HOMEE

Heritage Opportunities/threats within Mega-Events in Europe:

Changing environments, new challenges and possible solutions for preservation in mega-events embedded in heritage-rich European cities

Literature Review of Mega-events Addressing Cultural Heritage Issues

CULTURAL HERITAGE
A CHALLENGE FOR EUROPE

JPICH
Heritage in
Changing
Environments

Project Partners:
Politecnico di Milano
University of Hull
Neapolis University Pafos
International Cultural Centre

September 2019

HOMEE – Heritage Opportunities/threats within Mega-Events in Europe: Changing environments, new challenges and possible solutions for preservation in mega-events embedded in heritage-rich European cities

Literature review of mega-events addressing cultural heritage issues

This document derives from the joint research and intellectual effort of all contributors. However the first draft of entire or parts of the following paragraphs: introduction, 1.1-1.5, 2.4, 3.1, 3.5, 5.1-5.3 can be attributed to Davide Ponzini and Zachary Jones[1]; of entire or parts of paragraphs: 2.1, 2.3, 2.5-2.7, 3.4 to Franco Bianchini and Enrico Tommarchi; of entire or parts of paragraphs: 4.1-4.5 to Julia Georgi, Evanthia Dova and Angeliki Sivitanidou; of entire or parts of paragraphs: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.4 to Jacek Purchla, Joanna Sanetra-Szeliga, Anna Kozioł and Adam Dąbrowski.

This document corresponds to one key output of WP1 (activity A1.2 in particular) in the JPICH financed project "HOMEE – Heritage Opportunities/threats within Mega-Events in Europe".

Contributors
Politecnico di Milano: Davide Ponzini, Zachary Mark Jones
University of Hull: Franco Bianchini, Enrico Tommarchi
Neapolis University Pafos: Julia Georgi-Nerantzia Tzortzi, Evanthia Dova, Angeliki Sivitanidou, Natia Anastasi
International Cultural Center: Jacek Purchla, Joanna Sanetra-Szeliga, Anna Kozioł, Adam Dąbrowski
Front cover: Attikon/ Othellos Cinema, Pafos 2017. Photograph by Evanthia Dova.
Back cover: "Who cares? Ecologia del dialogo" performance, Matera 2019. Photograph by Zachary M. Jones.

Please cite as: Ponzini D., Jones Z.M., Bianchini F., Tommarchi E., Georgi J.-Tzortzi N., Dova E., Sivitanidou A., Purchla J., Sanetra – Szeliga J., Knaś P., Dąbrowski A., Kozioł A. (2019). *HOMEE Literature Review of Mega-events Addressing Cultural Heritage Issues*. Weblink: http://www.tau – lab.polimi.it/homee-literature-review-regarding-mega-events-cultural-heritage

Contact: Davide Ponzini (Project Leader) davide.ponzini@polimi.it

September 2019

[1] The contribution by Davide Ponzini and Zachary Jones draws on previous research work and publications of theirs, and in particular on Jones (2018) and Jones & Ponzini (2018).

Literature review of mega-events addressing cultural heritage issues

In the past, many cities used mega-events to support capital and revenue investments and boost tourism while harnessing their competitiveness on a global scale. Until recently, the emphasis has been placed by and large on the creation of new infrastructural components, new stadiums and other public facilities to host events. In many instances today, on the contrary, mega-event organizers have opted for the re-use of existing facilities, the conversion of inner-city areas and the regeneration of neighbourhoods. For heritage-rich European cities, this shift in paradigm represents both an opportunity and a threat. The HOMEE project brings together leading research centres working in the fields of cultural heritage preservation and mega-event planning, in close contact with key institutions and policy officers who have already had or will have direct responsibility for planning and implementing mega-events in Europe, from the local to the international level. The project investigates past events and develops new policy tools for dealing with the emerging opportunities and threats in planning and implementing mega-events in heritage-rich cities.

This document is the first deliverable (A1.2) of the "HOMEE – Heritage Opportunities/threats within Mega-Events in Europe: Changing environments, new challenges and possible solutions for preservation in mega-events embedded in heritage-rich European cities" research project, financed under the European call "JPICH Heritage in Changing Environments." The research explores for the first time the relationships between the planning and implementation of mega-events and cultural heritage in European cities. In order to provide background concepts and a sound critical framework for the analyses of the research and its case studies, this document carries out an extensive trawl of the existing literature, identifying and teasing out key messages emerging from both academic sources and high-level policy documents. Exploring these relations is important because one can find abundant literature and longstanding debates both on mega-events and heritage topics, yet there is a clear gap in research about the relationship between the two. Our review explains the reasons why it is important to address this gap.

In recent years this missing link has become more and more important in urban planning and cultural policy practice as mega-events and cultural mega-events in particular have more intensively being using, reusing and improving existing facilities and infrastructure within the city fabric and in historic city centres especially. This document defines mega-events (see section 1.1), showing similarities and relevance of their cultural dimension and international spread, with particular attention to cultural mega-events. Our aim is to lay the foundations for an informed debate as well to highlight the importance given to the costs and benefits for city policy makers while hosting mega-events to factor in the potential role of heritage preservation, appreciation and cultural identity building. In addition, the political dimensions of both built and intangible heritage often play a role in terms of mega-event planning practice, yet they are rarely discussed for their deeper implications (e.g. grassroots mobilization, catalysing political opinions and change). Similarly, the contents, pressure and ways of operating of mega-events, their success during the year of celebration or the typically aimed-for tourism boost can benefit as well as potentially put at risk the heritage of a city. Existing literature explains well heritage problems and opportunities as well as related issues for planning practice, yet it

is important to reconnect these to mega-events. Specific aspects of the process, governance and planning tools of mega-events require an understanding of geographic and institutional contexts. The literature clearly tells us that one can expect dynamics that are similar internationally, but the complexities of culture-led urban development across Europe do not allow one to simply assume that the same policy approach, planning tool or technical solution generate similar effects (or may be even possible) in different places.

Our exploration also suggests that there is a substantial lack of critical knowledge at the crossroads between mega-events and cultural heritage policy. One must be quite cautious with the challenges of transferring usable policy knowledge across Europe between different events and even within the same type of event. Cultural mega-events such as the European Capital of Culture and similar programmes are important fields of observation for understanding and for accumulating policy knowledge about the nexus between mega-events and cultural heritage.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In the past, many cities used mega-events to support capital investments and boost tourism while harnessing their competitiveness on a global scale. Until recently, the emphasis has been placed by and large on the creation of new infrastructural components, such as new stadiums, theatres and other public facilities to host events. In many instances today, on the contrary, mega-event organizers have opted for the re-use of existing facilities, the conversion of inner-city areas and the regeneration of neighbourhoods. For heritage-rich European cities, this shift in paradigm represents both an opportunity and a threat. The HOMEE project investigates past events and consolidates knowledge for dealing with the emerging opportunities and threats in planning and implementing mega-events in heritage-rich cities. The project addresses complex questions such as: What are the main blind spots in our current understanding of the relationships between cultural heritage and mega-event policies? How do preservation and conservation policies deal with the threats and opportunities generated by mega-events in heritage-rich European cities? Do key stakeholders in charge of mega-events and preservation policies have relevant operational knowledge and planning tools at their disposal? How to improve such tools and who should be involved in these decision–making processes?

Cutting across disciplinary fields became a clear need to address such questions as different specialisms have been fruitfully dealing with and studying mega-events and cultural heritage. In order to start answering these questions and to provide better understanding of the relationships between mega-events and cultural heritage preservation policies, we investigated existing literature and debates and derived ideas from various fields, including spatial planning, cultural policy, cultural and social theory, heritage studies, urban geography and urban studies, architecture and urban design, urban and cultural economics and other disciplines dealing with mega-events, heritage or both. These fields also reflect the background and specialization of the members of the four research teams involved in the HOMEE project.

These questions were not only approached through existing literature and debates because of their general importance, but with specific research operations and goals in mind. The core goal has been to provide a sound critical framework for the analyses that the HOMEE research project will undertake in subsequent phases. Definitions and conceptualizations of the key element in the research are important to foster a dialogue with current international debates. Identifying and fleshing out key issues that emerged in mega-events and heritage policy debates – from both existing academic sources and policy documents – was another goal as these can become important leads in the interactions that this research will have with scholars and policy makers.

There is a substantial gap between what we know about each of the two policy fields individually (on the one hand mega-event planning and on the other cultural heritage policy) and knowledge about their overlaps and the ways in which the two fields interact in practice. This literature review aims to find effective ways to fill this gap conceptually and to pave the way to do so in terms of evidence-based research and informed discussion with policy makers. Readers will find a wide collection of viewpoints and diverse disciplinary contributions that aim to foster the production of knowledge focusing on the problems and opportunities related to the planning and implementation of mega-events in heritage-

rich cities. Practitioners and policy makers can look at this document as a source of useful concepts rather than as a simple guide to a collection of readings on the topic.

This document is structured to be accessible to multiple readerships and multiple ways of reading/using the literature review or part of it. The first section covers mega-events (chapter 1) and heritage basics (chapter 2). A general definition of mega-events and a discussion of the current evolution of the debate and policy decisions are linked to more traditional ways of planning mega-events, with reference to the city, relevant facilities and infrastructure. An overview of the features, existing overlaps, similarities and differences among types of mega-events allows a deepening of the study of existing cultural mega-events and to provide a basic world map of them. Several works have been concentrating on the anticipated costs and benefits of hosting cultural mega-events, as this is key not only for motivating actors, but most importantly for legitimizing the policy discourse about bidding and investing energies and resources for hosting such events.

Chapter 2 considers a broad conceptualization of cultural heritage, cutting across interpretations that connect it more to the built environment and reach to the intangible. The more recent interpretation of the concept of 'Historic Urban Landscape' is considered as crucial to understand heritage-rich cities in contemporary Europe. The wide conversation regarding heritage authenticity is, again, dealt with in a very focused manner, relating it to culture and heritage as they are used in mega-events. The approaches to preservation and conservation of heritage are interpreted as part of broader cultural heritage policies. In addition, heritage identity building processes and policy narratives are considered. Cultural heritage and the mobilization of shared meanings attached to it are discussed with reference to the implications for urban and political change and to current changing cultural/political values in Europe.

The second section builds on the previous two chapters to discuss the relationships between cultural mega-events and cultural heritage. In particular, chapter 3 approaches the ways in which heritage opportunities and threats can be seen in the planning and implementation of cultural mega-events. It deals especially with the potential reciprocal benefits and risks of introducing mega-events into heritage-rich cities (e.g. funnelling mega-event resources for heritage appreciation or spectacularising the built environment for mega-events and tourism). Although this has not been explicitly discussed in the literature, we conclude the chapter with several considerations regarding the division between mega-events and heritage preservation policies and approaches.

The third section shifts to planning and policy matters, discussing what is known in the literature about processes, governance and tools for planning and implementing cultural mega-events in heritage-rich cities. A close observation of the preservation and planning systems in Europe shows a great variety of traditions, approaches and actors. These aspects must be taken into consideration when dealing with policy knowledge that is expected to transfer solutions and best practices across national and even continental borders. The challenges of integrating mega-events with other planning tools and processes seems particularly complex with reference to the heritage policy field.

This trek along different literature paths and across disciplines highlights that there is a gap of knowledge in literature at the crossroads between mega-events and cultural heritage debates. Perhaps

practice suffers from this gap in European cities as much as elsewhere. The conclusions discuss more pressing issues, particularly the kinds of knowledge that are missing and the reasons why this literature turns its attention towards cultural mega-events and the City/Capital of Culture programmes in particular. Finally, the bibliography provides an extensive list of references regarding the topic, of interest to researchers, policy makers and other readers. Besides serving as a solid base for the subsequent steps in the HOMEE project, we expect and hope that this literature review will help inform on-going and future scholarly and policy debates in Europe and beyond.

Section I. Definitions

CHAPTER 1 Mega-events, their features and the culture component

1.1. General definitions of mega-events

Mega-events have appeared across the world over the last 150 years to promote sport, culture, technology as well as serve as instruments to define cities, both physically and in the international imaginary. The Great Exhibition of 1851 in London later became the World's Fair or today the Universal Exposition. The first modern Olympics were staged 45 years later in 1896 in Athens, the city that also hosted the classical games in antiquity (Zimbalist, 2015). Since the mid-19th century, cities on every continent have hosted some version of these large events that have grown to become some of the costliest urban projects. Especially since the 1980s (The Los Angeles 1984 Olympics are often cited as a turning point), city policy makers have utilized mega-events as part of their strategies to secure much desired global recognition, attract investment and promote growth (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006; Roche, 1994, 2002; Short, 2008; Young & Wamsley, 2005). The range of effects generated by these events are potentially vast, spanning from physical improvements such as mass infrastructure projects or new facilities to social changes (Ponzini & Jones, 2015) along with more nuanced institutional changes and understandings of the city as a whole (including of its heritage).

The most generally accepted definition of a mega-event is the one proposed by Roche (2000: 1):

"… large-scale cultural (including commercial and sporting) events which have a dramatic character, mass popular appeal and international significance."

Using this definition, many types of mega-events, including many large cultural events, can readily be classified as mega-events, despite their specific differences. The most common examples of mega-events include the Olympics, FIFA World Cup and Universal Expo which vary in duration from 2 weeks (Olympics) to 6 months (Expo) and now regularly cost several or even tens of billions euros (Horne, 2007). Different categories have been created to separate mega-events from special events or hallmark events, based on their appeal, size, audience and governing bodies (Hall, 1989; Müller, 2015b), yet the differences between them have become increasingly difficult to measure, for example as some annual music festivals now attract greater number of tourists than the Olympics.

For Getz, the mega-event unequivocally signifies a substantial increase in quality of place through the specialized mechanism of the event accompanied by large investment in the physical realm and improvements in the image of the city/place (Getz, 2000), though of course the mega-event alone cannot guarantee or ensure such outcomes. While the idea of mega-events has become closely associated with the potential benefits they can provide to cities, these secondary effects result from a wide range of contextual and other factors and are far from guaranteed (Balibrea, 2001; Degen & García, 2012; Zimbalist, 2015). More specifically, they have been proposed as strategies to catalyse the development of urban infrastructure (Preuss, 2004) in order to immediately affect physical space (new and reused facilities, directly or indirectly associated with the event – rehabilitation of older or underused building stock, reclaimed brownfields, natural, cultural, historic heritage). Sometimes these

processes bring together and integrate a number of changes which may otherwise remain autonomous or fragmented (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017).

Mega-events have also led city policy makers to experiment with innovative technologies in service and transportation networks, administrative/governance processes, communication and networking (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017). These new approaches are in part made possible through easier access to funds not otherwise available (Wilson, 2009), the promotion of local and regional economic diversification and growth (Gratton et al., 2006), as well as the empowerment of communities and the building-of social capital (Chalip, 2006; Grix, 2012). Another common incentive is to put the host city on the world stage, raising its profile and improving its image and branding (Chen & Spaans, 2009).

Discussions of mega-events often also include the concept of 'exceptionalism', seeming to provide 'work arounds' to typical planning hurdles or political red tape that city policy makers face. Events can and typically do present an opportunity for additional funding, both in the form of private sponsorship as well as increased state level funding (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017). Their exceptionalism also paves the way for extraordinary – usually accelerated – governance practices to take place, which may not be acceptable under ordinary conditions (Smith, 2012). Basso (2014, 2015, 2017) has questioned the often assumed exceptionalism of mega-events by discussing how mega-projects are practically managed and delivered. Additionally, with the continued expansion and standardization of mega-events as a common global planning approach for cities to turn to (Basso, 2014), an entire business sector devoted to the delivery of major events has emerged, making them less exceptional and more routine. As mega-events continue to both expand (globally and thematically) and evolve, it becomes more difficult to pinpoint a singular and precise definition that can fully encompass them all. Ultimately, Roche's open ended and broad definition (2000) works well to encompass these changes, which will be specifically discussed in section 1.3.

1.2. Evidence of change in the 'traditional' mega-event model

The Olympic Games, arguably the most visible and well known of all mega-events, have found themselves at a critical point of change in recent years. During the bidding process for the 2022 Winter Olympics, 4 out of the final 6 candidate cities withdrew their bids from the competition. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) again faced the same situation some years later for the bid of the 2024 Summer Olympic Games when the cities of Rome, Boston, Hamburg and Budapest all withdrew their bids, forcing the IOC to select both Paris and Los Angeles to host the 2024 and 2028 games successively in order to avoid repeating the scenario a third time. Similarly, the bid for the 2026 Winter Olympics had only two candidates: Milan-Cortina – which eventually secured the event – and Stockholm-Are. Due to the huge expenditure often expected, many cities no longer consider the once highly competitive mega-event as a desirable and viable option for their own long-term development. The withdrawal of bids has occurred due to both popular referendums, as was the case in Boston and Hamburg, and through top-down political decisions, as in Rome, where a recently elected mayor deemed the city unfit, economically and in terms of infrastructure, to host the event. Interestingly, both ends of the decision-making spectrum have come to a similar conclusion regarding this particular

mega-event. Lack of political support from the central government likewise prevented the Amsterdam-Rotterdam joint bid for the 2028 Olympics from going forward. On the other hand, policy makers – in particular though not exclusively in secondary and middle size cities – appear more interested in retaining or attracting "second- and third-tier mega-events" (Gruneau & Horne, 2016: 2), especially where these are considered in line with the character of their cities and the image they wish to project externally. For instance, schemes such as the European Capital of Culture or the UK City of Culture are witnessing a growing number of applicant cities, while similar initiatives are being established or proposed at national and international level. Twenty-three cities across the world celebrated 'City of Culture' status in 2017 (Green, 2018). In response to these shifting attitudes, the IOC developed Agenda 2020, a document that sets a vision for the future of the Olympic Games. Recommendation 2.2 specifically aims at changing the most visible and as well as costly aspects of the event: newly constructed venues for the event, instead promoting:

"The maximum use of existing facilities and the use of temporary and demountable venues where no long-term venue legacy need exists or can be justified" (International Olympic Committee, 2014: 9).

This recommendation is a first step in shifting the Olympic Games towards greater sustainability that would increase its integration with the existing city fabric, rather than continuing to rely on the development of newly constructed isolated platforms located on the outskirts of urban zones. This new approach also makes it easier for more small to medium-sized cities to bid for and host the events. Within this more integrated approach, there is a greater likelihood for urban heritage to interact with or even become part of the event. Though Budapest eventually withdrew its bid to host the 2024 Olympics, its original proposal rested precisely on this issue, arguing for medium scale cities to host the event based on the Agenda 2020 goals and intended to highlight its heritage within the event. Most mega-events today include the use of various important historic locations throughout the host city. Paris, the city that eventually won the 2024 Olympics, proposes staging sporting events at key locations within the city centre, such as beach volley at the base of the Eiffel Tower (Mairs, 2017). This new approach will harness the existing image of the historic city, rather than relying on newly built infrastructure. However, it also potentially risks using heritage solely as a backdrop to be seen and referenced, rather than as a functioning, integrated part of the city.

