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Vanishing heritage, materialising memory: construction, destruction and social action in contemporary Madrid
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These lieux de mémoire are fundamentally remains, the ultimate embodiments of a memorial consciousness that has barely survived in a historical age that calls out for memory because it has abandoned it.

(Nora 1989, 12)

This chapter is not a defence of neocapitalism and its effects on archaeology and heritage. However, it reflects on the results of this model and its consequences for the construction of new memories and realities. Within a context of constant change, development has become one of the main characteristics of recent years. The destruction of the built environment in late modernity has been recognised as closely related to the loss of memory within our society (Connerton 2009). Meanwhile the reactions to the destruction of archaeological heritage argue for creating these lieux de mémoire (Nora 1989) in Madrid as a form of memory materialisation within a clear context of destruction.

Much has been written about commercial archaeology and the loss of archaeological heritage (for example, Aparicio 2015; Gnecco and Schmidt Dias 2015). However, we begin with the question: what is the generative dimension of this destructive process? Although far from perfect, current (commercial) management models have saved some archaeological sites from destruction. And although we cannot assume that those sites were the most valuable, either for science or for the general public, both those sites saved and those destroyed constitute the basis for
the future construction of – at least – the official collective memories of regions and countries.

In considering this approach, this chapter tackles these issues from different perspectives. First, it explores the development of archaeological heritage management in Madrid through its legislative development and some examples. Subsequently, it addresses two significant foundations of archaeological heritage management: values and discourses. The chapter concludes with what we recognise as a positive turn in the understanding of the dynamics of archaeological heritage management, value and memory.

Archaeological heritage management in Madrid

Spain suffered a traumatic dictatorship since the uprising and consequent Civil War of the 1930s. After years of isolation, the backing of the United States and the Stabilization Plan of 1959 led to an economic boom that eventually had tremendous consequences for archaeology. Urban and peri-urban spaces were deeply affected by new developments (industry, housing and infrastructure), which started the beginning of rescue archaeology in the 1960s (Rodríguez Temiño 2004).

The Law of Urban Planning of 1956, and associated instructions approved by many cities in the early 1960s (for example, Madrid in 1964), collided with a still working republican law, amended only by a decree of 1958 that allowed the administration to be aware of any works conducted near registered monuments. Nevertheless, there was still a lack of resources and planning actually to record everything that appeared during construction works and was not already registered under the 1958 decree. Weeks before the death of dictator Francisco Franco in November 1975, Spain ratified the London Convention of 1969, and the Transition to the new regime saw deep legal changes. A first draft in 1981 considered the regulation of urban archaeology (Fernández Miranda 1980), but the law finally passed in 1985, the LPHE (Ley 16/1985 de Patrimonio Histórico Español), set a different scenario. The State decentralised and autonomous competencies emerged, being the Culture ones for Madrid granted weeks before the approval of the LPHE. These fresh competencies meant that the new law just passed had to be applied regionally, in a process where each region took a different path – although all led to a very similar destination (Querol 2010).

A new model for managing archaeological heritage in Madrid emerged in the late 1980s. This model, known as the Modelo Madrid,
sowed the seed of preventive archaeology (for example, Querol and Martínez Díaz 1996); it opened the door to commercial practice similar to the British model started by RESCUE (Rahtz 1974). Modelo Madrid was based on the identification of large archaeological areas, in which interventions should be conducted only when building work was taking place (Velasco 1992). Modelo Madrid was theoretically useful to enforce the law, but it led to a management model in which the regional government merely overviewed private intervention in an administrative manner.

Commercial archaeology grew rapidly after Spain joined the European Economic Community (as it was then named) in January 1986. It subsequently adopted the basic principles of European policy, such as the Polluter pays principle and a wider attention to heritage in the planning process. This responded to the Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment. This in turn forced the approval of the Real Decreto Legislativo 1302/1986, de 28 de junio, de evaluación de impacto ambiental, which enforced the need for environmental impact assessments (including on cultural heritage) and opened the door to the implementation of the Polluter pays principle in Spain.

