lack of involvement of indigenous peoples in World Heritage, especially when it was connected to their own traditions and cultural values or was located in their ancestral lands, was voiced and recommendations were made (Titchen 2002). This resulted in several UNESCO declarations and new conventions, such as the Budapest declaration (2002), the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005).

In the Budapest declaration on World Heritage of 2002 four strategic objectives were approved: Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-Building and Communication (Albert 2012). The reason for the agreement on these objectives was the ostensible imbalance between developing and developed countries in World Heritage. In the evaluation of the success of these agreements five years later at the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee in New Zealand in 2007, a fifth C was added: Community. As the text of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage said, the World Heritage Committee welcomed the proposal "to enhance the role of the communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention" (World Heritage Committee Decisions 13B). It explained that

> The New Zealand thesis is that the identification, management and successful conservation of heritage must be done, where possible, with the meaningful involvement of human communities, and the reconciliation of conflicting interests where necessary. It should not be done against the interests, or with the exclusion or omission of local communities.
> (UNESCO 2007)

The reason for the inclusion of the fifth "C" as a strategic objective was an acknowledgement of the 'critical importance of involving indigenous, traditional and local communities in the implementation of the Convention' (World Heritage Committee Decisions 31.COM/13A and 31.COM/13B, 2007).

Six years after the Budapest declaration and thirteen years after the requirement to involve local communities in the nomination process having been included in the WH Operational Guidelines, these were again modified so that local stakeholders were also considered essential to the management of the properties. The new text read:

> States Parties to the Convention are encouraged to ensure the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders, including site managers, local and regional governments, local communities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other interested parties and partners in the identification, nomination and protection of World Heritage properties (Operational Guidelines, WHC, 2008, para. 12).

It is important to note that even if the move towards "participation" started mainly because of the tensions between indigenous groups and natural and cultural heritage, all documents use the term "local communities", which is much wider in its meaning and affects heritage globally[1]. Good examples[2] of increasing local participation are being produced all over the world. Two cases that illustrate this can be found at the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park in Australia (Cochrane 2015) and in Costa Rica. In the latter, the engagement of heritage professionals has had excellent results in using a recently designated World Heritage Site, the Precolumbian Chiefdom Settlements with Stone Spheres of the Diquís, into a tool for social cohesion (Corrales Ulloa, Badilla Cambronero 2013; Masis Munoz 2015). A balance between top-down and bottom-up approaches in the management of built heritage has been promoted by IC-CROM through the Africa 2009 and through Living Heritage Sites in Thailand programmes (Stovel 2004, p. 17). Other good examples of community participation can also be found at archaeological sites that are not related to the World Heritage list (Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Ferguson 2010; Colwell, Ferguson 2014; Hodder 2003; Smith, Waterton 2009).

---

[1] Although there are those who argue that indigenous communities' participation in World Heritage should be "based on different principles from the engagement with other local communities" because of their right to self-determination (DISKO 2012, p. 16), this is not a widely-accepted opinion. However, it is noticeable that in some parts of the current text of the Operational Guidelines both local and indigenous communities are included next to each other.

[2] There are many examples to the contrary. The literature is full of examples of World Heritage sites where the local communities have been badly impacted by the implementation of imposed WH rules or from the tourist interest in the sites in their territories (AL HAIJA 2011; COMER 2012; RONSTRÖM 2014; YAMAMURA *et al.* 2006). There are also examples of apparent economic benefit (JIMURA 2011), although whether this has actually favoured the local community is a moot point.

There is some disagreement about how social participation should be interpreted. In Turkey, participatory approaches were embraced in the state's heritage conservation legislation reform in 2004, but in practice stakeholders do not include members of the local population (Human 2015). Despite this, the procedure followed has led Turkey to be included by UNESCO in a document on best practice concerning "local people" (UNESCO-WHC 2012). The World Heritage Committee has recently responded by revising the Operational Guidelines once again to specify what is meant by local community involvement. Paragraph 123, for example, has been expanded to state:

> Participation *in the nomination process* of local *communities, indigenous peoples, governmental, non-governmental and private organizations and other stakeholders* is essential to enable them to have a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the property. State Parties are encouraged to prepare nominations with the *widest possible* participation of stakeholders *and to demonstrate that their free, prior and informed consent has been obtained, through, inter alia, making the nominations publicly available in appropriate languages and public consultations and hearings*. (UNESCO-WHC 2015, p. 124, added text highlighted in italics)

This revision of the process leading to a change in the role local communities are expected to play in World Heritage properties is by no means complete, although it is detailed enough to demonstrate that there has been a repeated and increasing interest in working together with people living in or near World Heritage areas. However, as this article will argue, there is a marked gap between the theory and the practice, and between the spirit of international agreements and their implementation at the level of national, regional and local policies. This article will exemplify this in the case of the World Heritage rock art sites in Spain.

2. World Heritage rock art properties in Spain and local communities

There are three World Heritage rock art properties in Spain out of a total of forty-four on the WH list. They are Altamira, inscribed in 1985 and extended in 2008 to include all the Palaeolithic cave art in northern Spain; the Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula

(ARAMPI) inscribed in 1998; and the bi-national inscription of Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley and Siega Verde, of which the Portuguese sites were inscribed in 1998, with an extension in 2010 to include the Spanish site of Siega Verde.