The Olympics are not the only mega-event undergoing changes. The UEFA European football championships in 2020 will introduce a new diffused model that will spread matches between 12 different European cities and countries, thereby drastically increasing the number of host cities, many of which contain significant heritage. Therefore, it is more important than ever to be aware of the potential benefits and threats these events pose in order to take advantage of their positive secondary effects without putting heritage at risk. In fact, 13 world heritage cities will host a mega-event between 2018 and 2024 (for an overview of relevant events see table 1). While this shift towards an increased integration with the existing urban fabric may be a new phenomenon for sporting mega-events, cultural mega-events have long been fully integrated within heritage rich cities.

1.3. Different features and overlaps/similarities/differences among types of mega-events

Mega-events vary in many ways. Whether sporting or cultural mega-events, there is a significant range in their duration, costs and spatial spread. Even within the same type of event there can be significant differences between the various iterations of the event. As suggested earlier, there are many desired secondary effects which these very different types of events have in common and which city decision makers hope to benefit from. All mega-events tend to be an occasion for significant investment (both public and private) in cities as well as for greater than usual advertising of the city at national and international levels. Mega-events of all types can serve as an opportunity for cities of various sizes and global standing to reinterpret and redefine their internal and external images through intensive media attention and event campaigns with specialized graphics and slogans (Smith, 2005). Interestingly, even unsuccessful bids can attract media attention through the process, leading to potentially beneficial coverage (Jones, 2015).

However, the aspects that can make the greatest differences between sporting and cultural events can be found in their governance, image/identity promotion and spatial layouts. While most cultural mega-events tend to cost far less than the typical Olympics or Expo, the combined public and private funding leading up to the 2008 Liverpool ECoC came to over 2 billion euros, not much below the cost of past Olympics and Expos. The IOC has also made the reduction of costs of future Olympics one of their main goals within the 2020 Agenda, therefore the costs gap between future cultural and sporting mega-events may continue to decrease. The smaller budget of an ECoC, when concentrated on improving the physical environment of smaller or medium sized cities, may produce more strongly felt and experienced results than a larger budget for an Olympics spent on an isolated platform and infrastructure located at the edge of or far away from cities.

The issue of governance is particularly important in the case of the Olympics and the Expo, as both the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Bureau International des Expositions (BIE) have developed quite stringent guidelines and requirements that direct the development and delivery of these events (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017; Müller, 2015a). These external international organizations raise questions of democratic norms as the typical 'rule of law' can come to be suspended to ensure the delivery of events (Müller, 2015a; Basso, 2017) as decisions for the entire city come to be framed within the delivery of the event (Clark, 2008). Regarding cultural mega-events like the ECoC, the European Commission develops guidelines for the event and specific themes future ECoCs should emulate, with the 'European Dimension' of projects becoming increasingly important. However, once cities have been selected to host the event, it does not directly oversee or guide development of the events. As seen in various cases, ECoC host cities are able to manage and implement the event in a variety of ways with the ability to involve a diverse range of actors and stakeholders if they choose or even for a group of NGOs to initiate the bid as in Istanbul 2010

When it comes to the promotion of these events and the associated city identity, there are differences in how different types of events interact and value the city itself. In the case of the Olympics or Expo, the city aligns itself with a well-established global event brand. Cultural mega-events like the ECoC or similar UK and Italian City of Culture programmes, however, allow each city to craft a specific message

more closely related to the image/identity they aim to project during the event and into the future. Mega-events can also vary significantly in the duration of the event. While the Olympics last only for a 2-week period and the Expo for 6 months, the ECoC lasts for a much longer period, usually an entire year.

In terms of their physical construction and layout, Olympics and Expos have often tended towards isolated platforms that can be quite disconnected from existing urban fabric. However, the 2020 Agenda, the document produced by the IOC to guide future Olympic development, states that Olympic host cities can shift towards a more integrated model that promotes the reuse of existing venues. This approach is potentially much closer to the ECoC in terms of the event itself taking place primarily within the city and utilizing existing venues. Meanwhile, the Expo has thus far continued within the vein of traditional approaches with both the 2015 Milan and 2020 Dubai Expos constructing large isolated 'platform' sites located on the outskirts of the city. While some cities have built new infrastructure for the ECoC, comparatively, they more often make greater use of existing facilities than other mega-events and often do not construct entirely new concert halls or cultural centres. As mentioned above, the IOC, through Agenda 2020, now supports a similar approach of utilizing existing sport venues rather than requiring the construction of new venues as in the past. We can already observe shifts occurring in the example of Paris hosting the 2024 Olympics as the city intends to place key events and venues within the historic city itself where sites like the Eiffel Tower, symbols of the city's past mega-events, will form the backdrop for the upcoming games (Mairs, 2017).

1.4. Overview of existing cultural mega-events and city/capital of culture across the world

The topic of cultural mega-events and the aspects that particularly define one have not been specifically covered within literature. While sporting mega-events are more readily definable, cultural mega-events could come to encompass a much broader and diverse range of formats. For example, while not typically classified as such, the Universal Expo, for all intents and purposes, easily falls within the category of cultural mega-events. While the specific promoted themes change between each host city, each version of the event brings together nations from around the world to present their approach to the issue, often through associated exhibitions and cultural activities/performances throughout the 6-month event.

The more commonly thought of cultural mega-event is that of the European Capital of Culture (ECoC), a yearlong cultural programme consisting of various cultural events and projects happening throughout the city and/or region. It happens to be one of the longest running continuous EU policies and the flagship cultural programme for the European Commission (European Commission, 2014). The event has been hosted annually by one or more host cities every year since 1985, with over 50 cities throughout Europe having already held the title. The standard year typically sees 2 cities co-hosting, though there have been variations and some special years with additional host cities (García & Cox, 2013). Cities have highlighted a number of cultural themes through the ECoC with a focus on the 'European' dimension coming to play a more important role over time. It has evolved from originally focusing on traditional European cities with a long history (e.g. Athens 1985; Florence 1986;

Paris, 1989 and others), to urban regeneration through cultural heritage, to focusing on being a melting pot of cultural diversity as well as through a broader regional understanding of the city (Ponzini & Jones, 2015).

Some of the cities which have highlighted their long histories as a key element of their event include Thessaloniki 1997, Weimar 1999, Avignon 2000, Graz 2003, Genoa 2004, Istanbul 2010 and Tallinn 2011 amongst others (García & Cox, 2013), promoting themselves as pleasant places to live, work or visit. Glasgow 1990 was the first city to use the event to 'reinvent' itself and initiate a process of urban regeneration through culture. As will be discussed further in later chapters, this approach brought about accusations of 'inventing' culture within the city, yet it became an approach replicated by many other cities (e.g. Genoa 2004), though with disputable results. The events of Liverpool 2008 and Marseille 2013 particularly emphasized their history as a melting pot for cultural diversity and the introducing of different populations, in large part due to their being port cities. Lille 2004, Luxembourg and the Greater Region 2007 and Essen for the Ruhr 2010 heavily presented their candidature and event as an entire region in order to spread events throughout a broader area and connect them through culture (Marseille 2013 also tried to involve the Provence region, with limited effects).

The success of the European Capital of Culture has led to the development of similar international and national programmes of varying dimensions and popularity: Culture City of East Asia, Arab Capital of Culture, American Capital of Culture, Ibero-american Capital of Culture, UK City of Culture, Italian Capital of Culture, and others. These programmes have replicated the one-year format of the ECoC and use culture as a unifying force to promote a shared identity between different places.

One of the earliest programmes was the Ibero-american Capital of Culture that was first hosted by Bogota in 1991 and has since been hosted by one of the members of the Union of Ibero-american Capital Cities (UCCI, 2019). The privately run American Capital of Culture initiative began in 1998 and has been hosted by one city a year since 2000 across the Americas (Capital Americana de la Cultura, 2019). The programme is supported by The International Bureau of Cultural Capitals which is also responsible for the sub-regional Capital of Catalan Culture which began in 2004 in the small Catalonian city of Banyoles. Other regional titles include the Arab Capital of Culture that started in 1996, the Cultural Capital of the Turkic World that began in 2012, the Finno-Ugric Capital of Culture in 2014 and the Cultural City of East Asia hosted by cities in Japan, China and South Korea which was also inaugurated in 2014 (Ocón, 2017; Christensen-Redzepovic, 2018). At the national level, City/Capital of Culture events can be found in the UK, Italy, Lithuania, Belarus, Slovakia and Russia. While many of these events are much smaller than the ECoC and are not equivalent in terms of funding or planning (they may not even be perceived as mega-events), they reveal the mass interest in hosting cultural events to boost the profiles of cities in order to attract investment, tourists and new residents. It is this range of perceived benefits cities hope to gain from hosting events that has long driven their growth and spread.

Table 1 – Main international and national sporting and cultural mega-event programmes, relevant culture city/capital events, and their main features, examples of UNESCO World Heritage Site cities hosting them.

Name of the mega-event or event	Governing body (weblink)	Year of the first edition	Duration	Average hosting costs*	Examples of recent/forthcoming hosting cities with UNESCO WH sites
Universal Expo	BIE – Bureau International Des Expositions See: https://www.bie-paris.org/site/en/	1851	6 months	€2-48 billion	Seville 1992 Milan 2015
Olympic Games	IOC – International Olympic Committee See: https://www.olympic.org/the-ioc	1896	2 weeks	€2-50 billion	London 2012 Paris 2024
European Capital of Culture	European Commission See: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/capitals-culture_en	1985	1 Year	€10 million-1 billion	Florence 1986 Amsterdam 1987 Paris 1989 Luxembourg 1995/2007 Weimar 1999 Avignon 2000 Krakow 2000 Prague 2000 Porto 2001 Bruges 2002 Graz 2003 Genoa 2004 Liverpool 2008 Vilnius 2009 Istanbul 2010 Riga 2014 Pafos 2017 Matera 2019
Ibero-american Capital of Culture	Union of Ibero-american Capital Cities See: https://ciudadesiberoamericanas.org/home-2/	1991	1 year	€100k-3 million	Havana 1997 Lima 2002 Panama City 2003/2019 Quito 2004 Sucre 2005 Mexico City 2010
Arab Capital of Culture	League of Arab States See: http://www.lasportal.org/ar/Dynamic/Pages/worldCapitalsDetails.aspx?RID=3	1996	1 year	€N/A-500 million	Cairo 1996 Tunis 1997 Sana'a 2004 Algiers 2007 Damascus 2008
American Capital of Culture	CAC – Capital Americana del la Cultura See: http://www.cac-acc.org/present.php?lang=en	2000	1 year	N/A	Panama City 2003 Cordoba 2006 Cuzco 2007 Brasilia 2008

					Santa Domingo 2010 Quito 2011 Sao Luis 2012 San Miguel de Allende 2019
UK City of Culture	DCMS	2013	1 Year	€22-110 million	
Culture City of East Asia	Agency for Cultural Affairs See: http://www.bunka.go.jp/english/policy/international/eastasia/	2014	1 Year	N/A	Quangzhou 2014 Kyoto 2017 Xi'an 2019
Italian Capital of Culture	MIBACT – Ministry for Cultural Heritage, the Arts and Tourism See: http://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/export/MiBAC/sito-MiBAC/Contenuti/visualizza_asset.html_1398816910.html	2015	1 Year	€15-770 million	Siena 2015 Mantua 2016 Palermo 2018

*The figures available from official documents and websites depict different mixes of capital, infrastructural and management budgets for each programme. This makes it difficult to compare them precisely; these figures provide a sense of the relevance of such programmes in public discourse and urban/cultural policy making.

1.5. The anticipated costs/benefits of hosting cultural mega-events

Mega-events have long been promoted as opportunities for cities to attract much desired tourism, economic improvements and mass urban improvement projects. Mega-events have been often depicted as the key for translated into an increase in quality of place through the specialized mechanisms they instigate. This view however presents a very limited view of the reality of these events, overlooking the many possible difficulties in their planning and implementation and the uncertainty of the final outcomes (Sykes & Brown, 2015). Yet these idealized aspects represent many of the core reasons why mega-events have engendered such competition amongst cities to host them (Müller & Pickles, 2015). The following sections will explore the various dimensions of mega-events more in-depth and how they have come to be addressed within literature.

Mega-events vary in their size and expenditure, trans-nationality, exceptionality and regenerative abilities across host cities, though these qualities point to an underlying base consensus of the ability of these events to benefit host cities in some way. While these outcomes can be difficult to measure, the literature primarily uses varying economic analyses of profitability to demonstrate the 'success' of events (Getz, 2000). Much of the literature resides within event and tourism studies which has developed different methods to assess the value of large scale events through impact studies on local and national economies or through surveys on visitor response (Ritchie & Smith, 1991; Ritchie & Yangzhou, 1987).

Yet the goals of host cities are not limited to physical improvements or economic measures; the intangible improvement to the image or perceived identity of the city is another important aspect of events. It is the range of these beneficial effects which will be heavily discussed through this literature review. Whether sporting or cultural mega-events, it is these desired benefits of events that have driven cities to compete to host them. Changing views about these effects, and subsequently of mega-events themselves, are key to understand current challenges for cultural heritage, along with the differences and similarities between various mega-events.

CHAPTER 2 Cultural heritage within the scope of mega-events

2.1. Definitions of intangible, built and cultural heritage

The concepts of culture and heritage are extensively broad and difficult to singularly define. Heritage represents the qualities that elevates something from merely being 'old', whether an object, custom, building or place to something truly historic and valuable. The specific defining attributes that qualify a place or thing as heritage can also be difficult to define (Garden, 2006) and stem from a particular set of values (Mason & Avrami, 2002). The broadest approach would suggest that "heritage denotes everything we suppose has been handed down to us from the past" (Lowenthal 2006: 81). Heritage can then be divided into different categories such as cultural (man-made) and natural, tangible and intangible, built, urban or rural, regional and world heritage, as well as others, which are not mutually exclusive.

Over the past decades the term "heritage," initially more connoted with a monument, a static term that implied even some sacredness (sacrum) and that needed to be merely preserved for the future generations, evolved and broadened, both in terms of its scope and accepted utilisation. Now cultural heritage is "not necessarily what is positively valued as beautiful, rare, old or embodying noble values" (Macdonald 2018: para 1). Apart from industrial heritage, for example, the term "dissonant heritage" has been coined to illustrate that part of human inheritance that find no owners and/or incur rejection, disagreement, or exclusion from the main heritage narrative (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1996).

Analysing heritage in context of cities might require more detailed definitions of some aspects of cultural heritage. Built heritage commonly refers to buildings and architectural structures, in relation to their historical value, which can be defined and protected through national legislation (Nuryanti, 1996; Tweed & Sutherland, 2007). However, places of urban heritage are comprised of built heritage, but may be part of a larger cultural landscape where certain intangible heritage and practices originate. Intangible heritage is a type of heritage that is embodied in people and human behaviours rather than in inanimate objects (Logan, 2007). As recognised by UNESCO (2003), intangible heritage consists of "non-physical characteristics, practices, representations, expressions as well as knowledge and skills that identify and define a group or civilization." (UNESCO, 2019: para 1) These include but are not limited to oral traditions, performing arts, folk traditions and traditional craftsmanship, as well knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe. It is also worth to mention one more related term, namely the site of memory (*lieu de memoir*). It is "any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community" (Nora, 1989: 7). "It may refer to any place, object or concept vested with historical significance in the popular collective memory, such as a monument, a museum, an event, a symbol like a flag or the French figure Marianne" (ibid). The term almost wholly exhausts the semantic scope of heritage – they can be either formalized and institutionalized (such as museums or official celebrations) or either individual and personal (Kowalski, 2013).

Cultural heritage lies at the core of cultural policies in many countries, as its importance for human development and quality of life is formally recognised (UNESCO, 2005). Gradually, cultural heritage

bears a growing significance on issues of sustainable development, the formation and protection of identity, diversity and sense of place in the context of globalisation and integration and the peaceful settlement of conflicts through openness and intercultural dialogue. It can also be seen as a catalyst for creativity or a vital element of diplomacy and international relations (Council of Europe, 2005; Council of the European Union, 2014; UNESCO, 2013). Viewed from this standpoint, cultural heritage policies need not only provide for a range of sectors with extreme differences among them, with many widely divergent actors and agencies involved, but also have the potential to contribute to other policies and ends (environmental, economic, social) as well.

Harvey (2008) likewise recognizes the role of contemporary society in determining and defining what counts as heritage, which he refers to as "the process by which people use the past" through processes of creating social identity (Ashworth et al., 2007). This idea of *using the past* suggests as well a political element to heritage, and revealing its potential to be redefined and change. It is by no means a static term but rather a process of transforming our inheritance, be it tangible or intangible, physical or digital, into "experiences in and for the present." It is, as Ashworth further claims, "an outcome, a condition deliberately created in response to current political, social, or economic needs" (Ashworth, 2012: 14). Therefore, as Howard (2003) remarked, "[n]ot everything is heritage, but anything could become heritage" depending on one's present choices and needs. This approach has to be kept in mind as it helps bypassing the problem of heritage standardisation (Skounti, 2009). Such current postmodern and pluralistic interpretations of heritage allow nearly anything to eventually be considered heritage under the proper conditions (Harrison, 2013; Lowenthal, 1998), far from the original and more narrow concepts of heritage that initiated the conservation movement (Glendinning, 2013; Jokilehto, 1999). These changes in understanding have been attributed to shifts in society and economics, globalisation, deindustrialization, world war, the rise of the experience economy and changing philosophical concepts of the 20th century (Harrison, 2013). The concept of heritage is thus a flexible and continuously evolving concept that changes over time, not only in terms of what comes to be recognized as heritage, but also the societal values that lead to acts of protection and conservation. Therefore, across differing societies and cultures, different interpretations and understandings of culture and heritage are bound to exist.

The debates on definitions of culture (elite culture vs. popular culture), on the processes of democratizing culture vs. the processes of cultural democracy, on creativity and culture as productive industries, on centralized vs. decentralized cultural decision-making (Bianchini, 1993; Mulcahy, 2006) seem to apply to cultural heritage policies as well. Heritage policies are also burdened by the tenuous relationships between preservation and conservation on the one hand, and creativity and innovation on the other; between providing references for identity and advancing inclusion and integration; and, when it comes to spatial heritage policies, between issues of history/ authenticity and reuse, between regeneration and gentrification.

2.2. Heritage-rich cities in Europe and the Historic Urban Landscape

With continuous development across the globe, particularly the unprecedented growth observed in the last decades, a significant quantity of heritage has been lost around the globe. While not entirely immune to this phenomenon, many European cities have retained much of their built heritage due to their spatial arrangements and fortified city centres. Though WWII and subsequent rebuilding/development trends resulted in the loss of built heritage, many cities across the continent have manage to preserve (or in some cases rebuild) much of their heritage. This concentration of heritage and historical structures within cities signifies the concept of 'heritage-rich' cities. The modern conservation movement was born out of the need to protect such places during the 20th century. While definitions and understandings of heritage have expanded substantially over the past decades to include diverse settings, cultures and spatial configurations of heritage, these 'heritage-rich' places, due to their nature, are more sensitive to the potential changes that mega-events might bring. Therefore, this specialization or focus on 'heritage-rich' cities does not refer to or connote a greater value or importance than other historic places, but presents the need, from a planning and policy point of view, for greater care and attention. In particular, the spatial concentration and density of heritage (built heritage especially) may have implications for planning and urban development. Several views pleading for more integrated approaches to include exceptional and unexceptional heritage into the wider urban realm have emerged in recent years and seem particularly important to our reasoning.

