DYNAMIC INTEGRITY: A NEW CONCEPT TO APPROACH THE CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE (HUL)

Silvio Mendes Zancheti & Rosane Piccolo Loretto

Centro de Estudos Avançados da Conservação Integrada

DYNAMIC INTEGRITY: A NEW CONCEPT TO APPROACH THE CONSERVATION OF HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPE (HUL)

Silvio Mendes Zancheti[1] & Rosane Piccolo Loretto[2]

Abstract

HUL is a tentative approach to deal with *complex urban heritage areas*. This type of heritage area can be understood as being: formed by urban elements that, among themselves, have significant relationships; composed by overlapped significance layers in space and time; related to a large number of stakeholders, and subjected to strong pressures for transformation. Although there is a great effort in the conceptualization of new categories of properties, seeking to understand them in context, advances in conservation planning have not been sufficient to ensure the continuity of cultural significance in urban areas. Presently, the conservation of heritage properties follows a methodological three steps path. Firstly, its cultural significance must be identified; secondly, the integrity of the attributes related to the significance must be assessed, and lastly the authenticity of the attributes to express the significance, must be judged as true or false. Therefore, integrity is the key concept to assess the state of conservation of heritage properties. However, the current concept of integrity, adopted by heritage field of knowledge, is not capable to deal with the complexity of the HUL. On the other hand, there is a tendency in heritage field to define conservation as the regulation or control of change. This assumption is problematic since it emphasizes the changes of meanings, values and attributes, instead of the idea of continuity. Controlling change means fixing the attributes that express the meanings of heritage areas, and this is a task fated to be unsuccessful in complex cities or, even in not so complex urban sites. Considering the role of integrity on conservation processes, besides the challenge to deal with continuity of significance in not static contexts, this paper advances the concept of *dynamic integrity*. It is a heritage quality that may be attributed to properties whose attributes are capable to express past and present meanings, and therefore values, in a context of change, without relying exclusively on records of memory. So, dynamic integrity emphasizes continuity in changing urban context and may be a key concept for the new HUL approach.

Key words: Integrity, complex urban heritage areas, continuity, change.

Introduction

The phenomena of rapid urbanization and transformation of existing cities have put the conservation of heritage areas in the core of urban planning. However, the traditional notion of monuments, groups of buildings or cities sections, identifying them as

---

separate entities within a wider urban context, is not sufficient to protect the characteristics and qualities of objects for fragmentation, degeneration and subtraction of significance. Therefore, there was a transformation of scale conservation, aroused from the challenges in this field, and as a consequence, the emergence of new approaches to deal with properties in territorial scale, such as the *Historic Urban Landscape* (HUL). But there are not enough advances in the instruments for identification, protection, management and monitoring of these objects in order to promote the conservation of large urban areas inserted in a context of high pressure for transformation.

It seems that this occurs due to integrity - heritage quality directly related to the state of conservation of cultural properties - being treated according to its traditional concept of "physical wholeness". Thus, this paper discusses the notion of *dynamic integrity* considering the current approach of HUL, in view of maintenance of cultural significance. The combination of these two key ideas in conservation imposes the challenge of dealing with an urban context and a property from the perspective of complexity.

The conservation of HUL

The HUL approach to the conservation of urban heritage areas arises after a long period of critique of the theory of conservation. Since the 1980's, the long and sound tradition of the conservation theory (Ruskin, Viollet-le-Duc, Boito, Giovannoni and Brandi) has been revised according to the 'postmodern' standpoint.[3] The Burra Charter opened this revision when it defined conservation as "… all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance" and associated the significance to the interpretation of "… different individuals or groups" (Icomos, 1999). This revision was well explained and contextualized by Salvador Muñoz Viñas (2005), when he states: (a) that the uses of objects (including urban areas) are necessarily a concern to conservation; (b) the new approach of the discipline is no longer attached to the ideas of truth and objectivity; (c) there is a move from the objects to the subjects (people or stakeholders) and (d) conservation is conditioned by expressivity and interpretation of the meanings of the objects.

