ALAN CLARKE

PREFACE: SUSTAINING THE SUSTAINABLE – VALUING THE VALUABLE

This paper introduces some very difficult concepts which are important to our ongoing discussion. It raises the questions about what sustainable development means and what sort of values are involved. This questioning of the values involved is focussed on themes coming from the management of World Heritage Sites. There are questions about how far value expressed in financial or economic terms can explain what the meanings of heritage are and how heritage can add different values to our lives.

Introduction

We dedicate a great deal of our media attention to what is wrong – sometimes, though more rarely right – with our financial markets. The world's economic experts are in search of signs of growth and enhancing our portfolios through investment, profit and re-investment. If this dominant view towards economic capital holds good, where is the equivalent in our attitudes to cultural capital? This paper will investigate the prevalent rationales giving value to the investments in cultural capital. It will explore these issues around re-valuing and devaluing cultural values by examining World Heritage Sites.

Sustainability, stakeholders and heritages

It is an honour to host the development of these discussions focussed on the sustainability of cultural heritages. It was not just being able to come to the wonderful conference, but to be able to participate in this very important initiative. It is inspiring to be able to meet and talk with so many actors in the hope that this talking will lead to decisive actions and a closer working relationship.

Given our stakeholder approach, we are looking to identify those who can affect and are affected by developments. The term has become almost ubiquitous as the United Nations' World Tourism Organisation adopted the term (UNWTO 1995) from the American management literature. In the context of Cultural Heritage Tourism, we must ensure that those we recognise as stakeholders represent all the heritages found in the destinations we are working with. It is important to ensure that all heritages are treated sensitively and are not over exploited. Development

needs to appreciate the delicacy involved in working with both tangible and intangible heritages.

Sustainability is a much travelled concept now and I am delighted to have been part of that dissemination since 1995, where I attended the The World Conference on Sustainable Tourism and contributed to the drafting of the Charter on sustainable Tourism. Our debates are worth recalling and the declaration read:

Charter for sustainable tourism

We, the participants at the World Conference on Sustainable Tourism, meeting in Lanzarote, Canary Islands, Spain, on 27–28 April 1995.

Mindful that tourism, as a worldwide phenomenon, touches the highest and deepest aspirations of all people and is also an important element of socioeconomic and political development in many countries.

Recognizing that tourism is ambivalent, since it can contribute positively to socio- economic and cultural achievement, while at the same time it can contribute to the degradation of the environment and the loss of local identity, and should therefore be approached with a global methodology.

Mindful that the resources on which tourism is based are fragile and that there is a growing demand for improved environmental quality.

Recognizing that tourism affords the opportunity to travel and to know other cultures, and that the development of tourism can help promote closer ties and peace among peoples, creating a conscience that is respectful of the diversity of culture and life styles.

Recalling the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of United Nations, and the various United Nations declarations and regional conventions on tourism, the environment, the conservation of cultural heritage and on sustainable development.

Guided by the principles set forth in the Rio Declaration on the Environment and Development and the recommendations arising from Agenda 21.

Recalling previous declarations on tourism, such as the Manila Declaration on World Tourism, the Hague Declaration and the Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code.

Recognizing the need to develop a tourism that meets economic expectations and environmental requirements, and respects not only the social and physical structure of destinations, but also the local population.

Considering it a priority to protect and reinforce the human dignity of both local communities and tourists.

Mindful of the need to establish effective alliances among the principal actors in the field of tourism so as to fulfil the hope of a tourism that is more responsible towards our common heritage.

APPEAL to the international community and, in particular, URGE governments, other public authorities, decisionmakers and professionals in the field of tourism, public and private associations and institutions whose activities are related to tourism, and tourists themselves, to adopt the principles and objectives of the Declaration that follows:

1. Tourism development shall be based on criteria of sustainability, which means that it must be ecologically bearable in the long term, as well as economically viable, and ethically and socially equitable for local communities. Sustainable development is a guided process which envisages global management of resources so as to ensure their viability, thus enabling our natural and cultural capital, including protected areas, to be preserved. As a powerful instrument of development, tourism can and should participate actively in the sustainable development strategy. A requirement of sound management of tourism is that the sustainability of the resources on which it depends must be guaranteed.

