



Proceedings of the International Conference
Preventive and Planned Conservation
Monza, Mantova - 5-9 May 2014

2

Sguardi ed esperienze sulla conservazione del patrimonio storico architettonico



A cura di **Stefano Della Torre**
Curatela editoriale **Maria Paola Borgarino**



NARDINI EDITORE

Proceedings of the International Conference
Preventive and Planned Conservation
Monza, Mantova - 5-9 May 2014



**POLITECNICO
DI MILANO**



Sguardi ed esperienze sulla conservazione del patrimonio storico architettonico

Proceedings of the International Conference
Preventive and Planned Conservation
Monza, Mantova - 5-9 May 2014

Comitato scientifico

Carlo Blasi, *Università di Parma, Italy*
Federico Bucci, *Politecnico di Milano, Italy*
Fausto Cardoso Martinez, *University of Cuenca, Ecuador*
Angelo Ciribini, *Università di Brescia, Italy*
Nigel Dann, *University of the West of England, United Kingdom*
Stefano Della Torre, *Politecnico di Milano, Italy*
Sasa Dobričić, *University of Nova Gorica, Slovenia*
Xavier Greffe, *Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, France*
Massimo Montella, *Università di Macerata, Italy*
Elena Mussinelli, *Politecnico di Milano, Italy*
Christian Ost, *ICHEC Brussels Management School, Belgium*
Ana Pereira Roders, *University of Eindhoven, Holland*
Pietro Petrarola, *Eupolis Lombardia, Italy*
Mario Santana Quintero, *Carleton University, Canada*
Koenraad Van Balen, *UNESCO Chair for PRECOMOS, KU Leuven, Belgium*
Minja Yang, *RLICC, KU Leuven, Belgium*
Rossella Moioli, *Distretto Culturale Monza e Brianza, Italy (coordinamento)*

Segreteria scientifica del convegno:

Maria Paola Borgarino, Stefania Bossi
Politecnico di Milano, Dipartimento ABC - Architecture, Built Environment and Construction Engineering

Atti a cura di Stefano Della Torre

Curatela editoriale: Maria Paola Borgarino
Impaginazione e collaborazione alla revisione dei testi: Cristina Boniotti

Politecnico di Milano - Dipartimento ABC - Architecture, Built Environment and Construction Engineering
Fondazione Cariplo, progetto Distretti Culturali
Distretto Culturale Evoluto di Monza e Brianza - Provincia di Monza e della Brianza
Distretto Culturale Le Regge dei Gonzaga

Con il patrocinio della



Regione Lombardia

@ 2014 Politecnico di Milano e Nardini Editore
Tutti i diritti sono riservati

Copertina Ennio Bazzoni

Stampato per Nardini Editore

Le immagini contenute in questo volume sono fornite dagli autori al Politecnico di Milano e all'editore sotto la propria esclusiva responsabilità e sono state utilizzate per scopo didattico e per divulgazione. L'editore è disponibile a riconoscere la paternità delle immagini ad altri che la dimostrino, e a citare gli aventi diritto nelle successive edizioni.



Proceedings of the International Conference
Preventive and Planned Conservation
Monza, Mantova - 5-9 May 2014