As noted, the conceptions and understandings of heritage have continued to grow and evolve, with the most recent approach being that of the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL), adopted by UNESCO. The idea of landscapes can first be observed already in international documents (even earlier in the Italian context) with the 1976 UNESCO Recommendation regarding the safeguarding and contemporary role of *historic areas*. Not more specifically defined at that time, historic areas could include entire towns or a group of buildings, which constitute a joint value on their own, rather than as mere secondary elements to singular monumental elements (Jokilehto, 1999; UNESCO, 1976). Subsequent recommendations and charters further evolved this concept to expand beyond the urban scale to that of entire landscape, further broadening the concept of heritage (Glendinning, 2013). By the start of the 21st century, experts identified a missing link in recognizing and managing the historic city as a singular whole, rather than just as separate districts or zones (Pereira Roders & van Oers, 2011; Van Oers, 2006).

The HUL began with the Vienna Memorandum in 2005 and UNESCO fully adopted the recommendation in 2011. It simultaneously re-envisions the way areas of urban heritage within cities are understood as well as providing improved management tools (Bandarin & Van Oers, 2012; Veldpaus et al., 2013). HUL aims to reintegrate historic areas within the larger existing functions of the entire city in order to make them functioning, active, lively places rather than mere stage sets for tourists (Bandarin & Van Oers, 2012; Rodwell, 2012; Veldpaus et al., 2013). HUL is a key step in going beyond the sole protection of individual historic districts/quarters or historic centre to an understanding of the entire historic city as a coherent and lively entity.

The scale and complexity of the city has long necessitated the need for a comprehensive view of its cultural space. Almost 60 years ago, Kevin Lynch published a pioneering work *Image of the City* (1960), presenting the presently well-known classic concept of Urban Landscape. A year later, in his book *The Concise Townscape* (1961), Gordon Cullen was already applying the concept of Townscape, and heading a movement of defenders of the urban landscape (Townscape movement). Passing from dreams about an ideal city to reflections on the city as a cultural landscape has allowed urban space to be seen not only as something functional but also, in cultural terms, as a work of art. The international community assembled around UNESCO, has long recognized the need to develop a strategy for the effective protection of the most valuable historical urban complexes.

Table 2 – Most relevant international documents, charters and recommendation regarding heritage recognition and protection

1931	Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments (International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments);
1964	Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments);
1972	Declaration of Arc-et-Senans (Council of Europe)
1972	Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO);
1975	Amsterdam Declaration on the European Architectural Heritage (Council of Europe);
1976	Recommendation concerning Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (UNESCO);
1981	Florence Charter on Historic Gardens (ICOMOS);
1982	The Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies [Mondiacult] (UNESCO);
1987	Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas – the Washington Charter (ICOMOS);
1994	The Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS);
1999	Charter on Built Vernacular Heritage (ICOMOS);
2005	Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Council of Europe);
2005	Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas, the Xi'an Declaration (ICOMOS);
2005	Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (UNESCO);
2011	Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (UNESCO).
2013	The Hangzhou Declaration – Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies (UNESCO).

Analysing these documents throws light on the distinct change in the geography of the debate on protecting historic cities, more especially on the activity of Asian countries in this area, as evidenced by, among others, the Nara Document and Xi'an Declaration. In many cases, these documents were written seemingly as finalized documents that failed to foresee either the changing dynamics of heritage concepts or the incredible speed of change affecting their contexts and surroundings. This applies particularly to the issue of protecting historic cities where the effects of globalisation are heightened. The above mentioned HUL approach in effect aims to address these issues through a more integrated approach to protecting historic cities that recognizes and actively harnesses the potential of heritage rather than solely focusing on its protection. Cultural heritage is one component of the urban environment that can play an important role in broader city development, but which of course requires an interdisciplinary management of heritage, not only from city decision-makers, but also from town inhabitants.

In most countries, cultural heritage policies focus on the protection and preservation of tangible cultural heritage, movable or immovable, and modes of financing them. This is widely expected from the state, as heritage is generally considered a 'public good' and directly tied to national history and identity (Dubois, 2013). Other, less prominent objectives, include listing regulations (definitions of what is considered as heritage and listing procedures), the responsibilities of and relationships between the institutions responsible for heritage, heritage education and accessibility, the sustainability of interventions, the economic impacts of heritage on local industries (e.g. construction) and tourism (Klamer et al., 2013). Heritage policies place more weight on the public sphere and a variety of public stakeholders rather than the private sector or volunteer support; yet this attitude appears to be changing, involving private institutions in heritage preservation through special incentives (e.g. through tax exceptions or reductions) and attracting volunteer support as parts of heritage policy agendas (Klamer et al., 2006). The concept of intangible heritage is also a relatively new idea that is being given increasing attention in heritage policies (Bortolotto, 2007). All these conceptual improvements are relevant when discussing the planning of mega-events in heritage rich cities. At the heart of these planning issues and responsibilities lie a number of ideological issues that must be considered.

2.3. Issues of authenticity and the critical debate about pseudo-events and 'fake' culture related to mega-events

The question of authenticity is intrinsic to heritage and forms a significant basis for value claims (Harvey, 2008). The authenticity of a site, or even merely the perception of authenticity is one of the determining elements in defining the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage Sites (UNESCO, 2013). The term authenticity itself has become deceptively ambiguous over time in its use and overuse (Jokilehto, 1999). The term was first used internationally in the 1964 Venice Charter to refer to something "genuine," in the sense that it is composed of the its original physical material (ICOMOS, 1964; Pereira, 2007). However, debates and discussions on the issue of authenticity have taken place since then (MacCannell, 1973, 1976; Cohen, 1988; Wang, 1999). Authenticity has recently been understood in more dynamic and relative terms (see for instance Silverman, 2015) as a socially determined concept (McIntosh & Prentice, 1999) which may assume different meanings to different people (Alberts & Hazen, 2010) and is constantly generated and reframed (Olsen, 2002).

The concept has been discussed primarily in relation to cultural and heritage tourism, for which it is considered crucial (MacCannell, 1976; Apostolakis, 2003; Kolar & Zabkar, 2009), as cultural tourism is heavily driven by nostalgia about the past (Chhabra et al., 2003). Scholars such as Boorstin (1961 [1992]) and MacCannell (1973, 1976) suggest nonetheless that authenticity is staged, framed by both visitors and hosts. Whether interested or not in genuine experiences, visitors can only have access to a semblance of authenticity (Quinn, 2009) and consume "inauthentic and commodified products and events" (Macleod, 2006: 178). In addition, this constructive authenticity is filtered by an existential authenticity, which is shaped by tourists' personal feelings (Wang, 1999; Richards, 2007). Visitors may also be more inclined to appreciate sanitized authenticity (Sharpley, 1994; Povey & Van Wyk, 2010: 14–15).

In this context, events of any scale raise issues of authenticity whenever tourism-related goals are present (Getz & Page, 2016). In the case of mega-events, one first point is the homogenizing tendency resulting from the replication of supposedly successful templates (Richards & Wilson, 2006), or the transnational dimension of the ECoC (see for instance Immler & Sakkers, 2014; Tölle, 2016) or other similar programmes (see table 1), and the willingness to meet the expectations of a broader public. This is also linked to the tendency of an overprovision of events and replication of similar cultural contents that has raised issues of "cultural fatigue" (Liu, 2014: 508). For example, in some ECoCs this has affected attendance figures during the year of celebration. Secondly, mega-events are primarily conceived to pursue exploitative goals (Getz & Page, 2016). The resulting commodification of local cultures and the attempt to exploit the development potential of these occasions may lead to a sanitization of authenticity or a loss of heritage itself through processes of urban development and creative destruction (Gruneau & Horne, 2016; Gotham, 2016).

Boorstin (1961 [1992]) also introduced the concept of pseudo-events to describe the 'flood' of purposely-constructed events aimed at gathering media attention in contemporary Western societies. Boorstin's work stimulated research on fake news and construction of reality through the media (see for example Rojek, 2001; Ferrucci & Painter, 2013) and initiated the debate on festivals and authenticity. Further research (Ritchie & Beliveau, 1974; Snowball & Webb, 2008) drew attention to other aspects, such as the duration of festivals and the durability of reported values in the process of socio-political changes.

The flows of events, and pseudo-events, characterising many European cities produces a sense of "'festivalisation' or 'hyperfestivity'" (Richards, 2010: 7). Festivalisation can be understood as the "increasing use of flagship festivals and large cultural events as a means to market major cities" (Hitters, 2007: 282) or as an attempt "to make cities eventful all year round, with a need to feel any gaps in the event calendar" (Richards & Palmer, 2010: 27). This also involves the mobilization of the past, through heritage, to sustain current activity (ibid., 2010). This is strictly relevant when considering that one often aimed-for legacy of mega-events is the continued presence of tourists.

ECoC events themselves generate considerable expectations, arising from both local audiences and visitors, that spectacularised and purposely-constructed cultural contents and events attempt to fulfil. Pseudo-events are also linked to the commodification of culture, which in turn contributes to producing new, 'fake' culture, designed for commercial purposes. This production of pseudo-events and fake culture is part of the broader instrumental view of culture behind the very concept of mega-events as crucial occasions to pursue regeneration and development. In this context, cultural contents such as arts programmes appear to play a "tokenistic role" within mega-events, including the European Capital of Culture (García, 2004b: 103). Pseudo-events and staged authenticity also impact on people's search for authentic tourist experiences within mega-events (Getz & Page, 2016b: 610).

2.4. Preservation/conservation approaches

As with authenticity, a full discussion on the various approaches to protecting heritage would be too expansive for this work. However, a brief overview of the main concepts will serve to highlight the

differences in how heritage has been treated and the consequences of these approaches in order to better understand the actions taken as part of the cases studied currently being studied in the HOMEE research project.

Conservation and preservation are two closely linked terms, which are often used interchangeably, but according to the 2013 Burra Charter: "*Conservation* means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance" while "*Preservation* means maintaining a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration" (ICOMOS Australia, 2013: 2). Both focus on the current existing quality of and aim to alter the existing fabric as little as possible. Of the two, preservation focuses more specifically on physical aspects while conservation represents a broader approach that includes the intangible aspects of heritage (Jokilehto, 1999). By contrast, for a long period, *restoration* was considered a threat to conservation. Rather than maintaining the existing conditions of a site, as through conservation, restoration seeks to restore a building, place or area to a previous historical condition (Fitch, 1990; Glendinning, 2013; Jokilehto, 1999). *Restoration* was typically used to reveal the ideal beauty of a particular architectural style and justified the removal of later additions perceived to reduce the overall beauty or perfection of a style. In pursuit of stylistic perfection, restorers might even add entirely new components to a structure as long as they were true to the ideals of the style (Jokilehto, 1999). In some cases, a restoration of a building resembled something closer to the deconstruction and rebuilding of a structure. The Weimar European Capital of Culture in 1999 stands out as one example where the year of culture celebrated the noted authors Goethe and Schiller and the city of Weimar restored its centre back into the city of the 18th century from the post-soviet city it had previously been (Tölle, 2014). Such practices have been accused of being 'disneyification' (Hassenpflug, 2004), raising questions of authenticity when such drastic changes occur in the name of heritage conservation.

Less extreme practices that see changes to part of historic structures include adaptive reuse and *façadism*. Adaptive reuse inserts new uses into historic structures and has become an increasingly common way to ensure the continuing use and re-vitalization of historic buildings and parts of cities (Bullen & Love, 2011). This practice has been particularly useful for industrial heritage and the conversion of large factory and warehouse structures into all sorts of new uses. When only the external façade of a structure is retained while the rest is essentially replaced, then it would be considered *façadism*. Like other restoration practices, it too has significant consequences for the authenticity of historic structures. A yet even more extreme form of 'protection' is the complete *reconstruction* or *replication* of heritage. These practices create a facsimile of an original prototype (also termed facsimile building) (Fitch, 1990; Glendinning, 2013). The differences between *reconstruction* and *replication* is that reconstruction occurs in the original location of a destroyed structure while replication recreates an exact copy of a structure (or one very similar) in a different location and often while the original still exists (Fitch, 1990). The most extensive and well known heritage reconstruction at the city scale is the reconstruction of Warsaw following the destruction of the historic city centre during WWII (Jokilehto, 1999) and was later added by UNESCO in 1980 to the World Heritage list as an intangible expression of the identity of the Polish people, rather than for the actual physical structure of the city itself (Elżanowski, 2012; UNESCO, 1980).

Finally, social preservation attempts to protect some of the intangible aspects connected to physical heritage sites. By the 1970's, Appleyard (1979) already recognized the trend and potential threat of gentrification taking place in and around heritage areas that had been preserve and protected. *Social preservation* focuses on safeguarding the local inhabitants living and working in historic areas, making sure that they are not forced out of their homes due increases in rent or costs or preventing local inhabitants from immediately selling restored or conserved properties. The most famous example of social preservation is Bologna's conservation plan of 1968 (Bandarin, 1979; Bandarin & Van Oers, 2012; Bonfantini, 2013). While the plan, devised by Leonardo Benevolo, created a system of 4 typologies that allowed a variation of interventions and approaches depending on their categorization, it also actively sought to safeguard the existing population (Bandarin, 1979). Part of the plan proposed to use existing housing stock to provide public housing in the centre of the historic city instead of constructing new buildings, a first in Italy (Bandarin, 1979). These specifics were not easily reached, requiring the participation of the entire city (Bandarin & Van Oers, 2012). The devised agreement would provide for the owners of buildings to be compensated for costs only if the original tenants and rent levels were maintained and future increases negotiated with the local government (Bandarin, 1979). During the process of renovation, temporary housing was also provided for tenants. Bandarin (1979) notes that this effort could only be reached due to very particular social and political circumstances in Bologna at the time and may not be easily replicated everywhere. While final outcomes were not entirely perfect (De Pieri & Scrivano, 2004) as some gentrification still took place (Kupka, 2012), Bologna to this day remains a strong precedent for including social preservation as part of the overall conservation policies implemented.

2.5. Heritage identities and narratives

Heritage is accessed and consumed in relation to contemporary understandings of history and the past. This implies that local communities and visitors are consuming its representation, which has to be produced through a particular narrative (Groote & Haartsen, 2008). As briefly explored in the next section, the way in which heritage is understood and communicated is the result of the radical changes occurred in the 20th century. According to Harvey (2001), this implies that there is a supposedly correct narrative of heritage and that past narratives are believed to be more genuine than present ones. In addition, Pendlebury et al. (2004) highlight that the strategic shifts that have involved the framing of heritage since the 1970s include how cultural built heritage is conceptualized, traditionally, as a set of historic places and elements but also as a resource for pursuing economic and social regeneration.

Heritage narratives are undoubtedly influenced by power. As noted by McDowell (2008: 43) "those who wield the greatest power […] can influence, dictate or define what is remembered and consequently what is forgotten." Power relations can emphasise certain narratives and neglect others within decision-making processes about heritage, in particular in the case of mega-events that assume a top-down approach to planning and delivery. In places and arenas where local cultures and heritage are contested, the politics of communication and the construction of heritage narratives assume particular significance (Groote & Haartsen, 2008; Bianchini & Borchi, 2018). Policy makers also

mobilize "selectively embellished" versions of their cultural history (Bélanger, 2000: 386–387), by emphasizing certain elements of the past and neglecting others. This has been clear in the case of many European Capitals of Culture, where activist groups questioned the way in which certain aspects of tangible and intangible heritage were presented. For example, the Workers City group contested how the exhibition *Glasgow's Glasgow* within the European City of Culture 1990 programme portrayed the conditions of the city's working class, while the movement *Where's Me Culture* criticised the ECoC 2005 in Cork for neglecting certain aspects of heritage including local music (Boyle & Hughes, 1991; O'Callaghan & Linehan, 2007; Bianchini & Borchi, 2018). Heritage narratives in mega-events have also been playing a role of political reconciliation in post-conflict cities, for example in the case of the European Capital of Culture 2016 in Donostia-San Sebastián or the UK City of Culture 2013 in Derry-Londonderry. They are also used to reflect upon painful collective memories, such as in the case of the preliminary programme for the European Capital of Culture 2020 in Rijeka (Bianchini & Borchi, 2018)

Mega-events can be a means to increase awareness, knowledge and appreciation of heritage. These occasions may strengthen local values and traditions (Hall, 1989) because of the visibility and media attention they are able to generate. In addition, mega-events may also be occasions for reflecting about environmental issues, which can in turn contribute to the preservation of elements of local landscapes that could have otherwise been neglected (Deccio & Baloglu, 2002). However, since mass media tend to conform their messages to the taste of the broad audiences they aim to reach (Groote & Haartsen, 2008), mega-events may convey distorted heritage representations because of the huge media attention they generate.

2.6. Cultural heritage in urban and political change

Since the meaning of heritage and its patterns of access and consumption are a result of its framing according to contemporary social norms and values, the radical urban and political changes that have characterized the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century represent a crucial factor in current understandings of heritage. As noted (Harvey, 2001: 335), "concepts of heritage have always developed and changed according to the contemporary societal context of transforming power relationships and emerging nascent national (and other) identities" through a "hand-in-hand transformation, rather than one of straight cause and effect." The structural processes characterizing the transition to post-modernity are then behind the key features in present understandings of heritage, such as its very definition in relation to economic commodification and the post-modern nature of leisure (Harvey, 2001), or the globalizing process behind heritage and World Heritage as practices that contribute to shaping the world (Harrison, 2015).

The 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape reminds that our time is characterized by "the largest urban migration in history" (UNESCO, 2011: 2). Rapid urbanization, standardization and fragmentation of urban environments require to frame heritage conservation strategies in the context of sustainable development for diverse people. The tendency towards gentrification in historic districts in many European cities also represents a challenge for heritage conservation (Ripp & Rodwell, 2015), as urban regeneration may produce invasive transformation

towards certain income or social groups. The capacity of cities to absorb these changes without major transformations in their historic urban fabric also depends on the way in which the needs of different societies are understood (Ripp & Rodwell, 2015). The complex and variegated composition of European societies implies the need to question traditionally elitist definitions of heritage, involving reflections on how class and ethnicity contribute to influencing what heritage is (Littler, 2008).

The 2014 Florence Declaration (ICOMOS, 2014) attempts to underline the role that heritage plays in broader societal issues – such as well-being, cultural tourism, social cohesion and sustainable development – despite the use of traditional definitions of culture and heritage (Ripp & Rodwell, 2015). The document also recognises climate change as a challenge for heritage conservation. A report by the Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe Consortium (CHCfE Consortium, 2015: 28) underlines that "heritage is part of the solution to Europe's climate change challenges," considering for instance how the restoration of historic buildings can produce benefits in terms of energy efficiency. Climate change is also entering mega-event agendas, as many host cities now include environmental issues in their event programme (Bianchini & Borchi, 2018), such as the recent European Capitals of Culture Aarhus 2017, Leeuwarden 2018 and Matera 2019.