2. Tourism should contribute to sustainable development and be integrated with the natural, cultural and human environment; it must respect the fragile balances that characterize many tourist destinations, in particular small islands and environmentally sensitive areas. Tourism should ensure an acceptable evolution as regards its influence on natural resources, biodiversity and the capacity for assimilation of any impacts and residues produced.

3. Tourism must consider its effects on the cultural heritage and traditional elements, activities and dynamics of each local community. Recognition of these local factors and support for the identity, culture and interests of the local community must at all times play a central role in the formulation of tourism strategies, particularly in developing countries.

4. The active contribution of tourism to sustainable development necessarily presupposes the solidarity, mutual respect and participation of all the actors, both public and private, implicated in the process, and must be based on efficient cooperation mechanisms at all levels: local, national, regional and international.

5. The conservation, protection and appreciation of the worth of the natural and cultural heritage afford a privileged area for cooperation. This approach

implies that all those responsible must take upon themselves a true challenge, that of cultural, technological and professional innovation, and must also undertake a major effort to create and implement integrated planning and management instruments.

6. Quality criteria both for the preservation of the tourist destination and for the capacity to satisfy tourists, determined jointly with local communities and informed by the principles of sustainable development, should represent priority objectives in the formulation of tourism strategies and projects.

7. To participate in sustainable development, tourism must be based on the diversity of opportunities offered by the local economy. It should be fully integrated into and contribute positively to local economic development.

8. All options for tourism development must serve effectively to improve the quality of life of all people and must influence the socio-cultural enrichment of each destination.

9. Governments and the competent authorities, with the participation of NGOs and local communities, shall undertake actions aimed at integrating the planning of tourism as a contribution to sustainable development.

10. In recognition of economic and social cohesion among the peoples of the world as a fundamental principle of sustainable development, it is urgent that measures be promoted to permit a more equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of tourism. This implies a change of consumption patterns and the introduction of pricing methods which allow environmental costs to be internalised. Governments and multilateral organizations should prioritize and strengthen direct and indirect aid to tourism projects which contribute to improving the quality of the environment. Within this context, it is necessary to explore thoroughly the application of internationally harmonised economic, legal and fiscal instruments to ensure the sustainable use of resources in tourism.

11. Environmentally and culturally vulnerable spaces, both now and in the future, shall be given special priority in the matter of technical cooperation and financial aid for sustainable tourism development. Similarly, special treatment should be given to zones that have been degraded by obsolete and high impact tourism models.

12. The promotion of alternative forms of tourism that are compatible with the principles of sustainable development, together with the encouragement of diversification represent a guarantee of stability in the medium and the long term. In this respect there is a need, for many small islands and environmentally sensitive areas in particular, to actively pursue and strengthen regional cooperation.

13. Governments, industry, authorities, and tourism-related NGOs should promote and participate in the creation of open networks for research, dissemination of information and transfer of appropriate knowledge on tourism and environmentally sustainable tourism technologies.

14. The establishment of a sustainable tourism policy necessarily requires the support and promotion of environmentally-compatible tourism management systems, feasibility studies for the transformation of the sector, as well as the implementation of demonstration projects and the development of inter-national cooperation programmes.

15. The travel industry, together with bodies and NGOs whose activities are related to tourism, shall draw up specific frameworks for positive and preventive actions to secure sustainable tourism development and establish programmes to support the implementation of such practices. They shall monitor achievements, report on results and exchange their experiences.

16. Particular attention should be paid to the role and the environmental repercussions of transport in tourism, and to the development of economic instruments designed to reduce the use of non-renewable

17. The adoption and implementation of codes of conduct conducive to sustainability by the principal actors involved in tourism, particularly industry, are fundamental if tourism is to be sustainable. Such codes can be effective instruments for the development of responsible tourism activities.

18. All necessary measures should be implemented in order to inform and promote awareness among all parties involved in the tourism industry, at local, national, regional and international level, with regard to the contents and objectives of the Lanzarote Conference.

Final resolution

The World Conference on Sustainable Tourism considers it vital to make the following public statements:

1. The Conference recommends State and regional governments to draw up urgently plans of action for sustainable development applied to tourism, in consonance with the principles set out in this Charter.

