

# SEEKING AUTHENTICITY: HERITAGE AND VALUE WITHIN THE INTANGIBLE ECONOMY

CAMILA DEL MÁRMOL & BEATRIZ SANTAMARIA  
*Universitat de Barcelona    Universidad de Valencia*

In this article, we approach heritage as a strategy of value production within the rise of the intangible economy. We focus on the potential capacity of heritage of being used as a producer and transformer of space. We explore two cases of local development in Spain of what have come to be known as smart cities and charming rural villages. Focusing on the transformations experienced in Valencia that underwent a creative repositioning due to a strategy based on the production of cultural and heritage assets, and a case in the Catalan Pyrenees in which an abandoned valley was changed into a compendium of charming villages, our aim is to understand the role of heritage as an intangible investment. We explore how value is produced through heritage policies and initiatives in an effort to transform cities or regions that seek to overcome economic and demographic collapse.

**Keywords:** Cultural Heritage; Intangible Economy; Authenticity; Smart Cities; Intangible heritage; Local Development.

## Introduction

Smart cities and charming villages are the contemporary fictions that underpin the metamorphosis undergone by different urban and rural centers. In this article, we explore two different cases in Spain, Valencia and a valley in the Catalan Pyrenees, focusing on the role of heritage as a strategy of value production within the rise of the intangible economy. We examine the potential capacity of heritage to be used as a producer and transformer of space. Firstly, we focus on the transformations experienced in Valencia,<sup>1</sup> on the Mediterranean coast, that underwent a creative repositioning due to a strategy based on the production of cultural and heritage assets. Secondly, we analyse a series of policies applied in a valley of the Catalan Pyrenees,<sup>2</sup> which, focusing on the activation of cultural and heritage assets, helped transform an abandoned valley into a compendium of charming villages. Our argument proceeds to explore how specific heritage discourses and policies play a crucial role in projects aimed at subverting a current state of affairs in certain locales, seeking a second life for cities or whole regions that are desperately intent on overcoming economic and demographic collapse. In this context, the production of space works by projecting new imaginaries, staged as part of the new intangible economy strategy, as well as new infrastructures that help redefine a new reality for the region or city. Authenticity is a key element in these processes, instrumental in legitimising narratives and heritage discourses on the ground.

In this article, we use heritage as a catch-all term for a number of complex concepts that have been developing within heritage literature, mainly in the context of a critique of managerial approaches that take heritage as a given, a natural legacy of history. Critical approaches, on the other hand, strived to break heritage down into its constitutive aspects: as an authoritative discourse (Smith, 2006), a process (Bendix 2009; Davallon 2010), a

45 regime of power (Bendix Eggert & Peselmann 2012), etc. Instead, we go back to refer  
 46 simply to heritage: from an emic perspective as a general concept accepted as such by  
 47 global politics and individuals around the globe. In doing so, we do not intend to disregard  
 48 the rich path of critiques and analytical endeavours pursued within the social sciences.  
 49 Heritage must be thought of as a complex phenomenon of current sociocultural realities,  
 50 conceived in the nineteenth century (Choay 1996) and expanding ever since, co-opting  
 51 more and more spaces of power and influence worldwide.

### 52 **Intangible Assets: Turning Space Upside Down**

54 In 2013, Bloomberg announced the ‘Rise of intangible economy’,<sup>3</sup> echoing several voices  
 55 that predicted the growing relevance of intangible assets within the current economic state  
 56 of affairs (Haskel & Westlake 2017). In the early 2000s, the idea of the importance of  
 57 intangible goods started to spread throughout economic ideas; they referred to an array of  
 58 phenomena such as knowledge, social relations, ideas, brands, R+D, product design or  
 59 human capital. The use of the term burst into academic journals in the field of economics,  
 60 especially from 2010 on (Haskel & Westlake 2017: 6). These authors contend that  
 61 intangible investment has been growing steadily in almost all developed countries.

62 Curiously enough, the concept had a mirror effect within social sciences. The latest  
 63 twist in heritage regimes has been the adoption of a new conceptualization of heritage  
 64 within the heritage inflation denounced by numerous authors (Heinich 2009). It is the  
 65 case of ‘Intangible Heritage’, coined within UNESCO discussions to enlarge the  
 66 restrictive frame of the 1972 World Heritage Convention (Hottin 2011). First mentioned  
 67 in Mexico in 1982 (Aikawa 2009), the concept became known worldwide in a vertiginous  
 68 and successful process starting with the approval of the Convention for the Safeguarding  
 69 of Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO) in 2003. Beyond the sharply critical voices  
 70 raised in academia (Smith & Akagawa 2009; Hafstein 2009; Santamarina 2013, amongst  
 71 others), intangible heritage, and especially its Masterpieces List, is widely known and  
 72 most states are striving to register a sampling of their traditional traditions (former  
 73 folklore, as Bortolotto (2011) and other authors have noted). Furthermore, the adoption  
 74 of the Convention prompted a cascade effect on national legislation worldwide,  
 75 proliferating the local protection, identification and safeguarding of what became known  
 76 through UNESCO definitions as intangible heritage.

77 The rise of intangible assets is thus a fact, a well-known aspect of current economic  
 78 systems, paralleled by its prominence in cultural policies all around the world. Some  
 79 authors have identified the exploitation of intangible heritage, handicrafts, communal  
 80 cultural expression, and other elements as important aspects of the new cultural economy  
 81 (Anheier & Yudhishtir 2008) — what Scott (2008: 307) defined as ‘all those forms of  
 82 economic activity producing outputs with significant aesthetic or semiotic content, or  
 83 what Bourdieu characterised as symbolic output’. Heritage is a key asset within the  
 84 cultural economy, a domain highly valued worldwide, legitimised by global policies  
 85 (Smith 2006) and appropriated by locales all around the globe. Anthropologists analysing  
 86 global organizations such as UNESCO point out the tricky relationship between heritage  
 87 and economic dynamics (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 2006; Bendix, Eggert & Peselmann  
 88 2012), a relation we intend to explore further in this article. UNESCO documents for the  
 89 implementation of the ICH Convention<sup>4</sup> clearly state that the trigger for ICH proposals  
 90 must not be tourism or economic development, a clause that is a recognition of its own  
 91 failure (Bendix 2009). Referring to the World Heritage Convention, Meskell (2015: 7)

92 goes as far as to identify UNESCO with a brand, and alleges that ‘the Convention’s  
93 original mandate to protect and conserve the world’s most important cultural and natural  
94 heritage places has been largely replaced by an international desire for securing and  
95 mobilisation of that brand’. This follows an old path related to the valorisation of culture,  
96 which is not a new dynamic, as Bendix, Eggert and Peselmann (2012) remind us.