Some major construction works illustrate how the management model in Madrid evolved. During the 1990s the construction of a tunnel and an underground parking space in the centric Plaza de Oriente unveiled remains of the medieval city. The threat of destruction to these remains led to some protests and deep concern over the way in which the process was managed (for example, Caballero Zoreda 1996). Dozens of comprehensive interventions have affected the surrounding area over the last 30 years, thus making the remains visible in many cases—whatever the conditions—thanks to the social and professional impact of the events at Plaza de Oriente. Soon after this occurred, the construction of a new terminal for Barajas airport projected major archaeological works (Aena 1999). The media reported the biggest archaeological survey in Spain’s history, involving almost 12,000 pits and several excavations. There is no trace of the results of this survey in Barajas, nor in the collective memory of the capital.

However, it is possible that the biggest intervention in archaeological heritage (mis)management started in the early 2000s. The terraces of the Manzanares river are one of the main protected archaeological areas in the region, and a series of tunnels crossing them were proposed. The developers decided to split up the project into small sectors to avoid obligations regarding environmental impact assessment—a dodge that resulted in sanctions from the European Court of Justice and the Superior Court of Madrid. The works did not stop, however, and hundreds of
archaeologists tirelessly recorded all sites affected. The investment in archaeology was unprecedented, but the outcome for society was not substantial. After a temporary exhibition of ten months duration, along with its catalogue (Rus and Domínguez 2008) and several scientific publications, all the archaeological work was plunged into oblivion until now. Meanwhile new underground lines (Trabada et al. 2006), or the so-called Túnel de la Risa (‘Tunnel of Laughter’) between Chamartín and Atocha stations, managed to commit vast sums of money to relocate and display archaeological remains, such as those on Ópera station or the one of El Buen Suceso in Sol, the centre of Madrid (Fig. 7.1).

While those examples show the darker side of commercial archaeology, they also resulted in the beginning of new interests such as Modern and Contemporary Archaeologies in Spain (Bengoetxea 2017: 66). Examples like Casas del Canal in 2000 (Morín de Pablos et al. 2002) set the starting point of a crucial period for the development of an archaeology of the Spanish Civil War. In this instance commercial archaeology has been key – not only in terms of research, but also of public outreach and policy shaping (with a new plan to document, study and protect all the remains of the period in Madrid, being heavily funded by the regional government).

Figure 7.1 Remains of El Buen Suceso in Sol train station. The outcome of the display is questionable, but the investment had no precedent in Madrid. Photograph © the authors.
The panorama remained mostly unchanged. *Modelo Madrid* was out of effect after many interventions in protected areas, and the new models of preventive archaeology fomented more flexibility. However, the reality was far from optimistic and the predation of developers appeared to have no limits. Madrid had approved its own regional heritage law in 1998, under consensus, but had not included many advances in comparison to the national frame law. In 2011, following Spain’s ratification of the Valletta Convention, a professional association of archaeologists, AMTTA, posted several parliamentary questions regarding the law’s regulatory development. The written answer on 24 November stated that the law was sufficiently regulated and there was no need for further changes (PE 195/11 R 3049). This was ratified in a sectorial committee on 11 February 2012. Only 12 days later, however, the press office of the regional government announced an imminent new law whose draft was ready by the end of May. Why? Maybe the forces of neoliberalism.

The legal fight against this new law was fierce. Firstly, AMTTA made some amendments (*AMTTA 2012*) while different statements and news were released (for example, *Ansede 2012*; *Querol 2012*; *Torija López 2012*). That summer AMTTA integrated into MCyP, a civic platform already fighting for many heritage sites in the region, and so pushed ahead the protest against the law (*Fig. 7.2*). A working group of experts was set up.

*Figure 7.2*  During a protest against the new law and for the protection of cultural heritage in front of the main building of the regional government (2012). Photograph © the authors.
to advise on a sensible reform of the draft. Nonetheless, the majority of the government party in the regional parliament passed the law with minor amendments¹ in June 2013—contrary to the advice of their own legal team and over 6000 signatures from professionals opposed to it. Finally, after an appeal to the Constitutional court, 20 per cent of the law was suspended only a year after its approval. Today the new reform has been slowed down by the daily affairs of the current government, but the process has made several public—and professional—movements for the protection of cultural heritage in the region more visible.

Do citizens dream of archaeological sites?

