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ABSTRACT
This paper explores the impact of the living heritage approach for sustainable tourism & economics in Mount Lebanon. The proposed living heritage model is separated into three fundamental actions: firstly, the identification of important historical places and buildings that are reused to serve conservation and tourism development, as well as the participation of the core community in determining this. Secondly, the development of a tourism strategy and development plans, in which the local community must also participate. Thirdly, the development of maintenance and control programs, which must be supervised by the local community through its partnership with the Ministry and those responsible for conservation operations. Moreover, the hypothesis is to find a way to implement the living heritage in a local rural context. It also tackles different ways of implementing the living heritage approach based on international case studies (Albergo Diffuso, in Italy and the Meteora, in Greece), to inform sustainable economic and tourism development in the local rural context of Mount Lebanon. The methodological study will take into consideration two analyses: a theoretical (literature reviews and main definitions) and a practical (comparative analysis and case studies). In conclusion, several strategies can be taken into account in order to attain a successful living heritage of sustainable economics and tourism in Mount Lebanon. In fact, such a goal will be achieved through the partnership among private, public, and local sectors that can create a strong historical-touristic-economic bond.
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Introduction

Generally, architecture is the science and art of designing buildings, open areas, communities, and environments taking into consideration some esthetic effects. In specific, cities are places where people live, using and
maintaining their facilities. This paper explores the impact of the living
heritage approach for sustainable tourism & economics in Mount Lebanon.
The implementation of this approach in Mount Lebanon is the study of the
physical and spiritual values of traditions in the environment. The main
problem to be discussed in this framing paper is the lack of a sense of identity
derived from conserving the heritage quarters. Instead, it seems easier to
decide to damage them, not being aware that this will adversely affect the
economic and touristic factors. Moreover, the hypothesis is to find a way to
implement living heritage in a local rural context. The study tackles different
ways of implementing the living heritage approach based on international
case studies (Albergo Diffuso, in Italy and the Meteora, in Greece) and to
inform sustainable economic and tourism development in the local rural
context of Mount Lebanon. The methodological studies will take into con-
sideration two analyses: a theoretical (literature review) and a practical (com-
parative analysis and case studies).

Sustainable tourism is traveling with the intention of having a positive
impact on the environment, society and economy. It seems like to be this
way, but unfortunately it is not. Mass tourism has had a very negative impact
on some host countries, and the economic benefits often fall short of the local
level. So, the benefits of sustainable tourism are: (1) Sustainable tourism
keeps the environment clean; (2) Supports local communities; (3) It has
a lower environmental impact; (4) Allow wildlife to remain wild. Sustainable
tourism is not always black or white, there are many shades of gray in
between. Educating yourself and making a conscious decision in favor of
ethical and sustainable service providers is the first step in ensuring that
visiting any country does not leave you with a negative impact.

In the last few decades, people became more aware of the value of
heritage buildings and their conservation through demolition and renova-
tion. In fact, the word heritage is related to the old and ancient tastes of the
buildings in these areas [1]. Countries categorize their heritage buildings
according to specific physical and spiritual values. Lebanon classifies its
buildings as heritage buildings after 50 years of their construction. Mount
Lebanon, which is rich in both urban and rural areas, is the core of touristic,
social, cultural, and economic factors, and is divided into several districts, one
of which is Shouf [1,2]. In addition, the values of historical buildings are
related to the past and linked to the present and future in all cities. Marcus
Garvey, a Jamaican political leader states that: ‘A people without the knowl-
dge of their history, origin and culture is like a tree without roots’.

Thus, a living heritage approach insists on making use of its main key
element, namely the continuity to conserve the historical sites and core
communities [3]. Also, stakeholders have been creating a sense of globaliza-
tion of a way to implement the living heritage approach for creating sustain-
ability in economics and tourism in rural contexts [4].
The objectives of this study are: (1) Investigating how historic quarters & buildings are graded; (2) What are the main principles of a living heritage approach for sustainable economics and tourism in a rural context? (3) Exploring international case studies to implement a living heritage approach in a local rural context; and (4) Proposing a framework for action from a living heritage approach and its application on international case studies to be implemented in Mount Lebanon.