97 This dominance of economic reasoning encroaching on the realms of culture has also  
98 been denounced by critics of neoliberalism. Treanor (2005) states that neoliberalism is  
99 not simply an economic structure, but rather a philosophy that has permeated increasing  
100 areas of social life. It acts by integrating a new shaping of beliefs and values that leads to  
101 a reconceptualization of the social and cultural world. The neoliberal logic entails  
102 continuous expansion of the market (Treanor 2005) drawing forth fierce competition  
103 between peoples and territories forced to incessantly seek for innovation and new  
104 transactions. Harvey (2005) points out how all human activity is placed under the  
105 umbrella of the market economy, warranting its expansion over the realm of culture and  
106 introducing the cultural economy (Throsby 2001; Pratt 2008).

107 While Haskel and Westlake (2017) are investigating what they call the unmapped  
108 territory of modern intangible investment from an economic perspective, we intend to  
109 understand the uses of heritage as an intangible investment. In consideration of Alonso  
110 (2014) warns of the need to explore how immaterial value is concretely produced and  
111 seized within post-industrial economies, we will explore the way in which heritage  
112 policies and discourses may be deployed as a strategy to reshape local markets pivoting  
113 around the search for the authentic (Davallon 2010; Santamarina & Moncusí 2015).  
114 Intangible assets being a crucial aspect of the changing nature of capital in the modern  
115 economy, we seek to understand their weight in the development of specific cities or  
116 regions. As noted by Anheier and Yudhishtir (2008: 6): ‘Since the marriage of culture  
117 and economy has been consummated internationally, funding agencies (...) are now  
118 actively investing in the “creative economy” as a way of stimulating local economic  
119 growth’. Nonetheless, in many cases the mobilization of heritage as a cultural asset in  
120 order to foster economic development has proved to constitute a siren call, an insidious  
121 encouragement that ends up more often than not in dispossession and objectification  
122 (Collins 2008; Herzfeld 2010; Del Mármol, Morell & Chalcraft 2015).

123 The fact is that states and local governments, as well as NGOs, and international  
124 agencies are increasingly promoting development based on the exploitation of intangible  
125 heritage (Labadi 2011; Winter 2011; Collins 2018). In this article, we refer to heritage as  
126 an intangible investment, not to ignore the tangible aspect of many heritage processes,  
127 but to highlight the relevance of the intangible as a crucial asset. The weight of what  
128 heritage casts as a symbolic authority, its allegedly supreme values, social cohesion, and  
129 positive connotations together constitute a higher incentive when it comes to prompting  
130 heritage investments. For UNESCO, heritage, as a manifestation of culture, ‘constitutes  
131 a source of identity and cohesion for communities disrupted by bewildering change and  
132 economic instability. Creativity contributes to building open, inclusive and pluralistic  
133 societies. Both heritage and creativity lay the foundations for vibrant, innovative and  
134 prosperous knowledge societies’.<sup>5</sup> Creativity as an innovative asset that permeates the  
135 most recent discourses set forth by UNESCO, together with heritage, offer the promise  
136 of social change. They are part of the new secular soteriology embodied by UNESCO and  
137 related agencies (Stoczkowski 2009).

138 Bendix (2009) argues that the economic potential of heritage has grown to be the  
139 primary incitement in the development of heritage projects. This situation would

140 contradict the official narratives of heritage, mainly widespread by UNESCO documents  
 141 and conventions. In it, heritage is portrayed as detached from its economic value, even  
 142 rejecting its market value:

143 ‘There is also a danger of freezing heritage through a “folklorisation” process or the quest for  
 144 “authenticity”, or of the disregard of customs that govern access to secret or sacred  
 145 information. Indeed, this could lead to a “market value” being placed on the intangible cultural  
 146 heritage instead of its cultural value, leaving it open to inappropriate commercial  
 147 exploitation’.<sup>6</sup>

148 The implicit opposition between ‘market’ and ‘cultural’ value contains a  
 149 contradiction, which is indeed the basis of the exceptional value of heritage according to  
 150 Franquesa (2013: 347): ‘heritage, as a concept, idiom, and discourse, tends to cut  
 151 connections, establishing its own domain as an incommensurable sphere and thus  
 152 obscuring the relationship it maintains with other fields of social reality, most notably (...)  
 153 with economic structures, relations, and practices’. This author highlights that when  
 154 certain objects are identified as heritage, they are put outside of the market. But it is this  
 155 same mechanism that makes the object acquire a higher value in the market. Cultural  
 156 value is then translated into market value, confirming that the contradiction is not such,  
 157 but rather an active mechanism in current neoliberal economies. In the same vein, Miller  
 158 (2008), advocating for a new theory of value based on ethnographic uses, refers to the  
 159 polysemic character of value while also highlighting the economic price and the  
 160 inalienability of symbolic possessions. For him, what value does is connect these two  
 161 purportedly incommensurable spheres: ‘this ambiguity between being priced and being  
 162 beyond price is precisely what makes someone or something highly valuable’ (Miller  
 163 2008: 1128).

164 Heritage as an intangible investment mobilises legitimacy and inalienable values in  
 165 the hope of highly increasing the value of an element, which could later be translated into  
 166 economic value, ultimately economic development. Connecting different regimes of  
 167 value is the neoliberalism’s latest strategy for ultimately achieving the promise of  
 168 promotion and growth for entire regions or cities (cf Tsing 2015). The siren call of  
 169 development obscures the fact that the beneficiary of growth is not always the whole  
 170 population. Recent analysis on World Heritage investment (Brumann & Berliner 2016)  
 171 shows that this could work in unintended ways, when transnational actors and capital  
 172 control the benefits arising from development projects based on heritage. Indeed, locales  
 173 can be confronted with a restriction on their own rights of appropriation and use of what  
 174 is declared as heritage (Breglia 2006; Copertino 2014; Chalcraft 2015, among others).

175 The strategic mobilisation of heritage discourses and policies recasts local  
 176 imaginaries and representations of place. Beyond the particularity of the cases  
 177 examined here, we can find a common ground on which development discourses based  
 178 on heritage emerged: depopulated rural areas experiencing a crisis in their production  
 179 systems due to changes in the new economic global contexts, as well as post-industrial  
 180 cities and mid-sized villages affected by the closure of companies and the end of  
 181 manufacturing or industry. As analysed by Vaccaro (2010), there are special  
 182 frameworks that allow us to understand how localities affected by the new dynamics of  
 183 global capital and their radical transformations reformulate to find a way out. The  
 184 author identifies a recurring sequence of events, a socio-economic global phenomenon  
 185 that includes market integration, hyper-mobility, expansion, abandonment and  
 186 reinvention. The cases we address are affected –to a greater or lesser extent– by

187 situations that fit this picture. A dynamic of initiatives, success and then failure are  
188 followed by an attempt of a new rebirth, recast in the hegemonic discourse of heritage.  
189 The initial market exclusion thus has a counterpart in a new integration discourse that  
190 portrays heritage initiatives as heralds of new social and ecological development. Collins  
191 (2008: 297) points out that ‘the redemptive power of heritage, a technique employed by  
192 nation-states and transnational organizations to lift objects out of impoverished contexts  
193 and burnish them so that all members of society may make out some shared, if factitious,  
194 basis for belonging’. And redemption is a seductive discourse for impoverished and  
195 peripheral areas, a salvation that is not just embellished by oaths of commonality and  
196 belonging but also by the hopeful prospect of economic regeneration.