Considering that the destruction of archaeological remains occurred in the context of neoliberalism, one might wonder whether what is protected from economic ravage is a matter of public interest. Measuring the real impact of archaeology in society requires recurrent comprehensive sociological studies, which have yet to be done. Current surveys (ranging from the classic work in the USA by Ramos and Duganne [2000] to other regional attempts such as the one by Castillo et al. [2016]) show a great deal of public concern about archaeological heritage and their values (European Commission 2017; Marx et al. 2017). Yet, looking at the data of the last survey on cultural habits in Spain (MCU 2019), only 21.8 per cent of the population has visited an archaeological site in the period of the study; in the same time 45.3 per cent of the total population has visited a museum, with 22.5 per cent of them visiting archaeological museums. Maybe it is popular culture that moves the appeal to archaeology (Holtorf 2005, 150), with the likes of Indiana Jones and Lara Croft inspiring the public.

Similarly, in the process of approval and appeal of the new heritage law in Madrid, media coverage was scarce. Public involvement was limited to MCyP members with few other colleagues, and only the political support of the opposition parties in the region seemed to legitimise the struggle (see Almansa-Sánchez 2017 for a larger analysis of these power/politics relations). Compared to other social movements fighting for better pensions, education or health in the last months, the real impact was low.

Although capable of lobbying governments and mobilising public opinion, associations are faced with several challenges. From a sociological perspective, there are factors that influence people’s involvement in them. Financial means, educational attainment, time available or social
skills constrain or enable participation (Van Ingen and Van der Meer 2011). Additionally, studies of associative patterns in Spain indicate that middle-aged and pre-retired people are the largest groups involved, while the number of younger people tends to be lower (Ariño 2007, 270). One could thus reasonably question the representativeness of associations to reflect public values regarding cultural heritage.

Value is a core concept in archaeological heritage management. In his classic book *Valuing Ancient Things*, Carman explored how archaeological heritage was managed, including the conformation of its so-understood intrinsic value (Carman 1996). Drawing on Thomson’s *Rubbish Theory*, in which the way that rubbish is treated defines its invisibility or its recognition (Thomson 1979), Carman analyses the process of designation and protection by means of law. Heritage laws accord public value to ancient remains, thus removing them from the sphere of ordinary objects and the rules affecting these objects (for example, market laws) – at least in theory. Simply put, then, our decisions and interventions on elements of the past (for example, through law designation) very much affect their social valuation, and may set new ways of understanding and valuing them in motion. However, it should be stressed that the values that are publicly created and sanctioned through this process do not exclude other possible readings and valuations. In fact, official recognition does not necessarily have any particular resonance in ordinary people’s lives due to its top-down nature.

As we mention below regarding Madrid’s regional network of archaeological sites, the public does possess a genuine if vague interest in these sites. Arguably, however, intervention may be variously defined. Via raising questions about a specific site and carrying out research, archaeologists may attach a series of diverse values to the place under scrutiny (Carman 2011, 496). Following this thread, then, academic and professional archaeological interest in a site has contributed to shape some of its values.

The *Plan de Yacimientos Visitables de la Comunidad de Madrid* is a case in point of how, broadly speaking, decisions made on what should be cultural heritage and how to deal with it scarcely resonate with ordinary people. This network, started in 2003 by the regional government, includes 21 sites already open and 17 still under analysis (Fig.7.3). Any new addition to the network is based on ‘scientific and technical criteria’ in order to ‘provide the citizenry with elements for self-identification with their past and their territory’ (Comunidad de Madrid n.d.). But it also answers to a homogeneous territorial distribution in which the different sub-regions must be represented.
Nevertheless, the relationship of the public with these spaces is not assessed nor taken into account. Moreover, some of the activities to promote the sites are undertaken by an entirely different department (for example, the dramatised visits conducted by the tourism directorate). The Visigoth sites of Navalvillar and Navalahija provide scenarios of a community archaeology project originally conducted from a commercial unit (Equipo A de Arqueología). Local citizens had the opportunity to participate in the excavations (ABC 2012) and to become involved in a long-term relationship with the sites in a research project backed by the local council.

As much as this project, which can be understood as a pseudo bottom-up initiative, has been positive, other sites have been more controversial. For example, the Roman road of Galapagar was a target of the critiques made to the regional government for failing to protect the site correctly (García Flores 2017), although at the same time the project aims to serve as a catalyst for economic development within the region (Tercera Información 2017). As for the Spanish Civil War bunker Blockhaus 13, in Colmenar del Arroyo, questions were raised about the type of narratives promoted by the site. Was it supporting only one side of the war? Would it become a focus for militarism and war, rather than an opportunity to criticise past conflict and violence (Colectivo Utopía Contagiosa 2017)? While a huge economic effort has been made on the
archaeology of the Spanish Civil War and its enhancement, the regional government’s silence is of little help in addressing these public concerns. Management of the sites is also controversial, as problems of access and abandonment of the sites (not directly managed by the regional government, but left to the local councils or private hands) are common. As mentioned, poor public involvement in this network of open archaeological spaces highlights the low impact that some interventions may have on the wider public consciousness.