The conservation of urban heritage is an activity involved with maintenance of present and past cultural significances. To achieve sustainable conservation, managers of urban areas and other stakeholders act on the attributes of the heritage objects that convey cultural meanings identified throughout intersubjective processes. The attributes can be of a material (tangible) or a non-material (intangible) nature. The social agents involved with conservation may keep, change, restore, reshape or substitute the attributes or the objects. They may also produce activities that help to foster meanings as part of the collective memory of society, through educational and cultural activities. The actions of managers and other stakeholders should be guided in such a way that the meanings, the integrity and the authenticity of the objects attributes are maintained. This means that sustainable

---

[3] "Postmodernism is largely a reaction to the assumed certainty of scientific, or objective, efforts to explain reality. In essence, it stems from a recognition that reality is not simply mirrored in human understanding of it, but rather, is constructed as the mind tries to understand its own particular and personal reality. For this reason, postmodernism is highly skeptical of explanations which claim to be valid for all groups, cultures, traditions, or races, and instead focuses on the relative truths of each person. In the postmodern understanding, interpretation is everything; reality only comes into being through our interpretations of what the world means to us individually. Postmodernism relies on concrete experience over abstract principles, knowing always that the outcome of one's own experience will necessarily be fallible and relative, rather than certain and universal". For further information, see www.pbs.org/faithandreason/gengloss/postm-body.html .

conservation seeks to maintain the condition for the interpretation of the relation attributes-meanings between generations, because it should: (a) carry forward the present meanings of heritage to future generations; (b) maintain records of meanings given by past generations for the use of present and future generations and (c) leave opened to future generations the possibility of interpreting and associating new meanings of past and present to heritage. But in order to do this, it is fundamental for sustainable heritage conservation to keep the integrity and the authenticity of material or non-material attributes of the objects.

This approach to conservation does not start from values since it is composed of a three stages process: (a) identification of objects and attributes; (b) assessment of meanings or significance and (c) the judgment of the integrity and the authenticity of the attributes|objects. Values are the outcome of the process when the cultural relevance of the object is compared with other heritage objects of interest for society. Only in this moment, it will be possible to state that the object is more or less valuable in relation to other objects of historic, artistic, scientific and other types of values.

Cultural significance, complexity and the HUL approach

The historic urban landscape approach is an answer to the management of urban World Heritage Sites under new forms of development pressure. The enlargement of the concept of heritage associated with the growing perception of its importance to the social, economic and environmental sustainable development raised management problems that were not usually associated with the conservation of urban heritage areas. The zoning instruments, as the protected and buffer zones, for example, have shown low efficacy under circumstance of high urban pressure for change. The new perception that maintenance of cultural significance is the main goal of sustainable heritage polices, makes zoning boundaries a week instrument for defining and redefining social, economic and cultural meanings and therefore values of the material and nonmaterial urban heritage and its attributes.

The Vienna Memorandum (Icomos, 2005) was an alert to the fact that the inclusion or suppression of architectural artifacts and urban infrastructures in buffer zones, or other close areas to the protected sites, may change the cultural significance of the World Heritage Sites. In this context, it was suggested a "landscape approach for identifying, conserving, managing and valuing historic areas within their broader urban contexts, by considering the inter-relationships of their physical forms, their spatial organization and connection, their natural features and settings, and their social and cultural values" (Unesco, 2010, p. 9). From the analysis of the main documents produced by Unesco and Icomos in drafting the HUL, it is possible to infer that the core of the approach is composed of two main ideas. First, the conservation management must deal with the *complexity* of contemporary cities and second, sustainable conservation seeks to maintain the condition for the interpretation of the relation attributes-meanings over time, which is the cultural significance.

Complexity

The recognition of cities and urban heritage areas as complex systems[4] is at the center of the management problems faced by HUL. This is not a novelty since complexity

---

[4] Complex systems are defined in this paper as "...one made up of a large number of parts that interact in a nonsimple way. In such systems, the whole is more than the sum of the parts, not in an ultimate, metaphysical sense, but in an

has been a methodological contribution to the analysis of cultural heritage (Kowalski, 1998, p. 245) and of contemporary cities, metropolis and others forms of urbanized areas from the standpoint of the scientific paradigm of order & disorder. The interpretation of the contemporary cities asks for a high level of abstraction (Secchi, 2006, p.146), since the categories used till recently have not shown interpretative capacity to express the new urban phenomena. One of the clearest examples is the usage of the category of landscape (cultural or urban historic) to express forms of the recent and past urbanizations. In the heritage field, landscape came into the scene to complement or replace the categories of monuments, groups of buildings, urban sites and others, in order to integrate material and non-material values of urban areas. Therefore, urban landscape is a highly abstract concept that exists only within an *interpretative model* or a discourse. It is a difficult interpretation category, since it cannot to be "seen" by non-specialists which have not being trained on scientific and discursive approaches.