197 The mobilization of intangible heritage assets on a national level has been pursued  
198 within discourses promoting the valorisation of resources. Several countries have acted  
199 according to the instructions of the UNESCO ICH charter, promoting the creation of  
200 national programs for safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage (Estrada & Del  
201 Mármol 2015). Meanwhile, UNESCO has been supporting the ‘creativity’ discourse to  
202 develop new fictions, stressing the relevance of urban cultural industries and constituting  
203 the Creatives Cities Network in 2004, with the main aim of networking cities that were  
204 ‘placing creativity and cultural industries at the heart of their development plans at the  
205 local level’.<sup>7</sup> These movements prelude the triumphing reign of intangibles assets; moving  
206 beyond limited definitions, they emerge as a basis for development and a source of moral  
207 claims. The imaginaries revolving around the supreme value of cultural heritage stimulate  
208 intangible investments and allow them to outline a hopeful future. Beyond these high  
209 expectations we find the actual market and the inequalities that populate our current  
210 economic realities.

211 In the next sections, we will introduce two cases to illustrate these dynamics. Building  
212 on long-term ethnographic research studies conducted separately, we will highlight the  
213 commonalities and recurrences these Spanish cases display.

## 214 **Smart Cities: Entering the Cognitive-Cultural Economy**

215 Valencia is a mid-sized Spanish city on the Mediterranean coast with a population of  
216 about 800,000<sup>8</sup> that has been deeply affected by changing market conditions, production  
217 relocations and institutional and geographic marginality within the Spanish government.  
218 In recent decades, the city’s public agenda has clearly focused on a creative conversion.  
219 The restructuring of global markets, the advent of the cultural economy and the failure of  
220 the local economy set the stage for a new cultural policy that reshaped the spaces and  
221 features of the city. The regional Valencian government as well as the City Council,  
222 inspired by the rising value of intangible assets, made a commitment to pursuing the  
223 activation of new cultural assets as producers of wealth and driving forces to place the  
224 city on the global geo-economical map. Accordingly, the city leaned towards modernity  
225 and towards a repositioning in the global market through competitiveness and  
226 creativity, turning culture and heritage — as tangible and intangible assets with market  
227 value — into top-notch economic assets. The city, in response to a favourable economic  
228 climate right before the 2008 economic crisis, was determined to develop new fictions  
229 to be accepted in the increasingly aggressive financial and tourist markets under the  
230 auspices of ‘creativity’.

231 The Valencia approach materialised in vast cultural containers, including the spread  
232 of museums, cultural centres and convention halls, together with the creation of a city  
233 within a city: The City of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the flagship of the new urban model.

234 Even the name of the project, with the combination of Arts and Sciences, is a significant  
 235 sign of the change of paradigm towards the New Urban Policy (NUP) (Swyngedouw,  
 236 Moulaert & Rodriguez 2002). In short, we can say that three main components define  
 237 the policies deployed: a) star architects' projects (*archistars*); b) promotion of mega-  
 238 events; and c) huge public investment linked to private capital. The city became a live  
 239 experiment for a new pattern based on the creative economy for urban development  
 240 (Rausell 2006; Dıaz Orueta 2010; Cuco 2013). Accordingly, the CAS –an impressive  
 241 architectural complex made of seven Santiago Calatrava buildings– became an icon for  
 242 what has come to be known as the 'Calatrava model', and a symbol of the  
 243 spectacularised city (Boix, Rausell & Abeledo 2016). But it also embodies the  
 244 deleterious face of the quest for the intangible economy, showing how the project  
 245 allows for urban speculation in the thousand square kilometres that run from the dry  
 246 riverbed to an abandoned industrial area on the opposite bank.

247 A brief chronology can help us follow the shift towards the city's repositioning. At  
 248 the end of the 1980s, the social, political and economic transformations occurring in Spain  
 249 led to the approval of an Urban Development Plan (1988) that sought to integrate urban  
 250 spaces and allow for building new infrastructures. In 1986, the City Council announced  
 251 the construction of the Valencian Institute of Modern Art, following the idea of equipping  
 252 the city with a cultural complex with a global presence. Three years later, the City of  
 253 Science project acquired a high profile as a scientific and tourist centre that would bestow  
 254 the city with an iconic building. These new cultural spaces soon became landmarks within  
 255 the city's imaginaries.

256 During the mid-1990s, a crucial shift towards a conservative, neoliberal government  
 257 pushed the city towards the NUP, 'characterised by the change from a dream of high  
 258 culture to a view of "glittering culture"' (Boix *et al.* 2016: 10). The project of the City of  
 259 Sciences was redrafted and some buildings suppressed. The name changed significantly  
 260 to reach its current form. Already in 1998, the two first buildings were inaugurated: The  
 261 Convention Centre by Norman Foster and the Hemispheric Theatre by Santiago  
 262 Calatrava. Within the next five years, more buildings kept on opening. Ultimately, the  
 263 city went from having 12 museums and monuments in the 1970s to a total of 37 new or  
 264 refurbished venues between 1989 and 2012 (Martı 2010).<sup>9</sup>

265 Following the same path, the next five years brought about further openings and  
 266 major events. The Art Palace and the Assut Bridge (2005) in the CAS, the Sails and Wind  
 267 Building by David Chipperfield (2006), the Valencia Street Circuit (2008), were all  
 268 inaugurated in this period. Regarding the international events with wide media coverage,  
 269 we can refer to the Louis Vuitton Cup, the V Meeting of Pope Benedict XVI and the  
 270 Formula 1 European Grand Prix. All these events took place at the new urban and  
 271 architectural venues developing in the CAS and along the waterfront.

272 These projects were all developed under the auspices of the Regulatory Law of Urban  
 273 Activity of 1994, which prompted changes in land use allowing for an expansion of  
 274 property development opportunities (Dıaz Orueta & Loures 2008). In addition to cultural  
 275 hyperinflation, Valencia experienced increasing residential development, an urbanization  
 276 tsunami fostered by financial and real estate speculation and the specific market  
 277 conditions (Gaja 2008). In the following years, the model started to show its first cracks.  
 278 The global economic crisis exposed the failure of these policies based on real estate and  
 279 cultural bubbles and underpinned by public waste and political corruption. In 2009, the  
 280 last building of the Calatrava CAS, the Agora, was inaugurated without being properly  
 281 finished. This marked the end of the exponential growth of cultural facilities in Valencia.