2.7. Current changes in cultural/political values in Europe and their implications for heritage

The political aspects of heritage cannot be ignored (Barthel, 1996; Harvey, 2008), and the changing of cultural and political attitudes impacts understandings and definitions of heritage. The intentional act to conserve one place establishes a narrative of a particular aspect of history, highlighting certain stories and experiences over others. The conservation movement has long faced accusations of pandering to or promoting heritage narratives that serve the interests of limited, cultural elites and ignoring other heritage (Glendinning, 2013). Protected and promoted heritage areas play a powerful role in shaping society's collective memory of its past (Glendinning, 2013; Ruggles, 2012).

The politicizing of heritage cannot be considered as only a recent phenomenon, as it has been an aspect present throughout the development of the conservation movement. Since the French revolution and throughout the 20th century, heritage has been utilized by nationalistic movements as a way to unify citizens (Evans & Boswell, 1999; Fladmark, 2000; Glendinning, 2013; Jokilehto, 1999; Rhiannon Mason, 2004). The work of Riegl (1903 [1996]) aimed to promote a more universal and humanistic view of heritage that went directly against the aims of nationalism. The newly founded Kingdom of Greece established very early conservation legislation in 1834 as an effort to strengthen the idea of a national identity (Jokilehto, 1999). Likewise, following the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the new Republic of Turkey intentionally did not conserve many Ottoman structures as they were considered symbols of the past (Aygen, 2013). While the modern international conservation movement has embraced the approach of Riegl in promoting heritage that belongs to all of humanity, the current changing cultural and political climate, in Europe though not exclusively, brings with it changing attitudes towards heritage, which put into question its very definition.

As a result of the major urban and political changes occurred at the turn of the 21st century, as well as of mass migration towards Europe, the progressive erosion of welfare provisions and the rise of terrorism, more Europeans feel that their living standards and ways of life are threatened (Reynié, 2016). The resulting rising populism and nationalism in many European countries fuel populist heritage narratives, associated with colonial discourses of whiteness and empire (Littler, 2008), which attempt to revive images of a glorious past. This "heritage populism" is based on hostility towards elites, migrants and the European Union (Reynié, 2016: 47–48). Also, nationalistic cultural policies may push for re-enacting past or even artificially reinvented traditions. Populist ideas are amplified through the media, in particular through social media, and contribute to producing considerable threats to heritage. Nationalism and right-wing populism fuel attacks targeting religious buildings – e.g. mosques and synagogues – and war memorials, because the values that these sites represent are questioned (Bianchini & Borchi, 2018).

In this context, the decision of the UK to leave the European Union on the basis of the EU Referendum held in June 2016 is also impacting mega-events in the country. For example, the UK's participation in the European Capital of Culture 2023 was cancelled by the European Commission (BBC News, 2017). A recent study on cities bidding for the UK City of Culture 2021 (Cunningham & Platt, 2018) maintains that Brexit negotiations generated uncertainties in bidding processes, in particular in regards to cultural participation and engagement of residents, and negative external perceptions of such cities.

Section II. Relationships between cultural mega-events and cultural heritage

CHAPTER 3 Heritage opportunities/threats in cultural mega-events

3.1. Potential benefits and risks of introducing mega-events in heritage-rich cities

Beyond the potential threat that events can pose, their large budgets can also come to represent a much-needed funding source to help conserve and valorise heritage. Likewise, events can also come to inspire new functions for unused historic structures or revitalize currently underdeveloped areas. Whether or not built heritage in host cities is highlighted and promoted as part of an event could also come to influence how city policy makers manage local heritage even after the event has ended. While physical improvements to heritage may be the most immediately visible benefit, events can also introduce new management and governance networks to cities, which could come to include heritage as well. The event also generates broad public interest and even increased participation in the city with national/international promotion presenting a unique opportunity not only for the city, but its heritage as well (Ponzini & Jones, 2015).

A crucial issue when dealing with mega-events and heritage areas are the potential threats such events pose to sensitive contexts. Threats, frictions and risks may come from physical alterations to the city in terms of the new construction of venues, demolitions or urban restoration projects. Beyond the physical, ideological reinterpretations of the identity of the city that come to be promoted could come to affect how heritage is viewed and considered. Most notably, the introduction of mass tourism, typically a much-desired consequence of hosting a mega-event, into sensitive heritage areas likely will impact both the physical and social qualities of these parts of cities, from increased pollution and traffic to higher living costs and gentrification. Additionally, the historic nature of a host city can inversely affect the planning of the event itself, whether through existing conservation regulations that determine what kinds of changes to built environment or uses of places can be made and where.

All of these potential changes require planning and preparation of these issues in advance of and in conjunction of the event. Yet the already existing complexity of planning and delivering these events can easily overshadow the needs of heritage. Additionally, their short-term delivery period also makes it challenging to ensure the delivery of potential conservation or restoration works which require additional research, planning and approval. If not properly planned for, the issue of time could preclude heritage projects from being included within mega-events or rushing to finish on time and improperly completing works. If heritage projects are begun, but not finished on time for the event, they may then be at risk of not having enough funding to complete them as was the case in the Istanbul 2010 ECoC (Jones, 2017). The advance planning of heritage related projects within mega-events is thus crucial and requires the collaboration of local heritage experts in the planning and managing phases. Such aspects have attracted limited attention in literature and, because of their policy relevance, deserve more attention.

3.2. The characteristics of cultural mega-events contributing to heritage policy

As underlined in section 2.1, the definition of cultural heritage is constantly evolving and which is then mirrored in the way heritage policy is constructed both at national and regional/local levels. The conservation and maintenance of cultural heritage are still the main objectives of policy, together with the importance of education and accessibility. In some communities, for example in Belgium or in Scilly, cultural heritage policies specifically mention the importance of intangible heritage, usually connecting it to the local identity and the feeling of belonging (Klamer et al., 2013). Cultural mega-events can support such aims, or in some cases even have the identical goals defined, especially when it comes to the issues of identity or city narratives (e.g. Derrett, 2003). This is especially true in the case of European Capitals of Culture, where apart from strengthening European identity of a given city, the local context, residents' feeling of belonging and local identity are very frequently put to the fore. Moreover, projects that evolve around certain urban landmarks, monuments, heritage or historic areas, their conservation and promotion could be seen as the mega-event contribution to the heritage policy.

Conclusions on cultural heritage as a strategic resource for a sustainable Europe by (Council of the European Union, 2014) well demonstrate the new approach to the potential of heritage that starts slowly to be also reflected in the heritage policy. As Licciardi & Amirtahmasebi point out, the primary objectives of heritage policy have become "to promote efficiency in the production of both economic and socio-cultural benefits through heritage conservation, and to protect the public interest in regard to the various aspects of the public-good benefits of heritage" (2012: 58). Although there seems to be little direct analysis linking heritage policy and its goals with mega-events, it could be stated that mega-events that include regeneration processes of particular areas of a city might be contributing to achieving some goals of a heritage policy. The degree of involvement of culture in the regeneration processes was categorised by Evans and Shaw (2004) with 'culture-led regeneration' (culture is the trigger for urban change), 'cultural regeneration' (culture is a part of revitalization strategies), and "culture and regeneration" (culture is not an integral part of the planning) as the main categories. Landry et al. (1996) proposed a different categorization presenting a number of cultural regenerators with 'events' being one of them. They can draw out and present the socio-economic potential of degenerated districts of a city and play a role of a catalyst for their revival. Nearly all ECoCs in the past decades have tried to use the mega-event to trigger such change – with Glasgow 1991 or Lille 2004 being the best-known cases. Although links, or potential links, and relations between heritage policies and mega-events could theoretically be found, the literature review indicates rather that mega-events themselves are not quite seen nor analysed yet as a potential for cultural heritage policies as such.

There are, on the other hand, examples of potential threats or challenges posed by a mega-event to a city's heritage (such as losing their genius loci and uniqueness due to commercialization of culture and heritage or their instrumentalisation, gentrification and the loss of social meaningfulness of heritage areas), however, no one (to the authors' knowledge) discusses such threats specifically in heritage policies.

3.3. Spectacularization of cultural heritage for mega-events

Spectacularisation is a key discourse in the literature about festivals (see for example Bankston & Henry, 2000; Cavalcanti, 2001; Favero, 2007; Foley & MacPherson, 2004; Knox, 2008; Getz, 2010). The concept of society of spectacle was first introduced in 1967 by Marxist philosopher Guy Debord (1983) to describe how modern capitalist societies are dominated by representations and images, which mediate social relations. This concept is potentially applicable to all spheres of social existence, including urban spaces and heritage. Urban spectacles have been criticised by Harvey (1989) as a means to attract tourists, shoppers and businesses into the city while Gotham (2005) underlined the irrationalities and contradictions of the spectacularisation of cities. Ponzini (2012) argues that the spectacularisation of the urban environment can be related to the homogenization of urban landscapes and finally the loss of distinctiveness of central places in contemporary cities. Moreover, the danger of 'urbanalisation' (Muñoz, 2010), meaning the simplification and standardization of local differences in order to become internationally brand-able and palatable, accompanies the idea of 'festivalisation' of urban policies as cities transform from places of production to sites of consumption.

The spectacularisation of built heritage contributes to shaping the dreamscapes for visual consumption and the aesthetic spaces of entertainment (Zukin, 1991, 1995). Spectacularisation is therefore inextricably linked to the concept of cultural consumption, in which "urban space becomes a theatre decoration" (Doğan & Sirkeci, 2013: 36). In this regard, as noted by Fouseki and Dragouni (2017), heritage spectacles as a form of staged heritage are based on theatricality with the aim of producing media content. The circulation of positive media narratives about one city become a powerful tool to attract tourism and investment, yet this might imply serious trade-off for the physical and social realities of that city.

Cultural and sport mega-events have been used in many cities to celebrate urban regeneration policies (Evans, 2011) or to legitimize urban propaganda projects promoted by coalitions of interests (Boyle, 1999). Historic buildings are also involved in this process of spectacularisation within mega-events. Recent examples are the use of fireworks in iconic locations during the opening or closing events of ECoCs and UKCoC (e.g. in Liverpool 2008, Marseille 2013; Plovdiv 2019) or of light shows involving heritage buildings (e.g. Liverpool 2008 and Hull 2017 opening event *Made in Hull*). ECoC events have also contributed to celebrating urban development through the spectacularisation of modernist heritage and contemporary architecture, as in the case of Rotterdam 2001 (Richards & Wilson, 2004).

3.4. Creating a new culture vs. celebrating existing culture for mega-events

Mega-events also generate opportunities and threats in terms of the kind of culture they promote. On the one hand, these events can be used to promote local cultures through an unprecedented amount of resources, also in terms of expertise and capabilities. On the other hand, their huge budgets and top-down governance may contribute to imposing new or standardized forms of culture with the aim of meeting the expectations of broader external audiences. This is related to the role of mega-events in affirming globalisation – namely "the promotion of standardization and uniformity in all spheres of

life" (Roche, 2006: 30) – and to the very understanding of 'culture' and of 'local cultural needs' behind these events.

It is worth pointing out a few examples of how events and festivals may be used to create a new and celebrate existing culture. Smith and Forest (2006) highlight how smaller-scale ethnic events such as Bradford Mela can help in fostering pride in terms of place, identity and heritage. The UK City of Culture 2017 in Hull aimed at telling residents and visitors the story of the city and at exploring its 'Hullness' through the arts and produced positive outcomes in terms of increased awareness of local culture and heritage (Culture, Place and Policy Institute, 2018). The event arguably contributed to raising momentum for the heritage project Hull Yorkshire's Maritime City. Conversely, Bankston and Henry (2000) investigate Cajun festivals in Louisiana, where completely invented (created) traditions contributed to the revival of this ethnic group's identity in the 1960s. One of the goals of the European Capital of Culture 2002 in Bruges and Salamanca was to change the image of the city from historical and traditional to a more modern one by adding elements of contemporary culture (Richards & Wilson, 2004: 1937). As noted by García (2004a), the European City of Culture 1990 in Glasgow and the 2004 Forum of Cultures in Barcelona displayed a top-down approach to cultural representation, prioritising international perspectives over local cultures. The America's Cup 2007 and the Formula One European Grand Prix from 2008-2012 contributed to imposing a postmodern appearance to Valencia's historic harbour, which negatively impacted its industrial heritage (Del Romero Renau & Trudelle, 2011). In the case of the ECoC 2010 in Istanbul, many heritage buildings in Sulukule were demolished and replaced with a modern and standardized urban environment (Bianchini, Albano & Bollo, 2013; Bianchini & Borchi, 2018) to create an attractive and international-looking district in time for the event.

Thus, we can describe two models of creating and using culture. On the one hand, it is used to create "modern traditions" and achieve pragmatic goals. On the other hand, so-called "new culture" is always superimposed on its earlier version, thus preserving and creating culture are dimensions to be considered jointly when discussing heritage in relation to mega-events.

3.5. Reasons for the existing division between mega-events and heritage preservation

Jones and Ponzini (2018) have identified three key points to explain the current divide between mega-events and heritage in existing literature. Through an in-depth review of the literatures of both fields, they came to the conclusion that many overlapping qualities in fact already exist between the two fields. Particularly, the range of desirable secondary effects of both events and heritage have become increasingly important in decisions to pursue and fund them, even more than their primary purposes. For example, mega-events like the Olympics and Universal Expo/World's Fair originally aimed to unify nations through friendly sport competition or the promotion of technological innovations. However, over time and with increasing globalisation and interconnection, these events have primarily come to serve as tools of urban development and regeneration for cities, with the nature of sport or culture playing less of a role in the public discourse.

Similarly, the original recognition and protection of built heritage originated from the need to conserve ancient monuments that would otherwise be lost. While those tenets do of course remain a crucial element of the conservation movement, much of the justification of costs and public investments relates to strategies to increase tourism or raise surrounding property values. In this way, both have become key assets for cities and can contribute to strategies to promote and improve cities. Therefore, both mega-events and heritage are now expected to deliver or produce amenities and environments for cities that will attract masses of tourists for the long-term.

Traditionally, a significant difference between these two fields has been in the perception of mega-events as being highly ambitious in terms of growth and idea that heritage is inherently anti-growth. By no means an accurate depiction of heritage, this framing by critics does not readily present a potential asset to mega-events or vice versa. Yet the potential impacts of the intensive growth often posed in the past by mega-events suggest an urgent need, from a heritage perspective, to prevent or limit harmful side-effects. The literatures are quite broad, even covering similar issues, but they tend do so in insular ways, having overlooked this existing overlap. Also, despite the broad similar evolutionary path of mega-events and heritage, the distance between the two fields in part derives from their different traditions of studies. While some past research has addressed aspects of this gap, such as the special edition in the *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (Gammon, Ramshaw & Waterton, 2013), which focused on the idea of Olympic sites themselves becoming eventual heritage sites, it did not touch on the on the idea of linking the two fields in a more substantial way.

Another factor has been that research scopes and methods do not converge. As noted by Ryberg-Webster and Kinahan (2014) regarding the preservation field we find a particular level of tunnel vision. On the one hand it is a highly technical profession of preservation practice (in terms of actual physical/architectural conservation matters). Often heritage has also been framed as being under threat from new development projects instead of highlighting the potential benefits of utilizing heritage within or complementing development schemes. Much of the research into mega-events also tends to be limited by an economic tunnel vision that focuses primarily on the economic contribution of mega-events (Jones & Ponzini, 2018). In recent years there have been advancements from the social sciences that use questionnaires, reviews of newspapers, media and social media coverage to track the impact of events on the image of a place or quality of life. However, such investigations do not study the actual physical/architectural changes that may have occurred in heritage areas. Another contributing factor is that most studies focus on either the Olympics or Expos. In the past these events have more often been located outside of city centres, and their link to heritage has been overlooked or unconsidered. For this reason, we see the field of cultural mega-events as a new potential field for crosscutting reasoning and debate.

Finally, there also tends to be a time frame disconnect between the two research fields. Usually mega-events are popular subjects to study during the lead up years as well as during the host year itself. Studies typically do not or are not able to look back over a long period of time to observe the impact and changes brought around by the event. Hiller (1998) observes the absence of backward and forward linkages, referring respectively to the objectives behind mega-events and their outcomes, and suggests the need of approaching the study of these events from a longitudinal perspective. This means much of the research deals primarily with potential impacts, rather than definitive evidence (with the notable

exception of Impacts 08, see: García, Melville & Cox, 2010). Though impact reports may often be produced, these tend to be financed by the host city or promoting organizations themselves and lack a strong independent research component. On the contrary, long-term considerations are crucial for the study of heritage.

We intend to position our research project in this framework, considering both the scholarly and policy debate as well as the use of knowledge in the practice of planning and implementing mega-events and of heritage policy making. We now turn to these aspects.

Section III. Planning and policy

CHAPTER 4 Processes, governance and tools in cultural mega-events

4.1. Mega-events as part of planning strategies

Mega-events can have the power to produce both economic and symbolic payoff for cities (Müller, 2015b) through the spatial and temporal intensification/concentration of investment in infrastructure and global media exposure. Therefore, they are presented repeatedly as opportunities to activate urban transformation (Chalkley & Essex, 1999; Gold & Gold, 2008; Hiller, 2006; Kassens-Noor, 2012). As part of this process, city policy makers also need to shift their commonly held interpretations of mega-events. Rather than framing them as a single opportunity to carry out mega-projects, they should instead be seen one step within long-term planned processes and policies (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017). Likewise, rather than considering them solely as a prize to be won or tool to re-make the city, mega-events can instead use the event to focus on the existing city itself, including its cultural offerings and built heritage.

Mega-events have the potential to shape new flexible geographies at urban, regional and international scales, when understood as processes with localised, wider impacts throughout their entire 'life cycle' (bidding, planning and implementation, legacies) (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017). The differences among mega-events regarding their focus, typology and scale, and the specificities of each city-host (economic, environmental, political, socio-cultural, technological and spatial) may lead to a variety of positive and negative effects in both the immediate and long-term, with a lasting or temporary influence on the development of a city.

Relationship between long-term strategic plans/visions and mega-events

Although ephemeral 'instances' in the life of a city, the short-term spatial interventions required for mega-events can be integrated into long-term urban development perspectives. After all, the changes that such events introduce to the urban landscape far outlive the events themselves, with the once-considered 'monstrous' Eiffel Tower standing as a prominent example of a now celebrated public space resulting from a mega-event. Along with building new or re-furbishing existing buildings specifically for the needs of a mega-event, such occasions become opportunities for city policy makers to apply changes to the urban structure; they may fast-track the implementation of existing city plans, like Barcelona's projects for the 1992 Olympics (Marshall, 1996; Monclús, 2003) or Athen's projects for the 2004 Olympics (Tzortzi-Georgi & Kapnistou, 2005), or catalyse the development of new planning strategies, like London's 2012 Olympic sites master plan (Chen, 2015). Brownfields or deprived neighbourhoods may be re-developed, and supporting infrastructure, such as transport facilities, improved or expanded (Wilson, 2011). Those newly developed and easily accessible areas are regarded as potential new urban sub-centres or nodes for future urban development. Even more forward-looking cities consider the mega-event as a medium-term goal within a long-term strategy, like the Netherlands' 2028 Olympic Plan which, although cut short, proposed a spatial development in stages in order to gradually match the requirements of the Games with the spatial needs of Dutch society (Wierenga et al., 2012).

