

HERITAGE AND TOURISM: A DIALOGUE OF DEAF?

THE CASE OF BRUSSELS

Anya Diekmann and Laurence Gillot

Université Libre de Bruxelles, IGEAT-LIToTeS, Faculté des Sciences

adiekman@ulb.ac.be

laurence.gillot@ulb.ac.be

ABSTRACT

With the increase of urban tourism, many historic city centres suffer from overcrowding. Heritage administrators are worried about the growing threats from mass tourism while at the same time tourism authorities promote heritage assets as pull factor for visitors. These opposite approaches of heritage and tourism stakeholders make the development of integrated management strategies difficult. In the first part, the paper looks at the complex relationship between heritage and tourism stakeholders and introduces the case of the world heritage site «Grand Place» in Brussels' historic centre. In the second part the authors present the first results of an ongoing comparative research with key stakeholders on the heritage and tourism relationship.

INTRODUCTION

Within the last decades, urban tourism developed into an important tourism sector. The development was notably due to an increase of short breaks and the democratisation of transport in the nineteen nineties. With the growing visitor numbers, heritage sites and historic centres suffered in many places from overcrowding resulting in environmental degradations. In that context, heritage administrators are worried about the increasing threats from mass tourism while at the same time tourism authorities promote heritage assets as pull factor for visitors. Conse-

quently, many stakeholders assume that the relationship between heritage and tourism is inevitably difficult and that compromise is difficult, even impossible, to reach. In that perspective, the relationship between heritage and tourism has been under scrutiny by both tourism and heritage academics for the last two decades (Choay 1992; Holloway 1994; Laws 1995; Swarbrooke 1995; Bouché 1998, Ashworth and Howard 1999; Evans Campbell *et al.* 2003). The relationship between heritage and tourism is generally considered as conflicting *per se*, though recent trends show that they could be complementary (Robinson 2000; Patin 2001; Robinson and Picard 2006). While most of the researches focus on the nature of heritage and tourism activities, they take little account of the role of both heritage and tourism stakeholders in the tourism development of heritage sites. Indeed, what lacks is an empirical assessment of the functioning of the concerned sides. There is little evidence how heritage administrators and tourism stakeholders influence heritage site management and how they perceive their own action in relation to heritage preservation.

In order to address these issues, the present paper draws from a presentation given at the first conference of the European project «MECOAN»»: Preserving Places – Managing mass tourism, urban conservation and quality of life in historic centres (Ankara, December 2008). The main objective of the European research project (2008-2010) was to investigate the risks faced by historic city centres and to address the relationship between urban conservation and tourism. The paper further includes the first results for Brussels of a comparative research *Brussels, Madrid and Rome: A difficult path between tourist pressure and sustainable development* led in collaboration with Armando Montanari, Barbara Staniscia and Manuel Valenzuela in 2009. The preliminary results have been presented at the international Conference *Preserving Places. Tourism and Conservation for a Sustainable Enhancement of Historic Centres* in Rome in November 2009. This ongoing research aims to analyse the perceptions of heritage and tourism relationship in three cities. It should be stressed that many stakeholders are involved on the supply side as well as on the demand side. However the present paper focuses particularly on the opposite approaches of heritage administration and some tourism stakeholders (notably the tourism authorities) protecting and promoting the heritage sites respectively.

The paper presents in a first part the characteristics of the heritage and tourism sides and their specific perception regarding heritage. The second part addresses the empirical data gained from Brussels in order to analyse the complex relationship between heritage and tourism, which is also influenced by a broader political and socio-economic context. Finally, the authors discuss the perspectives of heritage-tourism relationship and propose to go beyond a dichotomous and antagonist approach of these relations, as also suggested by recent studies (Robinson 2000; Patin 2001; Diekmann 2004; Robinson and Picard 2006; Gillot 2008).

1. CHARACTERISTICS AND PERCEPTIONS OF TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS AND HERITAGE ADMINISTRATION

McKercher and Du Cros state that: «Tourism industry professionals value cultural assets as raw materials for their products to generate tourism activity and wealth. Cultural heritage management professionals value the same assets for their intrinsic merits» (McKercher & Du Cros 2002: 13). These two different approaches and understandings lead to mutual incomprehension and raise many management issues. *Table 1* highlights the major differences in the appreciation of a heritage site.

Tab. 1
Comparison between tourism industry and heritage administrations
(adapted from Diekmann 2004).