2.1. The Cave of Altamira and the Palaeolithic Cave Art of Northern Spain (UNESCO Property Number 310)

The first of rock art property from Spain to be inscribed on the World Heritage list was the Cave of Altamira. The cave had been discovered in 1868 but it was not until 1879 that the paintings came to the attention of the excavator, Marcelino Sanz de Sautuola (1831-1888). He was the owner of the land, a middle-class lawyer and amateur archaeologist who had become aware of Palaeolithic portable art through the objects displayed by Lartet at the Parisian Universal Exhibition of 1878. The discovery was not well received by the international community of experts and it took more than two decades for the paintings to be accepted as genuine; a recognition epitomised by the publication in 1902 of Émile Cartailhac's *Mea culpa d'un sceptique* (Bahn, Vertut 1988; Moro 2008). Altamira was declared an Architectural-Artistic Monument in 1924 and for many decades it was one of the many pillars of Spanish nationalism, seen as a precursor to the Spanish genius and the Sistine Chapel of prehistoric art, a metaphor used many times, including in the application for WH status (Fatás Monforte 2011, p. 177). The long-standing perception of the importance of the cave is also indicated by its repeated occurrence in school books, almost the only prehistoric site to be systematically mentioned (Barreiro *et al.* 2014). From the outset it was also a place for tourism, with the annual number of visitors growing from 55,000 in 1955 to 173,000 in 1973 (Barreiro, Criado-Boado 2015, p. 124, see also Fatás Monforte 2011; Martínez Roget, Pereira López 2014).

In 1985 the Cave of Altamira was one of the first sites in Spain to be added to the World Heritage List. The inclusion of a rock art site on the list was not out of the ordinary, as rock art had been present from the first year of World Heritage designations (Díaz-Andreu *et al.* 2015). In 1985 Altamira made it onto the list together with two other rock art properties, all of them as cultural sites: the Rock Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) and the Rock Art of Alta (Norway). In the case of Altamira the outstanding universal values that were deemed to be met were i and iii, i.e. (i) to represent a masterpiece of human creative

genius; and (iii) to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or civilization which is living or has disappeared.

At the time of the inscription the Operational Guidelines of 1984 did not include any explicit mention of local communities. However, the local level was alluded to when discussing training (Paragraph 65) and the "general public" was also referred to in passing:

> the educational value both for the training of local experts and for the general public, that is, the training opportunities that would arise for local staff and the impact which the project would have on the awareness and appreciation of the general public, not only in the country in which the property is located, but on a world-wide scale
> (Operational Guidelines[3] 1984, paragraph 81.v)

It could be argued that in 1985 education and training were already taking place in Altamira by three means: the museum, first opened in 1924 and renovated in 1979; the publication of tourist guides (the first in the 1920s (Obermaier 1928a; Obermaier 1928b)); and finally conferences such as the Altamira Symposium held in 1979 (although the talks took place in the Archaeological Museum in Madrid and then moved north to visit several caves in northern Spain (VVAA 1980, p, 15)). Regarding the first aspect, it is possible to say that in the early 1980s there was a clear understanding of the public role of museums. Thus, Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez explained that museums "at first only the delight of a few … nowadays have become demanded, consumed, and enjoyed by large crowds" (Pérez Sánchez 1983: 59). This author also argued that people, despite not being fully aware of the meaning of the specialised language employed in the museum environment, were asking to be taught. However, he contended that the terminology needed to be adapted to the new times (Pérez Sánchez 1983, p. 60).

Over the years, the euphoria surrounding the designation of Altamira as World Heritage gave way to a feeling of discontent amongst heritage managers in the north of Spain, as they argued that Altamira was only one of several spectacular caves in northern Spain. In 1998 the first steps were taken towards applying for the whole of northern Spain's cave art to be included on the World Heritage list, although it was not until 2005 that

---

[3] In order not to clog up the bibliography it has been decided not to include a reference each time a version of the Operational Guidelines is mentioned. They can be easily found on the following website: for 1984 whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide84.pdf and for subsequent years the same address, but changing the final numbers.

the three autonomous communities involved — Asturias, Cantabria and the Basque Country — finally agreed to submit the application (Ontañón Peredo 2010) (Ontañón, *pers. comm.* 23 Oct 2015). Given that the geographical imbalance of the list would have made it almost impossible for a new application to be successful, it was decided that the logical way forward would be to apply for an extension of the Altamira property (Ontañón Peredo 2010, p. 498). In order to achieve the extension, in 2007 an inter-regional commission was formed with the purpose of sharing the "common management aspects and initiatives of conservation, awareness and dissemination of its values" related to the sites (Lasheras *et al.* 2012, p. 613). The extension to the nomination was accepted at the meeting of the World Heritage Committee held in Quebec on 7 July 2008. In that year, therefore, the inscription was expanded to include seventeen other caves: three in the Basque Country, nine in Cantabria and five in Asturias, a total of 19 caves including Altamira.