**Literature review**

**THE value of historical buildings**

Historical buildings reflect the social, military, cultural or political history in their structures and preserve it for the coming generations. They express the timeworn values that are affected by several factors. Their values exceed being monuments to shaping the local heritage of the area [2]. In fact, every city is linked to a mental map, where the physical environmental image plays a role in creating a memorial. Mental maps are created through five elements: the paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks [5]. Nowadays, the preservation of historical buildings is limited to specific areas showing the legibility of the existing physical and emotional conditions in these districts. This leads to considering the historical buildings as landmarks.

To conserve the values of these historical buildings, a strategic plan must be followed. The stakeholders include, but are not limited to, architects, archeologists, economists, engineers, historians, urban planners and designers, researchers, governments, and municipalities. The whole group considers the timeline and historical background of the project during the planning phase. This section traces the values of historical buildings [6] (Figure 1). The following are some of the several aspects that explore this idea:

The historical interest is related to the age, residents, politicians, and the historical timeline [7]. Several methods can be applied to collect information about the history of the building. The preexisting conditions are the main resources to rebuild the historical knowledge [8]. For example, the Colosseum in Rome has its own earlier means and authenticity, where battles between humans and animals occurred in that time. Thus, the historical interest is one of the values of the heritage buildings [7].

Architectural merit constitutes the style and the type of the building, such as arches, decorations, materials, location [7]. This is considered one of the cultural values. This refers to the period and culture of the building. For example, Gothic buildings had pointed arches, buttresses, large windows, thin walls, and dark colored stones; however, Romanesque buildings had
Figure 1. Conservation policy reference: [9] – represented by the authors.
rounded arches, flat buttresses, smaller windows, thicker walls, and light colored stones. Therefore, the historical value is well-developed through the architectural style of an old building [6].

The group value is the architectural design of the building which shows certain cultural values of the historical buildings [7]. The design and the composition of the historical buildings, such as the geometrical forms, solids and voids, connections between volumes, sizes, and complexities will affect their cultural principles. For example, the earlier Egyptian temples, known during the intermediate periods, had large scales, more solids than voids, thick walls, and huge symbolic sculptures, to develop the philosophy of power and strength in the area. Thus, the group value triggers the historical knowledge of the building.

Social value and local interest reflect the identity of the building in terms of a symbolic or landmark importance in the context [7]. This is considered as one of the use values. Each historical building creates its own unique taste in the area, where it could transmit the knowledge to its surrounding neighborhoods. For example, the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, France, is the symbol of peace, harmony, and secularism in the urban city. Hence, a social value and local interest create the value of the historical buildings in an area.

Authenticity demonstrates whether the building has experienced any modifications through its architectural design or even historical importance [7]. This is considered as emotional values. Historical buildings are affected by several alterations through time, be it a recovery or a restoration, after wars, vandalisms, or dilapidated conditions. For example, the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, was constructed 800 years ago, and has been exposed to frequent restorations. Therefore, the historical timeline restorations and authenticity structure the idea of the value of historical buildings in the area.

Rarity reflects whether the building is exceptional in the context with its social, political, local, and authentic values [7]. Each historical building has its own philosophy and concept of existence in the area. For example, the Egyptian pyramids were built as the pharaohs’ tombs in the area.

As a conclusion, there are several values of historical buildings other than the emotional, physical, and cultural means. Globalizing these values creates a powerful community that spreads the awareness and connects the nations.
Historic urban landscape approach as a tool to understand the living heritage approach

The Director of UNESCO at the World Urban Forum at Naples, 2012, Irina Bokova argued that: ‘Tangible and intangible heritage are sources of social cohesion, factors of diversity and drivers of creativity, innovation and urban regeneration – we must do more to harness this power’ [9].

The way of dealing with any cultural heritage area or Local Rural Context is the affirmation that the heritage area is anything but a static landmark or group of buildings, even though it is subject to dynamic powers in the financial, social and cultural circles that formed it and continue molding it. UNESCO’s approach to deal with overseeing the Historic Urban landscape (HUL) is all encompassing; it coordinates the objectives of urban heritage protection and those of social and financial improvement. This technique considers urbanity to be a social, cultural and economic resource [9].