2

Sguardi ed esperienze sulla conservazione del patrimonio storico architettonico



A cura di **Stefano Della Torre**
Curatela editoriale **Maria Paola Borgarino**

Indice

MONITORING HERITAGE VALUES: WHAT'S NEW? Ana Pereira Roders	pag. 1
ASSESSING CULTURAL CAPITAL IN PREVENTIVE CONSERVATION: TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM FOR ECONOMICS OF CONSERVATION Christian Ost	” 11
CONSERVANDO I SEGNI DELLA MEMORIA. STRATEGIE PER IL CAMPO DI FOSSOLI (CARPI) Marco Pretelli, Andrea Ugolini, Paolo Faccio, Chiara Mariotti, Alessia Zampini	” 17
VALORIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE BUILT HERITAGE OF FORTIFIED TOWNS: THE CASES OF THE UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE SITES OF SABBIO-NETA, ITALY, AND VISBY, SWEDEN Mattias Legnér, Davide Del Curto, Kristin Balksten	” 29
I COLLEGI UNIVERSITARI DI GIANCARLO DE CARLO AD URBINO: DALLA PROGRAMMAZIONE DEGLI INTERVENTI ALLA COSTRUZIONE DI UNA STRATEGIA DI GESTIONE Maria Paola Borgarino, Andrea Canziani	” 45
CONSERVAZIONE PREVENTIVA E PROGRAMMATA PER UN FINE COMUNE: UN'ESPERIENZA IN AMBITO LIGURE Daniela Pittaluga	” 57
UN PROGETTO COLORE PER CASTIGLIONE OLONA (VA): BUONE PRATICHE PER LA VALORIZZAZIONE Margherita Bertoldi, Susanna Bortolotto, Lucia Toniolo	” 57
RETROFIT E PROGETTAZIONE AMBIENTALE DEGLI INSEDIAMENTI ESISTENTI: PROPOSTA DI UNA PROCEDURA STANDARDIZZATA PER LA RIQUALIFICAZIONE ENERGETICA DEL PATRIMONIO EDILIZIO ESISTENTE TRA STORIA E MODERNITÀ Maria Cristina Forlani, Fabrizio Chella, Michele Lepore	” 83
CONOSCENZA, CONSERVAZIONE E VALORIZZAZIONE. LE OCCASIONI OFFERTE DALLA SEDE DEL SERVIZIO BENI CULTURALI DELL'OSPEDALE MAGGIORE DI MILANO Mariangela Carlessi, Paolo M. Galimberti, Alessandra Kluzer	” 93
RESTI E RUDERI DI STRUTTURE FORTIFICATE IN PROVINCIA DI NOVARA: STUDI PER UNA STRATEGIA DI CONSERVAZIONE E VALORIZZAZIONE Carla Bartolozzi, Francesco Novelli	” 105

segue **Indice**

MOBILIZATION OF HERITAGE VALUES IN CONFLICT-AFFECTED CONTEXTS IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: ANALYSING THE CASE STUDY OF THE NICOSIA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT TERMINAL Emilia Siandou	” 119
LA DIMENSIONE DEGLI SPAZI APERTI NEL PROCESSO DI CONSERVAZIONE E VALORIZZAZIONE DEL PAESAGGIO STORICO URBANO Roberto Bolici, Cristiana Giordano	” 133
METODI E AZIONI PER LA VALORIZZAZIONE DEL PATRIMONIO RURALE. IL PROGETTO DI SVILUPPO LOCALE DELLE CORTI BONORIS A MANTOVA Chiara Agosti, Raffaella Riva	” 143
IL PATRIMONIO CULTURALE IMMOBILIARE PUBBLICO DISMESSO: TRA VALORIZZAZIONE E CONSERVAZIONE Giusi Leali, Silvia Mirandola	” 155
IL SISTEMA ITALIANO DEI PAESAGGI VITIVINICOLI: IDENTITÀ, QUALITÀ E INNOVAZIONE Alessandra Benevelli, Cristina Coscia	” 165
IL SASSO E LO STAGNO: LA CONSERVAZIONE COME STRATEGIA DI VALORIZZAZIONE PER LO SVILUPPO LOCALE Francesca Buccafurri, Sergio Raimondo, Mirella Scianda	” 177
PLANNED CONSERVATION AND CULTURAL ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY: THE VESUVIUS'S UNESCO ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE MANAGEMENT Marina D'Aprile	” 189
LA VALORIZZAZIONE DI EDIFICI STORICI. METODI E STRUMENTI PER ORIENTARE LE STRATEGIE DI INTERVENTO Marzia Morena, Maria Luisa Del Gatto, Anna Gornati	” 199
AUMENTARE IL VALORE DELL'ARCHITETTURA: UNO STRUMENTO PER LA VALUTAZIONE E IL MONITORAGGIO DEL POTENZIALE DEGLI EDIFICI Antonio Invernale	” 209
MONZA: UN NUOVO RUOLO PER LE AREE DISMESSE A SUD DELLA CITTÀ Raffaella Neri	” 223
VILLE VENETE, UNA RISORSA PER LO SVILUPPO CULTURALE ED ECONOMICO DEL TERRITORIO Livio Petriccione, Federico Bulfone Gransinigh	” 235

