

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Heritage Exclusivism in Postcolonial Algeria: Assessing Local
Heritageness in Annaba, Towards a Holistic and Participatory
Approach to Urban Heritage Management
Aouchal, Hocine, Boufenara, Khedidja and Verdini, Giulio**

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in The
Historic Environment: Policy & Practice, DOI:10.1080/17567505.2022.2146236.

The final definitive version is available online:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2022.2146236>

© 2022 Taylor & Francis

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to
make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and
Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Heritage exclusivism in postcolonial Algeria: Assessing local heritageness in Annaba, toward a holistic and participatory approach to urban heritage management

Hocine Aouchal ^a, Khedidja Boufenara ^a and Giulio Verdini ^b

^a *Department of Architecture, Faculty of Earth Sciences, University Badji Mokhtar Annaba-Algeria (UBMA)*

^b *School of Architecture and Cities, University of Westminster London-England*

Corresponding author: Hocine AOUCHAL, e-mail: h.aouchal@hotmail.com

Phone: +213 699 664131

Hocine Aouchal is Assistant Professor and Deputy-Head of the Department of Architecture in charge of pedagogy at UBMA. He holds a Magister degree in strategies of heritage conservation from University of Constantine 3. Currently preparing a Ph.D. Thesis on urban heritage management in Algeria, and was previously an Architect at '*DUC-Annaba*'.

Khedidja Boufenara is Senior-lecturer at UBMA. She holds a Magister degree in construction materials in 1989 from UBMA and PhD in planning in 2010 from the University of Constantine. Her interests are mainly in architectural, urban and urban health history along with cultural heritage.

Giulio Verdini is Reader in Urban Planning at the School of Architecture and Cities of the University of Westminster, and visiting Professor at the Polytechnic University Mohammed VI of Ben Guerir in Morocco. He is the co-author of the book *Management Planning for Cultural Heritage: Places and their significance* with Prof. Ken Taylor, and Editor of the Routledge Book Series 'Heritage, Planning, and Sustainability'.

Heritage exclusivism in postcolonial Algeria: Assessing local heritageness in Annaba, toward a holistic and participatory approach to urban heritage management

Abstract

This paper focuses on urban heritage meanings, values, and management challenges in postcolonial Algeria, and particularly on the question of exclusivism of *non-traditional* urban places in heritage discourse. In the process of reconstruction of homogenous national postcolonial cultural identities, local heritage views and perspectives are often ignored. This paper suggests looking simultaneously into national policies and legislative texts on urban heritage, and local stakeholders' perceptions of what heritage should be, to identify gaps and potentially ways to improve current urban heritage governance. The comparison between both national and local urban heritage indicators helps identify mechanisms and impacts of national exclusivism in the protection of urban heritage. Moreover, the result of focus groups and interviews with Annaba's citizens, specialists, and officials, has helped unravel the potential of a more place-based approach to heritage management in Algeria. We argue that focusing on the local heritageness of undesignated urban places could pave the way for a more forward-thinking, holistic and inclusive approach to community-based urban heritage management. It is a methodology with wide potential in contemporary North-Africa.

Keywords: national exclusivism; heritage discourse; urban heritage management; local stakeholders; local heritageness; holistic and community-based approaches; postcolonial Algeria; Annaba

Introduction

Urban heritage has regained international attention only recently.¹ Its meaning has shifted, from being primarily focused on its materiality, to a wider understanding of the social value and significance for affected communities.² The practice of urban heritage management is, therefore, no longer solely based on expert opinion but on citizens' engagement.³ This is an approach characterised as community-based, holistic and

participatory management and promoted by the Nara Document, the Faro Convention, the Burra Charter and the UNESCO Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) Recommendation. In Algeria, the dominant political discourse is crystallised in a postcolonial nation-building⁴ process that, understandably, opposes the legacy of French occupation and its violent cultural imposition. This is the result of a process of cultural reappropriation that has served the political purpose of re-defining the nation, using heritage as a powerful discursive construct. It is not far from what Smith has called *Authorised Heritage Discourse* or *AHD*⁵. Algeria was, moreover, a crossroads for numerous civilisations which explains its profusion of cultural heritage, as well as its conflicting meanings. Therefore, selective heritage approaches have been adopted in the reconstruction of a '*national story*'⁶ and cultural identity, typical of postcolonial countries. In practice, this has meant a focus on national unity, rejecting colonial symbols from national heritage but it carries the risk of undermining the meaning and value of some local tangible and intangible heritage representations and views. The combination of these factors can produce an exclusive national heritage discourse affecting both heritage management and *heritageness*⁷ itself at a local level. In narrowly understanding heritageness as a '*concept-objet*'⁸, postcolonial, dominant and exclusivist discourse ignores the attachment of local communities to their places, impeding de facto the recognition, protection and transmission to future generations of new forms of heritage.

This paper aims to unravel the mechanisms and impacts of national exclusivism on local urban heritage recognition and management. This can shed light on the challenges of current urban heritage governance, especially the fact that local stakeholders' heritage perspectives are often at odds with those imposed at national level. In taking this approach the paper contributes to the identification of the national-

local gap in heritage governance and formulates recommendations for the implementation of a more holistic and participatory approach to the management of urban heritage in Algeria.

Questions relevant to this research are, how do national heritage policies affect living, diverse and local urban places in Algeria? Is there discordance between the meaning of heritage in national policies, and how is heritage perceived locally? What are the local stakeholders' reactions to national discourse, and how does this contribute to understanding local values? And finally, what does urban heritage represent to people, and how is it possible to improve its management to reflect this?

In responding to these questions, we provide an account of the national evolution of heritage discourse, and consequent governance arrangements, before and after the colonisation, from the denial of Islamic roots to the unresolved rediscovery of tangible and intangible values. Secondly, the paper adopts a discursive approach to analyse the gap between current legislative texts and policies, and local heritage perspectives based on focus groups and interviews with Annaba's stakeholders.

Historic overview: the use and meaning of heritage in Algerian policies

Algeria occupies a very particular context in the Maghreb and broader North-African region due to the violent nature of its French colonisation.⁹ In comparison to the French protectorates of Tunisia and Morocco, urban and architectural heritage was subject to a greater level of destruction and alteration,¹⁰ during the colonial period when the cultural heritage discourse was intentionally selective and focused mainly on its materiality.¹¹ Three consecutive periods characterise cultural policy in Algeria.¹² The first (1830-1870) was distinguished by colonial dominance and the violent process of forceful acculturation when symbols from Islamic periods were subject to destruction, alteration,

and mostly replaced by new dominant European forms *e.g.* neoclassic architecture. Algerian traditional sociocultural expressions were marginalised¹³ amid scientific and artistic explorations focused mainly upon Roman archaeological sites¹⁴ to consolidate the new colonial State built on, what was considered, *ancestral* territory.¹⁵ The second period (1870-1939) was characterised by rhetorical tolerance of Berber and Arab-Islamic cultures even though colonial patterns of dominance were still tangible.¹⁶ This policy shift from dominator to apparently protector of indigenous arts and cultures recognised only a few emblematic monuments and sites from the Islamic periods, though it led to the retention of some urban heritage. The last period before independence (1939-1962), was merely a continuation of the previous two. Therefore, with the Revolution (1954-1962), Algerians reclaimed their oppressed intangible heritage with a sense of resistance and pride.