The HUL approach moves past the conservation of the physical condition, and casts light on the whole human condition with the entirety of its tangible and intangible qualities. It looks forward to expanding the sustainability of arrangements and structure intercessions by taking into consideration the current manufactured condition, intangible heritage, social assorted variety, and ecological dimensions alongside local community esteems. Urban heritage comprises a secret weapon in upgrading the livability of urban quarters. It encourages advancement and social union in a changing worldwide condition. This approach calls to include more individuals in conservation endeavors, raises levels of mindfulness, and looks for creative plans. By effectively captivating public, private and civic sectors, the historic and contemporary quarters can be better protected and celebrated [9].

The HUL approach describes the cultural heritage quarter as a continuum in time and space. Innumerable populace bunches have left their imprint and keep on doing so today. In numerous urban areas this approach has had extremely positive and empowering outcomes. For every nearby circumstance, a balance is come to among conservation and protection of urban heritage, economic improvement, functionality, and livability of a city. Along these lines, the requirements of current occupants are reacted to, while economically improving the city’s common and social assets for people in the future [9].

Living heritage approach for sustainable economic and tourism in rural context

As a definition, living heritage is a bundle of cultural, social, and physical practices through the interaction between the communities with the environment, which creates a sense of identity, diversity, and continuity that is
transmitted from generation to another [10]. Living heritage starts with the indigenous or the aboriginal people who are the original settlers sharing common cultural discourse and then merge it with other communities [11]. This is represented through a network between these various aspects of the intangible within the tangible living heritage (See Table 1). However, it is not required to have all these aspects, because they might differ [12].

The main principle of the living heritage approach for sustainable economics and tourism in a rural context is continuity. Indeed, continuity emphasizes on the conservation and management of heritage with support of adapting according to the needs of the community. This creates a link between the past preservation and its usage in the contemporary context [13]. Continuity is accomplished by the followings: the heritage site’s original function, the community’s relationship with the heritage sites, the care of the heritage sites by the community, and evolving tangible and intangible heritage expressions [14]. Thus, continuity is the main key to attain such a successful system and for sustainable economics and tourism in the rural areas [15].

The continuity of the heritage site’s original function targets to maintain the initial use of this heritage site. Each heritage site signifies the traditional parameters. For example, after the civil war, experts insisted on preserving the ancient monastic function in Meteora, Greece to maintain the sense of glorification of God through heritage. Thus, creating a sense of continuity of the original function of the heritage site. Furthermore, continuity is attained by the community’s relationship with the heritage sites. This tackles the hierarchy among the identity and structure of the core community with the cooperation with the heritage site, which creates a permeable periphery engulfed by different imported communities. For example, the monastic communities are given the priority with the involvement of the boarded communities and preserve the heritage site to create a better heritage monastic life. Hence, creating a sense of continuity of the living heritage (See Figure 2) [16].

### Table 1. Network of the various aspects.

| Intangible | Tangible |
|------------|----------|
| Personal/Private | Institutional Values |
| Human Development | Collective/Public |
| Sense of Identity | Community Development |
| Relationship with Self | Sense of Belonging |
| Cultural Value | Relationships with Family |
| Economical Value | Social Value |
| Health & Wellbeing | Citizenship & Social Cohesion |

Instrumental Values: Collective/Public

Reference: [3], Represented by the Authors.
Figure 2. Living heritage approach. Reference: [16], Represented by the Authors
Another element is the care of the heritage sites by the community. The community has to be aware of the site maintenance, by a collaboration between the traditional community and the scientific-based practices. For example, in the Philippines in 2013, Maribojoc Church is an ancient religious building that collapsed because of an earthquake. The building and the statues needed restoration; this case needed a balance between the traditional care heritage of the community and the architectural religious theories [16]. In fact, continuity is attained by evolving tangible and intangible heritage expressions [14]. This process seeks the physical and spiritual management, such as values, architecture, and expressions. For example, at Meteora, the living heritage finds that the space is well-developed by the religious communities and experts. Therefore, continuity is well-created by conserving the tangible and intangible expressions [16].