As explained in the previous section, years before the extension to the Altamira property was prepared, the Operational Guidelines had already been reformed to explicitly require the participation of local people in the nomination process. How was this participation demonstrated in the application? Or, put differently, in which way did the 2007 application differ from that of 1985 to reflect the changes in the Operational Guidelines as regards local communities? The reading of the documents produced about the extension seems to indicate that the changes were minimal to say the least. In the introduction to the extension proposal only artistic and historical values were highlighted (Ontañón Peredo 2008, p. 9) and the threats to its conservation were also detailed (Ontañón Peredo 2008, pp. 144-145, 157-161). In short, although local interest was mentioned, the participation of local communities in the application process was never fully discussed in the document.

In response to my questions about local communities to heritage managers who have been or are still working in Altamira, it was pointed out to me that, in the case of Altamira, the local community could be understood as the population of the nearby village of Santillana del Mar and, more widely, that of Cantabria. The National Museum and Research Centre of Altamira is the managing institution of the World Heritage property and the local community was represented on its Board of Trustees (Patronato del Museo de Altamira). The information on the Museum of Altamira website about the composition of this board indicates that there are representatives from the state and the regional and local administration, including in the latter the Mayor of Santillana and

two other members designated by the municipality. In terms of numbers, there is a total of three local members on a board of twenty-one (figures from the Museum of Altamira website). It should be pointed out here, however, that the Board is not a new creation, as it was set up in 1940 and therefore it is not possible to say that it represents a new approach to the local community resulting from the new directives given in the Operational Guidelines. I was also informed that, in addition to the Board of Trustees, the Museum of Altamira is also involved in the local community through cooperation in several joint projects with the Santillana Town Council (especially with the Culture and Tourism Departments). Moreover, it also maintains a direct relationship with business community of Santillana through, for example, its membership of the Santillana Business Association (Fatás *pers. comm.* 26 Oct. 2015). However, this was not mentioned in an article dealing with best practice in the management of Altamira (Lasheras *et al.* 2012) and one wonders whether this silence may be related to a perceived lack of relevance still prevalent in the institution. Nevertheless, this does not mean no attention is paid to the public by the museum. It was rebuilt and re-opened in 2001 and a copy of the cave — the *neo-cueva* (Lasheras 2003, pp. 189-241) — is part of the museum experience. The museum is a very active institution with a wide range of activities for all ages and great care is taken of the tourists and other visitors (Fatás Monforte 2009). However, these activities are far from what the Operational Guidelines mean by the involvement of local communities in the management of a WH property.

A similar conclusion regarding the need for the implementation of some changes in the roles of local communities seems to be indicated by a recent (and excellent) project on the social values of Altamira. In this project, sociological, economic and anthropological studies were carried out, as well as specific analyses of the dissemination of information relating to Altamira in the conventional, digital and social media; its reception in the history of art and in other types of material culture; the impact on science; how children learned about Altamira in schools; and an archival exploration of the visitors' books from the Museum of Altamira (Barreiro, Criado-Boado 2015; Criado-Boado 2014). Social values, therefore, were understood by this group in accordance with ICOMOS Australia as "the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group" (Burra Charter 2000 in Kalman 2014, p. 201). The study, made in the context of the debate on whether the cave should be opened to the public, found that a majority of people thought that if its conservation was at risk, the cave should be kept closed to the public, with the exception of a few specialists if needed. It is specified

that those in the minority who argued the opposite were local businesses and politicians. It was also revealed that the cave "is losing its relevance in terms of its emotional engagement with the local communities and actors" (Ayán Vila *et al.* 2014, p. 3). The recommendations made as a result of this study related to the need for transparency,

Interestingly it was also proposed that:

> The participation of all of the social actors engaged in Altamira, especially the local community, who have relevant memories in relation to the cave, should form a fundamental part of the management of the site. Why not include in the museum discourse the voices and opinions recorded during our project? There are large numbers of stories associated with the memory of the site and the experiences of the local population. These are stories that help to offset the problem of limiting access to the original cave, highlighting the symbolic entanglement with the site itself, helping to reconstruct the emotional engagement between the local population, general public and the museum.

and:

> Apart from the different voices that have something to say about Altamira, why not inform the public about the situation affecting Altamira, and why not incorporate their opinions in the decision-making process about the site? We think the management model for the site should be reconsidered as a first step towards reaching consensus about its administrative regime. This management model should also include non-experts, who at the end of the day are also its users.
> (Ayán Vila *et al.* 2014, p. 5)

These proposals are now under consideration by the Board of Trustees and it has been planned that they partly guide the renewal of the exhibition display at the museum (Fatás, *pers. comm.* 29 Oct 2015, 3 Nov 2015).

2.2. The Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula (ARAMPI) (UNESCO Property Number 874)

The Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula (ARAMPI) was inscribed on the World Heritage List on 2 December

1998. To begin with only the sites of the Valltorta Gorge were going to be proposed and in 1995 a petition of support to its nomination was sent to the heritage authorities in Madrid. Soon, however, this proposal was extended to include all the other sites with Levantine-style rock art, as well as other prehistoric styles such as Schematic and Macroschematic, and included sites in six autonomous communities (Andalusia, Aragon, Catalonia, Castile-La Mancha, Murcia and Valencia). After a series of meetings in 1996 and 1997 the application was sent to the Spanish Council for Historical Heritage (Consejo de Patrimonio Histórico Español) (Castells Camp *et al.* 2001, pp. 12-13).