The colonial material-based approach transposed and imposed a Western meaning of heritage which was in contrast with pre-colonial Islamic perceptions.¹⁷ Traditionally, in Islamic culture, monuments from all periods of the past are seen as historic documents from which facts and lessons can be learnt.¹⁸ Further, heritage values ‘...*from the viewpoint of Islam can be expressed as: spiritual, historical and scientific*’,¹⁹ even if, in Islam, they are also related to *ethics* and *normative codes* of behaviour²⁰ within religious and sociocultural practices. This is less materialistic than the Western attitudes though not incompatible with international laws.²¹ In fact, a progressive shift towards social values,²² as advocated by the Burra Charter, and the emphasis given to participatory heritage management approaches, from Nara to Faro Convention and HUL, have the potential to acknowledge the *immateriality*²³ of the Islamic perspective. In Islam, it is believed that everything is ephemeral and subject to decay, except for the divine. This explains the emphasis on the usefulness of a building

rather than on its material aspects, which can also be observed in the traditional reuse of materials and ornaments of collapsed buildings to create new functional ones. This approach is not, however, uninterested in material heritage.²⁴ An example in this respect is the notion of *Wakf* or *Habous*,²⁵ a perpetual public utility endowment that requires financial and management planning to ensure its durability. Although it originated as a religious donation to respond to the needs of the unprivileged and the poor, *Wakf* is considered an Islamic conservation practice that has helped preserve numerous historic buildings.²⁶ However, in the colonial period, many *Wakf* properties in Algeria were confiscated and controlled by the French administration. A *Wakf* building -pious or charitable- is therefore not conserved for aesthetic or historic purposes but to fulfil its usefulness and beneficence. Thus, immateriality, reusability, and usefulness could be considered principles of a traditional conservation approach in Islam. However, in the pursuit of modernity of the Nation-State, the official Algerian perception of heritage was developed from selective material-based French approaches rather than reassessment of heritage values according to its traditional Islamic roots.

When founded, the Algerian State set out to redefine its national identity by severing ties with the French regime. The process was complex and generated three consecutive cultural policies, and within each, cultural heritage was instrumental in achieving political objectives. The *Resumption*²⁷ policy of 1962-1967 was initiated by the 62-157 law; it was necessary to rely temporarily on colonial legislation and institutions that were vital to the functioning of the new Nation-State. Moreover, cultural heritage was used as a powerful display of political change. Some colonial monuments were subject to destruction and alteration, while monuments converted in the French period, especially Mosques, were returned to their original function²⁸ e.g. *El-Bey* mosque and its palace in Constantine, *Abou-Merouane* in Annaba and *Ketchaoua* in

Algiers. Later, with Ordinance 67-281, the *Algerianisation* period lasted from 1967 to 1998. However, it was still influenced by French legislation despite efforts to free heritage policies from conformity to French laws. For example the *Wakf* practice was legally re-adopted, even if, only as a religious charity governed by the Ministry of Religious Affairs and not in the sense of cultural heritage. The result was that Algeria used its pre-colonial heritage to redefine its postcolonial national identity²⁹ excluding the French period. Within this set of policies, there were only two protection systems; classification and inventory inscription. The more urban-focused French *Malraux law* (1962) on the 'safeguarded sectors' was yet to be adopted in Algeria. It was not until 1990 that urban heritage was considered part of urban management, with the adoption of the 90-29 law using two urban management instruments: Master Plan for urban Arrangement and Planning (*MPAP*)³⁰ and Land-Use Plan (*LUP*).³¹ This legislative text introduced an orientation in urban policies toward heritage preservation.³² Furthermore, it shifted understanding of urban heritage from its consideration as a monument to a place where change is inevitable.³³ Urban instruments, though, should specify management rules for cultural heritage and its surroundings, without which they are not properly adapted to heritage management and local realities.³⁴ The last and current policy period from 1998 to the present day has attempted to take heritage protection forward as a scientific and rational notion. This period is the most significant and was implemented by the 98-04 law, mainly with its recognition and requirement for the management of urban and intangible heritage. This law provided a framework of administrative procedures, agencies and rules between national and local scales. Moreover, it substituted urban land-use instruments with *PPSVSS*³⁵ (Permanent Plan for the Safeguard and Valorisation of Safeguarded Sectors) within officially designated urban heritage. This policy held far-reaching legislative texts related to the

implementation of the 98-04 law. Particularly, ED 03-324, which amended and supplemented by ED 11-01, which made the management of national urban heritage finally possible. It was not until 2005 that official recognition of safeguarded sectors took place. However, many urban heritage places are not officially recognised. These are described as *existing* or *old urban fabrics* and are not considered heritage in official discourse. Furthermore, in 2016, these excluded places were incorporated in ED 16-55 which focuses on local management, defining these urban places as dilapidated and unhealthy in need of rehabilitation. The latter concerns excluded *not classified and not protected*, mainly colonial, places, respecting, however, their *intrinsic values*. Although this policy stipulates that cultural heritage is related to all historic periods, urban places from the French period are still officially unrecognised and excluded. Indeed, French urban places as colonial heritage collide with the Algerian re-constructed national identity as it holds negative collective memories. The recognition of these places can be controversial.³⁶ Therefore, by emphasising the significance of place in a non-ideological values-based approach,³⁷ this paper argues that local communities who reside and interact within excluded urban places can have views which differ and diverge from official perspectives.

Urban heritage governance: from policies to practice

Cultural heritage governance

Definitions and categories: Cultural heritage is defined in law 98-04 as the set of public and private cultural properties within the national territory inherited from different civilisations from prehistoric periods to this day.³⁸ Moreover, there are three main categories of Algerian cultural heritage: immovable, movable and intangible cultural properties. The innovative feature of law 98-04 is not only in the recognition of

intangible heritage but the inclusion of urban heritage. This is recognised, not as a monument, but as an urban place in the category of Immovable Cultural Properties (ICP).

Protection systems:

[Table.1 near here]

Table1 shows three protection systems for ICPs; classification, inscription, and safeguarded sectors. Properties whose conservation is threatened are subject to the ‘*instance de classement*’ which is a temporary measure pending classification. There are, moreover, two levels of heritage decision-making in Algeria: national and local. Classified properties and safeguarded sectors are listed in the general inventory of cultural properties at the national level. At the local level, properties can be inscribed in a supplementary inventory by local decree. However, this is only a temporary inscription and authorisations and approvals are exclusively within the prerogative of the Ministry of Culture. In particular, urban heritage is protected as a safeguarded sector by a management plan (PPSVSS) that replaces land-use plans. Although the law stipulates that local initiatives of recognition, originated by interest groups such as associations and citizens, are admissible, the legislation does not lay down clear and efficient participatory mechanisms. The only exception is for a register of complaints in which concerned citizens, especially owners, can express their opposition to official recognition. As a result, official decision-making in urban heritage governance is exclusively national and centralised.

Main agencies and procedures:

[Figure.1 near here]

There are many cultural agencies. However, our focus is on those who directly manage ICPs and urban heritage in particular (Figure.1). The Ministry of Culture and Arts (*MCA*) represents the central agency of decision-making in heritage governance and the system is highly centralised. At the national level, *MCA* has two main agencies regarding ICPs according to ED 05-80. Firstly, the Directorate of Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Heritage is responsible for elaborating programmes of conservation for cultural properties, managing the inventory and working as the Secretariat of the National Commission of Cultural Properties (*NCCP*). Secondly, the Directorate of Legal Protection of Cultural Properties and Valorisation of Cultural Heritage is responsible for the application of legal procedures and implementation of cultural heritage policy. Furthermore, the *NCCP* is an important agency with a consultative role regarding the implementation of the law and provides an opinion on classification, inscription, and the creation of safeguarded sectors. Moreover, the Cultural Heritage Fund is an agency charged with financing management operations. At a local level, two of the main institutions of local governance are the People's Assembly of the Wilaya³⁹ (*PAW*)⁴⁰ and the People's Municipality Assembly (*PMA*)⁴¹ for each municipality as deliberative entities, whilst the Wali⁴² is an executive entity. These assemblies are composed of elected members, the Wali is appointed by the Government and the *Mayor*⁴³ is elected President among the members of the *PMA*. In regard to heritage matters, the Wali is consulted by the Local Commission of Cultural Properties (*LCCP*) that evaluates proposals for classification and inscription before transferring them to the *NCCP*. Local inscription can be signed by the Wali (Table.1) following receipt of a favourable opinion by the *LCCP*, which has for its Secretariat the Directorate of Culture and Arts (*DCA*). The latter is a local division of the *MCA* and is, according to ED 94-414, mainly charged with animating cultural activities, coordinating

with civic associations, and safeguarding cultural heritage. LCCP and DCA are the main links between national and local heritage management. Indeed, the Wali is notified of any decision on heritage recognition within their Wilaya and in turn, they then notify local agencies. Moreover, another agency of the MCA is the local division of the national Office of Management and Exploitation of protected Cultural Properties (*OMECP*)⁴⁴ which is responsible for the management and economic exploitation of officially recognised cultural properties; it works closely with DCA, yet it has a clear focus on the management and use of ICPs. In addition, there are two other further agencies outside the MCA: the Directorate of Planning, Architecture and Construction (*DPAC*),⁴⁵ under the Ministry of Housing, Planning and the City (*MHPC*), and Old Buildings and Urban Heritage Department (*OBUHD*) is a Department of the Municipality's Technical Services. These two agencies have management responsibilities for undesignated urban heritage as *old urban fabrics* though not for officially designated places.