As a conclusion, continuity is the main key of the living heritage approach. The living heritage seeks a connection between the core community and the heritage site to attain a well-developed rural area, and thus creates a sustainable economics and tourism. Thus, the living heritage approach links the heritage with the contemporary for a sustainable environment (See Figure 3).

**Research materials and methods**

Research Materials and Methods discuss the Research Tools, Target Case Study and Research Process Framework from the Introduction passes through Literature Review to Conclusion.

**Research tools**

Being a qualitative study, the information on the main characteristics of Mount Lebanon, as well as on Beit Eddine Palace were collected from the survey, observation, and in-depth interviews with the representatives of the local community. The information on Mir Amin Palace were obtained by organizing some meetings with the representatives of the local community while the information on social impact were gathered and analyzed from informants in the surrounding community as well. Additionally, an advanced digital camera, a sound recorder, and an interview guidelines form were used as tools for data collection.

**Target case study**

The Governorates of Beirut and Mount Lebanon are viewed as the core of Lebanon’s social, economic, political and cultural activities. Beirut is transcendentally urban, while Mount Lebanon has urban and rural quarters. Beit Eddine
was built in 1788 in Mount Lebanon and is used for concerts in the summer. Mir Amin Palace was built in the 19th century. Earlier, this palace was a normal Lebanese building. With time, this old heritage building was conserved to attain the continuity of the heritage site by the community.

**Research process framework (Figure 4)**

This paper comprises six sections: (1) Introduction which explains the background, phenomenon concerned with the living heritage, the research gap, the target area and the target building case study; (2) Literature Review which studies the definitions, the value of historical buildings (historical interest, architectural merit, social value, authenticity, rarity), the historic urban

---

**Figure 3.** Living heritage approach, planning process methodology. Reference: [16], Represented by the Authors
landscape approach (HUL) as a tool to understand the living heritage approach and the living heritage approach for sustainable economics and tourism in a rural context; (3) Research materials and methods which explains the research tools, the target case study, data collection, and the research process framework; (4) Case studies analysis which are separated into three sections: Meteora, Greece for the Greeks, Albergo Diffuso (AD), Italy and the implementation of the living heritage approach in Mount Lebanon; (5) Policy and managerial implications which explains the proposed living heritage framework; and (6) Research conclusion.

**Case studies analysis: a way to implement the living heritage approach in a local rural context**

This section strategically traces two international case studies, that tackle the implementation of the living heritage approach. Reasons for choosing these cases, specially Albergo Diffuso that widely applied in other countries of Europe, e.g. in Croatia, Switzerland, Slovenia and others in the second decade of the 21st century [17,18]. And Meteora that represent the sustainable economic and touristic development in the local rural context of Mount Lebanon.

**Meteora, Greece for the Greeks (Figure 5)**

The most significant dimension that has influenced the life of Meteora during its ongoing history is the development of the tourism industry. The religious communities in Meteora, in the context of their philanthropic-missionary approach to monasticism, have energetically acknowledged the advancement of tourism and their role in it. This acknowledgment has carried extensive capacity to the religious communities in the quarter’s activity and the executives in financial, social, and political terms – and a most critical situation of theirs in the tourism and heritage industry. Simultaneously, this acknowledgment has caused major issues in the activity and for the executives of the quarter: the division among religion, heritage protection and tourism activities; an expanded accentuation on tourism; and the modification of asceticism to the weight of tourism [16].

These issues can be seen in the changes in the utilization and arrangement of space: the religious communities have gotten progressively confined inside their space; the space has been obviously separated among the religious communities from one perspective and the guests on the other; and the religious communities believed that it was hard to lead their love of God in the current space, and thus created new spaces [16]. Meteora, as a historic context, is no doubt exceptional. Within the archeological pattern of the country, referring to older times and every other sort of Greek human
Figure 4. Research process framework. Reference: The Authors
Figure 5. Meteora thrones. Reference [18]
advancement, the uniqueness of Meteora regarding the area and its history render the site an extremely fascinating change for those ready to know Greece. Thus, if not all the religious communities, at any rate the five of the cloisters that exist and are active, are effectively protected, are growing and getting organized, in this manner presenting perfect conditions for their future maintenance [16]. The targets of the Meteora religious communities with regards to their humanitarian evangelist approach appear to have been effectively applied in the case of Meteora. Today Meteora has become a mainstream tourist goal elevating the Orthodox confidence of a huge number of guests. It is a very well kept heritage site reflecting quality and glory. Simultaneously, it is a significant religious site with religious communities that are prospering and expanding in estimate and have a huge commitment to the more extensive society [16].