IL SISTEMA DEI MULINI NEL TERRITORIO DELLE MADONIE IN SICILIA: LE RAGIONI DELLA CONSERVAZIONE E LE RAGIONI DELLA VALORIZZAZIONE Antonella Cangelosi	” 247
CULTURAL HERITAGE AND THE FUTURE OF TERRITORY: A PARTECIPATIVE EXPERIENCE BETWEEN MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT IN A SMALL MUNICIPALITY LOCATED IN EMILIA Flaviano Celaschi, Daniele Fanzini, Irina Rotaru, Cecilia Medri	” 259
THE REINFORCEMENT OF RATIONALIST ARCHITECTURE. RAISE AWARENESS OF THIS HERITAGE’S VALUE: IDENTITY Cristina del Bosch Martín	” 271
EDILIZIA RESIDENZIALE PUBBLICA E CONSERVAZIONE: IL CASO DEL VILLAGGIO OLIMPICO DI ROMA Simona Salvo	” 281
THE HALIC METRO CROSSING BRIDGE IN ISTANBUL: A BRIDGE BETWEEN CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT Enzo Siviero, Michele Culatti, Alessandro Stocco, Viviana Martini	” 293
WHAT KIND OF CONSERVATION POLICIES FOR ISLAMIC HISTORIC CITIES? Cecilia Fumagalli	” 303
HISTORICAL PUNJABI CITIES AND THEIR URBAN FABRIC TRANSFORMATION IN THE CONTEMPORARY ERA Daniele Beacco	” 313
SAFEGUARDING HISTORIC URBAN WATERFRONT IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. MOSUL OLD CITY AS A CASE STUDY Emad Hani Ismaeel, Nahith Taha Alkaymaqchi, Mumtaz Hazim Aldewachi	” 325
HISTORIC BUILDING VALORISATION IN THE CONSERVATION PROCESS IN JAKARTA Teguh Utomo Atmoko	” 343
FROM COOPERATIVE WORK TO A SCIENTIFIC APPROACH FOR A DYNAMIC AND RESPONSIBLE APPROPRIATION OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE: CASE OF SCHOOL PROJECT OF CREATION OF ART WORKS CENTER AND HERITAGE OF PORTO-NOVO TOWN (BENIN) Gbénahou Roch Alfred A. Kiki, Kiki Mahoutin Richard, Alexandre Mascarenhas	” 353

segue **Indice**

THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY IN THE RESTORATION OF TRADITIONAL ARCHITECTURE: A CASE STUDY OF NAM PHO TRUNG COMMUNAL HOUSE (PHU THUONG COMMUNE, PHU VANG DISTRICT, THUA THIEN HUE PROVINCE, VIETNAM) Nguyen Thang Long	” 367
ARMONIZZARE I PRINCIPI EUROPEI DI CONSERVAZIONE E RESTAURO DEI BENI CULTURALI CON NECESSITÀ E RISORSE DELLA CULTURA CINESE. TUTELA, SVILUPPO E AUTENTICITÀ NELL'APPROCCIO CINESE ALLA CONSERVAZIONE. Alessandro Pergoli Campanelli.	” 379

THE REINFORCEMENT OF RATIONALIST ARCHITECTURE. RAISE AWARENESS OF THIS HERITAGE'S VALUE: IDENTITY

Cristina del Bosch Martín

University of Seville

Abstract

In the 20th century, Europe was in a complex socio-political situation. Thanks to social action, this scene was overcome and the consciousness of the Modern Movement “humanism” was recovered.

Currently, several rationalist buildings-icons have been established as symbols and have been valued with the acceptance of its cultural significance. We can say that the asset valuation, motivated by its authenticity, has reached its objective. However, we believe that there is an absence of “clarity” in the appreciation of values which ends causing part of a loss of their own independent heritage values. The beginning of this “confusion” comes in the definition of the heritage object identity, from the relation of citizen-heritage. It is necessary to recognize it by itself from its values and mistrust to pre-established items. Therefore, the responsibility to conserve must fall on the society, creating a way of intervention on which society suggests a possible protection from the analysis of this architecture.

We establish the basis for this heritage awareness in the relation citizen-heritage. Being necessary to learn “how art objects are worth ‘not for what they are if not what they represent’. This knowledge is achieved when the observer has a true wealth of references”. The action that will allow us to know the heritage values, making safe the correct conservation, will be heritage education. Being necessary to understand the connection education-citizen-heritage as an instrument of protection because the correct use of “cultural use will guarantee permanence” of these least known patrimonial assets.