In particular, local agencies have fewer prerogatives concerning urban heritage. Since 2011,⁴⁶ the implementation and management of PPSVSS is no longer a prerogative of the DCA, but a task of the National Agency of Safeguarded Sectors (*NASS*).⁴⁷ Therefore, officially urban heritage falls into two categories; those under PPSVSS and those without. Algeria counts nineteen urban Safeguarded Sectors among which only five⁴⁸ PPSVSS are approved because of the slowness of unclear procedures and their deficient implementation.⁴⁹ Indeed, without this instrument, local management of officially recognised urban heritage is minimal. For example, the Medina of Annaba is pending a PPSVSS despite being officially designated in 2013. In the absence of PPSVSS, local authorities have very limited prerogatives and can stay proceedings in regard to residents' demands for repair and maintenance until PPSVSS is approved.

This situation has created a discordance between official conservation of urban heritage and the needs of its residents. This has led them to take charge of their living environment, for example by embellishing some streets and the ongoing rehabilitation of *El Bey* Mosque. This national-local gap in urban heritage governance must be taken into account when considering the needs of the community and their perspectives in order to reassess current heritage values and increase the efficiency of urban heritage governance.

Cultural heritage in urban governance

Urban and heritage governance have two distinct policies implemented by two different sectors in Algeria; respectively, MHPC and MCA which are represented locally by DPAC and DCA. Consequently, urban governance policy vaguely stipulates heritage preservation. For example, the 06-06 law only considers cultural heritage as part of planning orientations but not of urban development. This means that urban governance agencies have no prerogatives over safeguarded sectors where land-use plans are replaced by PPSVSS. Furthermore, the absence of an holistic approach to management is the main reason for the separation of safeguarded sectors from urban dynamics, a factor which also explains their lamentable state. Locally, MPAP and LUP are the main instruments for urban governance. MPAP is an urban management instrument which sets basic guidelines for land-use in one or many municipalities. LUP is a land-use instrument that manages the quality of the built environment respecting MPAP's orientations. Indeed, both instruments are set to promote heritage protection, however, in many cases heritage is often omitted in these plans and they sometimes fail to respect specific protection procedures. For example, planning projects within the setting of historic monuments have led to construction that does not correspond to heritage

protection policy in terms of visibility, style or function.⁵⁰ These kinds of actions have contributed to the devaluation of many historic monuments such as the *Hafsid* Citadel in Annaba. Nevertheless, undesignated urban heritage is managed entirely by land-use instruments which lack heritage management strategies. Consequently, urban heritage management takes two forms, PPSVSS for officially designated places of which most are still, after years, awaiting management, and Land-Use Plans for undesignated places considered, at best, *old urban fabrics* to be rehabilitated.

Urban heritage management in Annaba

Annaba is a plain between the mountain of Edough and the Mediterranean, a flat land interrupted by hills and bordered by yellow beaches. It was *Hippone* in Antiquity, *Bûna Al Haditha* during the Islamic periods and *Bône* under French colonisation; the toponymy of the city reveals the stratification of its historic urban environment. Moreover, changes from one period to another have led to social and economic restructuring, mainly with the shift from agriculture to an industrial city, the inevitable rural exodus and resulting rapid urban sprawl.

[Figure.2 near here]

However, with its growing population, the historic urban environment was densified with new urban and architectural forms established at the expense of the historic places. The resulting urban landscape holds numerous landmarks and sites, although not all are recognised. The Medina is Annaba's only officially recognised urban heritage structure.

[Table.2 near here]

Table2 illustrates the exclusive character of Algerian postcolonial policy of the French period. Recognition of national heritage focuses on the Islamic periods, with the

designation of more than 70% of such cultural properties. The remainder is represented by the *Hippone* archaeological site and its cisterns, which are both managed by PPVAS. Heritage from the Islamic periods is mostly located within the only safeguarded sector. However, the Medina, despite its designation, is in a lamentable state; urban ruins, voluntary destruction, loss of traditional practices and high crime rates are its contemporary characteristics.

[Figure.3 near here]

In contrast, the colonial city has not been recognised and is not even included in a Land-Use Plan. Nonetheless, local actions to rehabilitate old places were launched with Wali decree N°688 of 05-03-2012; particularly in relation to the colonial city. An official DPAC report⁵¹ went so far as to describe these places as heritage, historic, and old places. This local decision generated further diagnosis of old buildings in twelve places, an alarming concern over Medina's dire state⁵² and rehabilitation projects for which DPAC is the contracting authority, *e.g.* rehabilitation of *Cours de la révolution's* façades (see Figure.5), which is legitimised and organised by the previously mentioned ED 16-55. Despite this, no action could be planned in the Medina. This argues for more governance efficiency and the relevance of localism in a holistic and participatory approach to heritage assets in Algeria.

[Figure.4 near here]

[Figure.5 near here]

Assessing urban heritageness and exclusivism in national and local discourse

This study so far, has revealed a number of aspects of Algerian heritage policies and practice, both at the national and local level at Annaba: heritage is more politically

deployed than culturally conserved; heritage recognition is highly centralised; and policy conforms to an outdated French legislation. By ignoring other approaches, procedures and policy implementation are slow, often resulting in a lamentable state of urban heritage. Moreover, individual participation is purely tokenistic. Two issues in particular will be further analysed in this paper, the views of ignored communities and the conflicts between local heritageness and national exclusivism in the heritage-making process. Addressing these as discursive constructs and as indicators in political and local discourse, the goal is to understand the differences and similarities in urban heritage meaning. A second objective is to understand the differences in values and management perspectives between policies and social views, in order to highlight the principal obstacles and opportunities and to move toward a local, participatory and holistic urban heritage management.

Analysis of urban heritage in national discourse

This section critically analyses current understanding of what constitutes urban heritage in national heritage discourse, taking into consideration 98-04 law and ED 03-324 amended and supplemented by ED 11-01. The goal is to identify how exclusivism operates, understand its impacts on urban heritage management and identify its indicators. The analysis is structured around three points: terminology, meanings and management actions which are generated by political discourse related to urban heritage. Our analysis reviews the frequency of equivalent and contextual terms of urban heritage management and the semantic relations between such terms. We also focus on the meaning of absence, overuse or substitution of terminology, and on indicators of urban heritageness in management texts where this is made material by the use of adjectives. Ultimately these factors have generated exclusivist actions in urban

heritage recognition and management. For more objectivity, we have used the semantic analysis software *Tropes*.⁵³

Analysis of urban heritage in local discourse

In Annaba, the goal is to assess local urban heritage and its meanings, values and local perspectives on its management. In particular to assess the local heritageness of excluded urban places to better target possible changes in national policy as a means to implement holistic and participatory approaches. The first step was to identify local stakeholders, citizens, heritage specialists –academics and professionals- and heritage officials and the second to select methods of communication appropriate to the different categories.