From this examination, it is apparent that the Meteora religious communities, with the assistance of the heritage authorities and different communities ensuring and utilizing the quarter, should move away from the ‘philanthropic-missionary’ approach to deal with religious matters and focus more on the standards of the Orthodox Tradition, rethinking their ordinary religious life and their disposition toward the guests and the outside world: the focus will be shifted from enhancing tourism to venerating God, while tourism activities and heritage protection will be fused inside religious life. [16],This recommendation about an expanded accentuation on the Orthodox Tradition does not mean fossilization within an evolving world, but rather an endeavor to continue the ongoing change by looking for a harmonious integration between religious life, heritage protection and tourism activity, and along these lines to maintain its pertinence to the contemporary society [16].

This is well-known as the continuity of preserving cultural and natural values among a religious community, as well as the collaboration between the heritage and scientific-based practices, for a continuity of the heritage site’s original function and the monastic communities. Also, it aims at caring for the tangible values within the tangible heritage site and creating a harmony between the physical and spiritual expressions. Thus, this continuity creates a sense of attraction and sustainable economics and tourism in the rural context.

**ALBERGO DIFFUSO (AD), Italy (Figure 6)**

An Albergo Diffuso addresses an extraordinary improvement approach which does not convey negative natural effects. To create it, nothing should be recently developed, since it is only important to reestablish and recover existing houses and apartments according to the local cultural backgrounds, and to organize what as of now exists [20].
The effect of the advancement can fundamentally be outlined at the local level since an Albergo Diffuso highlights local development where tourism can be a main division if appropriately animated, and to accomplish the highest level of positive effects, regional and national administrations must receive such a model, rendering it conceivable in legal and economic terms. Laws on tourism must be redesigned so as to officially perceive this new kind of hospitality, giving it a similar pride of traditional hotels and of other models of hospitality [21]. Explicit credit plans as well as open financing systems could be set up to help the making of Albergo Diffuso, since their covert way of thinking is to advance local entrepreneurship, restoring historical centers and fighting them forsake through their revitalization. This means that having Albergo Diffuso entails a monetary as well as a solid social return. Since there is no ecological effect, and there is not much to be done, this innovation can succeed without much of a stretch to be replicated in other countries and can speak to an opportunity for their territorial development [20].

Albergo Diffuso (AD) is considered as one of the implemented living heritage approaches. In the 1970s, AD was adopted as a heritage management in the rural village in Italy. AD seeks the continuity of the heritage site and the local communities through restoring the physical and emotional aspects, to create a growth in tourism and the economy of the village [20]. This system is to redevelop and renovate in a horizontal framework the heritage buildings [22]. Thus, AD has played a major role in creating a monument activation approach in the context.

The implementation of a living heritage approach in Mount Lebanon, Lebanon

The Governorates of Beirut and Mount Lebanon are viewed as the core of Lebanon’s social, economic, political and cultural activities. Beirut is transcendentally urban, while Mount Lebanon has urban and rural quarters. Officially, the main characteristics of Mount Lebanon are: First, Mount Lebanon is divided into six quarters, specifically Jbeil, Keserwan, Metn, Aley, Baabda and Shouf (Figure 7). Second, the local population in Beirut and Mount Lebanon is associate with 2,000,000 people [2]. Third, the landmarks and highly important historic buildings are: Beit Eddine Palace (Figure 8), Mir Amin Palace (Figure 9), Saint Charbel Tomb (Figure 10), Byblos Castle (Figure 11), Moussa Castle (Figure 12), Saydet El-Talle Church (Figure 13), Fakhreddin’s Mosque (Figure 14), Churches of Harissa (Figure 15), and Jisr El-Hajar (Kfardebian) Natural Bridge (Figure 16). Great attention should be given to Beit Eddine Palace and Mir Amin Palace.