At the time the nomination was prepared the Operational Guidelines already mentioned that "participation of local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the site" (Operational Guidelines 1997, Paragraph 14), and also that "the nominations should be prepared in collaboration with and the full approval of local communities" (Paragraph 41). Despite this, it is unclear how the participation of local communities was demonstrated for the nomination, as nothing in the literature produced since alludes to this. It seems revealing that no representative of the local communities was included in the Council for Rock Art formed in 1998, which was (and apparently still is) composed of delegates from the six autonomous communities that were involved in the inscription, in addition to three researchers[4]. One of the initiatives of the council was to produce a journal of rock art, *Panel*, to be published annually. In the editorial of the one and only issue ever published, the anonymous author — who was Julián Martínez García (*pers. comm.* 19 Oct 2015) — mentioned the "social value" of rock art, which he linked to society's novel interest in it which, he argued, was related to a growing cultural demand for natural spaces. He effectively supported a top-down approach because he did not consider that local communities could play an active role. Rather, he focused on the managers, whose role was to ensure the cultural demand was fulfilled, also making it compatible with the protection of rock art, given its fragility. The protection of paintings and carvings had to be compatible with their visit and social enjoyment.

Another article in *Panel* provided an overview of the process that had led to the inclusion of the ARAMPI on the WH list. Regarding the application, the document had been divided into two parts. The first

---

[4] HERNÁNDEZ PÉREZ 2009, p. 60. The three academics in the first years of the Council for Rock Art were Antonio Beltrán (1916-2006), then retired but closely linked to all the rock art initiatives in Aragón, Vicente Baldellou (1947-2014) (Museum of Huesca) and Mauro Hernández (University of Alicante).

contained a description of the rock art and the circumstances relating to its management; the second was an inventory of sites. In the summary provided for the first part there was a brief history of the discovery of the rock art sites, followed by several aspects such as their legal status, conservation, protection, the management plans of each autonomous community and the justification of the rock art's Outstanding Universal Value. Concerning social impact, it was argued that the areas where the rock art is located were suffering from depopulation and poverty and that rock art would be a boost for the sustainable development of the area (Castells Camp *et al.* 2001, pp. 13-14). The latter comment once again confirmed the top-down approach to social value and public participation among the proponents of the ARAMPI for World Heritage status. These comments, together with those made in the aforementioned editorial and other passing mentions to the public dissemination of information about rock art, were the only indirect consideration given to local communities in the whole issue of *Panel*, which otherwise focused on the description of conservation and inventories.

Were local communities taken into account in the nomination process? Everything seems to indicate that for the people behind the nomination in 1998, some of whom are still in place, the involvement of local communities meant suitable public dissemination of information by the scientists and making the sites accessible to the public. It is in the latter where the ARAMPI has been very successful. One of the immediate consequences of the inclusion of the ARAMPI on the WH list was an interest shown in rock art by the autonomous communities. This, together with the innovative impulse received from UNESCO for the establishment of cultural parks, led to the creation of several such parks in the ARAMPI area. As early as the 1980s Antonio Beltrán had organised a series of meetings to discuss cultural parks. They were held in Albarracín (1986), Barbastro (1987) and Zaragoza (1989) and the last one was attended by a group of national and international experts and politicians (Jornadas 1990). This resulted in regional legislation that allowed cultural parks to be established in Aragón and Valencia in 1997 and 1998 respectively. In Aragón four cultural parks were established in the rock art areas of Albarracín, Maestrazgo, Río Martín and Río Vero. In the Valencian community, the setting up of the Cultural Park of Valltorta-Gasulla (Martínez Valle 2000) was followed by others: Bicorp-Millares, Pla de Petrarcos and Morella la Vella.

In addition to cultural parks, and sometimes in conjunction with them, several new museums and interpretation centres have been set up.

Professionals have felt more inspired by the art, congresses have been held, PhDs have been written and new rock art journals have appeared (Díaz-Andreu *et al.* 2015). The recent economic crisis and other circumstances, however, have led to the failure of some of these initiatives. One example is interpretation centres, with about a quarter of those established now closed (Díaz-Andreu *et al.* 2015). As regards public participation there is no evidence that these new museums and centres or the new scientific studies are in any way boosting local economies or improving cultural life and pride in the area (Juste Arruga 2012, pp. 245-246). At least 225,000 people visit Altamira every year (Martínez Roget, Pereira López 2014, p. 9), but the Valltorta Museum, the most successful the ARAMPI in this area, receives only 21,000 visitors. It is possible that there has been a slight increase in local appreciation of rock art sites, but there is no actual evidence of this. Actually, the recent decision to extend the Valltorta cultural park has met with fierce opposition from the local population (DiaDia 2015; redacción 2015; Ríos 2015). It could be suggested that the management of the ARAMPI area as a whole seems to lack any strategies to encourage local communities to take pride in and have a sense of ownership of the rock art sites in their municipality. This lack of engagement with local communities is in fact acknowledged in the recently written Second Periodic Report, as in it the cooperation with local communities is rated as "fair" and that with local or municipal authorities and owners receives a similar assessment (UNESCO-WHC 2014, p. 25).