Focus groups for local citizens: Focus groups were chosen as an exploratory methodology often used in qualitative research.⁵⁴ Focus groups can offer more in-depth results and generate ideas and views on knowledge, perception and understanding of local problems. The collected data consisted of verbal and non-verbal interactions between the participants, their reactions to images displayed from different places in the city and maps on which they have defined the historic urban environment. Moreover, the method was planned for eight weeks and structured on three key points; sampling, questions and analysis. The recruitment was based on two main criteria: homogeneity and heterogeneity. General homogeneity is important to avoid dominant voices, and is materialised by residency and knowledge of the city; participants must be Annaba's residents for a significant number of years, to ensure that they have developed a sense of place and an understanding of its meanings.⁵⁵ Furthermore, heterogeneity guarantees diversity and representativeness; diversity in terms of inclusiveness, yet the children category (under twenty) was excluded because the focus was on adult residents who

have more knowledge and diverse social interactions. Also, the sample is representative of different categories of local citizens, based on statistics from the National Office of Statistics⁵⁶ with respect to gender, age and education.⁵⁷

[Table.3 near here]

The sampling procedure consisted in limiting the number of participants per group to between 6 to 10 to guarantee a dynamic debate. We stopped after three groups because no new themes or ideas on urban heritage emerged. The third group constituted a repetition of some ideas from the first and second groups. Further, these semi-structured collective interviews were based on open-ended questions mainly around heritage meaning, significant places, their representations and use, and finally views on heritage management.

Debate group for heritage specialists: Debating groups were assembled from local most notorious architects and planners who have operated on Annaba's architectural and urban heritage, from academics and professors in the Department of Architecture in Annaba alongside post-graduate students. All of these specialised in heritage studies and have contributed to Annaba's cultural heritage. In addition, representatives of associations and social media groups promoting Annaba's architectural and urban heritage were invited. The questions were open-ended, targeting opinions and views on urban heritage management. These addressed local heritageness and excluded urban places, and community engagement in the heritage process from intellectual and professional perspectives. The debate was carried out with ten participants and recorded.

Interviews for local officials: Local agencies have experience and knowledge about the limits and obstacles to proper heritage management. Selected agencies were those directly managing official and unofficial urban heritage (Figure.1). These are DCA, OMECP, DPAC and OBUHD and interviews were conducted with five key officials. These were the Head of heritage department and the Coordinator of heritage from the DCA, the Regional-Head of OMECP, the Head of planning department of DPAC and the Head of OBUHD. This group comprised architects, planners or archaeologists by training. Interviews were involved open-ended questions about urban heritage management, participatory mechanisms, exclusivism and heritage recognition. Each interview was recorded.

Analysis: This was based on content analysis of all collected data from recordings and notes for which analytical categories were; meaning and terminology of heritage, reaction to exclusivist discourses, indicators of urban heritage values and heritageness, as well as views on management approaches. Data processing was more semantic because the aim was to identify similarities and differences between national and local perspectives. Further, quantification of qualitative data into maps, tables and graphs was necessary to further interpretation and then crossmatched with heritage realities in Annaba. The total sample from all categories of stakeholders was 39 participants.

Urban heritage assessment in national discourse and local perspective

Results of national discourse analysis

The findings of national discourse analysis emphasise urban heritage management and reveal mechanisms of national exclusivism and its impact in terms of statistics,

terminology, semantics and governance. Our analysis also describes what comprises local heritageness in the national discourse.

Terminology and lexical fields: Tropes software generated used references and counted frequencies of each occurrence and we have focused on terms strictly related to urban heritage management. Monuments, sites and practices are indicated under one head that substitutes 'cultural heritage' for 'cultural properties' and is more cited than any other term. In contrast, 'urban heritage' is completely absent and substituted by 'safeguarded sector' which is used in both urban and rural heritage as a protection system for both elements. Although the frequency of the term 'safeguarded sectors' is relatively low, its concentration is significant (Figure.6), mainly because it is one of the innovations in Algerian conservation. Moreover, the replacement of 'urban heritage' by a 'safeguarded sector' can imply an emphasis on one common set of characteristics. These may be embodied in the terms *Medinas*, *Kasbahs* and *Ksour* as specific lexical referents indicating what constitutes urban heritage in the national discourse.

[Figure.6 near here]

The terms *Medina* and *Kasbah* designate fortified North-African Islamic cities whereas *Ksour* are fortified places in the southern region of the Maghreb. These are either Berber-Islamic, e.g. *Ksour* of the *M'zab Valley*, or the product of Jews and Getules⁵⁸ which were then Islamised after the Islamic conquests. The three terms correspond to pre-colonial urban heritage, and thus exclude the colonial period placing emphasis on Islamic⁵⁹ places. Furthermore, the term management is less cited although its lexical field is more common, especially when terms related to *management* constituted a *trend* of the late 1990's and increased at the start of the 2000's.⁶⁰

[Figure.7 near here]

Moreover, it is noted that the use of classification terms is the highest and is mainly associated with tangible heritage which implies that the term ‘cultural property’ largely emphasises Immovable Cultural Properties (ICPs) and mainly historic monuments.

Meaning of urban heritage and indicators of national exclusivism: Urban heritage is described by a set of characteristics justifying thus its heritageness. Although the texts recognised cultural heritage from the prehistoric to the present day, the characteristics of urban heritage have at the same time a sense of the exclusive. Consequently, the definitions contain four indicators of exclusivism, which define urban heritage:

- (1) *Traditional:* The most significant exclusivism indicator. This is used to define urban heritage as ancestral, pre-colonial, and particularly Islamic-related. It excludes colonial urban places and some local sites which are neither *Medina*, *Kasbah* nor *Ksour*, and do not have a traditional character.
- (2) *Residential* (summarising the expression *characterised by their predominance of habitat*): It implies meanings of living place. Nevertheless, being inhabited is a *sine qua non* condition to create a safeguarded sector; the text does not offer any real participatory mechanism in urban heritage management and does not associate protection with intangible heritage and practices. This implies that this expression, even if it is about living places, is insufficient to include local residents in heritage process.
- (3) *Homogeneity:* Promoting an atomistic management approach based on separate urban entities. This is yet another way to exclude urban places outside pre-

colonial typologies *i.e.* homogeneity is defined as *historic and aesthetic unity* impeding the recognition of overall stratified urban historic environments.

(4) *Historical*: This is an exclusivist indicator when associated with *traditional* as it indicates relevance only to traditional Islamic periods. The result is that urban heritage from the French period is excluded. This aligns with selective postcolonial heritage policies. However, classification and inscription of historic monuments from the colonial period, although rare, have been designated, for example the *Basilica Notre Dame d'Afrique* in Algiers and the local inscription of other colonial monuments.

Local heritageness in exclusivist discourses: Local heritageness is embodied in the text by two indicators; local inscription and *Significant Local Value (SLV)*. The former is the only protection system (Table.1) that operates at both national and local levels. In fact, this is not local heritageness but just a temporary measure to prepare and justify national classification. SLV indeed represents a semantic ambiguity. The term clearly implies a value through which local heritage could be recognised, though it is not defined, and is only associated with inscription procedures. Nor does it take account of local citizens' views or local heritageness in the sense of a category or entity which can be distinguished from a national value. Nonetheless, it represents an opportunity to recognise local heritageness that needs to be valorised. In particular, urban heritage is excluded from this narrative as decision-making related to its recognition and management occurs at a national level.

Generated actions for heritage management: Exclusivism is found to be a normalised management practice both at heritage and heritageness levels. The former relates to the exclusion of urban heritage values and places related to negative collective memories

that do not fit the selective national discourse *i.e.* the exclusion of the French period and local places that are not considered significant and relevant to reconstructed national identity. The latter relates to a more subtle exclusivism, to the extent of systematically excluding local stakeholders from decision-making in the urban heritage process, thus affecting local heritageness of urban places. Indeed, exclusivist political discourse has resulted in urban heritage representing only approximately 2% of the general list of cultural properties.⁶¹ Moreover, safeguarded sectors promote an Islamic-related typology, thus excluding local and social values associated with excluded places.