While spatial infrastructure can sometimes be highly specialised for the event, it is both a necessity to host the event and often its most common visible legacy. Yet its realization is not the organising agency's responsibility and capital expenses are seldom included in the overall event expenses (Wilson, 2011). As the rising costs of mega-events are currently making cities reluctant to host them, sustainability is becoming a key issue even from the bidding and selection stages (International Olympic Committee, 2014), and legacy planning is being given increasing emphasis in academic discussions (Jago et al., 2010; Müller, 2015a). In reality, however, planning for the aftermath of a mega-event is usually deferred towards the end or even after the event, which lessens its reach and effectiveness (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017).

At the local level, once the mega-event is over, media exposure wanes, while the maintenance of expensive spatial and service infrastructures may prove difficult in the long run. Event-led urban regeneration may generate spatial dilemmas (Bianchini, 1993), emphasising disparities between city centres and peripheries. At the national level, a mega-event may in fact aggravate spatial inequalities in the country, as it tends to direct spending and development on the already more economically robust regions of the country (Wilson, 2011).

Relationship between land-use/preservation plans and mega-events

A mega-event bid is a singular challenge, since it must convince both the event authority of the applicant's vision and technical/ infrastructural competencies *and* the local community of the event's advantages for the city. It is therefore not unusual for bids to over-promise when it comes to the event's financial, social and environmental benefits, creating "an important psychological anchoring effect" (Müller, 2015a: 9). Strong narratives are developed, presenting the bid alternatively as a catalyst for long-term urban development, a tool for 'softer outcomes'. These can include capacity building for institutions and administration, collaborations and attraction of funds and attention or rather an experimental approach testing alternative policies and planning models with specific agendas, e.g. involving ecology, social and economic inequalities or industrial advancement (Oliver & Lauermann, 2017). As such, the bid can be exploited as a strategy for a project-oriented re-consideration of a city's development and a 'rescaling' of interests between the public and private sectors, economic, social and spatial policies. In many cases, the desired outcome is the bid itself, the mobilization of investments and urban change.

The relationship between mega-events and land-use/preservation plans differs even within mega-events of the same character. For global mega-events, like the Olympics, locations may be scattered within the metropolitan area as in Rome (1960), Barcelona (1992) or concentrated in specific peripheral sites in locations where land-use and preservation restrictions do not apply with the same urgency as in city cores, like Sydney (2000) and London (2012) (Chalkley & Essex, 1999). In line with the IOC's recent stress on sustainability, the development of these sites promotes an environmental agenda and their future evolution as additions to the constantly growing urban agglomeration.

Medium- or smaller-scale mega-events such as an ECoC prefer a series of locations embedded within a city in order to exploit the nature and character of an urban or semi-urban setting, and also to approach the local communities (García & Cox, 2013). As Jones (2017) points out, reconsidering the

city and its heritage often can serve as the entire focus or part of the event's theme. A mega-event can have a significant influence on the historic character of a city, not only in terms of its physical spatial heritage but also in how cities choose to outline and exploit heritage for the occasion of the event. In some instances urban heritage has been placed in a prominent position in the event programme with restoration projects – at various scales – either directly related and implemented through the event governing body or indirectly associated and completed from other public or private institutions (Jones, 2017). The occasion of a mega-event can also provide a forum for communication and collaboration among heritage preservation and management stakeholders. Heritage projects may be connected to strategic city plans (as in Genoa 2004) in order to address larger issues (infrastructure, environment, tourism, education, development, liveability) and to ensure project maintenance after the event. More than actual projects though, the attention given to heritage in preparation for a mega-event may rekindle a wider interest in heritage preservation, or it could put heritage under the pressures of development or it could foster changes in heritage regulation (in terms both of physical change and use for events) or its implementation. All these may induce long-term legacy for planning. In this vein, emerging issues of sustainability and environmental concerns may shift the locations of even larger-scale events, like the Olympic Games or Expos, towards existing urban fabrics.

4.2. Overview of planning tools for mega-events and heritage policy

A multiplicity of actors, powers and interests are involved during the bidding, planning and the implementation of a mega-event. Different agencies at various levels and scales have to be coordinated and new governing structures may be established, even if for a limited time. It seems important to provide a brief overview of the planning tools available (Ponzini, 2008) and their relationships with heritage policy.

The standards and regulations of the international governing bodies that control mega-events (e.g. IOC, BIE, FIFA) play a key role in the planning decisions of a prospective host during the bidding. At this stage, planning is pursued by ad hoc governance arrangements that may involve public officials (at the national and local levels), community representatives and private-interest groups (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017). Once the designation is secured, one or a series of ad hoc governing organisations are set up to implement the event; the development of infrastructure projects is usually undertaken by the city administration, via existing or newly established agencies, whilst the event governing body monitors the implementation of the projects. Operational costs are generally considered separately from capital expenditure on infrastructure and funding for spatial projects may come from a variety of public or private sources, with only a small fraction coming from the event authority (e.g. see Essex & Chalkley, 2004; Palmer/RAE Associates, 2004: 19–22). In many cases, governments directly intervene so that special legislation bestows extraordinary planning powers to the mega-event authority, sometimes surpassing those of local authorities (Basso, 2014), in order to ease preparations (Owen, 2002) (see also chapter 4.5). The time between bidding, securing the mega-event and implementation is by necessity several years and many changes may occur during this phase from administrative turnover, limitations in resource availability (at the local, the national or even the global

level) to the realignment of political interest, which may lead to stop-and-go processes (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017).

Public-private partnerships are increasingly involved in mega-event-related development, widening the range of participating stakeholders. Yet the inclusion of private bodies that are not publicly accountable or democratically elected may appear as elitist and self-promoting. Top-down practices, deemed necessary to expedite the delivery and control of the quality of a mega-event, have been criticized for opaque decision making, corruption, real estate speculation, gentrification and increasing social inequality (Bramwell, 1997; Hall, 2006; Hiller, 2006; Müller, 2015a). Greater private investment is expected but seldom achieved; the public sector assumes most of the risks and the private sector enjoy most of the benefits. Owen (2002) finds these partnerships to be characteristic of 'entrepreneurial' governance, which centralizes planning powers whilst relaxing planning processes, increasingly privatises government operations and minimises the participation of the local community.

When it comes to community consultations, the dominating mega-event narrative may affect local sentiment into easily accepting development decisions, yet its high cost, which might re-direct funds for other actions (see for example the description of ECoC schemes and cultural projects as a "Trojan horse" in Evans, 2003: 426), can easily trigger feelings of resentment. The role of public participation towards achieving a "city logic, more connected to citizens' needs" (Morandi & Di Vita, 2017: 8), counter-balancing the power of elites and ensuring positive and lasting impacts is stressed (Bramwell, 1997). Local communities and governments have an interest in protecting local amenities; this aspect, however, is easier for the better-educated and more affluent groups, leaving the lower socio-economic groups more exposed to the impacts of regeneration and fund re-direction (Owen, 2002).

Land-use regulation (master plans controlling land uses, building densities and street morphologies) and building legislation, the most common planning tools, may be supplemented, in the case of mega-events, by structure planning or even simpler infrastructure-led planning, which creates a new set of urban dynamics following the 'entrepreneurial city model' (Hall & Hubbard, 1996): new infrastructure, purpose-built for a mega-event, attracts labour, new works, and population (Couch et al., 2007), intensifying urban (or suburban) development around new nodes, all of which can be viewed as typical pro-growth politics rationale (Logan & Molotch, 1987).

At a different scale, innovative urban design and heritage management have assumed a prominent role in re-defining both the physical and the economic features of cities, honing a city's competitive edge in the globalised intercity competition; balancing these two extremities, namely, introducing new and impressive urban projects and promoting built heritage, is a task notably undertaken by many European mega-event hosts (Beriatos & Gospodini, 2004; Gospodini, 2002). Architectural and urban conservation policies, varying from country to country, directly affect these developments as they distinguish 'historic' from 'non-historic' areas, regulating the interventions possible in protected zones (Bandarin & Van Oers, 2015: 3), thus making collaboration between mega-events and preservation agencies necessary. As mentioned in section 2.2, the concept of 'Historic Urban Landscape' (HUL) composes monuments and contexts in a spatially, socially and economically continuous whole, highlighting the interconnectedness and complexities of urban heritage (Bandarin

& Van Oers, 2012), and may be used as a tool to connect heritage to mega-events (Jones & Ponzini, 2018).

4.3. Public participation processes contributing to cultural mega-events

Heritage-rich cities attract a wide variety of users that demand space for developing residential, commercial, service, cultural and recreational activities. However, heritage cities are frequently subjected to strict protections under national laws with potential investments and development in protected areas under strict public scrutiny. The broad spectrum of stakeholders involved in the management of heritage and the creation of policies ranges from international institutions (e. g. UNESCO, ICOMOS) to governing agencies at national, regional and local levels (e.g. conservation officials, representatives of the local community, property owners, real estate investors and the business community) (Rojas & Lanzafame, 2011). As noted, the introduction of a mega-event into a heritage rich-city brings both risks and benefits and agreement must be reached among differing stakeholders to balance the conservation, adaptation and development of areas related to the event (Flecha et al., 2010). The lessons from several international experiences indicate that, to effectively implement urban heritage conservation programmes using the adaptive rehabilitation approach, institutional mechanisms are required to manage the process and financial resources (Rojas 2004 and 2012).

In many cases, mega-event planning can also lead to the centralization of planning powers along with the increasing involvement of the private sector in governance, resulting in reduced openness, accountability and public participation (Roche, 1994; Owen, 2002). Veal (1994) refers to this approach as "hallmark decision making," where the plan to proceed with a project is made first and attempts are then later made to justify it (Haxton, 1999).

The governance of mega-events varies and approaches have changed over time. In recent years, it has become more important to receive community backing for mega-events (Gursoy & Kendall, 2006; Gruneau & Horne, 2016). The promotion of a new generation of long-term cultural heritage policy models through society and citizen-driven approaches is a growing theme in the renewed recognition of the role of cultural heritage as a strategic resource for a sustainable Europe (Council of the European Union, 2014). However, there is still a great need to integrate these processes in a dominant traditional view focused on conservation and protection of heritage with more effective action through governance (Barile & Saviano, 2015).

In the recent history of mega-events, participation is coming to gain a pivotal role. The word participation is however used to describe different phenomena, including cultural participation, audience engagement, active and creative involvement, volunteering and participation in decision making processes (Tommarchi et al., 2018). For example, in the case of the European Capital of Culture, Luxembourg 2007 promoted the active participation of citizens (Liu, 2014), while Tallin 2011, Turku 2011 and Umeå 2014 introduced the idea of 'co-creation' of culture (Tommarchi et al., 2018). Another growing trend has been the importance of studying and tracking the various impacts of

ECoCs on host cities. The first example of a truly long-term and extensive on-going study about the impact of the ECoC on different audiences has been the Impacts 08 and Impacts 18 reports for Liverpool 2008 (Bond, 2008; García et al., 2010; McEvoy, 2010). Such evaluation has become an obligatory task for awarded cities, while participant surveys are increasingly key tools within these studies.

ECoCs and UKCoCs in recent years provide example of how mega-events can be platforms for innovative forms of heritage-related participation, which in turn contribute to the redefinition of heritage itself. For instance, Hull UK City of Culture 2017 explored ways to engage residents and visitors with heritage through the arts and culture. Local residents positively rated this aspect of the event was who felt that they had increased their knowledge about Hull's heritage in innovative and interesting ways (Culture, Place and Policy Institute, 2018). These activities also involved less well-known items of built heritage, which attendees were encouraged to explore. Valletta 2018 proposed a range of initiatives aimed at the co-creation of culture and the negotiation of local embedded knowledge and memories. Examples are the creation of 'subjective maps' of the city's neighbourhoods and urban design proposals elaborated by residents, or the involvement of residents in the collection of memories, including oral histories (Tommarchi et al., 2018).

Heritage-related participation raises a number of issues. The 2011 UNESCO HUL Recommendation highlighted the role of heritage participation to "communicate with all sectors of society" (UNESCO, 2011: 5). Built heritage may be a means to promote social inclusion, albeit its potential in contrasting social exclusion is limited (Pendlebury et al., 2004) and it cannot be deployed as a tool to tackle structural inequalities within cities. The role of heritage-related participation in fostering engagement and sense of belonging has also been studied in relation to new technologies (Ciolfi et al., 2008) albeit their potential to connect heritage experience to everyday life is still underexplored (Giaccardi, 2012). Heritage participation is traditionally understood in relation to leisure activities, while broader everyday interactions with heritage remain difficult to assess (Neal, 2015). Participation in such activity is linked to matters of taste and social background. Bourdieu (1984) pointed to the correlation between museum appreciation and what he called cultural capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1979), which can be extended to cultural events and heritage-related activities. Studies on cultural capital and participation (e.g. Miles & Sullivan, 2012; Prieur & Savage, 2013; Tzortzi-Georgi *et al.*, 2014) suggest that this connection between social background and cultural taste is more complex. In this view, the attempt to involve broader audiences in traditional cultural activity from a perspective of social inclusion, overlooks the fact that residents and visitors might have different tastes and preferences regarding their leisure activities.

Despite its strong symbolic meaning, participation in heritage-related and mega-events decision making remains problematic. Participation in heritage-related planning processes has failed to provide a substantial contribution, especially where the complexity of these processes exceeded the potential of collaborative planning tools (see for instance Palermo & Ponzini, 2010; Ponzini & Vani, 2014). In the case of mega-events, participatory approaches have played a relevant role in ECoC and UKCoC bids and preliminary programmes. For example, Aarhus 2017 pursued the active involvement of citizens in planning and decision making tasks, although the focus of participation was progressively narrowed down to audience engagement as the initiative progressed (Jancovich &

Hansen, 2018). This shows the potential of mega-events as platforms for participation, albeit it remains challenging to adopt participatory approaches to decision making in the implementation phase.

4.4. Overview of different planning traditions and systems

Planning is realized through legislative and governmental processes that can differ significantly among countries, therefore, even within the EU, there is a variety of approaches to planning. Newman and Thornley (1996) distinguish five *families* of urban planning in Europe. The legal style of the *Napoleonic family* is based on advance codification and rule preparation, with the power of the commune evident in local matters. Planning power is distributed between the central government, which maintains a strong control, and the sub-state levels of local administration, that enjoy a certain autonomy and partake in decision-making. National-level master plans and guidelines are set centrally, but specific development plans are the responsibility of local authorities at different scales. In the Anglo-Saxon family, general planning principles and orientations, as well as selected policies, are set at the national level, while development is managed at the local level, allowing significant room for local government and players to manoeuver. The *Germanic family* is similar to the Napoleonic, but it lacks the strong presence of a central power. Planning generally operates at the sub-national level and many responsibilities are shared among central and local authorities; the federal legislative framework ensures overall consistency, but the details are left to the lower-level authorities which produce region-wide or localised plans. Various hybridisations can be found in the highly decentralised planning system, where the centrally regulated planning legislation sets out a hierarchy of plans that the local authorities take on. Each successive level (regional, structure and local) has to conform to the one above it, whilst public participation, regarded as a democratic safeguard, is involved at every stage. Last but not least, the shared communist past of the *East European* countries has left them with a heavy centralised approach in both the legal and the administration systems that have transitioned in different directions. The effort to decentralize decisions and promote public participation is evident in the new states, but reforms take a long time to ferment, become activated and consequently implemented.

The concept proposed by Newman and Thornley in 1996 relates to the West-East division of Europe during the era of the Cold War before 1989. It should be emphasized that several countries of Central Europe initially belonged to the tradition of the public administration system of the Habsburg Empire. This is why the townscape of Vienna, Prague, Budapest, Kraków, Zagreb and Ljubljana created at the turn of the 19th and the 20th centuries are so coherent compared to later developments. After the collapse of the communist system countries of Central Europe including the Czech Republic, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia have seen a return to their previous planning approaches.

The ways in which mega-event planning/implementation and heritage policy interact depend of course on the specific planning system and governance structure in place. Any analytical investigation into or approach to implementing heritage within mega-events requires locating these efforts within specific planning systems in place and time in order to define the types of actors entitled to decide, resources, veto power, modes of interaction, etc... While grouping planning systems into different families provides a broad overview of some shared similarities and differences, there exists a wide

range of specificities within each of these families that must be recognized and understood. For example, in the UK, the recognition and protection of built heritage falls under the responsibility of the local authority, where there is typically an innate agreement or cooperation between planning and processes and heritage protection. Conversely, in Italy, heritage falls under the purview of a state level ministry and managed by local and regional level superintendents. In this case, there is not necessarily such a close existing rapport between local planning and heritage protection.

Beyond differing governance models, different levels of policy, particularly existing cultural policy, or lack thereof, is expected in differing locations. Cultural policy supports actions that promote the development of the individual and communal 'cultural lives', defined as "the sum of all the practices and attitudes which affect man's capability to express himself, determine his position in the world, create his environment and communicate with all civilizations" (Girard & Gentil, 1983: 170-171). To this end, cultural policies have long been directed at well-established sectors such as historic preservation, the pre-electronic arts (fine & performance arts) and humanities, and their supporting institutions (museums/galleries, libraries/archives) as well as at recently emerging sectors like the digital arts or fashion, and show an increasing interest for aspects of culture that could be defined as 'intangible heritage' and the 'cultural/creative industries' (Klamer et al., 2013). Cultural policies cover a broader range of activities than arts policies, as they include sites and activities that do not fall under conventional definitions of aesthetics or artistic creation, but promote a sense of community belonging, such as zoos and gardens, local celebrations and parades, story-telling and food, radio and television broadcasting (Mulcahy, 2006). As the policy field is so vast and diversified in Europe, as well as being differently intertwined with heritage, particular attention should be paid to planning tools (as a discrete unit of analysis) while investigating its relationship with mega-event planning.

4.5. Coordination of mega-events with other planning tools and processes

Burbank et al. (2002) note how using a mega-event as a development strategy signifies a new direction in urban development politics. Planning for mega-events is neither part of traditional regulative planning nor of any other planning approach, such as 'trend planning' or 'private management planning' (Brindley et al., 1996). It is clearly not led by an overarching government initiative as its dominant aim is to satisfy firstly a set of contingent goals, secondarily to meet the expectations of local elites, and then those of the local community (Chalkley & Essex, 1999).

Mega-events often become an opportunity to suspend regular planning and governing practices in the name of efficiency, speed, global media exposure and security. Apart from providing an incontestable justification for drawing public and private investment, mega-events can rationalize the relaxation of rules for a variety of policies regarding taxation, labour, compulsory land purchase, population and activity relocation/resettlement procedures in order to realize mega-event-related 'fast-track' redevelopment (Basso, 2014). The strict deadlines, supranational specifications/interventions and the temporary ad hoc agencies involved in the delivery of a mega-event are the three features that distinguish mega-event planning from other planning processes. These three factors call for a highly

complex, 'de-politicized' and 'technocratic' structure that often overtakes the administration that founded it (Basso, 2014).