282 As far as the expensive and more than questionably profitable mega-events were  
283 concerned, they waned soon thereafter. The global economic collapse was mirrored in the  
284 breakdown of a cultural-urban policy orchestrating the creative city and based on the  
285 intangible economy.

286 How was this rapid and creative transformation of the city possible? How were the  
287 intangible assets so quickly perceived as fundamental economic assets? How were the  
288 new narratives regarding the city articulated? As pointed out by Scott (2014: 574):

289 ... in the context of the intensifying race for competitive advantage and the quest for  
290 inward flows of investment and human capital, there is continually intensifying pressure  
291 on cities to assert their global presence and ambitions by means of vibrant visual images  
292 and branding campaigns emphasizing local attractions such as lifestyle, cultural facilities  
293 and historical heritage.

294 Favoured by economic growth in Spain, the political strategy was built on specialised  
295 agencies that worked together to redefine the city. Urban marketing techniques such as  
296 city branding and brand management were priority actions to achieve creativity (Asheim  
297 & Clark 2001; Kavaratzis & Ashworth 2005; Cucó 2013). This affected the orientation  
298 of public policies: the administration shifted from city management to brand and image  
299 handling. For that purpose, special organizations were created such as VCL Valencia  
300 Tourism (1991) or the Centre for Strategies and Development of Valencia (CEDV)  
301 (2004–2012),<sup>10</sup> both public-private partnerships aimed at boosting the city's international  
302 image and prompting economic development. Under the auspices of specific narratives  
303 building on ideas of revitalization, relaunching, smart growth, sustainable and creative  
304 development, etc., public organizations prompted the transformation of the city, together  
305 with real estate developers and the support of the population inferred from ongoing  
306 electoral success.

307 The nature of the narratives activated within advertising campaigns shows how the  
308 identity representation of the city was articulated. A double linkage that included notions  
309 of history/tradition and modernity was set in motion, blending past images and projecting  
310 them into the future. The CAS was thus introduced as the fulfilment of a long-standing  
311 history materialised in historic buildings and age-old traditions. For instance, the City  
312 Council launched an international tourism campaign under the slogan 'Valencia,  
313 incredible but true'. In the commercial spot for TV and cinema<sup>11</sup> more than 74 images  
314 were broadcast including local references to traditional festivities and historic buildings  
315 together with the new buildings and the mega-events. Tradition and history were blended  
316 together within a discursive strategy that allowed for a symbolic authentication in the  
317 present and for the future (Santamarina & Moncusí 2013).

318 The results of the implementation of the cognitive-cultural model in Valencia are  
319 conspicuous: the city expanded its surface and skyline, changed its structure and  
320 transformed its imaginaries. The city's compendium of museums and monumental  
321 buildings tripled in only 20 years, but this growth was not followed by any  
322 communication strategy, so the huge buildings were neglected (Martí 2010). Moreover,  
323 the CAS prompted a crowding out effect, emptying the new museums in the city (Rausell  
324 2006). In any case, the focus on creativity in Valencia remains somewhat questionable.  
325 Cultural policies as well as the new heritage regimes (Bendix Eggert & Peselmann 2012),  
326 based on the mega production of cultural projects and events, had a positive impact during  
327 the first years, but its effects wound down and reached their lowest point during the  
328 economic recession. The media coverage and the architectural transformation have  
329

330 changed Valencia's international image, as indicated by Lonely Planet's listing Valencia  
 331 among its 'top cities' in 2011. What is being questioned is the sustainability of a model  
 332 that involves social, economic and spatial imbalances, as well as the sustainability of the  
 333 built infrastructures (Santamarina 2014; Rius-Ulldemolins, Hernández & Torres 2016).  
 334 This complaint appeared in several occasions during the many interviews conducted in  
 335 different researches from 2009 to 2017. A young student expressed it this way: 'It looks  
 336 like much money is spent in tourism, but not in us. Transportation, cleaning, it is not much  
 337 done, everything is going to the mega-events, for attracting tourism, earn money...'. A  
 338 housewife, in turn, said: 'Yes, it is prettier (the city), but I care more for public health,  
 339 public education and public transportation ... (and these are) in dire conditions'. Among  
 340 other things, the failure of the Valencia model is due to the fact 'that a strategy based on  
 341 arts, culture and big artefacts, and characterised by an exaggerated growth of spending on  
 342 arts and culture (cultural bubble), can weaken resilience when its use is improper,  
 343 incorrect or simulated' (Boix *et al.*, 2016: 16).

#### 344 **Charming Villages: Producing Appeal**

345 La Vansa i Tuixent is a valley located in the Southern slopes of the Cadí mountain, in  
 346 the Catalan Pyrenees. Critically depopulated during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, its 174.24 km<sup>2</sup> are  
 347 spotted with 13 tiny hamlets, the largest of which, Tuixent, has around 60 inhabitants.  
 348 During the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the mountainous terrain did not allow for intensive  
 349 development of its agriculture and livestock farming, forcing the local population to  
 350 either migrate to nearby cities or to remain in a context of abandonment and recessive  
 351 family agriculture and livestock breeding. It now has a population of 322.<sup>12</sup> Difficult  
 352 road access is still a matter of concern. Its relative isolation is partly responsible for the  
 353 characteristic quaint image of the valley, with its little hamlets of two or three-storey  
 354 houses with stone masonry walls, terracotta-tiled roofs, wooden balconies and exposed  
 355 beams. At the top of the villages, or on a nearby mountainside, one often finds  
 356 Romanesque churches standing amidst the fields. The tilled land, previously spreading  
 357 up the hills as proof of the local peasants' perseverance in gaining ground in this rocky  
 358 area, is now restricted to the pastures near the villages. Visitors may mistake the local  
 359 landscape for an isolated natural environment, untouched by human hands.  
 360 Nonetheless, it is the result of a specific political process that radically changed the  
 361 shape of the valley over the past 40 years (Del Mármol 2012).

362 From the 1980s on, the local public agenda was affected by the bitter blow of global  
 363 markets that drastically transformed the production conditions of agriculture and  
 364 livestock farming. Spain's entry into the European Union brought about its access to  
 365 broader markets, forcing the readjustment of the local economy based on intensive milk  
 366 production. European policies and wider global market conditions led to a drastic shift,  
 367 driving the valley to settle for a service economy and tourism. Rural development was  
 368 considered as the logical way to go, and was linked to the idea of fostering rural and  
 369 natural heritage and culture. In short, we can identify a series of concrete actions and  
 370 circumstances underpinning this transformation: the production quotas set by the  
 371 European Union, the CAP directives, the LEADER Program, the Declaration of Natural  
 372 Parks and Protected Natural Areas in the region, urban planning regulations, specific  
 373 actions for the restoration of the local heritage, the recovery of mountain paths and trails,  
 374 the opening of a cross-country skiing area, among others.