Results of local discourse analysis

Analysis of the local heritage discourse has focused on urban heritage management at local scale in terms of used terminology, meanings of urban heritage and its values. It illustrates reactions to the dominant national discourse, especially to assessments of local urban heritageness, local views of official management and excluded urban places.

Terminology and meanings: The terminology used by specialists and officials is nearly identical. For both, colonial places are considered an urban heritage. However, the lexical composition used by local citizens was more interesting; it is simple yet it has deep significance when used to describe heritage in general. Most participants used the term heritage both in Arabic and French (تراث/*Patrimoine*) associating it with ancestral properties referring to a *traditional* sense of heritage using terms such: heritage, traditional, historic, inherited buildings and places, and traditional practices. Some citizens systematically used many other terms relating to heritage recognition that have slightly different meanings to cover *non-traditional* heritage *i.e.* legacy, old neighbourhoods, remains, relics or ancient centers. Consequently, the majority of citizens recognised colonial places as heritage, yet only a small minority of participants

considered them as ‘*aggression*’ and ‘*intrusion*’ with the remainder seeing them as no longer French but *their own* with which new memories were associated and for which a willingness of transmission was observed. Consequently, heritage meanings to citizens can be categorised into five groups:

- (1) *Relative to the past, old, ancient...:* historic or not, this heritage meaning is independent from different ideologies. It embodies considerations of buildings and sites ‘... *Even something from the colonisation period*’;
- (2) *Ancestral (traditional):* Islamic-related heritage considered as ancestral. The influence of national discourse attributing a *traditional* indicator to these periods was observed. Although most properties identified as a manifestation of this meaning coincide with Annaba’s national heritage list, some other urban places were considered traditional even if not nationally relevant *e.g. Beni M’haffer*⁶²;
- (3) *Intangible heritage:* traditional music, cooking, artefacts, practices and community know-how mainly related to religious practices and social cohesion. These practices were mostly associated with the Medina, *Beni M’haffer* and *la colonne*⁶³;
- (4) *Natural heritage:* the beaches and Edough Mountain were important for their natural, cultural and social characteristics; a place that assembles relics associated with traditional practices since the antiquity;
- (5) *Representations of social identity:* specific to Annaba’s local context *e.g.* accent, traditions and way of life; specific social characteristics of residents.

Local heritage recognition, values and local urban heritageneess indicators:

Local heritage recognition by local stakeholders encompassed many urban places from different periods and typologies, other than the Medina. This is in contrast to the

national discourse and to Annaba's national list (Table.2), which was judged as '*Post-Card*'⁶⁴ monuments. All three categories of local stakeholders recognised nearly identical heritage places, with the exception that some industrial sites were not identified by citizens (Figure.8). It was, in fact, surprising to most officials and specialists to see what citizens considered their urban heritage environment. This was especially the case for specialists whose emphasis was on citizens' '*ignorance*'. Moreover, when asked about the most emblematic heritage in Annaba, almost every participant, whether in focus groups, debate or individual interviews, identified the Medina and the Basilica Saint-Augustine. These represent two extremes of the heritage spectrum in Algeria, a traditional, nationally recognised place, and a colonial, previously locally listed monument.⁶⁵ Although the focus was mainly on the Medina, local stakeholders emphasised four undesignated urban places, colonial city, *cours de la révolution*, *la colonne*, and *Beni M'haffer*.

For local specialists and citizens, values were more memorial and social than historic and rather economic for some officials. Moreover, local values were found to be narrowly linked to social cohesion and to traditional practices especially for citizens for whom the Medina, *Beni M'haffer*, and *la colonne* were associated. Further, other colonial urban places were appreciated for their aesthetic and use values e.g. colonial city, *Champs de Mars*, and noticeably the *Cours de la révolution* for the additional social value associated with social interactions. The latter is the most emblematic and frequented public space. Based on the description and representation of recognised places by most stakeholders, urban heritage was categorised into national and local assets. The former relates to historic *traditional* heritage, whilst the latter corresponds to *non-traditional* places.

Local urban heritageness indicators were deduced based on local heritage recognition and values, as such:

- (1) *Local values*: memorial, social, and economic rather than historic. Recognised urban places were also appreciated for their aesthetic and use values;
- (2) *Social cohesion*, particularly for local citizens who emphasised places where social aspects are-or-were organised by community laws, *savoir-vivre*, and know-how;
- (3) *Intangible heritage* is associated with the most emblematic urban places. The Medina, *Beni M'haffer*, and *la Colonne* were considered the places within which cultural expressions and community practices thrive;
- (4) *Heterogeneity* means that the identified historic urban environment (Figure.8) is heterogeneous and representative of its stratified quality, as well as inclusive of colonial and specific local places.

Views on urban heritage management:

Citizens have expressed sadness over urban decay, deterioration of the local historic built environment, and the loss of half of *Beni M'haffer* due to a project that was never completed. A minority even questioned the need to renovate the Medina because it no longer has value due to its aggravated deterioration, a position largely opposed by the remainder.

Specialists have largely debated the state of the urban historic environment and its management. Urban decay, especially at the Medina, was thought to be politically motivated in support of big *projects*, such as a controversial shopping mall project. Some participants were pro-regeneration and others were hesitant due to the loss of

authenticity. The second concern was about *El Bey Mosque* and volunteer actions for its rehabilitation led by a social media group and some residents. Some specialists supported this, yet for others, concerns about authenticity were raised.

Officials passionately regretted the dire state of the Medina. However, they were well-aware that the absence of PPSVSS and its centralised procedures are key factors in the inefficiency of official urban heritage management. Most officials interviewed considered official recognition double-edged; they welcomed national recognition, yet they did not appreciate the limitation it implied on their prerogatives in urban heritage management. Moreover, even if local official recognition by inscription has listed mainly monuments from the French period (Table.4), urban heritage remains strictly nationally recognised.

A constructive way forward for local urban heritage management in Algeria

This discussion section addresses our research objectives comparing national exclusivist discourse to local heritage reality and suggesting a strategic approach to urban heritage in Algeria based on local stakeholders' views.

From discourse to reality

The results of our research have shown both concordance and discordance in urban heritage recognition and meaning. Similarities are embodied in the *traditional* indicators associated with Islamic-related heritage, which stakeholders considered ancestral.

Discordance though was clear in colonial and other *non-traditional* urban places.

However, the appropriation of these nationally excluded places by citizens was based ironically on *traditional* indicators, which through interaction became tolerated⁶⁶ for their usefulness and for aesthetic reasons rather than avoided for negative, historic

memories. They were even appropriated in the sense of social cohesion and traditional practices as they became the physical vessel where a community's cultural expressions came to life. In fact, heritage discordance is mainly in the interpretation and manifestation of the term *traditional*. At a national level the term is associated with the typology and historic period of places, and in local views it is associated with how places are (re)appropriated and (re)used. The origin of this discordance can be traced back to the independence period when Algeria officially adopted French material-based approaches, while citizens maintained an Islamic view of their environment. Consequently, Annaba's old and historic urban environment was found to be more diverse when identified by local stakeholders. Furthermore, most citizens of all demographic categories re-appropriated colonial places. In fact, even senior citizens (re)appropriated them as they represented new memories diverging from negative historic connotations.