The demands that a mega-event places on a city often push aside other development priorities. Müller (2015a) notes how temporal, budgetary and community 'emergencies' together with the popularity and the glamour of the event may also be used to establish consensus among otherwise dissenting bodies, or employed by local governments to pressure for funds from the central government that were previously out-of-reach (Müller, 2015a). Mega-event-related development may take over urban space and absorb funds that could be used for other public facilities with a broader scope; its relationship to actual city needs, even in the case of major infrastructure projects, is often debatable.

Such practices are characteristic of "new urban policies" (Swyngedouw et al., 2002) that tend to produce more fragmented, flexible, often opaque and privatized forms of urban governance, and emblematic of the 'practices of exception' (Baptista, 2013) that seem to have seeped into contemporary urban planning. Special legislation is introduced to allow exceptions in urban planning and property rights; environmental impact studies are not required, heritage restrictions may be moderated (Owen, 2002). Additionally, regulations further loosened in taxation or immigration processes and the reverse may happen for freedom of speech, which is regulated more strictly (Coaffee, 2015; Müller, 2015a; Owen, 2002; Sánchez & Broudehoux, 2013). These changes do indeed speed things up, but with a price of reduced public accountability and little information for the local community (Chen & Spaans, 2009). Budgetary concerns may be stressed or, depending on the situation, suspended, validated by the urgency of the project and the pressures of serving the 'public good' (Gray & Porter, 2015; Powell & Marrero-Guillamón, 2012). Such practices are discussed as homologous to Agamben's "state of exception," which describes the evocation by even democratic states of the 'necessity' or the 'urgent conditions' that legitimize military-style measures in times of peace (2005). In the 'state of exception', a "threshold of indeterminacy between democracy and absolutism" (Agamben, 2005: 3), the legislative, executive and judicial powers, distinct by definition, may be bestowed upon the same bodies; an exceptional and provisional measure which is increasingly becoming the dominant paradigm of government in contemporary politics. Applying private-sector practices in the public sector, or even involving private companies in the provision of social services within the context of extreme necessity, is seen as a tendency to "privatise the government," an indicator (at a more moderate scale) of Klein's 'disaster capitalism' (2007): a natural disaster, a crisis or collective trauma (or any set of extraordinary circumstances, even those imposed by the hosting of a mega-event) can be used as an occasion to temporarily (yet for an unspecified period of time) suspend democratic practices in favour of private profit, while the public sector bears the cost. When referred to the cultural heritage policy sector, the process of privatisation can become highly problematic because of the public nature of these goods, services and areas (Ponzini, 2010).

CHAPTER 5 The knowledge that mega-event and heritage policy makers need

5.1. Emerging problems across mega-events and heritage fields

The public importance of mega-events has been shifting from their core political message (of international friendship, share of cultural or technological perspective, etc...) to their economic and urban side effects. In this sense both the political legitimization and the planning for mega-events lever the expected outcomes of the event more in terms of its tourism impact, infrastructural betterment, branding effects than in the bare terms of the event itself. All these are quite context-specific issues and in most cases they show a strong path dependency: tourism can grow to a certain limit if the local and most importantly regional infrastructure and readiness has limits, infrastructure can improve to some extent in a few years, but only based on the existing urban structure and availability, etc… Especially when dealing with cultural heritage, the locale plays a central role and cannot be underestimated in conceiving mega-events that interact in space and symbolically with one city's heritage. In addition, the importance of the locale seems even greater when considering the institutional setting and planning system.

Planning systems have an ordinary functioning in managing planning and development processes. In some cases, they include extraordinary procedures that may speed up or vary their functioning according to emergencies like natural disasters or to accomplish goals that are of great importance. In general, planning systems do not envision mega-event planning as an option that induces changes in the existing planning processes and procedures. The fact that mega-events have become more and more a way to adopt exceptional variants to regulation and approval, as well as public work procurement and other relevant component may be seen as one reason why public administrations are interested in hosting mega-event (besides the additional flow of public resources and extra spending). This is particularly relevant for the field of heritage policy which, on the contrary, tends to operate in very long-term and stable ways. In general, this may induce pressure on heritage decision makers and managers, which might be either a good opportunity as well as a great risk to take.

The particular public-private arrangements in the preservation and appreciation of heritage may radically vary from country to country. In particular, some states have strong institutions and sets of laws and rules that are dedicated to heritage (Italy prominently among them), while others have more flexible systems with mixed public, non-profit and private intervention (e.g. the UK). These arrangements and their regional specificity must be taken in consideration when dealing with planning and implementing mega-events, not only in terms of the built heritage, but also in the use and modification of places and more intangible elements. In recent decades, a quite significant shift towards privatisation has occurred both on the side of urban planning and mega-events in general (e.g. creation of ad-hoc private agencies and companies for delivering the event and its legacy) and on the side of heritage (in terms of assets and management as well). This poses new questions as these policies impinge on the publicness of urban and cultural goods. In addition, the dialogue between

preserving and fostering development is inherently a public matter that may risk of being, at least in part, privatized because of its key players' ways of operating and political accountability.

Participation and more general public involvement emerged quite evidently in this latter point and figures as an important component in the process of planning, delivery and legacy. The relationship with heritage also poses questions of instrumentalisation of culture and authenticity of heritage and expressions related to it, as they can be commodified for the events and for the sake of tourist attraction. As mega-events are expected to induce significant changes to host cities, it seems quite important to understand how they become part of longer-term development vision and strategies (or not). In some cases, cities begin with strategic and structural planning processes that include an imminent mega-event and consider certain quadrants of the city or the whole infrastructure system in order to accommodate the needs of the event and benefit from its legacy. Given the higher speed and greater availability of resources and powers, the relationship between the mega-event and the vision is quite relevant and the role of heritage can make the difference for the present and future of the city.

Among the interpretations that deal with heritage in the framework of urban transformation (as one of the aims of mega-events), Historic Urban Landscape shows interesting potentials. It suggests that a broader understanding of heritage beyond its physical components should be taken into consideration within cities and over time (Pereira Roders & van Oers, 2011; Van Oers, 2006). Urban heritage and historic areas, their built environment as well as social uses and meanings are to be considered as part of a broader city and urban landscape capable of evolving in more or less consistent, integrated and equally positive manners. This view allows development yet it contrasts seeing historic areas as the stage for tourism or for certain social groups or economic interests (Bandarin & Van Oers, 2012; Rodwell, 2012; Veldpaus et al., 2013). UNESCO fostered a debate regarding planning options and management tools (Bandarin & Van Oers, 2012; Veldpaus et al., 2013) that seems quite relevant for but which has not yet been tested against the presence and induced transformation of mega-events.

Of course, the literature shows that there are great differences among types of mega-events. There are various possible classifications. For the purpose of this research we decided to concentrate on cultural mega-events, as, despite the varied features, their core theme and way of functioning show important similarities (a duration of several months to one year, relevant culture/innovation component, transnational or nation-wide character), that are to some extent different from typical sporting events such as the Olympics and World Cup.

All these issues pose new questions that have been seen only partially in literature and, in our opinion, require further attention. In particular the generation and transfer of policy-related knowledge are important, yet they pose particular questions in the transnational field of mega-event planning and management. At the same time, we argue that there are good reasons why turning the attention to cultural mega-events when looking for the relationships between mega-events and heritage (Jones, forthcoming b).

A set of critical issues and broad problems has not been addressed in the existing literature regarding mega-events and heritage policy. However, they could be derived from other debates and taken into consideration in the further steps of the HOMEE research project. One issue that seems relevant for

small and medium-sized cities is that they tend to imitate larger metropolitan centres while they envision their cultural and mega-event strategies and develop related infrastructure and facilities for culture and leisure. Clearly, the issue of 'right-sizing' has not yet entered these debates; perhaps heritage preservation seems more conscious in practice, though literature mostly deal with technical matters such as the carrying capacity of given sites. In general, we understand that mega-event research shies away from positions that radically question the need for economic or urban growth for a number of reasons. For example, ideas as 'foundational economy' and 'intelligent decline' have not gained ground yet in such debates. The strong connection of both the mega-event and heritage fields to tourism tends to impair the opportunities for mainstream literature to explore alternatives to given economic rationales and pro-growth political mechanisms. For similar reasons, we assume, we were unable to find significant work on other relevant frontiers of heritage studies with mega-events, regarding what urban heritage is or can be from the perspective of disadvantaged social groups (e.g. people living in deprived outer housing estates, homeless people, people with disabilities, refugees), if and how this could be mobilized through and during mega-events. Also, the intergenerational dialogue regarding the use and appreciation of given elements of urban heritage has not attracted relevant attention, and could be explored further. In this sense, besides providing a strong framework to the research project and arguing that there is a great gap to fill at the crossroads between heritage and mega-event studies, this literature review opens up potential paths for further theoretical and field research, as well as for informed policy debates.

5.2. Transferring usable knowledge between different and within the same type of mega-events

The transfer of knowledge among mega-event holders aims to supplement the limited experience of future and aspiring host cities with time-and-money-saving ideas. The Olympic Games Knowledge Management (OGKM) Programme, initiated by the IOC in 2000 (Sébastiani, 2016), transfers knowledge through extensive documentation, direct observation and workshops. Knowledge sharing, however, poses a number of challenges (Stewart, 2012), such as the problem of generalization within very different geographic, cultural and socio-economic contexts, the variations brought about by the time interval between mega-events, or even the dissimilarities among mega-events of differing types. The tendency to gloss over difficulties draws a partial picture of the difficulties involved, together with the possible reluctance to share information due to unspoken competition between hosts or even the powerful consultancy market.

It is important to also look at the difficulties of acquiring usable knowledge from a mega-event. The tight implementation timeframe and budget make documentation archiving, research and assessment of processes not a priority; it is also difficult to allocate money for something that is assumed to benefit others (Stewart, 2012). Research is tricky because its findings may contrast what is expected or advertised, even though it could provide evidence in favour of the event (Bramwell, 1997). In particular, these knowledge service settings and the importance that positive communication has gained in recent decades pose serious questions about the possibility of spreading critical knowledge outside the circles of academic research. In particular, the knowledge and information that shows

shortcomings might be perceived as a threat undermining the legitimisation and desirability of entire programmes. In this sense, despite the fact that some international organisations promote research, they have a constitutive acceptable level of criticism that might impair the production and circulation of relevant knowledge.

Moreover, contrary to explicit knowledge which can be stored in documents, the problem of transferring tacit knowledge from volunteers (who disperse after the event) or professionals (who increase their value through it) is also observed (Schenk, Parent, MacDonald & Proulx Therrien, 2015). The European Capital of Culture has experimented with various ways of transferring knowledge. Although after the Network of European Cultural Capital Cities and Months (ECCM), no formal network actually appeared (the activity of ECCM led by the Melina Mercouri Foundation faded away in the beginning of 2000s), representatives of the cities (either municipality offices or agencies charged with ECoC organisation) meet on a regular basis with the specific aim to exchange experiences, good practices and knowledge. There are also events organized that are purely intended to help new ECoCs in their preparations, such as Shaping a European Capital of Culture event organised by the Soul for Europe and Culture Zone Wroclaw. Recently, the ECoC Family Meetings bring together policy makers and representatives of past events to discuss with and provide support to cities and organisations that are about to undertake hosting an event. This is more a way to exchange direct experiences rather than a critical knowledge and assessment of the ECoC as it is mostly done through interested parties. On the opposite side, the UNeCC organization (University Network of the European Capitals of Culture) aims at fostering a stable exchange between universities and the organizations promoting the ECoC and grant a proactive role to universities in the process.

Little has been written however, on the *kinds* of knowledge that could benefit policy makers when it comes to bidding for, planning, or implementing a mega-event. Grabher & Thiel note that, due to the inherently transient nature of the organisations that run such events, knowledge is not embedded in them, but carried by individual professionals; they also introduce the notion of 'project ecology' to describe "a complex multi-scalar 'relational space' that embraces firms as well as various inter-organisational and interpersonal networks" (2015: 329), connecting thus the singularity of the mega-event to both the city's pasts and futures. Lauermann (2014a) discusses transnational interurban policy-making networks, created in the context of mega-events, as a mechanism that turns urban planning into an inter-city and internationally marketable service. Bidding templates, planning models and best practice guidelines circulate among these networks as their actors travel from city to city, sharing their experience on solutions, technologies and materials used to promote their localities. Most of the literature, however, has focused on the project-management side of the mega-event, paying limited attention to the particular challenges that a city's past development, future aspirations and heritage features pose and have to face in such a context (Jones & Ponzini, 2018).

Finally, another issue has to do with classic and recent debates about how decision makers deal with knowledge and information within policy-making processes. Although ignorance has been recognized as a common pitfall in policy making (e.g. Boven & t'Hart, 1996; Nair & Howlett, 2017), Perl et al. (2018) observe that decision makers' lack of knowledge has been increasing together with the growing complexity of policy programmes. Recent social and political changes have then encouraged a political culture that has been criticized for "substituting denial for scepticism, auto-didacticism for education

and emotion for rationality" (Perl et al., 2018: 588). Whether wilful or unintended, this kind of ignorance may severely hamper the transfer and incorporation of existing knowledge in policy making.

While mega-events such as the Olympics have recently endured much public outcry and criticism, particularly relating to their high costs, cultural mega-events seem to be growing in their popularity with a series of national and even regional cultural events beginning in recent years (see paragraph 1.4). When the topic of cultural mega-events is brought up in conjunction with mega-events like the Olympics and Expo, questions of comparability and transferability are raised. As shown in paragraph 1.4, events can vary drastically in terms of their duration, cost and focus. While these differences exist, in terms of desired secondary effects including attracting visitors, increasing investments, streamlining projects and improving the image and competitiveness of the city, there are indeed many existing similarities between these mega-events and cultural mega-events (Jones, forthcoming a). One clear piece of evidence to support this assertion is the recycling of event bids and plans that occurs (Lauermann, 2014b; Tölle, 2014).

One example is the experience of Istanbul as the 2010 ECoC. City officials clearly stated their intention to use the ECoC as a precursor to the city hosting the Olympics, as a way to prove to the IOC that it was capable of organizing and hosting a mega-event. The eventual Lille 2004 ECoC occurred through the opposite process, where the city had originally hoped to host the Olympics, but transformed that bid into their ECoC event (Paris & Baert, 2011). This transferability of bidding and preparation for the event suggests that the preparation, planning and knowledge required can constitute a common ground for learning exchange between cultural mega-events and other mega-events (Jones, forthcoming a). Additionally, these cities valued these differing types of events for the same desired secondary effects and ultimately accomplished many of their goals. Therefore, as cities continue to face increasing pressures to perform on a global stage, but at the same time can no longer carry the traditional burden of the costs of the Olympic Games, less expensive cultural events like the ECoC may continue to grow in popularity with cities, as well as serve as a possible example of how to plan, organize and host a mega-event within existing urban fabric.

5.3. Reasons for studying cultural mega-events

The first necessary step to allow the transfer of lessons between cultural mega-events and other mega-events would require changes at the highest levels. Ultimately, the IOC and BIE respectively are responsible for how the Olympics and Expos are organized based on the requirements they set for their respective events. If regulations and policy makers' inclinations continue to require or promote the construction of new and iconic venues situated within distinct settings separate from the urban fabric, then transferable knowledge regarding the relationship with cultural heritage among events will remain quite limited. Section 1.3 discussed the changes introduced to the Olympics by Agenda 2020, which reveal the willingness of the IOC to reconsider the delivery of the Games. Future mega-events could allow or require an even greater permeation and utilization of the existing city. Other strategies could be the diffusion of an event to the regional, national or even international level, as shown to

some degree by the ECoC programme, where multiple locations might share the event, reducing the overall impact on each partner location. Such a strategy, as suggested earlier, has been adopted by the UEFA Euro 2020 Cup. Such future scenarios for mega-events would see them more closely resemble, in terms of their operation and function, the ECoC. The more than 30-year tenure of the ECoC, if nothing else, demonstrates that it is indeed possible to host mega-events within city centres. Again, in order for such changes to take place, the international managing bodies must introduce changes to the regulations as well as begin to select cities willing to implement such approaches rather than those cities that will spend the most.

As noted above, the ECoCs over 30 years have clearly demonstrated that large events can be hosted within city centres and accomplish many of the goals city policy makers hope to achieve with the Olympics or Expo. Each individual ECoC, though organized by a single managing body, tends to be governed through more horizontal processes that involve partnerships with many local institutions to ensure successful delivery. The ECoC has also had greater success in including broader forms of public participation, both in the bidding and planning stages as well as in the event. These more open forms of management and cooperation with local stakeholders and citizens are processes that are not commonly found in other mega-events and which could be learned from the ECoC. The involvement of so many stakeholders and the inclusion of the public within the process can be crucial to building support for the event and in making the outputs more felt. Of course, in such a process, the potential threats and as well as benefits to heritage would be just as present as in the ECoC. Therefore, careful planning and cooperation with heritage experts would be crucial to the integration of other mega-events within historic fabric.

As regards knowledge transfer, it seems important to notice that mega-events, whether cultural or not, have created a great demand for consultancy services, often supplied by large consulting company (e.g. PWC, E&Y, Deloitte and KPMG were involved in the Polish Euro 2012 bid, see: Cope, 2015). This tendency hinders actual knowledge transfer between the bidders and policy makers in each of the cities as they have become valuable services. In the case of the ECoC, it is less international companies but rather international experts travelling from place to place advising in the bidding process and eventually managing the ECoC celebrations. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe, still having less experience in the game, seem even more eager to employ foreign consultants and experts, although this trend is seen all over the world (Müller & Pickles, 2015). However, as emphasized by Müller (2015a: 125), this transferred knowledge is not merely copied and pasted but rather "reworked, adapted and implemented in new, sometimes haphazard and often unpredictable ways."

It needs to be underlined here that the strategy of leaving the bid to a professional but not a local agency or company might not prove to be as successful a strategy with the ECoC, as the focus of the event is placed on cities' uniqueness and original programme. In order to prepare a bid one must really know and understand a city and its needs (failing to do it might lead to losing the bid as it was in the Poznan 2016 case, where the bid was prepared by a PR agency from another city). However, as the ECoC is a public initiative, the EU tries to encourage some exchange of experience and knowledge by organizing conferences that sum-up the experiences of the past ECoCs or publishing analyses of the cities that have hosted the event (e.g. the *European Capital of Culture: Success Strategies and Long-term Effects* study written by Beatriz Garcia and Tamsin Cox in 2013).

Facing this complex reality, the HOMEE project aims at delving into the relationship between mega-events and heritage by studying quite different cultural mega-events and deriving critical knowledge by them. The aim of the project that this literature review serves is to provide critical learning and policy guidance rather than finding perfect comparisons or cure-all solutions.