2.3. Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley and Siega Verde (UNESCO Property Number 866)

In 1998 Portugal's proposal for the inscription of the Côa Valley Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the World Heritage list was successful. By the time of the inscription, the Côa Valley Archaeological Park (PAVC) had already been open for a year. The PAVC had been given the responsibility to "manage, protect and organize for public visits, including the setting up of museum facilities, the monuments included in the special protection zone of the Côa Valley" (Zilhão 1998, p. 193).

In an article published in 2006, António Batarda Fernandes and Fernando Pinto discussed the issue of how best to communicate with stakeholders. Despite considering them as important for the implementation of management processes, the authors questioned whether the local community should take precedence over other stakeholders merely because they were local. In the case of the Côa Valley heritage, they explained that the park had been built against the

wishes of much of the local community who had seen a source of income in construction of the dam that, to their regret, the park had brought a halt. The authors then explained that the mood, had changed once the benefits of using the World Heritage brand had become obvious (Fernandes, Pinto 2006, pp. 137-140). Fernandes and Pinto argued that

> CHM bodies have a preservation pact with all humankind that must be kept. Rational and reasonable preservation policies — such as the ones implemented in the Côa Valley — "dictate" that some stakeholders' ambitions cannot be taken into account if we want to safeguard cultural heritage properties.
> (Fernandes, Pinto 2006, p. 141)

and:

> Even if we agree with Liwieratos' (2004) statement that "there is a greater chance of achieving sustainable conservation through development if responsibilities are shifted to the public," we also believe that, before such a change, it is vital to make sure that the public and the stakeholders, especially local ones, are truly prepared to deal wisely with the responsibility of contributing decisively to the management of a World Heritage Site.
> (Fernandes, Pinto 2006, p. 142)

In 2010 the WH property was extended to include the site of Siega Verde in the province of Salamanca (Spain). The art motifs, very similar to those of the Côa Valley, had been discovered in 1988. The area was soon legally protected, signposts were installed in the 1990s and in the year 2000 an interpretation centre was opened. Guided tours for small groups — a method also used in Côa — were organised. Interestingly, the tours and workshops are organised by a local body, the Association for the Development of the Ciudad Rodrigo District or ADECOCIR. Since 2012 virtual visits have also been possible on the museum's website (Burón Álvarez, del Val Recio 2012, p. 141; Burón Alvarez, Fernández Moreno 2009, p. 252).

3. Conclusion

Participatory and bottom-up approaches to heritage management have been supported by most international bodies for many years now. From the 1980s documents, action plans, guidelines, recommendations, declarations, protocols and conventions have increasingly insisted on giving a voice to local communities. UNESCO first voiced its interest in

what in 1976 was termed "people and associations" and in 1995 the World Heritage Committee made this interest its own with the revision of its Operational Guidelines to make the participation of local communities in the nomination process compulsory, and again in 2008 expanding this participation to the management of World Heritage properties. However, in practice there seems to be a large gap between the intentions and the implementation of the guidelines. This has been shown in this article through the examination of a particular case study: that of the rock art World Heritage properties in Spain. In two of the three properties, and some would suggest in all three of them, the participation of local communities both in the nomination process and in the current management of the properties is still largely absent.

The Operational Guidelines had already made the participation of local communities compulsory by the time the ARAMPI was inscribed on the WH list in 1998, the Altamira property was extended to include seventeen other Upper Palaeolithic painted caves in northern Spain (2008) and the Upper Palaeolithic engraved landscapes of the Côa Valley WH property was enlarged to include Siega Verde (2010). Nevertheless, the process took place in all three places without local communities seemingly having participated and this was overlooked (see also van den Dries 2015 on this issue in relation to other WH sites). The omission did not stop there as, perhaps with the partial exception of the Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley and Siega Verde WH property, community involvement could only be described as loose (Deegan 2012, p. 77) and local communities are not currently participating in the management of the resources. The Periodic Reports seem to acknowledge this, but again no eyebrows seem to have been raised. As the reading of the various publications issued by the managers of these World Heritage properties seems to indicate, the intrinsic value of the resource is still predominant in their approach. Their upmost concern is the conservation of the sites, a focus that is obviously essential, but the fixation with this and with (decreasingly?) supporting specialised studies of the sites overshadows any other type of concern for other aspects that, in theory, seem to be equally critical in the eyes of the World Heritage Committee, such as the socialisation of heritage, i.e. the participation of local communities in the management of the resource.