Brief review about Rationalist Architecture. Past and present

“[...] each day brings their harvest. We are unfortunate, if we do not see it, nor we know it; we are blind by to not discover, every morning, the promise of the new time.” (Le Corbusier, 1963: 25).

In the 20th century, Europe had a complex socio-political situation which was reflected in its devastated cities who demanded be intervened. Thanks to social action, this scene was overcome. It was based on the work developed by

Vanguards and it recovered the consciousness of the Modern Movement “humanism”.

Mainly, the rationalism was based on analytical reason. Distinction and classification were the instruments for this logical process and it is approaching almost to the abstract. The rationalism in architecture agrees with the functionalism. The volume, where it is the activity, is the result of a utilitarian process. The expressiveness of the function is the base of beauty. Materials and techniques are expressed in a way more or less authentic *“In fact, these same beliefs of modern architecture have become the biggest obstacles in order to achieve a monumental expression. In this sense, modern architecture has distinguished itself by its willingness to form [...] the concept key of expression consists in directly identifying modernity with functionality and technological advancement”* (Montaner, 1997: 92).

In *the House of men*, in 1979, Le Corbusier developed the “Principles of Human City”. He defined the liberation of the individual and his personal accomplishment as part of a city, making a condition of how it must be built. Then, *“the material city must be equipped in such a way that facilitates this release in the best possible conditions, given the place and the time”* (Le Corbusier, 1999: 26). This is the reason why we need to know what social reality represents and which historical moment reflects different elements in that form because *“every age has its style of being unfulfilled in the world. And each conscious dissatisfaction regarding the world contains the germ of a new culture”* (Sloterdijk, 2001: 65). Therefore, the 20th century worries are reflected in the rationalist architecture.

With the passage of time, some of these rationalist buildings form part of the architectural heritage of the 20th century but we must not forget that for a long period of time, for various reasons, part of this heritage, the weaker and less considered by society, it has been altered improperly (re-used or preserved) and, even, it has been lost. However, thanks to the work developed by certain institutions (UNESCO, ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO, CATH20C, TICCIH, etc.) it has been able to begin to raise awareness about these heritage values without social esteem and with lack of recognition. Ortega y Gasset defined the “unpopularity” in a new art which *divided into two parts; a minimal, consisting of a small number of people that are favourable; another majority, innumerable, that are hostile [...] what happens is that the majority, mass, not understand the characteristics of the Art Nouveau [...] From the sociological point of view, it is that you divided the public into these two kinds of men: those who understand it and those who do not understand it.*

Eventually, some of these buildings were surrounded and were attached to each other. Sometimes, this process has been a degradation time and, today, we can consider this like traces of this human city. However, we believe that when

“the physical place begins to degrade not only comprises environmental degradation, it refers also to degradation of the territory built and to social degradation, which is a consequence of both” (Magnaghi, 2011: 92). It is in this approach of territory where we see of the relevance of built elements within the whole of the city. The *“rationalist heritage object results of a germ and answers of a social feeling that need being a subset of these forgotten objects put into value and get to be considered world heritage. It will be a new heritage created from a new monumental character”* (del Bosch, 2014: 1). *“Each period has the necessity of create own monuments”* (Giedion, 1997: 165).

It is necessary to evolve and to break with the pre-established ideas that define the current concept of “heritage’s aura”. Within *“the long historical periods, together with the mode of collective human existence, they also change the way of its human’s perception”* (Benjamin, 2003: 46). As a result, we can say that we need to redefine the aura like an extensive concept, which includes the whole of the physical urban reality from the identity of this heritage object. Its eloquence will be the final factor to look for and to define a new monumental character. This evolution finishes with a hermetic language where the emancipation of design and architecture are not independent of social implications.

Acknowledgement of Rationalist Architecture. Identity

“The task of art, and therefore also of modern art, remains the same as always: the modern art must provide modern forms created by ourselves, that accord with our knowledge and our activities” (Wagner, 1993: 54).