As a category landscape has the merit of been synthetic and comprehensive. However, it is too broad to cover practically everything that happens under the range of heritage objects. The broad and bold characteristics has been put in evidence, in the attempts to identify cultural urban landscapes and operationalize their management processes, as was, for example, the cases of the recent tentative nomination to the World Heritage List of the cities of Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires.

Partially recognizing urban heritage areas as complex phenomena, Unesco (2011) recently defined HUL as "…the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of 'historic center' or 'ensemble' to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting". The layering and the extension characteristics imposed the appropriation of different scales of space for analyzing HUL, but are not enough to capture the complexity of the urban areas of nowadays. Rosane Piccolo Loretto (2011) framed a more comprehensible view of these objects as *complex urban heritage areas*, that are characterized as properties which: (1) have many layers of significance overlapped in space and time; (2) are composed by subsets that do not have necessarily spatial continuity, but show some significant relations among them; (3) are inserted in a urban context of development and subject to pressure for change in use and spatial configuration and (4) are subject to the emergence and action of many stakeholders that act competitively.

It seems that this definition is close to the reality of the nowadays cities and provides analytical elements to operationalize the concept with practical tools.

Significance

Significance is a synthetic representation of the identification, assessment, judgment and social validation of past and present social meanings associated to heritage areas (Zancheti, Hidaka, Ribeiro, & Aguiar, 2009). In a recent article, Mirian Clavir (2009, p. 142) states that "[c]ultural significance is tied not only to the period that created its original meaning, but to today, and the future". That is related to the recognitions that cultural significance is not fixed in time but is the expression of the interpreted past and present meanings of heritage attributes. In this way, cultural significance is a synthetic and *dynamic* representation that expresses the *continuity* of heritage meanings, in a context of change of material and non-material attributes, as well as functions and uses of HUL.

---

important pragmatic sense that, given the properties of the parts and the laws of their interaction it is not a trivial matter to infer the properties of the whole." (Simon, 1969, p.86)

The meanings carried forward from the past are grasped by virtue of the memory of individuals, with the help of instruments that support social memory such as books, documents, photographs, buildings, and so forth. From a sociocultural perspective, significance is derived from assessments of many subjects which latch a multitude of meanings onto the cultural heritage, thus depending on intersubjectivity with the items that support memory (Anderson, 1998). The supports to memory mediate the choices between the past and present meanings of the objects and pass judgment on the values used in determining the conservation action of the heritage. To be effective, the outcome of this judgment must be socially validated. If not, it is expected that conservation actions will be the source of conflict between the stakeholders.

In spite of the holistic character of significance, it cannot be used directly in managing HUL, since it is not objectively or completely known. Significance is operational only in the format of a statement of significance, which is a partial subset of the meanings that compose the significance of the object. For Mason (2004), institutionalizing the statement of significance as a guiding element in the process of conservation tends to perpetuate the meanings presented in the statement, which prevents other meanings from emerging or fading away. This is due to the emphasis on conservation of the physical and material aspects, thus forgetting the "natural essence of significance" which is an expression of cultural meaning. Mason concludes by adding that significance should "change, and involve multivalency and dispute and be contingent on time, place and other factors" (Mason, 2004, p. 65).

The following topics search to characterize the specificity of the significance of complex urban heritage areas using the description of a conscious complex system proposed by Geyer (2003, p. 15):

(a) *Orderly and chaotic*: Significance is not totally controlled. It may show an orderly structure that changes with the current cultural patterns, but may also presents emergences and losses of meanings that are not normally predicted;

(b) *Non reducible to elements:* Significance means more than the summation of the sets of meanings of their singular objects;

(c) *Partially modeled:* Significance cannot be totally organized into comprehensible models of interpretation. The explanation models of the significance are always partially tied to specific analysis field and to social perspectives of the agents involved with the management of the area;

(d) *Boundaries and uncertainty*: Significance is tied to the urban areas but its composition|territory is not completely known. There are no clear spatial or social boundaries where the significance is objectively identified;

(e) *Adaptation and emergence*: Significance is changing continuously adapting to the social milieu and is open to the emergence of new social meanings of the attributes;

(f) *Conscious agents:* Significance is the outcome of social process of conscious agents (the subjects, being individuals or social groups) acting competitively or cooperatively.