	TOURISM STAKEHOLDERS	HERITAGE ADMINISTRATIONS
STRUCTURE	Private and public	Mostly public or trusts
PERCEPTION	Asset	Cultural property
VALUES	Economic	Cultural
AIMS	Profit orientated exploitation-maximising tourism activity	Non-profit orientated conservation – limiting tourism activity
TARGET GROUPS	Tourists	Local or national community

While the tourism stakeholders are either private or public bodies, the heritage administration is by definition a public authority in charge of the protection, listing and management of heritage. Although listed heritage sites could be privately owned, private owners always depend on public institutions for all transformation of their property, either in terms of funding or authorisation. Heritage stakeholders could also include NGOs or private companies, but these are equally under the supervision of the public authorities. As for the tourism side, it includes a set of heterogeneous stakeholders exercising various functions (Richter 2002). The public tourism authorities are generally in charge of promoting and coordinating the tourism sector, while the private operators (tour operator, hotelkeepers, carriers, guides, etc.) supply the various services or infrastructures to organize the activity.

For the tourism industry and the tourism authorities the heritage site represents an economic asset that can be commodified into a tourism product and used as a marketing tool. The heritage sector argues that cultural values are compromised for commercial gain (ICOMOS-UK 1990; Urry 1990). For the heritage administration, the heritage site represents indeed a cultural property with intrinsic values related to identity and community issues (Avrami *et al.* 2000; de la Torre 2002). In contrast, tourism stakeholders are clearly focusing on use and economic values. For them the heritage site embodies an asset to be sold as a product to visitors. In that perspective tourism managers attempt to attract as many visitors as possible. On the contrary, the heritage administration or curators refer to the different non-use and cultural values (architectural, historical, etc.) of a site and they do not necessarily search to improve visitor numbers. The different perceptions of the values of heritage sites can directly be related to the target groups of the tourism and the heritage sides. The tourism stakeholders want to attract domestic or international tourists while the heritage side targets the local population and community with an educational goal. Consequently the heritage administration operates mainly on a national basis and the tourism authorities work equally on international grounds (Diekmann 2004; Gillot 2008).

However, with all these variations and oppositions of approach, both sides need the heritage asset for their goals. Research evidenced that her-

itage needs tourism to a certain extent for preservation. Indeed sites that are not open to the public suffer often from natural degradation for they are not maintained properly (Diekmann 2004). In the same way, tourism stakeholders need to preserve the asset in order to attract the visitors.

Albeit the obvious need for heritage preservation on both sides, the antagonism is informing the complexity of the relationship between tourism stakeholders and heritage administration, who come hardly together. In the urban context there is an additional difficulty since both sides have to deal with public spaces that can neither be closed to the public nor be entirely reserved for tourism. A balance between the different uses and an integration of the local community has to be found. Integrated strategic management and stakeholder networks could be a solution. Both sides need to collaborate and to analyse and develop together issues of access, visitor demands, marketing, organisation and the traditional urban resource conservation considerations that deal with the urban heritage resource (Page and Hall 2002: 257). While this approach is not yet widely applied, growing visitor numbers and the need for appropriate management in historic sites urge more and more heritage administrations to develop strategies together with tourism stakeholders. These strategies should achieve three objectives: ensuring the conservation of tourism resource values, enhancing the experiences of the visitors who interact with tourism resources and maximising the economic, social and environmental return to stakeholders in the host community (Hall and McArthur 1998 cited in Page and Hall 2002).

2. THE CASE OF BRUSSELS

2.1. *Some facts and figures*

Brussels is the European, Belgian and Flemish capital at the same time. With around one million inhabitants, it attracted 2.734.000 visitors in 2007 (OPT 2007). International and domestic visitors spend 5.099.264 (OPT 2007) in the 131 hotels in the city. While a high percentage of

visitors come for business, leisure tourists come to experience the historic centre, amongst other reasons. In Brussels, the «organic» image as defined by Law (2002) is the Grand Place, the market square in the historic city centre. The square rebuilt in the early eighteenth hundreds represents the most recognisable and emblematic image of Brussels. It has been listed as world heritage site in 1998.