Eventually, the evolution of rationalist architecture has created some famous landmarks or buildings-icons. And, today, it is almost impossible to choose just one. Several rationalist landmarks have been established like iconic symbols and have been valued with the acceptance of their cultural significance. We should know it like the *“meaning aesthetic, historic, scientific, social and/or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the site itself, its setting, fabric, use, associations, meanings, records, related sites and related objects. Sites may have a range of significances for different individuals or groups”* (ICOMOS, 2011). We can say that their value is motivated by their authenticity. In the Nara Document, in 1994, the main lines were settled in the heritage act. It was based on respect for cultural diversity, social and cultural values where identity and authenticity of objects are the objective to reach. However, we believe that there is an absence of “clarity” in the appreciation of values which causes a lack of their own independent heritage values. This confusion is in the definition of the current heritage’s identity.

The society understands the historical and traditional value of architecture but it should know a new value, the “contemporary value” defined by Riegl. Nowadays, “*in this respect, the indifference to the people is wonderful and, equally, the indifference to things to our respect*” (Baudrillard, 2001: 80). The historical heritage is well known without a doubt. The past stirs emotions because we have a framework of references that we can recognize in ourselves. However, the present and future are unknown and we don't know where it can come from. “*Continuously, the present is reviewed in the light of the past with the intention of obtaining, by comparison, the validation of situations and attitudes which still used today despite the discrediting of authority in this post-moralist time*” (Ballart, 1997: 44).

We believe that the indifference to origin's feelings makes complex the heritage's definition because it establishes the nature of this architecture. If we apply to architecture, the latest works on the identification of a generic artwork, whatever its nature, as an asset, we would highlight the importance of citizen-heritage relationship. The recognition of a generic type of architecture like heritage must be initiated by the individual, believing and picking it up voluntarily, because the forced establishment of a meaning which does not arise in a natural way it can lead to rejection. As a result of this new link, citizen-heritage, it has been created a new definition of heritage, which leads to a dynamic and social participatory process. Sometimes, we mistrust recognised items. In this action to looking at we must understand heritage and how everything helps to identify shape, to characterize contexts, to generate feelings of ownership. The heritage belongs to a society that is at the time your direct legatee and it can modify it according to every look. The question about value should be always attributed to the society because it can be acquired it or not, when it is projected onto it. Rationalist buildings need being looked at by society. In this way, it can ensure the knowledge and transmission of its cultural meaning.

In 2009, Copeland defined the memory's product, both personal and collective. He was based on experiences, with both tangible and intangible aspects of the past, and how it contributes in the new heritage education to broader aims of developing identity and citizenship. However, citizenship should also bring with it responsibilities. We have to build the heritage from the education. By doing so, we help develop and maintain societies establishing the relation citizen-heritage. People need to recognize this heritage by itself and to mistrust pre-established items. Therefore, “*the responsibility to conserve must fall on the society, creating a way of intervention on which it suggests a possible protection*” (Arévalo, del Bosch, 2011: 3) from the analysis of this architecture.

Since Franceschini Commission, where it was established that cultural values belong to the cultural heritage of the nation, we have incorporated the historical reference from civilization. Therefore, the historical value - art appears like a benchmark of civilization; highlighting the social value of the monuments to know where *“people are better adapted to the future that social institutions and their representatives”* (Beck, 2009: 16). The knowledge allows people to decide and to behave like a free person. However, it should be built under reflected forms. Because when a lack of knowledge, it is not known, the consequences will be unintended and of no value. *“The distinction between knowledge and ignorance, and the distribution of knowledge and ignorance, it is based, therefore, on a social structure, a gradient of power among individuals, groups, authorities, monopolies and resources [...] this concrete and sociological distinction is the correlate of a conflict of rationalization that is very difficult to delimit. Talk about unintended consequences [...] of this conflict [...] it starts to exclude other forms of knowledge and it starts to use the ignorance”* (Beck, 2009: 199). We need a new sociological imagination, sensitive to this modern knowledge and enough strong to break the academic routines. This would entail that we should create a social definition of risks and management of risks in different cultural contexts. Therefore, it is essential to clarify the issues of irresponsibility organized and to define the relations between different politic-cultural contexts.