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, for many people some of the best well-known archaeological sites of their town are, apparently, those affected by controversy (Castillo et al. 2016, 305). However, the value of all these sites is officially taken for granted, while only a few examples can be labelled as successful.

**Chinese whispers**

Critical Heritage Studies have until recently focused on analysing the discourses of heritage experts. Although it is clear that we have witnessed the emergence of new approaches to Cultural Heritage exploring materiality, performance, emotions and affects since Smith’s (2006) Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD), it is clear that discourses are a significant part of research into heritage. They can be understood as ‘ways of representing aspects of the world – the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the “mental world” of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world’ (Fairclough 2003, 124). Not only do they describe the world, but they also have a material impact upon it as they naturalise and create particular ways of understanding it. The idea of one single monolithic heritage discourse should be dismissed (Pendelbury 2013), yet the official discourses about cultural heritage have stressed the pre-eminence of experts in speaking for it. Furthermore, terms such as ‘cultural heritage’ are not even part of the general public’s way of speaking in some scenarios (Sánchez-Carretero 2012). In other non-rural areas, these discourses have been mobilised by non-experts to resist political decisions threatening the landscapes they live in (De Cesari and Herzfeld 2015), forming at least part of people’s vocabulary in contexts not threatened by development (Castillo et al. 2016, 299). We should turn now to consider the effects of archaeological heritage destruction at other levels.

The case of Alcalá de Henares, a World Heritage town close to Madrid, is quite significant. This town, along with many others located
alongside the Henares river, suffered an intense pressure of development over the 1960s and 1970s as part of the area’s industrialisation. The town grew in an uncontrolled way around the historic city centre. Many new residential areas associated with Alcalá’s industrialisation lacked adequate living infrastructure and standards (Vallhonrat and Rascón 2011, 12–13), although the city centre remained largely undisturbed by these changes. In 1998 this historic precinct and the university of Alcalá were inscribed in the World Heritage List as a first example of medieval urban planning and a university town (ICOMOS 1998). However, Alcalá is more than its city centre. Four archaeological sites lie outside the core protected area: the Roman villa of Complutum, the Roman villa of Val, the Visigoth necropolis of Camino de los Afligidos and the Calcolithic site of La Esgaravita. Only Complutum has been included within the regional network of open archaeological sites, yet all four archaeological sites have been subject to intense civic surveillance regarding their protection and care.

Complutum was discovered in the 1970s as the result of a series of construction works in one of the emerging quarters of the western part of Alcalá, designed to provide accommodation for the town’s industrial workers (Fernández-Galiano 1984). It could safely be said that the discovery and works carried out in this archaeological site raised awareness of the relevance of protecting the town’s archaeological heritage (Castillo 2012, 52), as described below. From 1972 to 1976 a series of Roman mosaics were unearthed. Their size and beauty meant that they were removed and sent to the National Archaeological Museum in Madrid. This archaeological intervention was organised by the central government (Almagro Basch 1974), as the works took place before the competencies were transferred and the LPHE passed (p. 112). Despite this discovery, the construction works still continued and most of the site was built over.

The area had long been significant for the local population. It contained the place where, according to a local legend, two young shepherds – Los Santos Niños (‘the two sainted children’) – had been tortured to death due to their Christian faith. There was a visible Roman wall in the area, later identified as part of Complutum’s basilica (Fernández-Galiano 1984, 270); it was believed by local people to be where the children had been bound and tortured. In the 1960s the owners of the land where the wall was standing decided to build a small church to house it (García Saldaña 1986, 65–6) – a decision that finally protected the wall from destruction.

Due to the poor planning of the construction works, the local council decided in 1984 to buy this land to create a public park. Aware of the archaeological findings, they arranged for an assessment of the
archaeological potential of the area to be carried out, resulting in the identification of the remains as the town of Complutum. It was then decided that comprehensive archaeological campaigns should take place in the area, and an archaeological school was set up to excavate and restore the remains. At this point archaeological heritage was the responsibility of the regional government, a situation that changed the scope of events.