Following from these characteristics, cultural significance of HUL should always be reviewed and updated considering the continuous movement of society and the effects of these changes in physical and functional aspects of urban areas. It must be open to the addition of different significant elements or the opposite, the oblivion of meanings that occurs more frequently and at great speed in complex urban areas.

Continuity facing gaps, damages and losses of attributes

The adoption of the significance as the main concept of the conservation theory triggered the redesign of many conservation management instruments as, for example, the heritage conservation and management plans. According to James S. Kerr (2000, p. 1), a conservation plan of a heritage site is "…a document which sets out what is significant in a place and, consequently, what policies are appropriate to enable that significance to be retained in its future use and development. For most places it deals with the management of change". This definition shows the strong association between conservation and management of change, and this association is not arbitrary or casual. It was a way to bypass the barriers imposed by the ideas of *permanence* derived from the restoration theory, centered on material and physical aspects of objects. Significance is the outcome of the constant tension between two parts of a same process – permanence and change – of the cultural meanings of the material and physical world. The emphasis on change opens a door in the conservation process to all sort of pressures for change independently to their origins and purposes. This has been certainly the case of many regeneration projects of historic centers which are under economic pressure for adopting new typologies of buildings in buffer zones as alerted by the Vienna Memorandum (Icomos, 2005).

It seems the concept of continuity is a good way for characterizing the objectives of the conservation management of HUL. The associated ideas of cohesion, flow, connection, sequence, succession, progression, wholeness and interrelationship express the capacity of continuity for dealing simultaneously with permanence and change. There is no simple way of defining continuity since it has been a tricky problem in philosophy since Aristotle. One of the central definitions of continuity was given by Kant when he stated that this phenomenon occurs when an object is formed by elements that have different parts of the same kind. The philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce, starting from Kant, proposed a new definition of continuity that escapes from the traditional conception of succession and of collections of similar things. He defines continuity as:

> The material parts of a thing or other object, *W*, that is composed of such parts, are whatever things are, firstly, each and every one of them, other than *W*; secondly are all of some one internal nature (for example, are all places, or all spatial realities, or all spiritual realities, or are all ideas, or are all characters, or are all relations, or are all external representations, etc.); thirdly, form together a collection of objects in which no one occurs twice over and, fourthly, are such that the Being of each of them together with the modes of connexion between all subcollections of them, constitute the being of *W* (*apud* Potter & Shields, 1977).

This definition associates continuity to the diversity of the collection elements and the connections between all subcollections to form one being. It is definition very "inspiring" when adapted to continuity of significance in space in time and the connection between past, present and future significances of HUL.

The shift from permanence|change to continuity in conservation management immediately focuses on the analysis of the problems regarding the representation models of significance when there are space and time discontinuity between significant attributes, objects, subcollections and collections of objects of the HUL. May the continuity of significance be maintained in the presence of "gaps or damages" in the significant elements? Or may it be "filled" with elements of a different nature as the records of memory that perform all types of documents from the past?

Tung (2001) in studying the heritage continuity in Rome shows that, in spite of the enormous changes in the physical fabric of the city, its residents and visitors identify continuity between the present and the past (even going back to the antiquity) by interpreting the significant material|physical layers of the city and recurring to the living cultural memories. The attributes of the material|physical attributes and the living memories of Rome "transmit" information from the past to the present without canceling the potential of the city to generate new meanings. People can apprehend *continuity* of the significance in the presence of many "gaps" in the subsets of significant attributes and objects.

This can be explained due to the perception of a relationship between continuity and the maintenance of the significant relations among the material|physical attributes of Rome in long periods of time. In this case, the records of cultural memory are important because they are resources reinforcing the perception of the significant relations. The documents may "fill the meaning gaps" existing amongst material|physical attributes which would be important to express past cultural significance of the city.

The documents may help to rememorize previous existing relations but cannot substitute or reestablish them. The documents are always dated (historical) expressions of the "world vision" of the individuals or social groups that produced them. They reflect the understanding of a period of time but cannot give to present generation access to *all* information that might be encapsulated in the objects of the past (Staniforth, 2000).