375 European rural regions share common features and dynamics. Woods and McDonagh  
 376 (2011: 156) refer to the 'emergent global countryside' as a contested space including

377 uneven geographies. They identify a changing emphasis within European rural  
378 development, leaving behind a paradigm that relied on foreign investment in a shift  
379 towards an internal mobilisation and revalorisation of local resources. These relate to the  
380 new uses and consumption of rurality, within what Sivaramakrishnan and Vaccaro (2006)  
381 called the new post-industrial landscapes. Several documents, policies and plans of the  
382 European Union are clearly in favour of promoting tourism and heritage as fundamental  
383 development strategies (Bell & Jayne 2010), presented as panaceas for rural  
384 abandonment, disconnection, and the lack of job opportunities. Numerous authors argued  
385 that many of these policies were clearly aimed at supporting post-productivist measures  
386 (Buller, Wilson & Höll 2000; Wilson 2001).

387 A brief chronology can guide us through the main changes affecting the valley of la  
388 Vansa and Tuixent in the past decades. In the early 1980s, the first steps were marked by  
389 the declaration of a Natural Park affecting the valley's lands, the Catalan High Mountain  
390 Law and several decrees for the creation of protected natural areas.<sup>13</sup> These documents  
391 share an interesting characteristic: they launch a new understanding of mountain areas, in  
392 accordance with contemporary European initiatives, placing what is referred to as 'natural  
393 heritage' above the production perspective of agriculture and livestock farming, and  
394 valorising the area's 'cultural heritage', in terms of its built heritage but also to its 'rural  
395 heritage'. The point is to activate and mobilise intangible assets in order to promote new  
396 production models while the old one is considered obsolete. Similarly, the Generalitat de  
397 Catalunya (Catalan Government) passed a series of rules and regulations for urban  
398 planning and land use that clearly showed the influence of heritage discourses.<sup>14</sup> These  
399 documents delineated a new 'traditional typology', defined as traditional and rural and  
400 understood as the legacy of older ways of life in which a closer and more embedded  
401 relationship with the environment was the norm. This new typology was at the basis of  
402 the appearance of most villages and buildings in the area, resulting in specific images of  
403 rusticity that are in keeping with the new market models (Del Mármol 2017).

404 Several administrations acting locally, such as the *Consell Comarcal de l'Alt Urgell*  
405 and a variety of development agencies, incorporate this political mandate within their  
406 activities, facilitating the promotion of tourism and fostering local heritage. The shift  
407 materialised in several actions such as the construction of a cross-country ski area in the  
408 valley, the improvement of local roads, the creation of local museums, etc. European  
409 initiatives launched by the European Commission were also fundamental, including the  
410 LEADER Programme, which played a crucial role in the valley. Most of the 10 rural inns  
411 open nowadays benefitted from the economic support of this European program in the  
412 late 1990s and early 2000s, as did the local *Museu de les Trementinaires*, devoted to the  
413 traveling medicine women, and all of the churches in the valley, both Romanesque and  
414 from other historic periods, which were restored. Two Visitor Centres were inaugurated  
415 in the early 2000s, an initiative supported by the Natural Park that seeks to promote the  
416 region. In addition, many fairs and festivities started to be organised locally, offering a  
417 diversified portfolio of activities designed to attract visitors. Other lines of action were  
418 aimed at promoting quality labels for local food, especially handmade cheeses and jams  
419 sold in one of the hamlets in the valley. The positive connotations of concepts related to  
420 nature and rural culture are capitalised in order to obtain new added value.

421 These initiatives were met with different reactions. The fact that so much money was  
422 spent in the recovery of old altarpieces was criticised by many, a general criticism that  
423 could be heard in bars and social gatherings but did not specify an alternative use of the  
424 funds. They did come together, in some other occasions, with general regrets about the

425 loss of population. In one of the bars of Tuixent, in 2009, a lively conversation took place  
426 between local inhabitants who found the 60,000 euros spent in the building of the *Museu*  
427 *de les Trementinaires* a ludicrous choice. Irene, the host, recognised that the money could  
428 not be spent in any other item since it was a specific LEADER fund tied by fixed criteria,  
429 but she found it unfair. A local rancher agreed, they were not able to take any decision. It  
430 was usual to hear these complaints from local inhabitants, even from persons holding  
431 offices in the local Councils.

432 These changes implied that suddenly, local uses of the land, traditional cosmologies  
433 and worldviews related to an agricultural paradigm were left behind, having to adapt to  
434 the new political and market conditions (Frigolé 2012). Elderly farmers still laugh at the  
435 sight of old farm implements such as wooden mattocks and harvester's sickles, the same  
436 as those they had used to farm the land, now decorating the walls of the new rural inns.  
437 Nevertheless, the intangible assets mobilised within the new cultural economy became in  
438 the end integrated as common knowledge. People accepted for the most part that fostering  
439 their cultural and natural heritage was the way to go, and that the promotion of tourism  
440 led to development in the region. Locals were considered dumb or simpletons if they  
441 stood against this new logic, as was the case of a local public development agent that  
442 blamed an elderly inhabitant who did not approve of a current restoration project for a  
443 local church: 'they don't understand the value of old things', she objected, 'they don't  
444 know what they have'. She was referring to a specific change of value in which elements  
445 that were formerly considered obsolete or worthless, as a consequence of successive  
446 crises and depopulation, are suddenly reinterpreted in new contexts of meaning  
447 production. Likewise, constant references to a pristine landscape in leaflets and  
448 promotional pamphlets erase centuries of human presence, a complex history that inhabits  
449 the memory of the local population. Vaccaro and Beltran (2010) have already referred to  
450 a recent 'naturalization of rural landscape' in the form of an environmental recovery  
451 occurring after the decrease in agricultural pressure on the land. This naturalization was  
452 carried out at the expense of a deeper knowledge of the complex relationship of the local  
453 society with its surroundings. During a local meeting to discuss heritage actions in 2008,  
454 a local priest working at the Urgell's diocese commented ironically in a low voice after a  
455 presentation on the recovery of rural paths by an Association called Wild World: 'we  
456 need something more than roads up here (in the mountains), we are not so wild!'

457 Many rural settings find themselves dragged into the new cultural economy (Throsby  
458 2001, Anheier & Isar 2008; Pratt 2008): alternative production sectors such as service  
459 industries, tourism, and leisure activities, as well as neo-artisanal forms of diversified  
460 production (food, clothes, etc.), were given priority for economic development (Scott  
461 2008). The intangible assets mobilised in the example presented here are basically related  
462 to heritage, in its natural, cultural or rural variants. It works as a powerful rhetorical device  
463 creating symbolic values that can be transformed into economic values in the market.  
464 Nature, authenticity and ideas of rurality are also powerful domains of the social  
465 imagination that are mobilised within these processes.