As aforementioned the divergence between the interests and aims of heritage and tourism stakeholders exists in most places. Yet, in Brussels some further dimensions are added to an already complex relationship. The political and geographical background influences to a large extent the policies of both sides. Belgium is divided into three regions and three communities, overlapping partially each other (see map), but four of these entities have chosen Brussels as their capital: the federal state of Belgium, the region of Flanders, the region of Brussels and the French community (*Fig. 1*). Tourism and heritage competences are split between these different levels (regional and communities) adding to a difficult flow of communication and decision taking.



Fig. 1
Map of Belgium with communities and regions (IGEAT 2009).

Belgium has indeed a very long history in heritage protection with the «Commission Royale des monuments et sites» being one of the first created in the 19th century in Europe. However, since the World War II, urban development and heritage protection did not really go hand in hand, resulting in the destruction of numerous heritage buildings within the city (Cordeiro and Moutury 2006). One of the most famous cases is the «House of the people» of Victor Horta demolished in the sixties. As a matter of fact, the term «Bruxellisation» stands in architectural studies worldwide for the disrespect of urban heritage and the uncontrolled destroying (destruction) of important buildings.

However, in the early nineteen nineties, policies changed with the introduction of a new legislation (1989 and 1993)¹ which gave power to the Regions on heritage matters and created the position of a state secretary for heritage issues. In Brussels, the public service «Direction des Monuments et Sites», dependent on the region of Brussels, became responsible for listings and archaeological excavations. In addition a particular heritage department depending on the city authorities, the «Cellule Patrimoine historique», was in charge of conservation of the built heritage. Another consequence of this new legislation was the creation of an archaeological service operating rescue excavations in the city. With the improvement in legislation concerning heritage sites in the nineties, frantic listing took place and the number of listed properties grew very quickly and reached 250 in a couple of years (Cordeiro and Moutury 2006). One reason was certainly a reaction to the destructive years that transformed large parts of historic Brussels and destroyed archaeological evidence of the origins of Brussels forever. This encouraging development however did not last for long. Already at the end of the legislation in 1996 the new government of the region of Brussels reduced the competences of the heritage state secretary. As a result of these changes, most of the archaeologists left and only a fragment of the former heritage service survived. Fortunately the situation did not go back entirely to its starting point and in 2004 the remnants

¹ In 1989, the heritage competence has been transferred to the Regions. In 1993, an ordinance defined the role and functioning of the Royal Commission of Monuments and Sites.

of the 1993 legislation have been included in the «Code bruxellois de l'Aménagement du Territoire (Cobat)».

The example of the «Grand Place» is symptomatic of this evolution and of the difficulties to protect historic centres. The square is a public space that is used by many different users, among whom tourists do not represent the majority. Users are mostly residents, passers-by and locals from the city of Brussels. Indeed the «Grand Place» and its surroundings target and successfully attract the younger generation with many bars, nightclubs and restaurants. The square is often crowded, particularly in summer, but since many of the visitors are not strictly speaking tourists, it seems inappropriate to talk about tourism overcrowding. The threat from tourism comes indeed not from direct physical degradation on site, but from uncontrolled development of service industries around the square, partly tolerated by the city's authorities. However these developments cannot be attributed solely to tourism authorities but to the absence of general town planning.

With the exception of punctual listings of buildings in the thirties (town hall, the King's House) and the seventies, the first plan to protect the «ancient character» of the Grand-Place and its vicinity was adopted in 1960. Named «Grand-Place et environs» (Grand-Place and surroundings), it covered an area corresponding to the future protection zone of the UNESCO. In the late nineteen seventies, when Belgium applied for the world heritage listing for the Grand Place, the map submitted to the UNESCO committee thus included an extensive protection zone around the site. However, this protection zone has been baffled with the constructions of hotels in an allegedly «ancient style» (Disney like) very close to the square (beginning of the nineties). This caused a transformation of the spatial configuration in the historic centre and generated a concentration of tourism service supplies. In 1996, the Regional Development Plan further defined a mixed protection area of the Grand-Place and surroundings which were placed in a perimeter of both cultural and historic interest and residential use. In order to confirm the buffer zone («îlot sacré») proposed in the application file for the UNESCO listing, it was also foreseen to adopt a «Plan particulier d'affectation des sols» (UNESCO 1998; Cordeiro and Moutury 2006). Although world heritage sites are requested to adopt a management plan since the reform

of the world heritage listing process in 1996, the Grand-Place site still lacks of such a plan despite several attempts to draw one (1998, 2007). Besides, the maps and plans that have been drafted after the inscription of the Grand-Place on the world heritage list did not respect anymore the first protection zone defined in the seventies and early nineties but they only show a very reduced buffer zone covering the square and adjacent buildings and excluding definitely the sector where the hotels have been built in the nineties. In order to remedy the situation, a working group for the «Grand Place – UNESCO» has been created recently with the task of setting up a new management plan, but such a plan has not been implemented yet. Moreover, the group does not refer to visitor statistics or even interpretation issues and take a purely conservative and building preventive perspective, as heritage authorities consider that they are not competent in tourism issues (see interviews below).