The case of Rome is important to show the relevance of the material and non-material attributes to continuity in the interpretation of the cultural meanings and significance of the city. The standard definition of integrity is "a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and|or cultural heritage and its attributes" according to Unesco, 2005[5]. This definition is centered on the permanence of attributes for the continuity of the place significance of the place. The "damages and losses" in attributes would mean reduction in the capacity of the integrity to convey cultural meanings.

The changes in the theory of conservation due to the adoption of the cultural significance as its central concept tends to insert the idea of integrity into a dynamic context in which continuity of cultural significance is not necessarily affected in a negative way by certain changes in the material|physical attributes.

Some interpretations of integrity[6]

Integrity is an important concept for the theory of conservation and is an object of intense discussion in the specialized literature especially in the works dealing with the ethics of conservation (Clavir, 2009). However, in spite of its theoretical importance, integrity has not been subject to clear procedures for its assessment in the current practice in complex urban heritage areas.

Initially, integrity was a quality associated to natural heritage and meant the wholeness of ecosystems and environments. Since 1992, it was required to assess cultural properties in National Parks in North America, and since then several studies for its conceptualization and operationalization were produced.

---

[5]More precisely the Operational Guide of the World Heritage Convention defines that: "Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity, therefore requires assessing the extent to which the property: a) includes all elements necessary to express its outstanding universal value; b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property's significance; c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect (Unesco 2008).
[6] This part of the paper is based on the research project of Rosane Piccolo Loretto (2011)

In 1995, the National Park Service launched the guide *How to Apply the National Register: Criteria for Evaluation* in which integrity was defined as the ability to convey the significance of the object, and this evaluation was strictly obtained from a subjective judgment. According to the guide, integrity must always be grounded in an understanding of the physical characteristics of their attributes and the way they relate to the significance. According to this approach the historical properties maintain their integrity (i.e., convey their meaning) or not in an absolute form of measurement. For National Park Service, integrity is defined by seven aspects that can be combined in countless ways, namely: location, design, environment, materials, labor, feeling and association. Determining which of these aspects constitute the most important for the expression of the meanings of the objects depends on their significance.

Gordon Bennett (1995), in the same year, coined the term *commemorative integrity*, meaning the health or integrity of a historic site. This proposal was made in order to provide tools to monitor the state of conservation of historic sites of Canada. To the author, the state of commemorative integrity is given when: the resources that represent the significance of the site are not compromised or at risk; when the reasons that establish the significance are disclosed; and when the values attributed for the place are respected by all decisions and actions affect the site.

Three years later Sease (1998), in the proposal for a code of ethics for conservation, states that integrity refers to the condition of incorruptible, conveying a sense of something that was not violated.

In the late 1990's, amid the myriad of debates about the concept and importance of considering the integrity of properties in the pursuit of its conservation, Unesco promoted the Nara Meeting on Development and Integrity of Historic Cities (1999), in which was stated that integrity: (a) covers human activities related to the characteristics of the physical settlement; (b) is represented by the coherence of the historic area in relation to the merging of components; (c) includes historical overlaps of the cities; (d) should be treated recognizing the link between socio-economic development, community well-being and preservation of historical characteristic.

A few years later, Miriam Clavir (2004), in her study on the preservation of property in museums, discusses the idea of *conceptual integrity* which is determined from the interpretation, not only of the object but also its relationship with its cultural context.

Pearson and Marshall (2006), considering the importance of the context recognized by Clavir (2004), stress that integrity refers to the degree that the place retains the shape and completeness of its physical fabric, of its historical associations and its uses or functions, that provide social cultural significance to the place.

In 2005, integrity was firstly conceptualized by Unesco in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, considering both natural and cultural properties. According to the document, integrity consists in the intact character of heritage and of its attributes.

A year after the Guidelines, Jokilehto (2006) reiterated the notion of integrity previously established and suggested the use of three dimensions to evaluate in a cultural property.
   (a) Social-functional integrity: identification of the functions related to social development processes, peculiar to the place where the property is located;
   (b) Structural integrity: identification related to physical and material sources;
   (c) Visual Integrity: required to identify the aesthetic aspects of the place.

For this author, the evaluation of integrity must necessarily be based on the qualities or attributes that are valued in a property, and therefore related to its cultural significance.