466 As every economic change, this new model has its lights and shadows. On the one  
467 hand, the protective regulations on natural areas avoid the extensive gentrification and  
468 the ski tourism model experienced in other neighbouring regions such as Cerdanya or  
469 Vall d'Aran (for other examples in the Alps see Vlès 2014). On the other hand, many  
470 inhabitants felt that land use had been radically restricted. The decorative and aesthetic  
471 dimensions underlying urban legislation promote the construction of residential areas and  
472 second homes, which make use of local resources such as services and water beyond the

473 ecosystem's ability to prevent enduring damage. This model also fosters speculative  
474 dynamics that give priority to building activities, or even 'protective' actions within  
475 natural parks, over agricultural and livestock farming practices which are forced to  
476 compete for scarce land in mountain areas. Finally, this has a direct effect on the  
477 depopulation indexes in these regions: the increased prices of land and houses, as well  
478 as the limited possibilities of finding a job, drive younger generations to emigrate. A  
479 local ranger complained in 2010 about his future in the valley, saying that nothing was  
480 being done to increase the local population, everybody was leaving and no one could  
481 stay: 'In the end, I would end up turning into a wild boar, nuts as a boar wandering  
482 through the woods'.

### 483 **On the Search of Authentic Value**

484 Boltanski and Chiapello (2007) associated the critique of inauthenticity developing within  
485 capitalist societies during the 1970s with the critique of massification, which essentially  
486 referred to the standardization either of things or of human beings. This perspective  
487 follows the approach that began with the Frankfurt school and its analysis of mass  
488 production and consumption (Benjamin 2007; Theodor & Horkheimer 1994), and was  
489 further developed by several authors (Appadurai 1986; Bendix 1997; Maccannell 1999;  
490 Jekhileto 2006, among many others). The strategy for overcoming the longing for  
491 differentiation is based on drawing some goods from the commodity sphere (Boltanski &  
492 Chiapello 2007), a process we have already referred to in these pages. Our two examples  
493 fall into the category of what these authors have described as the commodification of the  
494 authentic, the process by which sources of authenticity are explored in order to identify  
495 profit potential. The triumphing reign of intangibles is closely linked to the search of  
496 authenticity in contemporary culture, but, more importantly, within current neoliberal  
497 dynamics (Heinich 2009; MacDonald 2013).

498 The cases discussed in this article allow us to analyse different ways of tapping the  
499 demand for authenticity, based on different conceptions of the authentic. Definitions of  
500 the word 'authentic' can be split into two basic meanings. The first is related to the  
501 authorship of an element, its genuine character or its legitimacy to represent a significant  
502 feature or thing. The use of ideas of authenticity in the case of Valencia described here  
503 tend to follow this pattern: the new city (including the city within the city) is advertised  
504 as being unbelievable, authentic, in the sense of being original, without comparison.  
505 'Incredible but true' is one of the mottos used for advertising the transformation of the  
506 city. Being authentic refers here to the idea of being trustworthy, a representation of a  
507 truth. The second definition of the concept relates to the idea of being true or faithful to  
508 the original, to its principles or its origin. Benjamin (2007: 221) states that 'The  
509 authenticity of a thing is the essence of all that is transmissible from its beginning, ranging  
510 from its substantive duration to its testimony to the history which it has experienced'.  
511 This origin also implies a relation to the past — that is, to the history of the object in the  
512 sense of its tradition. In the Catalan Pyrenees, what is being mobilised is the  
513 representation of an authentic place, in its relation to an idealised past inhabited by closer  
514 human relations and in contact with nature. A nostalgic approach to the past is a common  
515 feature in the search of authenticity and in heritage politics.

516 The UNESCO ICH Convention and other related documents on heritage offer an  
517 unrivalled source of exchange-value production. Their accent on the cultural value of  
518 intangible goods favours the commodification of the authentic, being a reliable source of  
519 legitimacy. By stressing the non-economic value of culture, they accomplish the removal

520 of certain goods from the market, which are then seized back by the commodity sphere  
 521 with increased value, and, thus, profit potential. The capitalist drive to seize all potential  
 522 sources of authenticity come into play affecting local dynamics. The theoretical efforts to  
 523 put together a new heritage category in order to overcome previous critiques have resulted  
 524 in the configuration of new sources of authenticity, ready to be harnessed by the market  
 525 and transformed into economic value.

## 526 **Conclusion**

527 Heritage entails different ways of putting imagination to work, of assembling bits and  
 528 pieces, even of creating temporary illusions and, of course, of reinventing the past. In this  
 529 article, we have stressed the potential of heritage as a value producer within neoliberal  
 530 dynamics. Intangible heritage, more specifically, has been mobilised later in order to  
 531 rebrand and reshape cities and regions, making them more likable and attractive (to attract  
 532 either capital or people). As Scott (2014: 574) stressed: ‘Cities, large and small, in many  
 533 different parts of the world are most assuredly being transformed in economic terms as  
 534 the new cognitive–cultural economy deepens and widens its hold; even rural areas are  
 535 participating in this shift’. By bringing together two cases of apparent dissimilar  
 536 characteristics, as is the case of the smart cities and the charming villages, we put forwards  
 537 a global understanding of local development.

## 538 **Acknowledgments**

539 This study was carried out as part of a project entitled: ‘Patrimonio inmaterial y políticas  
 540 culturales: desafíos sociales, políticos y museológicos’, which was funded by the Spanish  
 541 Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities and the FEDER Program. PGC2018-  
 542 096190-B-I00. We also want to thank the reviewers for their helpful comments.

## 544 **Notes**

- 545 1. Long-term fieldwork was conducted between 2009–2016. It consisted of participant-  
 546 observation, interviews, and press and official institutions texts review. For more information  
 547 see Santamarina and Montcusí 2013, Santamarina 2014.
- 548 2. In this case, fieldwork went on for 14 months between 2006 and 2008 and several short stays  
 549 of approximately 10 days. A second research effort was conducted between 2009–2011 and  
 550 comprised several short stays. For more information see Del Mármol 2012, 2017.
- 551 3. [https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2013-07-18/the-rise-of-the-intangible-economy-u-](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2013-07-18/the-rise-of-the-intangible-economy-u-dot-s-dot-gdp-counts-r-and-d-artistic-creation)  
 552 [dot-s-dot-gdp-counts-r-and-d-artistic-creation](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2013-07-18/the-rise-of-the-intangible-economy-u-dot-s-dot-gdp-counts-r-and-d-artistic-creation)
- 553 4. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/kit#5>
- 554 5. UNESCO’s website. Accessed from [http://en.unesco.org/themes/protecting-our-heritage-and-](http://en.unesco.org/themes/protecting-our-heritage-and-fostering-creativity)  
 555 [fostering-creativity](http://en.unesco.org/themes/protecting-our-heritage-and-fostering-creativity)
- 556 6. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/kit#5>
- 557 7. <http://en.unesco.org/creative-cities/>
- 558 8. INE, 2016.
- 559 9. For the sake of brevity, we are just mentioning the most outstanding projects and events.
- 560 10. Public-private partnership directed by the City Council that couldn’t outlive the economic  
 561 crisis and that is currently investigated under corruption allegations.
- 562 11. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dPbtXvV94n4>
- 563 12. Idescat survey, 2016.