Bibliography

Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception* (K. Attell, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Alberts, H. C., & Hazen, H. D. (2010). Maintaining authenticity and integrity at cultural World Heritage Sites. *Geographical Review*, *100*(1), 56–73.

Apostolakis, A. (2003). The convergence process in heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *30*(4), 795–812.

Appleyard, D. (1979). *The Conservation of European Cities*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Ashworth, G. (2012). The Heritage of the built environment as development. Paradigms, possibilities, and problems. In R. J. Lawrence, H. Turgut, & P. Kellett (Eds.), *Requalifying the Built Environment: Challenges and Responses* (pp. 13–27). Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Ashworth, G., Graham, B., & Tunbridge, J. (2007). *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London: Pluto Press.

Aygen, Z. (2013). *International Heritage and Historic Building Conservation: Saving the World's Past*. New York: Routledge.

Balibrea, M. P. (2001). Urbanism, culture and the post-industrial city: Challenging the 'Barcelona model'. *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, *2*(2), 187–210.

Bandarin, F. (1979). The Bologna experience: Planning and historic renovation in a communist city. In Appleyard, D. (Ed.), *The Conservation of European Cities* (pp. 178–202). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Bandarin, F., & Van Oers, R. (2012). *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Bandarin, F., & Van Oers, R. (Eds.). (2015). *Reconnecting the City: The Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage*. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Bankston, C., & Henry, J. (2000). Spectacles of ethnicity: Festivals and the commodification of ethnic culture among Louisiana Cajuns. *Sociological Spectrum*, *20*(4), 377–407.

Barile, S., & Saviano, M. (2015). - From the management of cultural heritage to the governance of cultural heritage system. In G. M. Golinelli (Ed.), *Cultural Heritage and Value Creation. Towards New Pathways*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Baptista, I. (2013). Practices of exception in urban governance: Reconfiguring power inside the state. *Urban Studies*, *50*(1), 39–54.

Barthel, D. (1996). Getting in touch with history: The role of historic preservation in shaping collective memories. *Qualitative Sociology*, *19*(3), 345–364.

Basso, M. (2014). Mega-events as urban mega-projects and issues of institutional reconfiguration: Evidence from London 2012 Olympic planning process. Paper presented at the *Second International Conference on Mega-Events and the City*, Rio de Janeiro.

Basso, M. (2015). *Governare 'Routines Eccezionali.' I Grandi Eventi e la Città Contemporanea, tra Eccezione e Regola: Forme, Pratiche ed Effetti sul Policy-making. Considerazioni attorno ai Casi di Londra, Milano e Shanghai*. PhD Dissertation, Venice: Università IUAV di Venezia.

Basso, M. (2017). *Grandi Eventi e Politiche Urbane: Governare 'Routine Eccezionali.' Un Confronto Internazionale*. Milano: Guerni e Associati

BBC News (2017, November 22). Brexit "bombshell" for UK's European Capital of Culture 2023 plans. *BBC News*. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-42097692

Bélanger, A. (2000). Sport venues and the spectacularization of urban spaces in North America. The case of the Molson Centre in Montreal. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *35*(3), 378–397.

Beriatos, E., & Gospodini, A. (2004). "Glocalising" urban landscapes: Athens and the 2004 olympics. *Cities*, *21*(3), 187–202.

Bianchini, F. (1993). Culture, conflict and cities: Issues and prospects for the 1990s. In M. Parkinson & F. Bianchini (Eds.), *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience* (pp. 199–213). Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.

Bianchini, F., Albano, R., & Bollo, A. (2013). The regenerative impacts of the European City/Capital of Culture events. In M. E. Leary & J. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Urban Regeneration*. London: Routledge.

Bianchini, F., & Borchi, A. (2018). Il patrimonio nei programmi delle Città e Capitali europee della cultura. Riflessioni su alcuni temi e questioni fondamentali. *Cartaditalia*, *Special issue*, 190–205.

Bond, H. (2008). *Estimating the Economic Benefits of Event Tourism: A Review of Research Methodologies*. Liverpool: Impact 08.

Bonfantini, G. B. (2013). The historic city as urbanity factor for the contemporary city. Three Italian cases: Rome, Genoa, Bologna. Paper presented at the *International Conference on 'Changing Cities'. Spatial, Morphological, Formal and Socio-Economic Dimensions*. Skiathos.

Boorstin, D. J. (1961 [1992]). *The Image. Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Vintage Books.

Bortolotto, C. (2007). From objects to processes: UNESCO's "Intangible Cultural Heritage." *Journal of Museum Ethnography*, *19*, 21–33.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1979). *The Inheritors. French Students and Their Relation to Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boven, M., & t'Hart, P. (1996). *Understanding Policy Fiascoes*. New Brunswick: Transaction Press.

Boyle, M. (1999). Growth machine and propaganda projects: A review of readings of the role of civic boosterism in the politics of local economic development. In A. E. G. Jonas & D. Wilson (Eds.), *The Urban Growth Machine. Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (pp. 55–70). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Boyle, M., & Hughes, G. (1991). The politics of the representation of 'the real:' Discourses from the left on Glasgow's role as European City of Culture, 1990. *Area*, *23*(3), 217–228.

Bramwell, B. (1997). Strategic planning before and after a mega-event. *Tourism Management*, *18*(3), 167–176.

Brindley, T., Rydin, Y., & Stoker, G. (1996). *Remaking Planning: The Politics of Urban Change* (2. ed). London: Routledge.

Bullen, P. A., & Love, P. E. (2011). Adaptive reuse of heritage buildings. *Structural Survey, 29*(5), 411–421.

Burbank, M. J., Andranovich, G., & Heying, C. H. (2002). Mega-events, urban development, and public policy. *Review of Policy Research, 19*(3), 179–202.

Capital Americana de la Cultura. (2019). *Presentation.* Retrieved from http://www.cac-acc.org/present.php?lang=en

Cavalcanti, M. L. (2001). The Amazonian Ox Dance Festival: An anthropological account. *Cultural Analysis, 2*, 69–105.

Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 11*(2), 109–127.

Chalkley, B., & Essex, S. (1999). Urban development through hosting international events: A history of the Olympic Games. *Planning Perspectives, 14*(4), 369–394.

CHCfE Consortium. (2015). *Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe. Full Report.* Retrieved from International Cultural Centre website: http://blogs.encatc.org/culturalheritagecountsforeurope/outcomes/

Chen, Y. (2015). Legacy creation strategy in Olympic cities: The path towards sustainable development? *International Review for Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development, 3*(1), 74–87.

Chen, Y., & Spaans, M. (2009). Mega-event strategy as a tool of urban transformation: Sydney's experience. Paper presented at *The New Urban Question: Urbanism beyond Neo-Liberalism. 4th Conference of International Forum on Urbanism.* Amsterdam and Delft. Retrieved from http://resolver.tudelft.nl/uuid:9a45d8f0-be77-4a07-a6d5-79178c5d16f5

Chhabra, D., Healy, R., & Sills, E. (2003). Staged authenticity and heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(3), 702–719.

Christensen-Redzepovic, E. (2018). *Cooperation between European Capitals of Culture and Cultural Cities of East Asia: Opportunities and Challenges.* Retrieved from cultural diplomacy platform website: https://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/cier-data/uploads/2018/03/ECoC-CCEA_2018.02.06_FINAL.pdf

Ciolfi, L., Bannon, L. J., & Fernström, M. (2008). Including visitor contributions in cultural heritage installations: designing for participation. *Museum Management and Curatorship, 23*(4), 353–365.

Clark, G. (2008). *Local Development Benefits from Staging Global Events.* Paris: OECD.

Coaffee, J. (2015). The uneven geographies of the Olympic carceral: From exceptionalism to normalisation. *The Geographical Journal, 181*(3), 199–211.

Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*, 371–386.

Cope, B. (2015). Euro 2012 in Poland: recalibrations of statehood in Eastern Europe. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *22*(2), 161-175.

Couch, C., Leontidou, L., & Petschel-Held, G. (Eds.). (2007). *Urban Sprawl in Europe: Landscapes, Land-use Change & Policy*. Oxford. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Council of Europe (2005). *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*. Brussels: Mimeo.

Council of the European Union (2014). *Conclusions on cultural heritage as a strategic resource for a sustainable Europe*. Presented at the *Education, Youth, Culture and Sport Council Meeting*, Brussels: Mimeo.

Cullen, G. (1961). *The Concise Townscape*. London: Routledge.

Culture, Place and Policy Institute. (2018). *Cultural Transformations: The Impacts of Hull UK City of Culture 2017. Preliminary Outcomes Evaluation. March 2018*. Hull: University of Hull.

Cunningham, I., & Platt, L. (2018). Bidding for UK city of culture: Challenges of delivering a bottom-up approach 'in place' for a top-down strategy led scheme. *Journal of Place Management*, 12(3), 314-325.

De Pieri, F., & Scrivano, P. (2004). Representing the" historical centre" of Bologna: Preservation policies and reinvention of an urban identity. *Urban History Review/Revue d'Histoire Urbaine*, 33(1), 34–45.

Debord, G. (1983). *The Society of The Spectacle. Detroit: Black and Red.*

Deccio, C., & Baloglu, S. (2002). Nonhost community resident reactions to the 2002 Winter Olympics: The Spillover impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, *41*, 46–56.

Degen, M., & García, M. (2012). The transformation of the 'Barcelona model:' An analysis of culture, urban regeneration and governance. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *36*(5), 1022–1038.

Del Romero Renau, L., & Trudelle, C. (2011). Mega events and urban conflicts in Valencia, Spain: Contesting the new urban modernity. *Urban Studies Research*, *11*. Retrieved from https://www.hindawi.com/journals/usr/2011/587523/

Derrett, R. (2003). Making sense of how festivals demonstrate a community's sense of place. *Event Management*, *8*(1), 49-58.

Doğan, E., & Sirkeci, I. (2013). The impact of a mega-event on city branding: The European Capital of Culture 2010 and the image of Istanbul. *Border Crossing: Transnational Working Papers*, (103), 29–50.

Dubois, V. (2013). Cultural policy regimes in Western Europe. In International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.). Retrieved from https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00836422

Elżanowski, J. (2012). Ruins, rubble and human remains: negotiating culture and violence in post-catastrophic Warsaw. *Public Art Dialogue*, *2*(2), 114–146.

Essex, S., & Chalkley, B. (2004). Mega-events as a strategy for urban regeneration. *Dialoghi Internazionali – Città nel Mondo*, *5*, 18–29.

European Commission (2014). *European Capitals of Culture 2020—2033 Guide for Cities Preparing to Bid*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/documents/ecoc-candidates-guide_en.pdf

Evans, G. (2003). Hard-branding the cultural city: From Prado to Prada. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *27*(2), 417–440.

Evans, G. (2011). Cities of culture and the regeneration game. *London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries*, *5*(6), 5–18.

Evans, G., & Shaw, P. (2004). *The contribution of Culture to Regeneration in the UK: A Review of Evidence. A Report to the Department for Culture Media and Sport*. London: London Metropolitan University.

Evans, J., & Boswell, D. (1999). *Representing the Nation: A reader: Histories, Heritage and Museums*. London; New York: Routledge.

Favero, P. (2007). What a wonderful world ! On the 'touristic ways of seeing,' the knowledge and the politics of the 'culture industries of otherness.' *Tourist Studies*, *7*(1), 51–81.

Ferrucci, P., & Painter, C. (2013). Pseudo newsgathering: Analyzing journalists' use of pseudo-events on "The Wire." *Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture*, *5*, 135–169.

Fitch, J. M. (1990). *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Fladmark, J. (2000). *Heritage and Museums: Shaping National Identity*. Donhead St Mary: Donhead.

Flecha, A., Lott, W., Lee, T., Moital, M., & Edwards, J. (2010). Sustainability of events in urban historic centers: The case of Ouro Preto, Brazil. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning and Development*, *7*(2):131-143.

Foley, M., & MacPherson, G. (2004). Edinburgh's Hogmanay: In the society of the spectacle. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *2*(2), 29–42.

Fouseki, K., & Dragouni, M. (2017). Heritage spectacles: The case of Amphipolis excavations during the Greek economic crisis. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *23*(8), 742–758.

Gammon, S., Ramshaw, G., & Waterton, E. (Eds.). (2013). Examining the Olympics: heritage, identity and performance. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *19*(2), 119–124.

García, B. (2004a). Cultural policy and urban regeneration in Western European cities: Lessons from experience, prospects for the future. *Local Economy*, *19*(4), 312–326.

García, B. (2004b). Urban regeneration, arts programming and major events. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *10*(1), 103–118.

García, B., & Cox, T. (2013). *European Capitals of Culture: Success Strategies and Long-Term Effects*. Luxembourg: European Parliament Committee on Culture and Education.

García, B., Melville, R., & Cox, T. (2010). *Creating an Impact: Liverpool's Experience as European Capital of Culture*. Liverpool: Impacts 08.

Garden, M.-C. E. (2006). The heritagescape: Looking at landscapes of the past. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *12*(5), 394–411.

Getz, D. (2000). Developing a research agenda for the event management field. In J. Allen, R. Harris, L. K. Jago, & A. Veal (Eds.), *Events beyond 2000: Setting the Agenda* (pp. 10–21). Sydney: Australian Centre for Event Management.

Getz, D. (2010). The nature and scope of festival studies. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, *5*(1), 1–47.

Getz, D., & Page, S. J. (2016). Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management*, *52*, 593–631.

Giaccardi, E. (2012). Introduction: Reframing heritage in a participatory culture. In *Heritage and Social Media. Understanding Heritage in a Participatory Culture* (pp. 1–10). London and New York: Routledge.

Girard, A., & Gentil, G. (1983). *Cultural Development: Experiences and Policies* (2nd ed). Paris: UNESCO.

Glendinning, M. (2013). *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation: Antiquity to Modernity*. London: Routledge.

Gold, J. R., & Gold, M. M. (2008). Olympic cities: Regeneration, city rebranding and changing urban agendas. *Geography Compass*, *2*(1), 300–318.

Gospodini, A. (2002). European cities in competition and the new 'uses' of urban design. *Journal of Urban Design*, *7*(1), 59–73.

Gotham, K. F. (2005). Theorizing urban spectacles. *Cities*, *9*(2), 225–246.

Gotham, K. F. (2016). Beyond bread and circuses. Mega-events as forces of creative destruction. In R. Gruneau & J. Horne (Eds.), *Mega-events and globalization. Capital and spectacle in a changing world order* (pp. 31–47). London and New York: Routledge.

Grabher, G., & Thiel, J. (2015). Projects, people, professions: Trajectories of learning through a mega-event (the London 2012 case). *Geoforum*, *65*, 328–337.

Gratton, C., Shibli, S., & Coleman, R. (2006). The economic impact of major sports events: A review of ten events in the UK. *The Sociological Review*, *54*(2_suppl), 41–58.

Gray, N., & Porter, L. (2015). By any means necessary: Urban regeneration and the 'state of exception' in Glasgow's Commonwealth Games 2014: By any means necessary. *Antipode*, *47*(2), 380–400.

Green, S. (2018). Capitals of Culture in 2018. Retrieved August 3, 2018, from Prasino. Steve Green's cultural chronicle website: http://prasino.eu

Grix, J. (2012). 'Image' leveraging and sports mega-events: Germany and the 2006 FIFA World Cup. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, *17*(4), 289–312.

Groote, P., & Haartsen, T. (2008). The communication of heritage: Creating place identities. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (pp. 181–194). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Gruneau, R., & Horne, J. (2016). Mega-events and globalization: A critical introduction. In R. Gruneau & J. Horne (Eds.), *Mega-events and Globalization. Capital and Spectacle in a Changing World Order* (pp. 1–28). London and New York: Routledge.

Gursoy, D., & Kendall, K. W. (2006). Hosting mega events: Modeling locals' support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *33*(3), 603-623.

Hall, C. M. (1989). The definition and analysis of hallmark tourist events. *GeoJournal*, *19*(3), 263–268.

Hall, M. (2006). Urban entrepreneurship, corporate interests and sports mega-events: The thin policies of competitiveness within the hard outcomes of neoliberalism. *The Sociological Review*, *54*(2_suppl), 59–70.

Hall, T., & Hubbard, P. (1996). The entrepreneurial city: New urban politics, new urban geographies? *Progress in Human Geography*, *20*(2), 153–174.

Harrison, R. (2013). *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Harrison, R. (2015). Heritage and globalization. In E. Waterton & S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 297–312). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler*, *71*(1), 3–17.

Harvey, D. C. (2001). Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *7*(4), 319–338.

Harvey, D. C. (2008). The history of heritage. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (pp. 19–36). Hampshire: Ashgate.

Hassenpflug, D. (2004). Germany, Weimar and the Bauhaus: A micro analysis of globalization. In F. Eckardt & D. Hassenpflug (Eds.), *Urbanism and Globalization* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Haxton, P. A. (1999). *The Perceived Role of Community Involvement in the Mega-event Hosting Process: A Case Study of the Atlanta 1996 and Sydney 2000 Olympic Games* (Doctoral dissertation. Sydney: University of Technology Sydney.

Hiller, H. H. (1998). Assessing the impact of mega-events: A linkage model. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *1*(1), 47–57.

Hiller, H. H. (2006). Post-event outcomes and the post-modern turn: The Olympics and urban transformations. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *6*(4), 317–332.

Hitters, E. (2007). Porto and Rotterdam as European Capitals of Culture: Towards the festivalization of urban cultural policy. In G. Richards (Ed.), *Cultural Tourism: Global and Local Perspectives* (pp. 281–301). New York: Howorth Press.

Horne, J. (2007). The four 'knowns' of sports mega-events. *Leisure Studies*, *26*(1), 81–96.

Horne, J., & Manzenreiter, W. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *The Sociological Review*, *54*(2), 1–24.

Howard, P. (2003). *Heritage. Management, Interpretation, Identity*. London-New York.

ICOMOS (1964). International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites. *Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments*. Venice: Mimeo.

ICOMOS (2014). *The Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values.*

ICOMOS Australia (2013). *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (2013).* Australia ICOMOS Incorporated.

Immler, N. L., & Sakkers, H. (2014). (Re)Programming Europe: European Capitals of Culture: Rethinking the role of culture. *Journal of European Studies*, *44*(1), 3–29.

International Olympic Committee (2014). *Olympic Agenda 2020 20+20 Recommendations*. Retrieved January 11, 2019, from https://stillmed.olympic.org/Documents/Olympic_Agenda_2020/Olympic_Agenda_2020-20-20_Recommendations-ENG.pdf

Jago, L., Dwyer, L., Lipman, G., van Lill, D., & Vorster, S. (2010). Optimising the potential of mega-events: An overview. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, *1*(3), 220–237.

Jancovich, L., & Hansen, L. E. (2018). Rethinking participation in the Aarhus as European Capital of Culture 2017 project. *Cultural Trends*, *27*(3), 173–186.

Jokilehto, J. (1999). *History of Architectural Conservation*. New York: Routledge.

Jones, Z. M. (2015). Urban effects of the European Capital of Culture competition: Matera 2019, italy and Europe. Interview with Franco Bianchini. *Urbanistica*, (155), 96–97.