Considering these interventions, it is understandable that these archaeological works remained in the memory of the neighbours. They raised an awareness among local people that the rescue of these archaeological sites helped to foster. Some of them still remember the works and the associated discoveries, and recall how works were halted (albeit temporarily) whenever materials appeared:

There were many times when workers were digging trenches to introduce wirings … archaeologists were right there to monitor what was there, and all of this [area] is full of archaeology, actually even this [the point where we are right now] is full of archaeology […] Many people have found things and have hidden them … Stones and columns were unearthed at the end of the street and of course the archaeologists were there waiting and if they saw a tile they stopped everything.

(Resident 1 of the residential area closest to Complutum in Alcalá, speaking in March 2017)

The new neighbours mobilised to defend Complutum and the materials unearthed on the site (see below). Some of them could recall how the landscape looked at that time:

Look, there was a construction work around here, in fact I have got some work done in my apartment block and we had to divert it a bit, but around here there were a pair of Roman conduits of the sewerage system that converged here, they are beautiful, Roman, and the end of it is around there [pointing to the distance], close to the river and discharging waters to the river […] and between those three trees there was another conduit, they were wonderful […] even the sewerage system was beautiful … I saw them at the beginning because they [the archaeologists] carried out a lot of excavations and they were really interested because it was the beginning …

(Resident 2 of the residential area closest to Complutum in Alcalá, speaking in March 2017)
It would be safe to say that people were – initially at least – influenced by all these changes, and the local council became increasingly sensitive to protecting archaeological heritage. In fact, as a result of the findings made in the area during the 1970s, both residents and archaeologists supplied information on archaeological findings, and any intent to hide or destroy them, to the city council (Alcalá Hoy 1984). The local elections held in 1983 saw victory by the left-wing political party that put forward an electoral programme focused on the ‘recovery of Alcalá’ (the programme’s actual title). This programme emphasised the importance of the past for the future of the town; it was believed that the past could serve as a unifying force for Alcalá’s increasingly diverse population (in the words of Alcalá’s mayor from 1983–7, speaking in July 2016). Sensitivity towards the past of Alcalá was reflected not only in the recent archaeological excavations in Complutum, in the land owned by the city council, but also in the organisation of an exhibition to display some of the findings made in 1984 (Fundación Colegio del Rey 1987).

Complutum’s discovery triggered public surveillance of the site over the 1980s and 1990s, while the different regional and local governments got to grips with their new responsibilities. In October 1988 Complutum was designated as Bien de Interés Cultural, the highest level of protection for cultural heritage. A month later, one of the early associations that had sprung up at that time, CODEPHAM, demanded specific measures to protect the archaeological site of Complutum (Diario 16, 1988). Further criticisms of Complutum’s preservation described how the site was being progressively abandoned, worsening the quality of life in the neighbourhood. In the 1990s people living close to Complutum were complaining about the insecurity in the area, with Complutum at its centre. The whole neighbourhood had become affected by drugs and alcohol while unemployment rates escalated (Castillo et al. forthcoming). Residents of the area and the local civic association asked the city council to fence off the archaeological site, then heavily used by drug addicts with consequent damage (Diario de Alcalá 1994; Puerta de Madrid 1995). Complutum was eventually fenced off with a stone wall, rendering the site isolated (Fig.7.4). While today many of Alcalá’s people do know about this archaeological site (Castillo et al. 2016, 305), a significant number of residents in the adjacent residential area to Complutum have never visited it (Castillo et al. forthcoming).

Overall, we encounter several realities regarding the different stakeholders involved. First we have the professionals, unearthing the past under the pressure of development. Their voice is hardly heard, but the remains were made visible and triggered a public response. Second we find the people of the area, concerned and committed in many cases, but silent and even indifferent in many others, a situation that has increased over time. Nowadays, for example, many are no longer interested in the site.
While the Roman past of Alcalá de Henares became a feature of local politics, relevant Neolithic sites such as Las Matillas were silently destroyed by development. All of this suggests that we still do not fully understand why some spaces are valued and fought for when threatened and others left to oblivion and destruction. This all happens in a public sphere where media and discourse are highly relevant (Habermas 1989), playing a fundamental role in shaping ideas and actions. Last but not least, institutional stakeholders are usually perceived in a negative light by all the other actors (Torcal and Montero 2006). Undoubtedly, administration is the easiest scapegoat to blame for the failures of archaeological heritage management – by people who do not appreciate the constraints of public procedures nor, in many cases, the scarce resources available that usually restrict officials’ capacity for action.