According to a number of meetings organized with the representatives of the local community, Beit Eddine was built in 1788 in Mount Lebanon. During the civil war, portions of the palace were destroyed and now the other parts are
Figure 6. Albergo Diffuso. Reference: [20]
open to the public after the conservation of the heritage site and local community. Moreover, this landmark is used for concerts in the summer, which draws a link between heritage and contemporary culture and thousands of tourists are visiting it and thus there is growth in the income. Another example can be found in the 19th-century Mir Amin Palace. Earlier, this palace was a regular Lebanese building. With time, this old heritage building was conserved to attain the continuity of the heritage site by the community, by the private sector and with the cooperation of the local municipality that transformed it into a hotel while maintaining the continuity of the site's original function [23]. This allowed the intangible to evolve within the tangible heritage expressions through the formal and light heritage building located in the context.

The Albergo Diffuso framework improves the landscape and is perfect with tourism advancement that may be less rapid but offers long-term outcomes. Thus, the ecological assets are safeguarded both actively and passively: from one viewpoint, it infuses new life into local communities and, on the other, it prevents the construction of hotel complexes that distort the scenery of characteristic excellence, keeping continuity of the site’s original function. In the light that it is mindful that tourism improves the zone and its

Figure 7. Mount Lebanon map (Beirut). Reference: [2]
uniqueness, secures the environment and supports traditional items, it is normal to think about the subsequent advantage of sharing information and experience among local communities. It is also about the capability of accessing the tourism buyers and the industry press [24].

A living heritage approach must rethink the current idea of heritage and the principles of heritage conservation challenging very strong assumptions established over time in the field, which were developed along with

Figure 8. Beit Eddine Palace. Reference: [19]

Figure 9. Mir Amin Palace. Reference: [19]
a material-based approach and were maintained by a values-based approach [25]. In other words, as indicated by a living heritage approach, firstly, the ability of the conservation procedure is no longer in the hands of the conservation experts, but in the hands of the communities. Second, accentuation is not solely on the conservation of the (tangible) material anymore, but also on the maintenance of the (intangible) association of the communities with the heritage, regardless of whether the material might be harmed. Third,
heritage should not be viewed as a monument of the past that must be shielded from the present community, to be preserved for the people in the future; heritage is currently observed and ensured as an indivisible piece of life of the present community. Thus, the future is not isolated (discontinuity), but rather brought together into a continuous present (continuity). Subsequently, a living heritage approach endeavors to check the move in heritage conservation from landmarks to individuals, from the tangible to intangible fabrics with heritage, and from discontinuity to continuity [26].
The core and the broader community in Mount Lebanon must be identified: the landowners, the municipalities in the villages and their advisory committees, community conservation and volunteer groups, and guesthouse owners. In turn, the local community must intervene through its partnership with the Ministry and those responsible for tourism and conservation operations in identifying important historical places and buildings. This is re-adapted to serve the conservation and tourism development processes, as
well as in the development of tourism conservation and development plans for the region. This is further applicable to the access to the management of visitors and tourists’ programs, as well as the continuous follow-up and maintenance programs for important historical sites and buildings.

The Implementation of the Living Heritage in Mount Lebanon includes a wide scope of stakeholders, for example, governmental associations, non-governmental associations, and private interests. However, the governmental organizations must proceed as incomparable administrators. To play out this reasonable obligation, the state must set up the right strategies. They are adjusted among development and preservation to initiate, mastermind, and execute the basic protection activities, and to protect these exercises against the interests of the community. Accomplishing an association among the Ministry, local administrations, investors, and non-governmental associations to all preservation zones is vital. It includes numerous tasks, for example: creating programs, funding, implementing projects, etc. (16). This is, hence, a significant asset that local communities can cautiously assess for creating tourism potential [24].