[Figure.8 near here]

Table4 shows more details on heritage recognition discordance and local reactions to national exclusivist discourse. Moreover, the comparison of national and local urban heritageness indicators implies two very different approaches to heritage. The national approach is more material-based, promoting a more fragmented approach to management. However, local citizens' views were related more to value and community-based approaches, which could indicate perspectives for holistic and participatory management based on community involvement. The latter is advocated in other cultures, *e.g.* Japanese Shinto and Chinese Confucianism where the principles of inclusiveness and participation, correspond to Islamic ethics of morality and community-led sustainable resource management.⁶⁷

[Table.4 near hear]

Today the DCA is preparing four new proposals for local inscription and also the proposition for the national classification of the Basilica St-Augustine. However, urban heritage is the most contentious property because *non-traditional* places are only identified by local stakeholders and are not officially recognised (Figure.9). Thus, local urban heritage is at risk, especially since local values are not considered at national level. A postcolonial national identity should not impede the recognition of local heritageness, especially in the absence of participatory mechanisms.

[Figure.9 near here]

From exclusivism to community-based approaches. Local heritageness as a key component to holistic and participatory approaches in Algeria

The national exclusivism of local heritageness in Algeria is an obstacle to an integrated community-based approach, which, by contributing to localism in urban heritage governance, is advocated⁶⁸ to improve local citizens' attachment to heritage and to its management. However, the results of this research, regarding urban places excluded in national discourse and locally recognised, is that there is an opportunity to design a better way to recognise and manage urban heritage. The opportunity can be seized in two different ways. The first one consists of including local heritage views and perspectives about excluded places into national discourse by redefining urban heritage with an emphasis on its social and local values. The second is a pragmatic compromise to maintain the postcolonial political tendency while adapting the protection system at the local level. It would mean keeping the national definition of urban heritage and developing, meanwhile, a clear definition of the SLV based on local stakeholders' values and heritageness indicators. This local definition should include urban heritage

and should be developed in a participatory way. The local protection system should be definitive and inclusive of urban heritage places, and should not require any further national approval. This would certainly require a new set of procedures, additional funding options, and new management instruments as part of a more effective decentralised local governance system of urban heritage. Under these conditions, the system would meet the requirements of a community-based approach in the sense of the *Nara* Document; interpreting heritage as an expression of people's responsibility, as emphasised in the *Faro* Convention; and ultimately as an holistic and integrated urban-change approach to management as advocated by the HUL Recommendation. In addition, approaches to urban heritage should focus progressively on significance and 'thoughtful change'⁶⁹ in an attempt to reconcile urban heritage and urban development in a sustainable way. Therefore, ad-hoc plans of action could be inspired by community-based and heritage-led urban development initiatives and projects which are flourishing elsewhere,⁷⁰ such as the COMUS⁷¹ and KAIRÓS⁷² projects. National exclusivism is an obstacle to the heritage democratisation process. However, the assessment of local heritageness, as evident in the case of Annaba, can inspire an ad-hoc, local, participatory and holistic urban heritage governance in Algeria.

Conclusion

Algeria clearly manifests an exclusivist postcolonial heritage discourse; a selective reconstruction of national identity collectively rejecting urban places from the colonial period and ignoring, in the process, potential impacts on local urban management and on the attachment of local citizens to their heritage. In particular, urban heritage was found to be the most contentious cultural property lodged between national political discourse and local viewpoints. Urban heritage is also the most affected by the dualism

of national exclusivism, which tends to undermine both the local heritageness of urban places, including colonial assets, as well as the importance of local stakeholders' perspectives and their representation in urban heritage management. The tangible result of this paper is that it reveals the nature of heritage discordance, its specifics, and its impacts on urban heritage governance. Even with many limitations, such as the absence of recent statistics and the difficulties of conducting focus groups and interviews during the recent pandemic, this paper has revealed the existence of local urban heritageness. This is in contrast with the national viewpoint and offers opportunities for localism and democracy in urban heritage management. Further, other Algerian local contexts should be studied in order to have a wider assessment of the Algerian situation and their contribution to ad-hoc participatory, holistic, and inclusive approaches at the local level. In addition, this paper proposes ways to include local perceptions and perspectives on heritage in national legislation by focusing on local heritageness as a linchpin for more heritage democracy and decentralisation in Algeria. As the Algerian heritage law is currently under revision, this paper offers insights on how to work with local stakeholders in order to bridge the national-local gap and pave a better future for urban heritage governance.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank everyone who participated in focus groups, debate group and interviews. Also, we are grateful for the input of the Editor and Reviewers of this Journal.

Declaration of interest statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes

1. Taylor and Verdini, *Management Planning for Cultural Heritage*.
2. Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, and Colenbrander, "Urban Heritage."
3. Díaz-Andreu, "Heritage values and the public"
4. Hill, "Identity and Instability in Postcolonial Algeria."
5. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*.
6. Hall, "Whose Heritage?"
7. Translation of the French term '*patrimonialité*' which means qualities and characteristics for which monuments and sites become heritage / attachment of the population to these places.
8. Watremez, "Comprendre Une Relation Au Patrimoine."
9. Grandguillaume, "Les médinas, lieux d'inscription de la culture musulmane."
10. Van Der Meerschen, *Les Médinas Maghrébines*, 80.
11. Matri, "Regards croisés sur la patrimonialité et la conservation."
12. Risler, *La politique culturelle de la France en Algérie*, 15.
13. Ibid, 16.
14. Oulebsir, *Usages du patrimoine*.
15. Aouchal, "La basilique St-Augustin et ses abords à Annaba." 92.
16. Ibid, 88.
17. See 14 above, 14.
18. Hodjat, "Cultural Heritage in Iran." 273.
19. Ibid.
20. Mahdy, "Is Conservation of Cultural Heritage Halal?"
21. Alshehaby, "Cultural Heritage Protection in Islamic Tradition."
22. See 3 above.
23. See 14 above, 14; less concerned with the veneration of objects and more about knowledge, practices and usefulness.
24. Ibid, 15.
25. Mortmain, an inalienable property conserved and used for the public interest.
26. See 20 above.
27. Schéma directeur des zones archéologiques et historiques (2007).
28. See 15 above, 94.
29. See 14 above, 305.
30. Official acronym in French PDAU: *Plan Directeur d'Aménagement et d'Urbanisme*.
31. Official acronym in French POS: *Plan d'Occupation des sols*.

32. Mazouz, “Le Renouveau Du Patrimoine Bâti Vétuste En Algérie.”
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Official acronym in French PPSMVSS: *Plan Permanent de Sauvegarde et de Mise en Valeur des Secteurs Sauvegardés.*
36. Ben-Hamouche, “L’Heritage Architectural Colonial.”
37. See 1 above.
38. Law 98-04, article 02.
39. Algerian administrative division.
40. Official acronym in French APW: *Assemblée Populaire de la Wilaya.*
41. Official acronym in French APC: *Assemblée Populaire Communale.*
42. Representative of the State at local level. A Governor.
43. Official title in French: *Président de l’APC* or *P.APC.*
44. Official acronym in French OGEBC: *Office de Gestion et d’Exploitation des Biens Culturels protégés.*
45. Official acronym in French DUAC: *Direction d’Urbanisme, d’Architecture et de la Construction.*
46. This is the result of amendment of Article 17 of ED 03-324 by ED 11-01.
47. Official acronym in French ANSS: *Agence Nationale des Secteurs Sauvegardés.*
48. Two of them very recently in 2021.
49. Khelifa-Rouaïssia and Boulkroune, “Le Patrimoine Architectural de l’époque Coloniale Française.”
50. See 15 above, 112.
51. Issued in April 2021.
52. Nearly 40% of buildings risking collapse in 2012.
53. Seignour, “Méthode d’analyse Des Discours” ; Boudene, “Image de La Ville.”
54. Krueger, *Focus Groups.*
55. Sundberg, “Heritage Perceptions.”
56. No new statistics available since 2008.
57. Architects, planners and heritage specialists are excluded from university-level educated citizens.
58. Mahrouf, “Contribution à l’élaboration d’une typologie ‘umranique’ des ksour dans le Gourara.”
59. Not only in a religious sense, but in an urban and architectural morphology and typology related to the Islamic civilisation.
60. See 2 above.
61. <https://www.m-culture.gov.dz/index.php/fr/liste-des-biens-culturels>, accessed 05 June 2021.