Lastly, according to Stovel (2007) integrity is a condition of qualifying heritage properties similar to the authenticity. It should be noted that the qualifying conditions are essential to ensure the relevance of the property to be nominated, and equally important to ensure the targeting of conservation and management guidelines upon registration. Integrity is related to completeness and intactness of the property, advancing the idea that it should be understood as the capacity of the object to carry its significance, being more a matter of *communication* than a physical reality.

The dynamic integrity (DI)

The discussion and reshaping of the concept of integrity has shown some conceptual overlapping among definitions and analytical approaches. All of them point to an enlargement of its scope beyond the material|physical structure of the urban heritage to include uses, functions and activities. However, it is important to underline that the concept has not surpassed the limits of the material wholeness and intactness of the heritage, being therefore strongly tied to the idea of physical permanence of the attributes still.

To escape from this restriction and dialog with the changing nature of the complex urban heritage areas, the assessment of the condition of integrity must take into account the dynamic aspect of significance since it will assess the carrier capacity of the attributes of heritage to express contemporary cultural meanings, and consequently values. Heritage cannot act only as transmitters of "stable and self-evident values", but it has to permit the "renewal and adaptation of values" (Hobson, 2004, p. 74).

Integrity must express the significance of HUL by a vertical cross section of their significant layers and the linkage of horizontal relations between different and not necessarily contiguous heritage areas. It is expected to express past and present meanings without canceling *the emergence* of new meanings and, furthermore, the reinterpretation of old ones and that means *continuity*. The importance of the condition of integrity for heritage conservation relies on the maintenance of an open field of interpretation for past, present and future meanings, allowing a constant reinterpretation of heritage values (Zancheti *et alli*, 2009; Hobson, 2004).

Based on this, the recognition of the condition of integrity of HUL is fundamental to conservation. However, one cannot discuss the integrity of these properties excluding that the understanding of the transformations to which they are subjected is as important as the maintenance of its significant structures. Thus, conservation activities, within the idea of continuity, must identify and communicate with certain changes that areas can suffer, without considering them as undesirable effects.

However, what kind of change can occur without loss of continuity of cultural significance? What are the limits of acceptable changes in complex areas like HUL's? How to describe these changes? What is the extent that they alter the integrity of HUL's and subtract the ability to interpret meanings that are expressed by this condition? If it is the nature of cities are subject to change, how to recognize integrity?

Based on these questions, it is possible to affirm that the current concept of integrity is not suitable to deal with the features of most of the cities around the world due to the fact that significance is an opened and an unfinished social construction. Therefore, it is being proposed the concept of *dynamic integrity,* a heritage quality of properties that

accommodate certain changes whilst maintaining continuity of cultural meanings in time. Owing to this, it is possible to express past and present meanings without canceling the emergence of new elements and the reinterpretation of old ones. There is a capacity of the heritage area to dynamically express past and present meanings without relying exclusively on records of memory to fill gaps in the set of attributes.

Conclusion

The HUL approach needs an object to make it specific and relevant. It would be very difficult to discuss the approach without an object as reference for the analysis. Due to the broadness of landscape category used in HUL, and the difficulties associated with its operation in conservation management, this paper proposed that the objects of the HUL approach are *complex urban heritage area,* which are objects understood as conscious complex system that stress the uncertainties in the objective modeling of the object, its dependence on the action of conscious agents and its openness to the emergence of new facts and events in the system when it is still under observation and analysis. In this sense, the interpretation of cultural significance of HUL will follows the same characteristics of the conscious complex system, implying that the assessment the significance of the object of HUL is an ongoing process open to the emergence of meanings even in the analysis of past as well as the present significance. The idea of *continuity* was introduced as a substitute for the change, that has been disseminated as the main purpose of heritage conservation.

Significance was viewed as a dynamic concept open to additions, subtractions and superposition of meanings. However the objectivity of the attributes of this object should not be denied because it is clear that the attributes, material and nonmaterial, convey the meanings between generations. In a discourse on the significance of a complex urban heritage area the gaps in the meaningful attributes may be filled by records of memory, so making the discourse intelligible. The interpretation of the HUL by people however will continue to be dependent on integrity of the attributes. The records of memory are not sufficient to recompose the integrity of the attributes to express the significance of the past and the present, and leave open the possibilities to the interpretation of the significance in the future.