The Shouf Biosphere Reserve (SBR) was pronounced a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve in 2005. It incorporates The Al-Shouf Cedar Nature Reserve (built up in 1996), the Ammiq Wetland Protected quarter, and 24 villages surrounding it. This particular SBR will lead the management stakeholders of Mount Lebanon area. The SBR should consider expanding helpful partnerships and developing a tourism strategy that depends less on governmental support and more on the SBR’s partners and local community. Building bridges with local stakeholders is basic to accomplish positive changes in the mentality toward the SBR

Figure 16. Jisr El-Hajar. Reference: [19]
partnership. It is imperative to push the need to regard the privileges of local communities, and those who, now and again, claim land inside the Mount Lebanon quarter. This procedure is an administrative model for the inclusion of local communities in the planning, decision making and execution processes [23].

In conclusion, stakeholders should cooperate in order to implement the living heritage in the local rural context in Mount Lebanon and to create a sustainable economy and tourism in the area. Also, this creates a link between heritage and contemporary culture.

**Policy and managerial implications**

This paper has been composed as a framework for action (Figure 17), and is not intended to be prescriptive but rather focuses on a method for working inside communities that will improve the value of heritage for people. It unmistakably exhibits the associations between heritage and the public good. Every one of us has the ability to lead by example. All things considered, no individual or association can accomplish on their own what they can accomplish by working with others. Undoubtedly, the heritage community all in all is vastly more than the aggregate of its parts. As we work to reframe the manner in which we talk about heritage and the manner by which we create, actualize and assess heritage projects, we can change and open mentalities about heritage, construct understanding about the intensity of the past and leave a significant inheritance for people in the future.

The proposed living heritage framework is divided into three main parts: The first is the identification phase of important historical places and buildings that are reused to serve conservation and tourism development, as well as the participation of the core community in determining this. Second, the development of tourism conservation and development plans, in which the local community must also participate. The third is the development of maintenance and follow-up programs, which must be supervised by the local community through its partnership with the Ministry and those responsible for conservation operations.

**Conclusion**

As a conclusion, continuity is the main key of the living heritage approach. The living heritage seeks a connection between the core community and the heritage site to attain a well-developed rural area, and thus create a sustainable economy and tourism. Thus, the living heritage approach links the heritage with the contemporary for a sustainable environment. The proposed framework is divided into three parts: (1) Identifying important historical places and buildings that are reused to serve conservation and
Figure 17. The proposed living heritage approach, a framework for action. Reference: The Authors
tourism development, as well as the participation of the core community in determining this. (2) Development of tourism conservation and plans, in which the local community must also participate. (3) Development of maintenance and follow-up programs, which must be supervised by the local community through its partnership with the Ministry and those responsible for conservation operations.

In addition, several strategies should be taken into consideration in order to attain a successful living heritage of sustainable economy and tourism in the local rural context. In fact, such a goal will be achieved through the collaboration between private, public, and local sectors that can create a strong historical-touristic-economic bond. This helps the historical sites to retain their living heritage in the rural context, in order to attract tourists [4]. Therefore, the study in this framing paper highlights on the value of the historical buildings and the living heritage in historical towns, and on the importance of applying it specifically in Mount Lebanon; accordingly, this will accomplish the concept of sustainability. Hence, there are several ways that help this system to work successfully, such as environmental impact assessment, conferences, and researches [27].

**Recommendations**

Collaboration is a powerful means of engaging diverse actors in a multisectoral perspective that enables integrated approaches to the specific ideals that characterize culture, land, and tourism. In fact, different actors are creating associations that involve different sectoral, legal and geographical entities. Therefore, it is an important resource that local communities can carefully evaluate in terms of developing tourism potential. Stakeholders should cooperate in order to implement the living heritage approach in the local rural context in Mount Lebanon and to create a sustainable economy and tourism in this area.

The SBR could consider developing useful partnerships and developing a tourism strategy that relies less on government support and more on SBR partners and the local community. This particular SBR will lead and manage the stakeholders of the Mount Lebanon area.

Furthermore, Continuity is the main principle of the living heritage approach. Then we must achieve Continuity by continuing the original function of Mount Lebanon cultural heritage, the community's relationship with cultural heritage site, the maintenance of cultural heritage sites by the community, and the development of tangible and intangible expressions of cultural heritage site.
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