- 564 13. *Llei 2/1983, de 9 de març, d'alta muntanya* (DOGC 312, de 16/03/1983); *Decret 353/1983, de*  
 565 *15 de juliol, de declaració del Parc Natural del Cadí-Moixeró* (DOGC 357, 24/09/1983); *Llei*  
 566 *12/1985 de 13 de juny, d'espais naturals* (DOGC 556, 28/06/1985).  
 567 14. *Llei 2/2002 de 14 de març, d'urbanisme* (DOGC 3600, de 21/03/2002) modified by the *Llei*  
 568 *10/2004 d'urbanisme* (DOGC 4291, de 30/12/2004).

## 569 References

- 570 Aikawa-Faure, N. 2009. From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the Convention for the  
 571 Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. In *Intangible Heritage*, (eds) L. Smith & N.  
 572 Akagawa, New York: Routledge, 13–44.  
 573 Alonso, P. 2014. From a given to a construct. Heritage as a common. *Journal Cultural Studies*  
 574 **28(3)**: 359–390.  
 575 ——— 2017. Heritage and Gentrification in Spain: The case of Santiago Millas. *International Journal*  
 576 *of Heritage Studies* **23(2)**: 125–140.  
 577 Anheier, H. K. & Yudhishtir R. (eds), 2008. *Cultures and globalization: The Cultural Economy*.  
 578 London: Sage.  
 579 Appadurai, A. 1986. *The social life of things. Commodities in cultural perspective*. Ed: Arjun  
 580 Appadurai. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 581 Asheim, B. & Clark, E. 2001. Creativity and cost in urban and regional development in the 'new  
 582 economy'. *European planning studies* **9(7)**: 805–811.  
 583 Bell, D. and Jayne, M. 2010. The Creative Countryside: Policy and Practice in the UK Rural  
 584 Cultural Economy. *Journal of Rural Studies* **26**: 209–218.  
 585 Bendix, R. 1997. *In Search of Authenticity. The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: University  
 586 of Wisconsin Press.  
 587 ——— 2009. Heritage between Economy and Politics: An Assessment from the Perspective of  
 588 Cultural Anthropology. In *Intangible Heritage*, (eds) Laurajane Smith & Natsuko Akagawa,  
 589 London: Routledge, 253–269.  
 590 Bendix, R., Eggert, A. & Peselmann, A. (eds) 2012. *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen:  
 591 Universitätsverlag Göttingen.  
 592 Benjamin, W. 2007. *Illuminations. Essays and reflections*, Walter Benjamin, 1955. New York:  
 593 Schocken Books.  
 594 Boix, R., Rausell, P. & Abeledo, R. 2017. The Calatrava Model: Reflections on Resilience and  
 595 Urban Plasticity. *European Planning Studies* **25(1)**: 29–47.  
 596 Boltanski, L. & Chiapello, E. 2007. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.  
 597 Bortolotto, C. 2011. Le trouble du patrimoine culturel immatériel. In *Le patrimoine culturel*  
 598 *immatériel : enjeux d'une nouvelle catégorie*, (ed.) Chiara Bortolotto, Paris: Éditions de la  
 599 Maison des sciences de l'homme, 21–46.  
 600 Breglia, L. 2006. *Monumental Ambivalence: The Politics of Heritage*. Austin: University of Texas.  
 601 Brumann, C. & Berliner, D. (eds) 2016. *World Heritage on the Ground. Ethnographic Perspectives*.  
 602 New York: Berghahn Books.  
 603 Buller, H., Wilson, G. & Höll, A. (eds) 2000. *Agri-environmental Policy in the European Union*.  
 604 Aldershot: Ashgate.  
 605 Chalcraft, J. 2015. Metaculture and its Malcontents: World Heritage in Southwestern Libya. In *The*  
 606 *Making of Heritage: Seduction and Disenchantment*, (eds) C. del Mármol, M. Morell & J.  
 607 Chalcraft, London: Routledge, 23–43.  
 608 Collins, J. 2008. 'But What if I Should Need to Defecate in your Neighborhood, Madame?':  
 609 Empire, Redemption, and the 'Tradition of the Oppressed' in a Brazilian World Heritage Site.  
 610 *Cultural Anthropology* **23(2)**: 279–328.  
 611 Collins, J. 2018. Culture, Content, and the Enclosure of Human Being: UNESCO's 'Intangible'  
 612 Heritage in the New Millennium. *Radical History Review* **109**: 121–35.

- 613 Copertino, D. 2014. 'The tools of the trade: The materiality of architecture in the patrimonialization  
614 of "Arab houses" in Damascus'. *Journal of Material Culture* **19(3)**: 327–351.
- 615 Cucó, J. (ed.) 2013. *La ciudad pervertida. Una mirada sobre la Valencia global*. Barcelona:  
616 Anthropros.
- 617 Davallon, J. 2010. The Game of Heritagization. In *Constructing Cultural and Natural*  
618 *Heritage. Parks, Museums and Rural Heritage*, (eds) X. Roigé & J. Frigolé, Girona:  
619 ICRPC 27–38.
- 620 Del Màrmol, C. 2012. *Pasados locales, políticas globales. Procesos de patrimonialización en un*  
621 *valle del Pirineo catalán*. Germanías: Valencia.
- 622 — 2017. 'The Quest for a Traditional Style: Architecture and Heritage Processes in a Pyrenean  
623 Valley'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* **23(10)**: 946–960.
- 624 Del Màrmol, C., Morell, M. & Chalcraft, J. (eds) 2015. *The Making of Heritage. Seduction and*  
625 *Disenchantment*. New York: Routledge.
- 626 Díaz Orueta, F. 2010. Regímenes urbanos y movimiento ciudadano en Valencia. *Cuaderno Urbano*  
627 **9(9)**: 275–294.
- 628 Díaz Orueta, F. & Seoane, L. 2008. La globalización de los mercados inmobiliarios: su impacto  
629 sobre la Costa Blanca. *Ciudad y territorio. Estudios Territoriales* **155**: 77–92.
- 630 Estrada, F. & Del Màrmol, C. 2015. ICH Inventories: Implementation of the UNESCO Convention.  
631 *Revista d'Emologia de Catalunya* **40**: 94–106.
- 632 Franquesa, J. 2013. On Keeping and Selling: The Political Economy of Heritage making in  
633 Contemporary Spain. *Current Anthropology* **54(3)**: 346–369.
- 634 Frigolé, J. 2007. Producció cultural de lloc, memòria i terciarització de l'economia en una vall del  
635 Prepirineu. *Revista d'Emologia de Catalunya* **30**: 70–80.
- 636 — 2012. Cosmologies, ecosímbolos y patrimonialización en el Pirineo catalán en un contexto  
637 global. *Revista de Antropología Socia* **21**: 173–196.
- 638 Gaja, F. (2008). El 'tsunami urbanizador' en el litoral mediterráneo. El ciclo de hiperproducción  
639 inmobiliaria 1996-2006. *Scripta Nova* 12(62). Accessed from [http://www.ub.edu/  
640 geocrit/sn/sn-270/sn-270-66.htm](http://www.ub.edu/geocrit/sn/sn-270/sn-270-66.htm).
- 641 Hafstein, V. 2009. Intangible Heritage as a List. From Masterpieces to Representation. In *Intangible*  
642 *Heritage*, (eds) Laurajane Smith & Natsuko Akagawa, New York: Routledge, 93–111.
- 643 Harvey, D. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 644 Haskel, J. & Westlake, S. 2017. *Capitalism without Capital. The Rise of the Intangible Economy*.  
645 Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 646 Heinrich, N. 2009. *La fabrique du patrimoine. De la cathédrale à la petite cuillère*. Paris: Maison  
647 des Sciences de l'Homme.
- 648 Herzfeld, M. 2010. Engagement, Gentrification, and the Neoliberal hijacking of history. *Current*  
649 *Anthropology* **51(2)**: 259–268.
- 650 Hottin, C. 2011. *De la théorisation à la mise en œuvre d'une nouvelle conception du patrimoine:*  
651 *le patrimoine immatériel. Patrimoine culturel immatériel. Premières expériences en France*.  
652 Paris-Arlès: Maison des Cultures du Monde – Actes Sud Babel.
- 653 Jokilehto J. 2006. Considerations on authenticity and integrity in world heritage context. *City &*  
654 *Time* **2(1)**: 1–16.
- 655 Kavaratzis, M. & Ashworth, G. 2005. City Branding: An Effective Assertion of Identity or a  
656 Transitory Marketing Trick? *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* **96(5)**:  
657 506–514.
- 658 Labadi, S. 2011. Intangible Heritage and Sustainable Development: Realistic Outcome or Wishful  
659 Thinking?. *Heritage and Society* **4(1)**: 115–118.
- 660 MacCannell, D. 1999. *The Tourist: a New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkeley: University of  
661 California Press, 1999.