Today, *“the situation remains unchanged in one aspect: the art is conceived like a luxury and not like a means to life sensorial [...] the imagination is needed to know the eternally changing reality [...] the demand of educating the emotional of the masses does not exist or it is considered like something secondary, and it is left, like political propaganda, in the hands of speculators and agitators [...] there is an amazing array at our disposal of new media and it is not used”* (Giedion, 1997: 170-175). If people think about these different characteristics and how this architecture makes them feel, for instance, they can conclude by asking, how this architecture uses ornaments from a psychological point of view because *“the ornament would serve to lighten the worker from the monotony of his work”* (Loos, 1931). Or maybe, just as Van Doesburg defined in 1924, in *“Towards a plastic architecture”*, a new architecture without pre-established shape or style; where the monument is not connected with a huge element; the ground plant is permeable and opened; the symmetry has disappeared, how it has been created. And just as, in 1929, Moholy-Nagy defined the architectural space like *“each cultural period has its own concept of space, but it takes some time people can understand it consciously. This is what happens with our own spatial conception. Even to define it, there is a considerable hesitation. This uncertainty manifests itself in terms that we normally use; and these in turn increase the general confusion”*. By the experience of

architecture “*it is necessary to possess the functional ability to capture space [...] This education is responsible that this educated man has not been really able to appreciate the architectural work like an expression of spatial articulation [...] All architecture must be conceived like a unit. Without this condition, the architecture becomes a simple meeting of bodies empty that it may be technically feasible, but never, it will provide the exciting experience of articulated space*”.

Some of the main rationalist ideas are functionality, unit of work and culture. And it will feature recurring concepts throughout this modern movement, and initially it will constitute a precious instrument for political economy. We have to know that the architecture is not only a monumental building facade, it is like an art object, and we should avoid deceptions. Fighting against the apparent deception and the immobility of historical ideas; this realism is the denial of any estrangement of reality and we have to put it in value.

But people need to identify that “*The aura of a human work consists of perennial and unrepeatable character of its uniqueness or singularity [...] For this reason, the work in which prevails the culture value, can only be an authentic work; It does not support copy of itself. Any reproduction of it is a desecration ... the same, it could be said about... the architectural works, although it seems to be made once into a single finished version... it exists in a state of work unique and unrepeatable, restricted and irreproducible*” (Benjamin, 2003: 16). Because in the “*Authenticity: even in the most perfect reproductions, one thing is always left out: the here and now of the work of art, its existence is only in the place where it is located. His history [...] is their only existence. Within this history, there are the same transformations that has been suffered in its physical structure over [...] the concept of the authenticity of the original is constituted by its here and now [...] the wide concept of authenticity escapes mechanical reproduction*” (Benjamin, 2003: 42).

This orders architecture’s functions and objects were defined by Le Corbusier in *The House of men*, and he explained too how to take up space with a few of buildings and roads. With this urban planning, Alberto Magnaghi establishes *The Statut of Place* like a scheme where “*the construction of the statute of the places, it through like a complex process of heritage’s value recognition, restricting the strategic scenario building [...] like part of the planning process. And the scheme shows how each stage of the planning process requires the promotion of specific instruments of participatory democracy: first, for shared self-recognition of the heritage values; subsequently, for the contractual and constitutional definition of the status of places, for the negotiated design of the strategic scenario, taking into account the rules statutory, and, ultimately, to the social production of plans and projects that build own stage*” (Magnaghi, 2011: 168). Both authors try to create a clear and scientific point of view about the city. The first defined the beginning and the second explained how it should preserve it.

Other relevant characteristic is the concept of elemental composition developed by Banham and the relation time-architecture developed by Le Corbusier. The first featured “*the sense of responsibility of the architect to society in which he lives [...] from the tradition of academic teaching*” (Banham, 1977: 27). And the second, in *The House of Men*, where Le Corbusier defined that the authenticity should not be like “*nostalgia of origins and / or authenticity obsession*” and, in addition, he made a complaint about the usual action with respect to the origin “*the demand for authenticity which translates into an obsession of the certainty: what is it the origin of the work, its date, its author, its sign*” (Le Corbusier, 1979: 86).

It is fully assumed the role of society through the Administration in the heritage action, to understand the collective nature, like this ensures the community enjoyment from cultural diversity and identity. This interdisciplinary work must be supervised by society because there is a great importance of the culture in today’s economy. Therefore, the duty to protect, preserve, and disseminate must rest with society who owns it and enjoys it, acting administration like an agent, which must work in the public consciousness through political support, being aware of the dangers that are emerging: the unpredictable character assimilate to its market value, in a new consumer society, in which the aging and obsolescence, are the main factors of evolution. It should not create a consumer product to save its heritage; we need a solid and independent basis, not subject to the oscillating character of the market.