62. Auto-constructed place which urban morphology is not typically Islamic-related.
63. One of colonial city's extensions.
64. Touristic and iconically monumental.
65. No longer listed since March 2021, however protected within the surroundings of Hippone site.
66. Marschall, "The Heritage of Post-Colonial Societies," 350.
67. See 20 above.
68. Ripp and Rodwell, "The Governance of Urban Heritage."
69. See 2 above.
70. See more in Ripp, "Writing a New Story."
71. COMMunity-led Urban Strategies in historic towns; applying Faro's principles.
72. 2019-2022; considering urban heritage a resilient asset in a participatory approach.

Bibliography

- Alshehaby, Fatimah. "Cultural Heritage Protection in Islamic Tradition." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 27, no. 3 (August 2020): 291–322.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739120000259>.
- Aouchal, Hocine. "La basilique St-Augustin et ses abords à Annaba. Pour une reconnaissance politique et sociale des valeurs des abords du patrimoine bâti en Algérie." Université de Constantine 3, 2013.
- Ben-Hamouche, Mustapha. "L'héritage Architectural Colonial □: Possession Et Patrimonialisation Contestées. Cas de l'Algérie." *African and Mediterranean Journal of Architecture and Urbanism* 2, no. 2 (December 8, 2020).
<https://doi.org/10.48399/IMIST.PRSM/amjau-v2i2.20976>.
- Berger, Stefan, Bella Dicks, and Marion Fontaine. "'Community': A Useful Concept in Heritage Studies?" *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26, no. 4 (April 2, 2020): 325–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1630662>.
- Boudene, Youcef. "Image de La Ville Dans Le Texte Législatif Algérien Analyse Sémio-Lexicale." Magister, Batna, 2011.
- Demeter, Laura. "Value Creation Mechanisms and the Heritisation of the Communist Legacy in Romania," 2014. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.5027.4883>.
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita. "Heritage Values and the Public." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 4, no. 1 (January 2, 2017): 2–6.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2016.1228213>.

- Giblin, John. "Critical Approaches to Post-Colonial (Post-Conflict) Heritage." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, 313–28. Springer, 2015.
- Goh, Daniel P. S. "Between History and Heritage: Post-Colonialism, Globalisation, and the Remaking of Malacca, Penang, and Singapore." *TRaNS: Trans-Regional and -National Studies of Southeast Asia* 2, no. 1 (January 2014): 79–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/trn.2013.17>.
- Grandguillaume, Gilbert. "Les médinas, lieux d'inscription de la culture musulmane : l'exemple de Nédroma." In *Histoire de l'Algérie à la période coloniale*, 428–31. Poche / Essais. Paris: La Découverte, 2014.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.bouch.2013.01.0428>.
- Hall, Stuart. "Whose Heritage? Un-Settling 'the Heritage', Re-Imagining the Post-Nation." In *The Politics of Heritage* □: *The Legacy of Race*, J. Littler and R. Naidoo (eds). 37–47. Routledge, 2005.
- Harrison, Rodney, and Lotte Hughes. "Heritage, Colonialism and Postcolonialism." In *Understanding the Politics of Heritage*, 234–69. Manchester University Press, 2010.
- Hill, Jonathan N.C. "Identity and Instability in Postcolonial Algeria." *The Journal of North African Studies* 11, no. 1 (March 2006): 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13629380500409735>.
- Hodjat, Mehdi. "Cultural Heritage in Iran □: Policies for an Islamic Country." PhD, University of York, 1995. <https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/2460/>.
- Jones, Siân. "Wrestling with the Social Value of Heritage: Problems, Dilemmas and Opportunities." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 4, no. 1 (January 2, 2017): 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2016.1193996>.
- Jørgensen, Helle. "Postcolonial Perspectives on Colonial Heritage Tourism: The Domestic Tourist Consumption of French Heritage in Puducherry, India." *Annals of Tourism Research* 77 (July 1, 2019): 117–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.05.001>.
- Khelifa-Rouaïssia, Sihem, and Heddy Boulkroune. "Le Patrimoine Architectural de l'époque Coloniale Française Au Prisme Des Politiques Patrimoniales Algériennes: Cas de l'hôtel de Ville de Bône." *Synthèse: Revue Des Sciences et de La Technologie* 34 (2017): 63–73.

- Krueger, Richard A. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Fifth edition. SAGE Publications, 2014.
- Mahdy, Hossam. “Is Conservation of Cultural Heritage Halal? Perspectives on Heritage Values Rooted in Arabic-Islamic Traditions.” In *Values in Heritage Management: Emerging Approaches and Research Directions*, by Erica Avrami, Susan Macdonald, Randall Mason, and David Myers. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2019. <http://www.getty.edu/publications/occasional-papers-3/part-two/9/>
- Mahrouf, Illili. “Contribution à l’élaboration d’une typologie ‘umranique’ des ksour dans le Gourara.” *Insaniyat / إنسانيات. Revue algérienne d’anthropologie et de sciences sociales*, no. 51–52 (June 30, 2011): 197–219. <https://doi.org/10.4000/insaniyat.12766>.
- Marschall, Sabine. “The Heritage of Post-Colonial Societies.” In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, B. Graham and P. Howard. 347–64, 2008.
- Matri, Faiza Bruscella. “Regards croisés sur la patrimonialité et la conservation de l’héritage traditionnel en Tunisie aux XIXe et XXe siècles.” *Nouvelle revue d’esthétique* 21, no. 1 (November 19, 2018): 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.3917/nre.021.0073>
- Mazouz, Fatima. “Le Renouveau Du Patrimoine Bâti Vétuste En Algérie. Le Cas Du Centre-Ville d’Oran.” *Droit et Société*, no. 1 (2015): 151–70. <https://doi.org/10.3917/drs.089.0151>.
- Mydland, Leidulf, and Wera Grahn. “Identifying Heritage Values in Local Communities.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18, no. 6 (November 2012): 564–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.619554>.
- Oulebsir, Nadia. *Les Usages du patrimoine: Monuments, musées et politique coloniale en Algérie, 1830-1930*. Editions de la maison des sciences de l’homme, 2004.
- Parkinson, Arthur, Mark Scott, and Declan Redmond. “Urbanity, Exclusionary Discourses and Built Heritage Policy in Ireland.” In *International RC21 Conference*, 2013.
- Ripp, Matthias. “Writing a New Story: Using Heritage-Based Urban Regeneration to Stimulate Urban Resilience.” Accessed December 2, 2021. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/writing-new-story-using-heritage-based-urban-stimulate-ripp>.

- Ripp, Matthias, and Dennis Rodwell. "The Governance of Urban Heritage." *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* 7, no. 1 (2016): 81–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2016.1142699>
- Risler, Camille. *La politique culturelle de la France en Algérie: les objectifs et les limites, 1830-1962*. L'Harmattan, 2004.
- Seignour, Amélie. "Méthode d'analyse Des Discours." *Revue Française de Gestion*, no. 2 (2011): 29–45.
- Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. New e. edition. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Sundberg, Madelyn. "Heritage Perceptions: A Study of Southwest Minneapolis," 2016.
- Taylor, Ken, and Giulio Verdini. *Management Planning for Cultural Heritage: Places and Their Significance*. London: Routledge, 2021.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315718484>.
- Van Der Meerschen, Michel. *Les Médinas Maghrébines*. Etudes et Documents Sur Le Patrimoine Culturel. UNESCO, 1987.
- Veldpaus, Loes, Ana R Pereira Roders, and Bernard J F Colenbrander. "Urban Heritage: Putting the Past into the Future." *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* 4, no. 1 (April 2013): 3–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1179/1756750513Z.00000000022>.
- Watremez, Anne. "Comprendre Une Relation Au Patrimoine Par Une Analyse Sémiotique Du Sensible." *Communication Langages*, no. 4 (2010): 163–77.
<https://doi.org/10.4074/S0336150010014092>
- Watremez, Anne. "Vivre Le Patrimoine Urbain Au Quotidien: Pour Une Approche de La Patrimonialité." *Culture et Musées*, no. 11 (2008): 11-36.
<https://doi.org/10.3406/pumus.2008.1467>
- Wu, Zongjie, and Song Hou. "Heritage and Discourse." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, edited by Emma Waterton and Steve Watson, 37–51. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137293565_3.