In this case, the role of the tourism authorities is equally complex. They did not confer the construction permission to the hotels, though they might have supported it. Brussels tourism authorities currently develop strategies to attract more visitors in Brussels, particularly on weekends, when hotels are mostly empty (Diekmann and Maulet 2009). In that context, heritage, particularly the Grand Place, is considered as the major pull factors for Brussels. They thus simply use the notoriety of the square in order to sell the destination, but they have no decision power on the urban development, which depends on the planning authorities. Actually, tourism authorities are neither competent for shops and restaurants and /or constructions and consequently, they do not have any influence on the site development. For instance, next to the «Grand Place» is a picturesque street, the «Rue du Boucher», full of restaurants hawking tourists and selling mostly low quantity food for over rated prices. International guidebooks warn visitors to go and eat there! Although aware of the problematic, tourism authorities cannot do anything to stop these businesses projecting a bad image of Brussels to visitors.

Finally, after the numerous listings in the nineties, only little happened to valorise the buildings and sites. The heritage side, in particular heritage associations and museums, only partly participated in educational actions and to some extent in interpretation but not in

larger tourism valorisation schemes. Tourism promotion is thus mainly operated by tourism offices without coordination with heritage stakeholders.

2.2. A Stakeholder's perceptions overview: preliminary results of the comparative study in Brussels, Rome and Madrid

The comparative research on Rome, Madrid and Brussels aimed to assess the similarities and differences of the tourism-heritage relationship in the capital cities under scrutiny. Based on the aforementioned observations that the communication between heritage and tourism sides is difficult, the research also assumed that the local conditions could influence the interactions between the heritage and tourism stakeholders. In this respect, the project developed common semi-structured interview guidelines in order to review the various perceptions of local key stakeholders towards heritage and tourism. In Brussels, the questionnaires have been adapted to the specific conditions of the tourism activity and heritage management. In addition to heritage administrations and tourism authorities, consumer and user groups were interviewed on three main topics:

1. *Perspectives and expectations in numbers: tourists, visitors and residents in the historic city.* The main questions were about the opinion of respondents towards the tourist and visitor flows in the historic centre and in how far tourism management policies are adopted to control these flows. Respondents were also asked whether they considered necessary and appropriate to increase the number of visitors in Brussels and its historic centre? Finally, they were questioned on the concentration of the cultural offer in the centre and the probable departure of residents, leading to a potential «museification» of the historic city.
2. *Quality of experience of users of the historic city.* Questions were concerned with the perception of the cultural offer in Brussels and its historic centres. Is the area of the historic centre specific, original or standardised? Respondents were also asked whether Brussels had to differentiate itself from other destinations and if yes, how?

3. *Quality of life in the historic city.* These questions were about the main environmental, socio-economic and cultural impacts caused by the increase of tourist flows. In particular, respondents were asked if they perceived these impacts as negative or positive?

The following section presents the preliminary results of this work in Brussels and focuses on heritage and tourism stakeholders, who will be dealt with separately. However, the research has not fulfilled the initial expectations and the study has been only partly achieved, since heritage and tourism players were not willing to participate and seemed little concerned by the issues of heritage management and tourism development². Some stakeholders altogether refused the interview (see below). Also, it has been impossible to make participant observations of the two sides in common meetings since these encounters are seldom, not to say lacking. Interviews were thus mostly led in face-to-face meetings, and in some cases, by phone. Besides, it was decided to respect the anonymity of respondents. Finally, most of the interpretations provided here are based on assumptions and former experiences of the authors and should be tested in the future by further surveys.