- 662 MacDonal, S. 2013. *Memorylands. Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London and New  
 663 York: Routledge.
- 664 Martí, J. 2010. Turismos y museos en la ciudad de Valencia. In *Museos y parques naturales:*  
 665 *Comunidades locales, administraciones públicas y patrimonialización de la cultura y la*  
 666 *naturaleza*, (ed.) Iñaki Arrieta, Bilbao: UPV, 63–90.
- 667 Meskell, L. 2015. Transacting UNESCO World Heritage: Gifts and Exchanges on a Global Stage.  
 668 *Social Anthropology* **23**: 3–21.
- 669 Miller, D. 2008. The Uses of Value. *Geoforum* **39**: 1122–1232.
- 670 Pratt, A. 2008. Locating the Cultural Economy. In *Cultures and globalization: The Cultural*  
 671 *Economy*, (eds) Helmut Anheier & Rajisar Yudhishtir, London: Sage, 42–51.
- 672 Rausell, P. 2006. Consideraciones globales hacia el tránsito de Valencia como una Ciudad Global.  
 673 *Ciudades* **71**: 49–57.
- 674 Rius-Ulldemolins, J., Hernández G. & Torres, F. 2016. Urban Development and Cultural Policy  
 675 ‘White Elephants’: Barcelona and Valencia. *European Planning Studies* **24(1)**: 61–75.
- 676 Santamarina, B. 2013. Los mapas geopolíticos de la Unesco: entre la distinción y la diferencia  
 677 están las asimetrías. *Revista de Antropología Social* **22**: 263–286.
- 678 — 2014. La ciudad suplantada. Percepciones sobre los nuevos imaginarios (turísticos) de la  
 679 ciudad de Valencia. *Pasos: Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural* **12(4)**: 707–718.
- 680 Santamarina, B. & Moncusí, A. 2013. Manifiestos y latencias en la Valencia de las Guías Turísticas.  
 681 In *Metamorfosis urbanas. Ciudades españolas en la dinámica global*, (ed.) J. Cucó, Barcelona:  
 682 Icaria, 259–283.
- 683 — 2015. El mercado de la autenticidad: las nuevas ficciones patrimoniales. *Revista de Occidente*  
 684 **440-441**: 93–112.
- 685 Scott, A. 2008. Cultural Economy: Retrospect and Prospect. In *Cultures and globalization: The*  
 686 *Cultural Economy*, (eds) H. Anheier & R. Yudhishtir, London: Sage, 307–323.
- 687 — Beyond the Creative City: Cognitive-cultural Capitalism and the New Urbanism. *Regional*  
 688 *Studies* **48(4)**: 565–578.
- 689 Sivaramakrishnan, K. & Vaccaro, I. 2006. Postindustrial Natures: Hyper-mobility and Place  
 690 Attachments. *Journal of Social Anthropology* **14(3)**: 301–317.
- 691 Smith, L. & Akagawa, N. (eds) 2009. *Intangible Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- 692 Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- 693 Swyngedouw, E, Moulaert, F. & Rodriguez, A. 2002. Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe:  
 694 Large-scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy. *Antipode* **34(3)**:  
 695 542–577.
- 696 Throsby, D. 2001. *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 697 Treanor, P. 2005. *Neoliberalism: Origins, Theory, Definition*. Accessed from [Error! Hyperlink](#)  
 698 [reference not valid.](#)
- 699 Tsing, A. 2015. *The Mushroom at the end of the world. On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*.  
 700 Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- 701 Vaccaro, I. 2010. Theorizing Impending Peripheries: Postindustrial Landscapes at the Edge of  
 702 Hyper-modernity’s. *Journal of International & Global Studies* **1(2)**: 22–44.
- 703 Vaccaro, I. & Beltran, O. (eds) 2010. *Social and Ecological History of the Pyrenees: State, Market,*  
 704 *and Landscape*. Walknut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- 705 Vlès, V. 2014. *Métastations: Mutations urbaines des stations de montagne – Un regard pyrénéen*.  
 706 Bourdeaux: Presses Universitaires Bourdeaux.
- 707 Wilson, G. 2001. From Productivism to Post-Productivism ... and Back again? Exploring the  
 708 (Un)changed Natural and Mental Landscapes of European Agriculture. *Transactions of the*  
 709 *Institute of British Geographers* **26(1)**: 77–102.
- 710 Winter, T. 2011. The Political Economies of Heritage. In *Heritage, Memory & Identity*, (eds)  
 711 Helmut Anheier & Yudhishtir Raj Isar, 70–81, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

- 712 Woods, M. & McDonagh, J. 2011. Rural Europe and the World: Globalization and Rural  
713 Development (Editorial). *European Countryside* **3**: 153–163.  
714