Reinforcement of Rational Architecture. The education heritage like an instrument of protection

“[...] *the culture like an alive system of ideas that we always have*” (Ortega y Gasset, 1984).

For establishing the basis for this heritage awareness in the relation citizen-heritage, it is necessary to learn how art objects are worth of what they are and not what they represent. This type of knowledge is achieved when the observer has a true wealth of references. The only action that will allow us to know the heritage values, ensuring the correct conservation, it will be the heritage education (ICOMOS, 2011). And, in addition, it is necessary to understand the connection education-citizen-heritage like an instrument of protection because “*the correct cultural use will guarantee permanence*” (del Bosch, 2013: 1) of these least known patrimonial assets. “*Culturally and socially, there is great indifference caused by the lack of social practice and an incorrect and insufficient heritage education to the aura of the rationalist heritage*” (del Bosch, 2013: 1).

“The learning capacity of the species is the critical point: a priori, humanity has difficulties to learn because it is not an individual, it is a set of [...] For this reason, humanity cannot be wiser than a human; altogether, it cannot be even so wise as the individual” (Sloterdijk, 2001: 78). From here, we defend specific instruction that identified the new object with its own cultural value, developed in a sustained unlimited growth; it allows controlling the market of the urban territory like a local system. The *“local development, the mode to take advantage of the heritage is decisive with respect to the possibility of overcoming the problems of sustainability (to keep promoting the heritage for future generations)”* (Magnaghi, 2011: 111). Always, it is adapted to each city understood like unique protection instance. *“The future of our historic urban landscape calls for mutual understanding between policy makers, urban planners, city developers, architects, conservationists, property owners, investors and concerned citizens, working together to preserve the urban heritage while considering the modernization and development of society in a culturally and historic sensitive manner, strengthening identity and social cohesion”* (Vienna Memorandum, 2005).

Undoubtedly, this new object-monument has a socio-economic value as well as all the elements included in the historical heritage. Choay, in his vision of the heritage city, postulated the understanding of heritage as something more than a “market value”, defending its collective character, regardless of its origin, protected not only by the age, and including also the most recent heritage’s buildings.

Then, to restore this part of the built environment, that shaped the city during the first half of the 20th century from a wide point of view, beyond the building, *“people need to remember the clear and rational approaches to its origin: live, work, recreate and circulate [...] And of these four functions, Le Corbusier made the following note: the urbanism is the way of being of an age”* (Fisac, 1975: 123). And, on this condition, it has to evolve social awareness of heritage and new monuments. It is based not only on the age of the item, but in its intrinsic value like a reflection of an era. It should be transformed it into an object worthy of being transmitted to future generations. And always, it should be understood like a whole and never like a way isolated. The only action, that will allow you to preserve architectural heritage values, is ensuring that there is an appropriate conservation with the heritage education.

Bibliographic references

- Aguilera V. (1975), *Once ensayos sobre el arte*. Madrid. Fundación Juan March.
Augé M., Mizraji M.N. (1993), *Los "no lugares": espacios del anonimato: una antropología de la sobremodernidad*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Arévalo F., del Bosch C. (2011), La pérdida inconsciente de los valores patrimoniales intangibles. Uso, espacio y reflejo, *International Conference Intervention Approaches for the 20th Century Architectural Heritage. CAH 20thC*. Madrid: ICOMOS.

Arnheim R. (1978), *La Forma Visual De La Arquitectura. Arquitectura-Perspectivas*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.

Ballart J. (1997), *El patrimonio histórico y arqueológico: valor y uso*. Barcelona: Ariel Patrimonio Histórico.

Banham R. (1977), *Teoría y diseño en la primera era de la máquina*. Barcelona: Paidós Estética.

Baudrillard J. (1969), *El sistema de los objetos*. México: Siglo veintiuno.

Baudrillard J. (2001), *L'autre par lui-même*. Barcelona: Anagrama.

Beck U. (2002), *La sociedad del riesgo global*. Madrid: Siglo XXI de España.

Benjamin W., Weikert A.E., Echevarría B. (2003), *La obra de arte en la época de su reproductibilidad técnica*. México: Ítaca.