A review of what is happening at other rock art properties around the world makes it clear that in some social engagement of local populations is taking place (Cochrane 2015), and there is some acknowledgement within the community that this should be the ideal (Agnew *et al.* 2015,

pp. 24, 25, 30). At other sites, however, there is a very similar situation to that observed in Spain, with a rather managerial top-down approach towards local communities (Deacon, Mazel 2010, p. 21; Onetto *et al.* 2010). In fact, local communities seem to be very low in importance to UNESCO officers with key responsibilities regarding rock art World Heritage properties, as this text seems to indicate (not because of what it says, but because of what it omits):

> At the moment, the experts handling nominations are examining the methodological connections between rock art expressions, anthropology, and archaeology, and are seeking assistance from institutions concerned with applied conservation research. Everything points to an urgent need to explore how to confront the global problems of the conservation of rock art…
> (Sanz 2012).

That is to say, conservation and intrinsic values still are considered central, to such an extent that local communities and social values are not deemed important enough to be mentioned in an article on rock art and World Heritage by someone from inside the institution.

To conclude, it could be argued that it does not seem in the spirit of the Operational Guidelines revised in 1995 and in 2008 that the state, regional (and sometimes) local heritage offices are the only ones with the remit for representing local communities, as this was the situation before these changes to the guidelines were agreed. The fact that the World Heritage Committee currently overlooks aspects that are clearly stated in the Operational Guidelines seems to suggest that better systems of monitoring and evaluation are needed. It may also be a good idea for the WH Committee to organise a series of workshops to give more practical advice on what is required for the involvement of local communities in the nomination and management of World Heritage properties and to share good practice where the operational guidelines have already been implemented.

References

N. Agnew, J. Deacon, N. Hall, T. Little, S. Sullivan, P. Taçon (eds) 2015, *Rock Art: A Cultural Treasure at Risk,* Los Angeles.

A.A. Al Haija 2011, *Jordan: Tourism and conflict with local communities*, "Habitat International", 35(1), pp. 93-100.

M.-T. Albert 2012, *Perspectives of World Heritage: towards future-oriented strategies with the five 'Cs'*, in Albert *et al.* 2012, pp. 32-38.

M.-T. Albert, M. Richon, M.J. Viñals, A. Witcomb (eds) 2012, *Community development through World Heritage*, "World Heritage Papers", 31.

X. Ayán Vila, D. Barreiro, F. Criado-Boado, A. Nicolau, E. Parga-Dans, C. Sánchez-Carretero, M. Santos Estévez, V. Téllez 2014, *Communication from the team that developed the Research Project on the Social Value of Altamira*, in Criado-Boado 2014, no page numbers.

P. Bahn, J. Vertut 1988, *Images of the Ice Age.* Winward, Leicester.

D. Barreiro, F. Criado-Boado 2015, *Analizando el valor social de Altamira*, "Revista del Instituto Andaluz del Patrimonio Histórico", 87, pp. 108-127.

D. Barreiro, V. Téllez, G. Ruiz Zapatero 2014, *Altamira en la escuela [Informe G5_Nº 10]*, in Criado-Boado 2014, no page numbers.

M. Burón Álvarez, J. del Val Recio 2012, *La Zona Arqueológica de Siega Verde: aspectos relacionados con su conservación y gestión*, in Juste *et al.* 2012, pp. 137-146.

M. Burón Alvarez, J.J. Fernández Moreno 2009, *El reto de la gestión del arte rupestre: experiencias en Castilla y León*, in López Mira, Martínez Valle, Matamoros de Villa 2009, pp. 249-258.

É. Cartailhac 1902, *La grotte ornée d'Altamira (Espagne): Mea culpa d'un sceptique*, "L'Anthropologie", 13, pp. 348-354.

J. Castells Camp, G. Hernández Herrero, R. Ten Carné, J. Martínez García, M. San Nicolás del Toro, R. Martínez Valle, R. Alloza Izquierdo, J.I. Royo Guillén, S. Sánchez-Chiquito de la Rosa 2001, *Arte rupestre del arco mediterráneo: breve historia de una propuesta*, "Panel", 1, pp. 12-17.

P. Cochrane 2015, *Managing Australia's World Heritage in Kakadu National Park and Uluru Kata-Tjuta National Park*, in *The 2014 IUCN World Parks Congress*, Sydney, pp. 66-71. Online: aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/13_Cochrane.pdf.

C. Colwell-Chanthaphonh, T.J. Ferguson 2010, *Intersecting magisteria. Bridging archaeological science and traditional knowledge*, "Journal of Social Archaeology", 10(3), pp. 325-346.

C. Colwell, T.J. Ferguson 2014, *The Snow-Capped Mountain and the Uranium Mine. Zuni Heritage and the Landscape Scale in Cultural Resource Management*, "Advances in Archaeological Practice", 2(4), pp. 234-251.

D. Comer (ed) 2012, *Tourism and Archaeological Heritage Management at Petra: Driver to Development or Destruction?*, New York.

F. Corrales Ulloa, A. Badilla Cambronero 2013, *Los sitios arqueológicos con esferas de piedra del Delta del Diquís: protección, conservación, investigación y participación de la comunidad*, in M. Aguilar Bonilla, O. Niglio (eds), *La conservación del patrimonio cultural en Costa Rica*, Roma, 305-326.

F. Criado-Boado 2014, *Colección Proyecto Valor Social de Altamira*. Online: http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/112860, Madrid.