2.3. The heritage stakeholders' perceptions

The heritage stakeholders selected for the interviews were representatives of the Royal Commission Monuments and Sites», representatives of heritage associations, in particular «Voir et Dire Bruxelles» and the «ARAU»³, as well as museum curators (Magritte Museum, Royal

² Previous researches made by the laboratory LIToTeS confirm the difficulty to gain information from interviews with heritage and tourism stakeholders, i.e. the research on the expected impacts of the new Magritte Museum (Diekmann *et al.* 2009). It was the same for the organisation of a seminar on «sustainable heritage tourism» in the framework of the Cycle of Round Tables *A Sustainable Urban Tourism for Brussels*, that was held from March to May 2009 (Decroly *et al.* 2009). Indeed, Tourism and Heritage authorities declined the invitation to participate and only representatives of museums and heritage association accepted to take part in the debates.

³ «Voir et Dire Bruxelles» is a platform of various civic associations concerned with the political action and the organization of cultural visits. It is composed by

Museum of Fine Arts, Brussels Council of Museums). As aforementioned, the heritage administration refused the interview arguing that they were not competent or concerned by tourism issues. This attitude could be explained by the fact that their role is generally limited to the physical preservation of heritage buildings, while the preservation of the human and cultural values are rarely addressed. Heritage authorities do not feel concerned by the users and visitors, who they consider mostly as threats to the heritage. Therefore, they privilege a protectionist approach and think that tourism, particularly mass tourism, is an evil to avoid and eradicate rather than an activity to control. Consequently, they have no specific approach to the tourism management of heritage sites. They nevertheless recognize that education and sensitization, through the «Journées du Patrimoine» (Heritage days) and pedagogic visits, could help to protect the heritage.

Heritage associations' representatives were on the contrary interested in responding to the interviews, since they think that their lobbying action could inform about the threats linked to tourism and urban development. They believe that education and information are key elements of the preservation of heritage and they have a more constructivist approach of the heritage and tourism relationship. Also, museum curators have a more balanced opinion of the relationship and generally distinguish the various publics and their respective impacts on heritage⁴. They consider that tourism could be respectful and is not necessarily a mass activity. Both heritage associations and museum curators think that collaboration and dialogue should be fostered between heritage and tourism stakeholders in order to find a compromise between heritage protection and tourism development.

Concerning the three topics addressed in the interviews, some further observations have to be mentioned. Regarding the perspectives and expectations of tourists numbers, heritage authorities, heritage asso-

several Brussels associations, among which the «ARAU», the «Atelier de recherches et d'action urbaines» (the Group of Urban researches and actions).

⁴ Also, the approach of cultural tourism by curators of new infrastructures, i.e. the Magritte Museum, is much more visitors oriented than of the approach of those managing heritage sites and monuments.

ciations and museum curators agree to say that an increasing number of visitors is dangerous and threatens heritage sites. However, while heritage authorities usually refuse the idea of increasing the number of visitors some curators are aware of the importance of tourism as an economic resource for their museums. Therefore they emphasize the role of management plans and devices.

Regarding the quality of experience of users, heritage associations argue that the public space is not subject to standardised urban planning as there is a lack of planning at all. However, they denounce the risks of «museification» of the historic centre. In this respect, their opinion echoes the views of tourism stakeholders. Finally, regarding the quality of life, heritage associations assume that the poor management of some parts of the build heritage lead to urban decay impacting on the environment of resident populations. Also, the authorities sustain the idea that a controlled urban development could improve the life quality for residents and other users. However they do not necessarily believe that heritage protection and regulations would dispossess residents from the historic centre from the right to dispose freely of their properties and would cause their departure.

2.4. The tourism stakeholder's perceptions

The Tourism stakeholders interviewed were composed by representatives of the Brussels tourism authorities («échevinat» of Brussels and ministry of the French Community Commission in charge of Tourism – Cocof), tourism promotion agencies (Brussels International Tourism and Congress – BITC – and Tourism Promotion Office – OPT) hotel managers and representatives of restaurant and cafes (Horeca), tourist guides and to a lesser extent, tour operators, who refused the interview. In general, tourism stakeholders do not feel competent in heritage matters, even if they consider heritage as a major asset for tourism. Consequently they do not feel responsible for the management and protection of heritage but they sense that this task comes under the jurisdiction of heritage authorities. They also do not perceive the relationship between tourism and heritage as conflicting and problematic but rather as com-

plementary. However, they feel more and more concerned by the need of more sustainable tourism management. Indeed, the participation of representatives of the BITC, the OPT and the Horeca sector at the round tables on sustainable tourism, organised by LIToTeS at the request of the Cocof (March-May 2009, see Decroly *et al.* 2009) testified this increasing interest of these stakeholders for sustainable tourism issues. However, this interest rather concerns the modern infrastructures and the environmental issues than the built heritage.