Calaf R. (1998), *Aspectos didácticos de Ciencias Sociales (Arte)*. Universidad de Zaragoza: Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación.

Calaf R., Navarro A., Samaniego J.A. (2000), *Ver y comprender el arte del siglo XX*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Calaf R., Fontal O. (2006), *Miradas al patrimonio*. Gijón: Trea.

Capitel A. (2000), *Arquitectura del siglo XX: España*. Sevilla: Tanais Ediciones.

Copeland T. (2006), *European democratic citizenship, heritage education and identity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Copeland T. (2009), Archaeological Heritage Education: Citizenship from the Ground Up, *Treballs d'Arqueologia*, 15.

Choay F. (2007), *Alegoría del patrimonio*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.

Criterios de Intervención en el Patrimonio Arquitectónico del Siglo XX (2011). Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

del Bosch C. (2013), Olvido del significado cultural de la Arquitectura Racionalista del siglo XX en España. La enseñanza como instrumento de protección. *Arquitectura, Educación y Sociedad. Fórum Internacional*. Barcelona.

del Bosch C. (2014), Hacia una nueva monumentalidad desde la recuperación del patrimonio racionalista como parte del medio construido. *Arquitectura, Educación y Sociedad. Fórum Internacional*. Barcelona.

Faure E. (1972), *Apprendre à être*. Paris: Fayard.

Giedion S. (1944), The need for a new monumentality, *New Architecture and City Planning*. Nueva York: Paul Zucker. 549-568.

Giedion S. (1997), *Escritos escogidos*. Murcia: COAAT de Murcia.

I Congreso Internacional Educación Patrimonial. Mirando a Europa: estado de la cuestión y perspectivas de futuro (2012). Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Le Corbusier (1963), *Cuando las catedrales eran blancas*. Buenos Aires: Poseidón.

Le Corbusier (1966), *Vers une architecture*. Paris: Editions Vincent, Freal & C.

Le Corbusier, de Pierrefeu F. (1999), *La casa de los hombres*. Barcelona: Apóstrofe.

Loos A. (1931), *Mi escuela de construcción ornamento y educación*. Meine Bauschule. Innsbruck. *Textos de Arquitectura de la Modernidad*. Montaner J.M., Oliveras J. (1994). Barcelona: Gustavo Gili. 200-204.

Magnaghi A. (2011), *El proyecto local: hacia una conciencia del lugar*. Barcelona: Architectonic, UPC.

Moholy-Nagy L. (1929), *De los materiales a la Arquitectura*. Von Material zu architektur. Munich. *Textos de Arquitectura de la Modernidad*. Montaner J.M., Oliveras J. (1994). Barcelona: Gustavo Gili. 243-248.

Montaner J.M. (1993), *Después del movimiento moderno: arquitectura de la segunda mitad del siglo XX*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.

Montaner J.M. (1997), *La modernidad superada: arquitectura, arte y pensamiento del siglo XX*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.

Ortega y Gasset J. (1984), *La deshumanización del arte y otros ensayos de estética*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente en Alianza Editorial.

Ortega y Gasset J. (1992), *Misión de la Universidad y otros ensayos sobre educación y pedagogía*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente.

Riegl A. (2007), *El culto moderno de los monumentos, su carácter y sus orígenes*. Junta de Andalucía.

Sitte C., Collins G.R., Collins C.C. (1980), *Construcción de ciudades según principios artísticos*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.

Sloterdijk P. (2001), *Eurotaoísmo: aportaciones a la crítica de la cinética política*. Barcelona: Seix Barral.

Subirats E. (1989), *El final de las vanguardias*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Uskokovich S. (2002), *Estrategias relativas al patrimonio cultural mundial. La salvaguarda en un mundo globalizado. Principios, prácticas y perspectivas*. ICOMOS action plan on the 20thCH. 13th ICOMOS General Assembly and Scientific Symposium. Madrid.

Van Doesburg T. (1924), *Hacia una arquitectura plástica*. *Textos de Arquitectura de la Modernidad*. Montaner J.M., Oliveras J. (1994). Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 224-225.

Wagner O., Rovira J.M., Siguán J. (1993), *La arquitectura de nuestro tiempo: una guía para los jóvenes arquitectos*. Madrid: El Croquis.