The concept of *dynamic integrity* was advanced to face the problem as a heritage quality of properties that accommodate certain changes whilst maintaining continuity of cultural meanings in time.

The final message of the articles is: conservation has to be focused mainly on continuity of significant attributes and theirs relations, in spite of the changing context and states of the attributes.

References

Anderson, B. 1998. The Importance of Cultural Meaning in Defining and Preserving Sense of Place. In: Tomlan, M. (ed.). *Preservation of what, for whom? A critical look at significance.* Ithaca: National Council for Preservation Education, p. 127-135.

Bennet, G. 1995. *Commemorative Integrity: Monitoring the State of Canada's national Historic Sites.* Available: www.icomos.org.

Clavir, M. 2004. *Preserving What is Valued: Museums, Conservation and First Nations.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Clavir, M. 2009. Conservation and cultural significance. In: Richmond Alison, Braker A. *Conservation: Principles, dilemmas and uncomfortable truths.* Oxford: Butherworth-Heinemann.

Geyer, R. 2009. *Europeanisation, Complexity, and the British Welfare State*. Available: aei.pitt.edu/1719/.

Hobson, E. 2004. *Conservation and planning: changing values in policy and practice*. London: Spon Press.

Icomos 1999. *The Burra Charter*. Available: australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/BURRA-CHARTER-1999_charter-only.pdf.

Icomos 2005. *Vienna Memorandum*. Available: whc.unesco.org/archive/2005/whc05-15ga-inf7e.pdf .

Jokilehto, J. 2006. Considerations on authenticity and integrity in world heritage context. *City & Time* 2 (1): 1, 2006. Available: www.ct.ceci-br.org.

Kerr, J.S. 2000. *The Conservation Plan*. Sydney: National Trust NSW.

Kowalski, W. 1998. Protecting the integrity of a complex heritage object. *Art antiquity and law*, v.3, n. 3, pp

243-252

Mason, R. 2004. Fixing Historic Preservation: A Constructive Critique of Significance. *Places, a Forum of Environmental Design*. v.16, n.1, pp. 64-71. Available: www.placesjournal.org/issues/issue.php?volume=16&issue=1.

Pearson, M.; Marshall, D. 2006. *Study of the condition and integrity of historic heritage places for the 2006*. State of Environment Report. Department of Environment and Heritage, Canberra, 2006. Available: www.deh.gov.au.

Piccolo Loretto, R. 2011. *Integridade dinâmica: manutenção da significância urbana em contextos de mudança*. Doctoral Dissertation Project Presented to Fauusp. São Paulo: Fauusp.

Potter, V.G.; Shields, P. 1977. Peirce's definitions of continuity. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 13:1, Winter, 1977, pp. 20-34. Available: www.arisbe.com/detached/?p=9969#footnote_51_9969.

Sease, C. 1998. Codes of ethics for conservation. *International Journal of Cultural Property*. 7(1): 98-115.

Secchi, B. 2006. *Primeira Lição de Urbanismo*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

Simon, H. S. 1969. *The sciences of the artificial*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Staniforth, S. 2000. Conservation: significance, relevance and sustainability, *IIC Bulletin*,(6), 3–8.

Stovel, H. 2008. Effective use of authenticity and integrity as world heritage qualifying conditions. *City & Time* 2 (3): 3, 2008. Available: www.ct.ceci-br.org.

Tung, A. 2001. *Preserving the world's great cities: the destruction and renewal of the historic metropolis*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Unesco 2011. *A new international instrument: The proposed Unesco recommendation on the historic urban landscape (HUL)*. Available: whc.unesco.org/uploads/activities/documents/activity-638-53.pdf

Unesco 2011. *Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape*. Paris: Unesco. Unpublished text.

Unesco 2011. *Recommendation on the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscape*. 1st Draft HUL Action Plan 2012-2024. Unpublished text.

Unesco 2005. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: Unesco.

Viñas, S.M. 2005. *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Zancheti, S.M.; Hidaka, L.T.; Ribeiro, C.; Aguiar, B. 2009. Judgment and validation in the Burra Charter Process: Introducing feedback in assessing the cultural significance of heritage sites. *City & Time* 4 (2), 2009. Available: www.ct.ceci-br.org.