Concerning the three topics addressed in the interviews, some further observations can be made. Regarding the perspectives and expectations of tourists numbers, tourism authorities and operators generally want to increase the number of tourists in order to create more jobs and to generate more economic income. As the tourist guide associations, they think that the increase of tourist numbers must be accompanied by a management plan. Regarding the quality of experience of users, tourist guides think that there are many bad tourist practices and a negative concentration of tourists flows and services in some quarters of the city centre («îlot sacré»). As for the Tourists authorities, they acknowledge a certain «negative» standardisation in the city centre (shops and restaurants from the «Rue des Bouchers» creating a bad image of Belgian products and gastronomy). The solution promoted by «supply» stakeholders consists in avoiding the «museification», and creating a specific product by developing cultural attractions and valorising Brussels's multiculturalism and gastronomy. They also intend to spread out tourists in other quarters. Finally, regarding the quality of life, tourism stakeholders believe that tourism development could impact positively on the local environment, by developing local infrastructures, creating local jobs and promoting contacts between tourists and residents, allowing an exchange and a better understanding between cultures. On the contrary, tourism stakeholders rarely mention the potential negative impacts of tourism activities.

3. CONCLUSION

This paper, based on conference presentations held in the framework of the MECOAN project, do not intend to shed a new light on the scientific and theoretical approaches of heritage and tourism relationship. It rather aimed at providing an empirical assessment of the relationship between tourism and heritage stakeholders. In the first part, the paper emphasized the dichotomous and conflicting approach of the relationship between heritage and tourism by focusing on the divergences between the players of both sides. While suggesting that interactions and collaboration could be fostered in order to allow a «balanced» tourism use of heritage assets, the paper showed, through the case of Brussels, that the misunderstandings and lack of dialogue are still present and important. In Brussels, heritage and tourism stakeholders are still interacting in a dialogue of «deaf», in which opposite perceptions of the tourism use of heritage site confront each other. This situation could be explained by several factors, and in particular the institutional organisation of heritage and tourism matters in the Federal State of Belgium. The sporadic encounters between the different stakeholders do not foster the dialogue. Each side remains focused on its matter of jurisdiction, i.e. Heritage for heritage stakeholders and Tourism for tourism stakeholders, arguing that they are not competent in the other matter.

Although for different reasons, both sides nevertheless need the heritage asset and have therefore a direct interest in its safeguarding. If tourism stakeholders might have interest in heritage management, it might although be argued that, if tourism stakeholders and heritage management would collaborate, the process of that commodification – the transformation of a cultural good into an economic asset – could be influenced and orientated by heritage experts. In Brussels the challenges regarding the heritage-tourism relationship are still numerous, but the problem presented in his paper could be solved. In this respect, integrated site management, such as the models developed in multicultural settings (Australia, Canada, United Kingdom) should be applied in historic centres, such as Brussels' centre, in order to preserve and valorise the cultural and economic values of the heritage. Indeed, while assuming that there is no opposition between the use of heritage and

its preservation, between cultural and economic interests, between tourism and heritage, this research urges communication between the various stakeholders, not only between heritage and tourist sides, but also between supply and demand sides. In this respect, further research should take into account other stakeholders (tourists, residents, etc.) and inform about the various perceptions of heritage and the respective expectations of stakeholders. The awareness of these latter could foster a new kind of dialogue, which could be fostered by workshops, unofficial or official meetings, common projects, etc.