Legislative texts

Loi 62-157, du 31 décembre 1962, tendant à la reconduction de la législation en vigueur au 31 décembre 1962

Ordonnance N°67-281, *du 20 décembre 1967*, relative aux fouilles et à la protection des Sites et Monuments Historiques et Naturels

Loi 90-29, *du 1er décembre 1990*, relative à l'aménagement et l'urbanisme

Décret exécutif N°94-414, *du 23 novembre 1994*, portant création et organisation des directions de la culture de wilaya

Loi 98-04, *du 15 juin 1998*, relative à la protection du patrimoine culturel

Décret exécutif N°03-324, *du 5 octobre 2003*, portant modalités d'établissement du plan permanent de sauvegarde et de mise en valeur des secteurs sauvegardés

Décret exécutif N°05-80, *du 26 février 2005*, portant organisation de l'administration centrale du ministère de la culture

Loi 06-06, *du 20 février 2006*, portant orientation de la ville

Décret exécutif N°11-01, *du 05 janvier 2011*, modifiant et complétant le décret exécutif N°03-324

Décret exécutif N°16-55, *du 1er février 2016*, fixant les conditions et modalités d'intervention sur les tissus urbains anciens

Table.1. Protection systems for ICPs; It shows details for each system and clearly displaying national centralisation of decision-making.

Protection system	Decision-making	Nature of the protection	Targeted ICP	Procedures and legislations	Management plan or instrument	Effects of the protection
1. Classification	National	Definitive	• Historic monuments	Ministerial decree	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection zone (surroundings) of 200 metres minimum • Any work of valorisation, construction, infrastructure, fragmentation and modification on the classified property and its surroundings is subject to authorisation of the Minister of Culture
			• Archaeological monuments and sites	Ministerial decree	PPVAS (Plan for the Protection and Valorisation of Archaeological Sites)	
			• Archaeological reserves	Ministerial decree	Delimited and mentioned on LUP and MPAP	
			• Cultural parks	Joint ministerial decree	GPDP (General Park Development Plan)	
1.1. 'instance de classement' : an emergency classification	National	Temporary (two years)	Same as classification	'Ouverture d'instance de classement' decree	Pending classification, otherwise monuments and sites will no longer be protected after 02 years	Same effects
2. Inscription (supplementary inventory)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National • Local 	Temporary (ten years)	Used more for monuments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministerial decree • Wali decree 	If not classified, monuments will no longer be protected after 10 years	Same effects
3. Safeguarded Sectors (SS)	National	Definitive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban • Rural 	SS created by: Joint ministerial decree PPSVSS approved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >50k residents: Joint ED • <50k residents: Joint decree 	PPSVSS	Same effects within the limits of the SS PPSVSS replaces land-use instruments

Table.2. List of nationally classified cultural heritage of Annaba according to Ministry of culture, 2021

N°	Heritage	Period	Protection system	Year of recognition
1	Hafsid Citadel and remains of the Fort and Rampart of the old city of Annaba	Medieval-Islamic	Classified	1978
2	Hippone cisterns	Antiquity		1900-1968
3	El Bey Mosque	Medieval-Islamic		2007
4	<i>Koubba</i> of Sidi Brahim El Mirdassi	Medieval-Islamic		2007
5	Abou Merouane mosque	Medieval-Islamic		2015
6	Hippone archaeological site	Antiquity		1952-1968
7	Old city of Annaba (Medina)	Medieval-Islamic (Stratified)	Safeguarded sector	2013

Table.3. Composition of focus groups and number of participants.

Categories	Age >20			Gender		Education		
	20-29	30-59	>60	Male	Female	University	non-univ.	No education
Percentage	33.11%	52.23%	14.67%	50.04%	49.96%	11.1%	73.3%	15.3%
Number of participants	<p style="text-align: center;">1st group = 08 + 2nd group = 10 + 3rd group = 06</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Total = 24 participants</p>							

Table.4. Concordance and discordance in cultural heritage recognition between national, local official inscription, and local (unofficial) citizens' recognition

Monuments and sites	Historic Periods	Nature of Properties	Main values (by citizens)	National recognition	Local inscription	Local citizens' recognition
Hafsid Citadel	Medieval Islamic	Archaeo./Arch.	/	✓	-	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hippone cisterns	Antiquity	Archaeo.	/	✓	-	<input type="checkbox"/>
All the other National monuments and sites of Annaba (Table.2)	Mostly Medieval-Islamic	Arch./ Archaeo./ Urban	Historic. and also Memorial/ Social / Use	✓	-	✓
Rahman Mosque	Modern	Arch.	Aesthetic/ Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
City hall	French	Arch.	Aesthetic/ Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
Regional theatre	French	Arch.	Aesthetic/ Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓
Diana's Statue (<i>El Gh'zala</i>)	French	Urban Statue	Aesthetic/ Memorial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
Covered market	French	Arch.	Use/ Social	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓
Basilica St-Augustine	French	Arch.	Aesthetic/symbolic/memorial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (2011-2021)	✓
Train station	French	Arch.	Aesthetic/ Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓
Cap de garde (<i>Ain ben sultane</i> / marble quarry/ Lighthouse/ Caves)	Stratified	Mult. Properties at the same coastal landscape	Aesthetic/Use/memorial/ social	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓ (only the Lighthouse and its surroundings)
Aqueduct of <i>Seraidi</i>	Antiquity	Archaeo.	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Fortin de la Caroube</i>	French	Arch.	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Pierre et Marie Curie</i> Building	French	Arch.	Aesthetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓
<i>Mountazah</i> Hotel	Modern	Arch.	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Cours de la révolution</i>	French	Urban	Use/ Social/ Aesthetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
Colonial city	French	Urban	Use / Aesthetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
<i>La colonne</i>	French	Urban	Social/Memorial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
<i>Beni M'haffer</i>	Local (specific)	Urban	Social/Memorial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
<i>Champs de Mars</i>	French	Urban	Use/Aesthetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
<i>El kattara</i>	Local	Intangible	Social/Memorial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
<i>Malouf</i> Music/ Traditional bridal and women's wear/ culinary heritage	Local	intangible	Social/Memorial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
Beaches/ Edough Mount.	Local	Mixed Nat./Cult.	Social	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓

Figure.1. Main national and local agencies for urban heritage governance

Figure.2. Urban history and sprawl through different periods in Annaba

Figure.3. Urban ruins and decay of the Medina

Figure.4. Some Land-Use Plans covering City-Center' places; Colonial City is not included

Figure.5. On-going rehabilitation of *Cours de la Révolution's* façades

Figure.6. Frequency of *urban heritage* equivalent and contextual terms; some urban-related terms were manually added to have a whole understanding of urban heritage terminology.

Figure.7. Term *management* lexical field; manually composed from *used references* and their frequency.

Figure.8. Urban old and historic environment between national and local recognition; limited areas are the result of the accumulation of recognised places by participants and intermediate old places

Figure.9. Heritage periods and properties between official (national and local) and citizens' recognitions

Word count:

Authors bio (including Affiliations): 192 words < 200 words as instructed

Abstract: 175 words < 200 words as instructed

Keywords: 08 keywords < 10 keywords as instructed

Main text (inclusive of Tables, References, and all Captions as instructed):

9349 words < 10000 words as instructed

Endnotes: 607 words