Jones, Z. M. (2017). Synergies and frictions between mega-events and local urban heritage. *Built Heritage*, (4), 22–36.

Jones, Z. M. (forthcoming a). *Cultural Mega-Events: Opportunities and Risks for Heritage Cities*. London: Routledge.

Jones, Z. M. (forthcoming b). Integrating cultural events and city agendas: Examples from Italian/UK practice. *Town Planning Review*.

Jones, Z. M., & Ponzini, D. (2018). Mega-events and the preservation of urban heritage: Literature gaps, potential overlaps and a call for further research. *Journal of Planning Literature*, *33*(4), 433–450.

Kassens-Noor, E. (2012). *Planning Olympic legacies: Transport dreams and urban realities.* London: Routledge.

Klamer, A., Mignosa, A., & Petrova, L. (2013). Cultural heritage policies: A comparative perspective. In I. Rizzo & A. Mignosa (Eds.), *Handbook on the economics of cultural heritage* (pp. 37–86). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Klamer, A., Petrova, L., & Mignosa, A. (2006). *Financing the Arts and Culture in the European Union*. Retrieved from European Parliament website: http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/files/134/en/Financing_the_Arts_and_Culture_in_the_EU.pdf

Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (1st ed). New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt.

Knox, D. (2008). Spectacular tradition: Scottish folksong and authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *35*(1), 255–273.

Kolar, T., & Zabkar, V. (2009). A consumer-based model of authenticity: An oxymoron or the foundation of cultural heritage marketing? *Tourism Management*, *31*, 652–664.

Kowalski, K. (2013). *O Istocie Dziedzictwa Europejskiego – Rozważania.* Krakow: Miedzynarodowe Centrum Kultury.

Kupka, K. (2012). *Redevelopment by Tradition: Urban Renewal in World Heritage Cities/The Effects of plans and projects in Amsterdam, Florence, Genoa and Venice*. Venice: Libreria Cluva Editrice.

Landry, C., Greene, L., Matarasso, F., & Bianchini, F. (1996). *The Art of Regeneration. Urban Renewal through Cultural Activity*. Stroud: Comedia.

Lauermann, J. (2014a). Competition through interurban policy making: Bidding to host megaevents as entrepreneurial networking. *Environment and Planning A*, *46*(11), 2638–2653.

Lauermann, J. (2014b). *Legacy After the Bid? The Impact of Bidding to host Olympic Games on Urban Development Planning*. Lausanne: Olympic Studies Centre. http://doc. rero. ch/record/209795.

Licciardi, G., & Amirtahmasebi, R. (Eds.). (2012). *The Economics of Uniqueness: Investing in Historic City Cores and Cultural Heritage Assets for Sustainable Development.* Washington DC: The World Bank.

Littler, J. (2008). Heritage and 'race.' In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (pp. 89–104). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Liu, Y. D. (2014). Cultural events and cultural tourism development: Lessons from the European Capitals of Culture. *European Planning Studies*, *22*(3), 498–514.

Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Logan, W. S. (2007). Closing Pandora's box: human rights conundrums in cultural heritage protection. In H Silverman & R. D. Fairchild (Eds.), *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights* (pp. 33-52). New York: Springer.

Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, K. (1960). *The Image of the City*. Cambridge MA: MIT press.

MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, *79*(3), 589–603.

MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schoken Books.

Macdonald, S. (2018). *What is Cultural Heritage?* Retrieved from http://erdk2018.pl/en/context/sharon-macdonald-czym-jest-dziedzictwo-kulturowe-en

Macleod, N. (2006). Cultural tourism: Aspects of authenticty and commodification. In M. K. Smith & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World. Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation* (pp. 177–190). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Mairs, J. (2017). Populous and Egis unveil masterplan for Paris 2024 Olympic Games. *Dezeen*. Retrieved from https://www.dezeen.com/2017/09/18/populous-egis-paris-2024-olympic-paralympic-games-park-masterplan-paris-france/

Marshall, T. (1996). Barcelona—fast forward? City entrepreneurialism in the 1980s and 1990s. *European Planning Studies*, *4*(2), 147–165.

Mason, R., & Avrami, E. (2002). Heritage values and challenges of conservation planning. In J. M. Teutonico, & G. Palumbo (Eds.) *Management Planning for Archaeological Sites*, (13–26). Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.

Mason, R. (2004). Devolving Identities: Wales and Scotland and their National Museums. In H. Brocklehurst & R. Phillips (Eds.), *History, Nationhood and the Question of Britain* (pp. 312–29). London: Palgrave.

McDowell, S. (2008). Heritage, memory and identity. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion on Heritage and Identity* (pp. 37–54). Aldershot: Ashgate.

McEvoy, D. (2010). *Tourism and the Business of Culture: The Views of Small and Medium-sized Tourism Businesses on Liverpool European Capital of Culture 2008*. Liverpool: Impact 08.

McIntosh, A. J., & Prentice, R. C. (1999). Affirming authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *26*(3), 589–612.

Miles, A., & Sullivan, A. (2012). Understanding participation in culture and sport: Mixing methods, reordering knowledges. *Cultural Trends*, *21*(4), 311–324.

Monclús, F.J. (2003). The Barcelona model: An original formula? From 'reconstruction' to strategic urban projects (1979–2004). *Planning Perspectives*, *18*(4), 399–421.

Morandi, C., & Di Vita, S. (2017). *Mega-Events and Legacies in Post-Metropolitan Spaces: Expos and Urban Agendas*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mulcahy, K. (2006). Cultural policy: Definitions and theoretical approaches. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, *35*(4), 319–330.

Müller, M. (2015a). The mega-event syndrome: Why so much goes wrong in mega-event planning and what to do about It. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *81*(1), 6-17.

Müller, M. (2015b). What makes an event a mega-event? Definitions and sizes. *Leisure Studies*, *34*(6), 627-642.

Müller, M., & Pickles, J. (2015). Global games, local rules: Mega-events in the post-socialist world. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *22*(2), 121–127.

Muñoz, F. M. (2010). Urbanalisation: Common landscapes, global places. *The Open Urban Studies Journal*, *3*, 78–88.

Naidoo, R., & Littler, J. (Eds.). (2005). *The Politics of Heritage: The legacies of race*. New York: Routledge.

Nair, S., & Howlett, M. (2017). Policy myopia as a source of policy failure: Adaptation and policy learning under deep uncertainty. *Policy & Politics*, *45*(1), 103–118.

Neal, C. (2015). Heritage and participation. In E. Waterton & S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 346–365). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Newman, P., & Thornley, A. (1996). *Urban planning in Europe: International competition, national systems, and planning projects.* Psychology Press.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, 7-24.

Nuryanti, W. (1996). Heritage and postmodern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *23*(2), 249–260.

O'Callaghan, C., & Linehan, D. (2007). Identity, politics and conflict in dockland development in Cork, Ireland: European Capital of Culture 2005. *Cities*, *24*(4), 311–323.

Ocón, D. (2017). Cultural capital schemes in Asia: Mirroring Europe or carving out their own concepts? *ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management & Policy*, *7*(1), 44.

Oliver, R., & Lauermann, J. (2017). Bidding and urban development. In R. Oliver & J. Lauermann, *Failed Olympic Bids and the Transformation of Urban Space* (pp. 27–47). New York: Palgrave.

Olsen, K. (2002). Authenticity as a concept in tourism research. *Tourist Studies*, *2*(2), 159–182.

Owen, K. A. (2002). The Sydney 2000 Olympics and urban entrepreneurialism: Local variations in urban governance. *Australian Geographical Studies*, *40*(3), 323–336.

Palermo, P. C., & Ponzini, D. (2010). *Spatial Planning and Urban Development: Critical Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Palmer/RAE Associates. (2004). *European Cities and Capitals of Culture. Part I.* Brussels: European Commission.

Paris, D., & Baert, T. (2011). Lille 2004 and the role of culture in the regeneration of Lille métropole. *Town Planning Review*, *82*(1), 29–44.

Pendlebury, T., Townshend, T., & Gilroy, R. (2004). The conservation of English cultural built heritage: A force for social inclusion? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *10*(1), 11–31.

Pereira, H. N. (2007). Contemporary trends in conservation: Culturalization, significance and sustainability. *City & Time*, *3*(2), 2.

Pereira Roders, A., & van Oers, R. (2011). World Heritage cities management. *Facilities*, *29*(7/8), 276–285.

Perl, A., Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2018). Policy-making and truthiness: Can existing policy models cope with politicized evidence and willful ignorance in a 'post-fact' world? *Policy Sciences*, *51*, 581–600.

Pinson, J. (2016). Heritage sporting events in territorial development. In M. Alvarez, F. Go, & A. Yuksel (Eds.), *Heritage Tourism Destinations: Preservation, Communication and Development* (pp. 76–90). Boston: CABI.

Ponzini, D. (2008). New Italian perspectives on urban planning: A policy tool approach. *Planum*, (December), 1–31.

Ponzini, D. (2010). The process of privatisation of cultural heritage and the arts in Italy: Analysis and perspectives. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *16*(6), 508–521.

Ponzini, D., & Jones, Z. (2015). Meanings, urban products and forms of 'European cities' in the European Capital of Culture program. *Urbanistica*, *155*, 70–78.

Ponzini, D., & Vani, M. (2014). Planning for military real estate conversion: Collaborative practices and urban redevelopment projects in two Italian cities. *Urban Research & Practice*, *7*(1), 56–73.

Povey, G., & Van Wyk, J.-A. (2010). Culture and the event experience. In P. Robinson, D. Wale, & G. Dickson (Eds.), *Events Management* (pp. 1–18). Wallingford: CABI.

Powell, H., & Marrero-Guillamón, I. (Eds.). (2012). *The Art of Dissent: Adventures in London's Olympic State*. London: Marshgate Press.

Preuss, H. (2004). *The Economics of Staging the Olympics: A Comparison of the Games, 1972-2008*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Prieur, A., & Savage, M. (2013). Emerging forms of cultural capital. *European Societies*, *15*(2), 246–267.

Quinn, B. (2009). Festivals, events and tourism. In T. Jamal & M. Robinson (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies* (pp. 483–503). London: Sage.

Reynié, D. (2016). 'Heritage Populism' and France's National Front. *Journal of Democracy*, *27*(4), 47–57.

Richards, G. (2007). Culture and authenticity in a traditional event: The views of producers, residents and visitors in Barcelona. *Event Management*, *11*, 33–44.

Richards, G. (2010). *Leisure in the Network Society: From Pseudoevents to Hyperfestivity?* Tilburg: Tilburg University.

Richards, G., & Palmer, R. (2010). *Eventful Cities: Cultural Management and Urban Revitalisation*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2004). The impact of cultural events on city image: Rotterdam, Cultural Capital of Europe 2001. *Urban Studies*, *41*(10), 1931–1951.

Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2006). Developing creativity in tourist experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture. *Tourism Management*, *27*(6), 1209–1223.

Riegl, A. (1903 [1996]). The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and its Development. In N. Stanley Price, M. Kirby Tally Jr. & A. Melucco Vaccaro (Eds.) *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage* (pp. 69-83). Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.

Ripp, M., & Rodwell, D. (2015). The geography of urban heritage. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, *6*(3), 240–276.

Ritchie, J. B., & Smith, B. H. (1991). The impact of a mega-event on host region awareness: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Travel Research*, *30*(1), 3–10.

Ritchie, J. B., & Yangzhou, J. (1987). The role and impact of mega-events and attractions on national and regional tourism: A conceptual and methodological overview. *Proceedings of the 37th Congress of AIEST*, *28*, 17–57.

Ritchie, J. R. B., & Beliveau, D. (1974). Hallmark events: An evaluation of a strategic response to seasonality in the travel market. *Journal of Travel Research*, *13*(2), 14–20.

Roche, M. (1994). Mega-events and urban policy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *21*(1), 1–19.

Roche, M. (2000). *Mega-events and Modernity: The Olympics, Internationalism And Supernationalism: International Sports Events and Movements in the Inter-war Period.* New York: Routledge.

Roche, M. (2002). *Megaevents and Modernity: Olympics And Expos in the Growth of Global Culture.* New York. Routledge.

Roche, M. (2006). Mega-events and modernity revisited: Globalization and the case of the Olympics. *The Sociological Review*, *54*(2_suppl), 27–40.

Rodwell, D. (2012). The Unesco World Heritage Convention, 1972–2012: Reflections and directions. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, *3*(1), 64–85.

Rojas, E. (2004). *Volver al Centro: La Recuperación de Áreas Urbanas Centrales.* IDB.

Rojas (2012). *Government Interventions in Latin American World Heritage Sites.* PhD thesis, Department of Architecture, Urbanism and Arts o the Universida de Lusofona de Humanidades e Teconolgias, Lisbon.

Rojas, E., & Lanzafame, F. (Eds.). (2011). *City Development: Experiences in the Preservation of Ten World Heritage Sites.* Washington DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

Rojek, C. (2001). *Celebrity.* London: Reaktion Book.

Ruggles, D. F. (2012). Introduction: The social and urban scale of heritage. In D. F. Ruggles (Ed.), *On Location* (pp. 1–14). Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4614-1108-6_1

Ryberg-Webster, S., & Kinahan, K. L. (2014). Historic preservation and urban revitalization in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Planning Literature*, *29*(2), 119–139.

Sánchez, F., & Broudehoux, A.-M. (2013). Mega-events and urban regeneration in Rio de Janeiro: Planning in a state of emergency. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, *5*(2), 132–153.

Schenk, J., Parent, M. M., MacDonald, D., & Proulx Therrien, L. (2015). The evolution of knowledge management and transfer processes from domestic to international multi-sport events. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *15*(5), 535–554.

Sébastiani, J. (2016). *Olympic Games Knowledge Management (OGKM) Factsheet.* Retrieved from https://stillmed.olympic.org/media/Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/Factsheets-Reference-Documents/OGKM/Factsheet-OGKM-July-2016.pdf

Sharpley, R. (1994). *Tourism, Tourists and Society.* Huntingdon: Elm Publications.

Short, J. R. (2008). Globalization, cities and the Summer Olympics. *City*, *12*(3), 321–340.

Silverman, H. (2015). Heritage and authenticity. In E. Waterton & S. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research* (pp. 69–88). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Skounti, A. (2009). The authentic illusion: humanity's intangible cultural heritage, the Moroccan experience. In L. Smith and N. Akagawa (eds) *Intangible Heritage* (pp. 74-92). New York: Routledge.

Smith, A. (2005). Conceptualizing city image change: The 're-imaging'of Barcelona. *Tourism Geographies*, *7*(4), 398–423.

Smith, A. (2012). *Events and Urban Regeneration: The Strategic Use of Events to Revitalise Cities*. London and New York: Routledge.

Smith, M., & Forest, K. (2006). Enhancing vitality or compromising integrity? Festivals, tourism and the complexities of performing culture. In D. Picard & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Festivals, Tourism and Social Change: Remaking Worlds* (pp. 133–151). Clevedon, Buffalo and Toronto: Channel View Publications.

Snowball, J. D. & Webb, A. C. M. (2008). Breaking into the conversation: Cultural value and the role of the South African National Arts Festival from apartheid to democracy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *14*(2), 149–164.

Stewart, A. (2012, August 7). Olympic host cities need transparency, not knowledge transfer. *Harvard Business Review*.

Swyngedouw, E., Moulaert, F., & Rodriguez, A. (2002). Neoliberal urbanization in Europe: Large-scale urban development projects and the new urban policy. *Antipode*, *34*(3), 542–577.

Sykes, O., & Brown, J. (2015). European Capitals of Culture and urban regeneration: An urban planning perspective from Liverpool. *Urbanistica*, (155), 79–85.

Tölle, A. (2014). The regional turn of the European Capital of Culture and its traits in France, Germany and Poland. *Tafter Journal, 77*(online edition).

Tölle, A. (2016). Transnationalisation of development strategies in East Central European cities: A survey of the shortlisted Polish European Capital of Culture candidate cities. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *23*(3), 374–388.

Tommarchi, E., Hansen, L. E., & Bianchini, F. (2018). Problematising the question of participation in Capitals of Culture. *Participations*, *15*(2), 154–169.

Tweed, C., & Sutherland, M. (2007). Built cultural heritage and sustainable urban development. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *83*, 62–69.

Tzortzi - Georgi, N. J., Vissilia, A. M., & Koutsolambros, I. (2014). Pafos cultural capital of Europe 2017: Landscape interventions in the urban fabric as a tourist development tool. *Proceedings of the 51th World Congress IFLA 2015: Thinking and Action: Earth, Home, Landscape of Places*, 425-431.

Tzortzi - Georgi, N. J., Kapnistou, M., & Sarikou, S. (2005). Landscape design in Athens during the preparation of the Olympic Games in 2004: Project implementation and maintenance. *WSEAS Transactaction on Environment and Development*, 1(1), 92-100.

UCCI (2019). Como surge. Retrieved April 30, 2019, from https://ciudadesiberoamericanas.org/galadornes-y-reconocimientos/capital-iberoamericana-de-la-cultura/

UNESCO (1976). *Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas*. Retrieved from United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization website: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001140/114038e.pdf#page=136

UNESCO (1980). *Report of the Rapporteur on the Fourth Session of the World Heritage Committee*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO (2003). *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris: Mimeo.

UNESCO (2005). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: Mimeo.

UNESCO (2011). *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*. Retrieved from UNESCO website: https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/activities/documents/activity-638-98.pdf

UNESCO (2013). *Managing Cultural World Heritage*. Retrieved from United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization website: http://whc.unesco.org/document/125839

UNESCO (2019). *Intangible Heritage*. Retrieved from United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization website: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/jakarta/culture/intangible-heritage/

Van Oers, R. (2006). Preventing the goose with the golden eggs from catching bird flu: UNESCO's efforts in safeguarding the historic urban landscape. *Cities between Integration and Disintegration: Opportunities and Challenges, ISoCaRP Review*, *2*. Retrieved from http://isocarp.org/app/uploads/2015/02/Istanbul-2006-_TXT_Ron-van-Oers.pdf

Veal, A. J. (1994). *Leisure Policy and Planning*. Harlow: Longman.

Veldpaus, L., Pereira Roders, A. R., & Colenbrander, B. J. F. (2013). Urban heritage: Putting the past into the future. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, *4*(1), 3–18.

Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *26*(2), 349–370.

Wierenga, E., Hornis, W., & de Groot, D. (2012). *Olympisch Ontwerpen / Designing Olympics.* Rotterdam: 010.

Wilson, M. I. (2011). Event engineering: Urban planning for Olympics and World's Fairs. In S. D. Brunn (Ed.), *Engineering Earth: The Impacts of Megaenginerring Projects* (1045–1055). Dordrecht: Springer.

Young, K., & Wamsley, K. (2005). *Global Olympics: Historical and Sociological Studies of the Modern Games.* Oxford: JAI Press.

Zimbalist, A. (2015). *Circus Maximus: The Economic Gamble behind Hosting the Olympics and the World Cup*. Brookings Institution Press.

Zukin, S. (1991). *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Zukin, S. (1995). *The Cultures of Cities.* Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.