4. REFERENCES

- Ashworth G. and Howard P. (eds.) (1999). *European heritage planning and management*, Exeter, Intellect.
- Avrami E., Mason R. and de la Torre M. (eds.) (2000). *Values and heritage conservation*, Research report, Los Angeles, The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Bouché N. (1998). *Tourisme et patrimoine urbain: les grandes interrogations*, in Cazes G. and Potier F. (eds.). *Le tourisme et la ville: expériences européennes*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Choay F. (1992). *L'allégorie du Patrimoine*, Paris, Seuil.
- Cordeiro P. and Moutury S. (2006). *Prise en compte d'un Patrimoine mondial au travers de mesures urbanistiques. La Grand-Place de Bruxelles*, in Patricio T., Van Balen K. and De Jonge K. (eds.), *Conservation in changing societies. Heritage and development*, Proceedings of the international Conference on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation (1976-2006), Leuven, 22-25 May 2006, 321-328.
- De la Torre M. (2002). *Assessing the values of cultural heritage*, Research report, Los Angeles, The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Decroly J.M., D'Ieteren E., De Myttenaere B. and Gillot L. (2009). *Un tourisme urbain durable pour Bruxelles*, Cycle of seminars organised by LIToTeS (IGEAT, ULB) at the request of the Cocof, Research report, Bruxelles.
- Diekmann A. (2004). *Bridging the gap: an inductive approach to the relationship between built heritage preservation and tourist consumption*, Brussels, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Unpublished Thesis PhD.

- Diekmann A. and Maulet G. (2009). *Diversifying the tourism product in Brussels*, in Maitland R. and Ritchie B.W. (eds.), *City tourism: national capital perspectives*, Wallingford, CABI.
- Diekmann A., Duquesne A.M., Gillot L., Maulet G. and De Nicolo B. (2009). *Les impacts de l'ouverture du Musée Magritte et du Palais des Congrès (SQUARE) sur la fréquentation touristique de la ville de Bruxelles*, Research report at the request of the Office de Promotion du Tourisme Wallonie - Bruxelles (OPT), January (Vol. 1) and February (Vol. 2), Bruxelles, IGEAT.
- Evans N., Campbell D. and Stonehouse G. (2003). *Strategic management for travel and tourism*, Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Gillot L. (2008). *La mise en valeur des sites archéologiques: un rapprochement entre archéologie, tourisme et développement. Le cas de la Syrie (Developping archaeological sites: bridging the gap between archaeology, tourism and development. The Syrian case)*, Brussels, Unpublished Thesis PhD.
- Holloway C. (1994). *The business of tourism*, London, Pitman Publishing.
- ICOMOS-UK (1990). *Heritage and attractions*, Canterbury, University of Kent.
- Law C. (2002). *Urban tourism: the visitor economy and the growth of large cities*, second edition, London, Continuum.
- Laws E. (1995). *Tourist destination management: issues, analysis and policies*, London, Routledge.
- McKercher B. and Du Cros H. (2002). *Cultural tourism – The partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*, New York, Haworth Hospitality Press.
- Page St. and Hall M. (2002). *Managing urban tourism*, Prentice Hall, Pearson Education.
- OPT (Office de Promotion du Tourisme Wallonie - Bruxelles) (2007). *Rapport annuel*, Brussels.
- Patin V. (2001). *Tourisme et patrimoine*, Paris, La Documentation française.
- Robinson M. (2000). *Tourism and heritage relationships: global, national and local perspectives*, Sunderland, Centre for Travel and Tourism in association with Business Education.
- Robinson M. and Picard D. (2006). *Tourism, culture and sustainable development*, Research report, Paris, UNESCO.
- Richter L.K. (2002). *The politics of heritage tourism development: emerging issues for the new millenium*, in Pearce D.G. and Butler R.W. (2002), *Contemporary issues in tourism development*, London - New York, Routledge, 108-128.

- Swarbrooke J. (1995). *The development and management of visitor attractions*, Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Urry J. (2000). *The tourist gaze – Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*, London, Sage.
- UNESCO (1998). *Proposal for registration of the Grand-Place in Brussels on the World Heritage List*, May 1997, Paris.

RIASSUNTO

Con l'aumento dei flussi di turismo urbano, molti centri storici soffrono di sovraffollamento. I responsabili della gestione del patrimonio culturale sono preoccupati per i rischi che derivano dal turismo di massa mentre allo stesso tempo le autorità turistiche continuano a cercare di attrarre nuovi visitatori. Questi opposti approcci da parte di chi è responsabile del patrimonio e di chi è responsabile del turismo rendono difficile mettere in opera strategie di gestione integrate. Nella prima parte vengono prese in esame le complesse relazioni tra il patrimonio e gli attori turistici e viene introdotto il caso della «Grand Place» un patrimonio dell'umanità nel centro storico di Bruxelles. Nella seconda parte gli autori presentano i primi risultati di una analisi comparata applicata ai vari attori che hanno interessi nella tutela e nelle relazioni con il turismo.