Construction has been a key industry in Spain, and the development of Madrid has been a radical example of it since the 1960s. First with rescue interventions, then with preventive schemes – whatever their outcome – archaeology has come into being within the society of Madrid; it has created significant memories of a past, regardless of how glorious, painful or indifferent that past may be. This is now part of the collective knowledge publicly available about the region. Trying to find the silver lining in what was, and still is, a dark episode for the management of archaeological heritage, its destruction had a price, but also a (small) reward.

Figure 7.4  A view of Complutum. © Asociación de Vecinos Cervantes, Alcalá de Henares, 1998.
Discussion: the future that never happened ...

As we have seen, what remains of the past emerges from a complex process in which different actors get involved. No single actor should be fully blamed for all the failures to preserve the archaeological past. Like the threads of a single ball of yarn, each episode, decision, action and counter-action affected the total picture, resulting in a very different outcome. We may have ultimately all failed in the final goal of making archaeology relevant, but along the way we dragged in many people and many stories that made the attempt worthwhile. Today probably more people have a clearer idea about archaeology and our responsibilities to the past in Madrid. Maybe this would have never been possible without the destruction of archaeological heritage.

Following the draft law of 1981, everything might have been different. Article 63.1 established agreements between owners and the administration, while Article 68.3 set the standards of authorisation that we still do not have today. Imagining an alternative future, the passing of this law would have entailed a wholly different scenario for the development of archaeology in Spain. However, it is not the only possible scenario. Depending on where we set the Jonbar hinge, an infinite number of outcomes is possible. Clearly, a different regulation would have fostered a different management model with different outcomes, although not necessarily better. A more restrictive legislation, able actually to protect all archaeological heritage from destruction, would surely have raised other conflicts. Ultimately people might have not valued archaeological heritage above a desire for better infrastructure or amenities. Probably legislation would have not been able to solve all problems related to the management of archaeological heritage, such conflicts normally requiring more creative and flexible approaches than the law permits. This analysis does not intend to be deterministic. It seeks rather to highlight the complex social fabric in which archaeological heritage is only a small part – but one relevant in constructing sites of memory.

Have we not sufficiently regretted and deplored the loss or destruction, by our predecessors, of potentially informative sources to avoid opening ourselves to the same reproach from our successors? Memory has been wholly absorbed by its meticulous reconstitution. Its new vocation is to record; delegating to the archive the responsibility of remembering, it sheds its signs upon depositing them there, as a snake sheds its skin.

(Nora 1989: 13)
This quote stands on the basis of current archaeological heritage management. It can explain initiatives such as the Plan de Yacimientos Visitables or the social concern for the protection of certain archaeological remains. Acting as lieux de mémoire, those sites saved from destruction and the processes that have given them birth define landmarks: remainders of memory as a resort to remember our past, to shape our identity or, more simply, to archive our history, even as the records from the interventions of the last decades that rest in the stores of the museum do.

Construction work has destroyed hundreds of archaeological sites in Madrid. Sometimes, indeed on most occasions, this destruction took place unnoticed by the people around it. On other occasions this destruction provoked a backlash in the form of public protest, somehow raising concern about archaeological heritage and creating memories out of the endangered remains. Overall, however, archaeological heritage management recorded the past and archived it as a form of rematerialising the memories of a vanishing heritage. We delegated to these archives some responsibility of remembering, as Nora has pointed out, but nevertheless we still have them.
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Note

1. The main amendments to the law were two articles – as additional provisions – for the construction of new casinos in the region, confirming the relationship between the law and the ‘Eurovegas’ project. This (ultimately unsuccessful) project aimed to develop a huge area in the southwest of the capital for a casino compound managed by a major international company. During the process the negotiators asked the government to create special provisions for the project, such as permission to smoke, within the compound (Marcos 2013). In terms of heritage, the overall aim of the new law was to facilitate bureaucracy for developers and ‘relax’ the protection of certain properties. As the first law passed during the negotiations, the aforementioned provisions ensured the goodwill of the regional government towards the casino project.
References


García Flores, A. 2017. ‘¿Por qué el ayuntamiento de Galapagar y la Comunidad de Madrid no protegen la Calzada Romana?’, El Español [blog], 9 May 2017. URL: https://www.elspanol.com/blog_del_suscriptor/opinion/20170509/214798520_7.html.


