

elements of heritage, namely diversity, continuity and community (Wijesuriya, 2010). One reason for overlooking the continuity relevant to this discussion was the assumption that the historical continuity between the past and present in heritage has been broken. This led to the development of conservation principles that advocate freezing heritage in a given time and space, thus eliminating the idea of continuity within the discourse. But let me highlight why continuity is important.

The link between the past, present and future is not always broken or unconnected and cannot be always considered as linear. The fact that time was considered as a linear concept was well established in western society and not surprisingly, conservation principles were influenced by this. Philippot explains that, “The past has been considered by Western man as a complete development, which he now looks at from a distance, much as one looks at a panorama [...]” (Philippot, 1996, p. 268). In other words, this makes it easier to draw a line between the past, present and future.

However, different societies have different views and maintain different links with their past and some considered time as a cyclical concept. For instance, Hinduism views the concept of time in a different way. Hindus believe the process of creation moves in cycles and because the process of creation is cyclical and never ending, it “begins to end and ends to begin”. This is true for Buddhism (Wijesuriya, 2010) as well, which includes the concept of *samsara*, or the wheel of life, which consists of cycles of birth and life and which explains vividly that time is cyclical.

The fact that there is an unbroken link between the past and the present is evident in many other non-western societies as well. Anyon explains that for American Indians,

Time is often not the linear concept it is to most Americans [...] To the Zunis, the present does not have to look like the past because the past lives on in the everyday actions of the Zuni people. The essential cultural difference is that non-native Americans want to see the past to know it, whereas to American Indians the present embodies the past and thus they do not necessarily have to see their past to know it (Anyon, 1991).

Matunga from New Zealand explains the view on time for the indigenous Maori community, “The past is viewed as part of the ‘living present’. This is at odds with the view that there is a firm line between the past and the present, and which often results in the relinquishing of obligation to the past in favour of the present” (Matunga, 1994, p. 219).

All this leads to the conclusion that there is a historical continuity between the past and the present and therefore heritage has to be understood from this point of view as well. The principle of continuity applies to all places we identify as heritage including those abandoned by societies and which have become ruins. More importantly, these have many implications for their protection. Anyon has