J. Deacon, A. Mazel 2010, *uKhahlamba Drakensberg and Mapungubwe: Contrasts in South Africa's World Heritage Rock Art Sites*, "Adoranten", 2010, pp. 5-23.

N. Deegan 2012, *The local-global nexus in the politics of World Heritage: space for community development?*, in Albert *et al.* 2012, pp. 77-83.

DiaDia 2015, *Els afectats pel Parc Cultural de Valltorta demanaran a Cultura que paralitzi la incoació del BIC fins que se'ls escolte,* diadia. 26 Oct 2015. Online, Castellón.

M. Díaz-Andreu, A. Vargas, M. Bea 2015, *From doodles to World Heritage: assessing the impact of the inclusion of the Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula (ARAMPI) on the World Heritage List*, in *Pre-Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage: People and Communities* (Menorca, Spain, 29-30 April, 1-2 May 2015).

S. Disko 2012, *World Heritage sites and indigenous communities: the importance of adopting a human rights-based approach*, in Albert *et al.* 2012, pp. 16-26.

P. Fatás Monforte 2009, *La cueva de Altamira y su museo: un caso extremo en la relación entre turismo y patrimonio*, in A. Domínguez Arranz (ed), *El patrimonio arqueológico a debate. Su valor cultural y económico,* Actas de las jornadas (Huesca, 7-8 mayo 2007), Huesca, pp. 185-194.

P. Fatás Monforte 2011, *Altamira, símbolo, identidad y marca*, in L. Garrote Mestre (ed), *Actas del Simposio Internacional El patrimonio cultural como símbolo*, Valladolid, pp. 161-186.

A.P.B. Fernandes, F.M. Pinto 2006, *Changing stakeholders and community attitudes in the Côa Valley, Portugal*, in N. Agnew, J. Bridgland (eds), *Of the Past, for the Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation*, Los Angeles, pp. 136-42.

M.S. Hernández Pérez 2009, *Arte rupestre Postpaleolítico en el Arco Mediterráneo de la Península Ibérica: balance de 10 años de descubrimientos y estudios*, in López Mira, Martínez Valle, Matamoros de Villa 2009, pp. 59-79.

I. Hodder 2003, *Archaeological reflexivity and the "Local" voice*, "Anthropological Quarterly", 76(1), pp. 55-69.

H. Human 2015, *Democratising world heritage: The policies and practices of community involvement in Turkey*, "Journal of Social Archaeology", 15(2), pp. 160-183.

T. Jimura 2011, *The impact of world heritage site designation on local communities - A case study of Ogimachi, Shirakawa—mura, Japan*, "Tourism Management", 32, pp. 288-296.

Jornadas 1990, *Jornadas sobre parques con arte rupestre (1989, Zaragoza),* Zaragoza.

M.N. Juste, M.A. Hernádez, A. Pereta, J.I. Royo, J.A. Andrés (eds) 2012, *Jornadas técnicas para la gestión del arte rupestre, Patrimonio Mundial*, Huesca.

M.N. Juste Arruga 2012, *Los parques culturales como ejemplo de gestión, desarrollo territorial e implicación de la población local*, in Juste *et al.* 2012, pp. 241-246.

H. Kalman (ed) 2014, *Heritage Planning: Principles and Process,* London.

J.A. Lasheras (ed) 2003, *Redescubrir Altamira,* Madrid.

J.A. Lasheras, C. Lafuente, R. Ontañón, A. Llamosas, J.J. Fernández 2012, *La Cueva de Altamira y el arte rupestre paleolítico de la Cornisa Cantábrica. Buenas prácticas para la gestión del arte rupestre paleolítico en España / The Cave of Altamira and the Palaeolithic Cave Art of Northern Spain. Best practices for the management of the Palaeolithic rock art*, in A. Castillo (ed), *Actas del Primer Congreso Internacional de Buenas Prácticas en Patrimonio Mundial: Arqueología / Proceedings of the I International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage: Archaeology*, Madrid, pp. 613-620.

K. Liwieratos 2004, *Introducing the competitive advantage theory/strategy in heritage management*, "Public Archaeology", 3(4), pp. 227-239.

J.A. López Mira, R. Martínez Valle, C. Matamoros de Villa (eds) 2009, *El arte rupestre del Arco Mediterráneo de la Península Ibérica: 10 años en la lista del Patrimonio Mundial de la UNESCO*, Actas IV Congreso (Valencia, 3-5 diciembre 2008), Valencia.

F. Martínez Roget, X. Pereira López 2014, *Estudio económico [Informe G5_Nº 3]*, in Criado-Boado 2014, no page numbers.

R. Martínez Valle 2000, *El parque cultural de Valltorta-Gasulla (Castellón)*, "Trabajos de Prehistoria", 57(2), pp. 65-76.

M.E. Masis Munoz 2015, *Festival de Las Esferas precolombinas: motor para el desarrollo sostenible en una comunidad del Canton de Osa, Costa Rica*, in Pre-Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage: People and Communities (Menorca, Spain, 29-30 April, 1-2 May 2015).

O. Moro 2008, *Art caves as symbolic spaces: the case of Altamira*, in M-.K. Mariková, Jana, N. Schlanger, S. Lévin (eds), *Sites of Memory. Between Scientific Research and Collective Representation*, Proceedings of the AREA seminar (Prague, February 2006), Prague, pp. 69-78.

H. Obermaier 1928a, *A Guide to the Caves of Altamira and the Town of Santillana del Mar (Province of Santander, Spain),* Madrid.

H. Obermaier 1928b, *Las Cuevas de Altamira cerca de Santillana del Mar (Santander),* Madrid.

M. Onetto, M.L. Funes, A. Murgo 2010, *Integrando a la comunidad en la protección del patrimonio. El caso de Cueva de las Manos, Perito Moreno, Provincia de Santa Cruz*, "Novedades de Antropología", 64, pp. 7-11.

R. Ontañón Peredo (ed) 2008, *Palaeolithic Cave Art of Northern Spain (Extension to Altamira)*, Proposal of Inscription of Properties in the List World Heritage List.

R. Ontañón Peredo 2010, *El arte rupestre paleolítico de la cornisa cantábrica, Patrimonio de la Humanidad*, in J.J. Durán, F. Carrasco (eds), *Cuevas: Patrimonio, Naturaleza, Cultura y Turismo*, Madrid, pp. 495-502.

H.N. Pereira 2007, *Contemporary trends in conservation: culturalization, significance and sustainability*, "City & Time", 3(2), pp. 15-25.

A.E. Pérez Sánchez 1983, *Función del museo en la colectividad*, in M. Fernández-Miranda (ed), *50 años de protección del patrimonio histórico artístico 1933-1983*, Madrid, pp. 59-64.

Redacción 2015, *La Unió de Llauradors presenta alegaciones al Parque Cultural Valltorta-Gassulla*, Cope. 30 Apirl 2015. Online: http://www.cope.es/detalle/La-Unio-de-Lla uradors-presenta-alegaciones-al-Parque-Cultural-Valltorta-Gassulla.html, Madrid.

A. Riegl 1903, *Der moderne Denkmalkultus. Sein Wessen und seine Entstehung*, Wien-Leipzig.

S. Ríos 2015, *Aluvión de alegaciones a la protección BIC del parque cultural de la Valltorta*, "El Periódico Mediterráneo", 1 May 2015. Online: www.cope.es/detalle/La-Unio-de-Llauradors-presenta-alegacio nes-al-Parque-Cultural-Valltorta-Gassu lla.html, Valencia.

O. Ronström 2014, *Consequences of World Heritage production: the heritage town*, in H. Hølleland, M. Oldham (eds), *Between dream and reality: Debating the impact of World Heritage Listing*, Oslo, pp. 7-19.

M. Rössler 2012, *Partners in site management. A shift in focus: heritage and community involvement*, in Albert *et al.* 2012, pp. 27-31.

N. Sanz 2012, *Rock Art and the UNESCO World Heritage List*, in J. MacDonald, P. Veth (eds), *A Companion to Rock Art*, Oxford, pp. 491-514.

L. Smith, E. Waterton 2009, *Heritage, communities and archaeology*, London.

H. Stovel 2004, *Top-down and bottom-up management*, "ICCROM Newsletter", 30, pp. 16-17.

S. Titchen 2002, *Indigenous peoples and cultural and natural World Heritage sites*, Presentation at the conference 'Cultural Heritage and sacred sites: World Heritage from an indigenous perspective', New York, 15 May 2002 (accessed October 2015).

UNESCO-WHC 2012, *Sharing best practices in World Heritage management*, UNESCO, World Heritage Centre, Paris.

UNESCO-WHC 2014, *Periodic Report - Second Cycle Section II-Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula*, UNESCO, World Heritage Centre, Paris.

UNESCO-WHC 2015, *Operational Guidelines*, UNESCO, World Heritage Centre. Online: http://whc.unesco.org/document/ 137843, Paris.

UNESCO 1972, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, UNESCO [English version on http://whc.unesco.org/archive/conven tion-en.pdf], Paris.

UNESCO 1976, *Recommendation on Participation by the People at Large in Cultural Life and their Contribution to It*, UNESCO. Online: http://portal.unesco.org/ en/ev.php-URL_ID=13097&URL_DO= DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, Paris.

UNESCO 2007, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, World Heritage Committee, Thirty first Session (Christchurch, New Zealand, 23 June-2 July 2007).

M.H. Van Den Dries 2015, *Social involvement as a buzz word in World Heritage Nominations*, in A. Castillo (ed), *Proceedings of the II International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage: People and Communities*, Madrid, pp. 668-686.

VVAA 1980, *Altamira Symposium. Actas del Symposium internacional sobre Arte Prehistórico celebrado en conmemoración del primer centenario del descubrimiento de las pinturas de Altamira (1879-1979)*, Madrid.

T. Yamamura, T.X. Zhang, Y. Fujiki 2006, *The social and cultural impact of tourism development on world heritage sites: A case of the Old Town of Lijiang, China, 2000-2004*, "WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment", 97, pp. 117-126, doi:10.2495/ST06011.

J. Zilhão 1998, *The rock art of the Côa Valley, Portugal: Significance, conservation and management*, "Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites", 2, pp. 193-206.