2. The Conference agrees to refer the Charter for Sustainable Tourism to the Secretary General of the United Nations, so that it may be taken up by the bodies and agencies of the United Nations system, as well as by international organizations which have cooperation agreements with the United Nations, for submission to the General Assembly.
(https://www.gdrc.org/uem/eco-tour/charter.html)

These principles can be expressed in the representation of the holy trinity of sustainable tourism development as captured in *Figure 1*.

Figure 1: The Venn Diagram of Sustainable Development

This model underpins our work, but some found this to be theoretical and came up with the more catchy idea of the Triple Bottom Line *(Fig. 2)*. It does not take a great leap of the imagination to see the connections!

We will have these models in our minds when debating the issues here.

Partnerships can be seen as a necessary and essential way of working, especially in a complex construct such as cultural and heritage tourism. Cultural and Heritage tourism draws on not only the specific cultural and heritage tourism attractions but also the amenities, the accommodation and the transport. No matter how committed your tourists, they will need to be able to access your offer, stay over to enjoy it and relax with food and drinks.

Figure 2: The Venn Diagram of the Triple Bottom Line

Stakeholders

Stakeholders are individuals or groups who are impacted by or can influence the success or failure of a development. They can come in all shapes and sizes and can act as individuals or as groups often expressing contradictory or even mutually exclusive positions.

Freeman defined stakeholders (1984:46) as "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organisation's objectives" The suggestion was that this would include owners, customers, competitors, employees, suppliers, governments, local community organisations, special interest groups, environmentalists, consumer advocates, media, unions, trade associations, the financial community and political groups. We would add that for us the involvement of the tourists and the local communities are integral to our understanding of the term.

The stakes that allow holders to be identified include:

– AN INTEREST – including any direct and/or indirect interest in the tourism development
– RIGHTS – expressed sometimes as legal rights but this can also extend to moral rights
– OWNERSHIP – mostly this is recognised as property or real estate but should also respect the concerns for intellectual property rights
– CONTRIBUTION – again this can be manifest in many shapes and forms covering knowledges (both in terms of expertise and experience) and support (funds, human resources and advocacy)

For tourism developments, this can be interpreted as EVERYBODY!

Tourism is complex and cultural heritage is also a complex, composite term which makes any developments very difficult. Many businesses operate with a single core business but the fields discussed here operate multi-core business models. Ask yourself a simple question – do you know one person who can develop cultural heritage tourism on their own?

Value(s)

In order to gain inscription, sites must satisfy at least two of the 10 criteria outlined by UNESCO and be able to substantiate a claim that the site has Universal Value – given our starting point this claim could be seen as the cultural capital equivalent of the gold standard but for cultural capital the claims are more complex.

We have witnessed the remarkable success of the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage. At the moment

over 1000 sites have been designated. This must have been and continue to be a tough task. Indeed this points to both a strength and a weakness with the process. Bourdeau et al (2015) discuss the criteria involved in meeting the requirement for Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and the critical parameters involved in these discussions are vital to deepening our understanding of the inscription and management of World Heritage Sites. The power issues involved in such processes and the ways in which value is recognised and realised are fundamental ones that impact on heritage where ever we find. The study of WHSs adds weight to this by drawing attention to sites which inscribe parts of localities and communities which the communities find difficult to value. The power to raise values above boundaries carries many implications, not least in the other part of the valuation processes which lead to other parts of our cultures and heritages appearing to be devalued. This may well be an unintended consequence of inscription but it makes it harder to promote, manage and gain profit from those other values.

THE WHS structures are based on sites justifying claims of Outstanding Universal Value. This was first defined in the 2005 Operational Guidelines and repeated in subsequent revisions including the 2012 edition: 'Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity' (OG para 49). However, OUV has a broader dimension that needs to be understood when justifying it for nominations and that in turn will form the foundation for managing the property. The OG state with regard to OUV: To be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding. (OG paras 77–79) A property needs to meet these three requirements of Outstanding Universal Value to be included on the World Heritage List.

The nexus formed through touristic operations and even partnerships with heritage organisations reinforces these tensions. The cases draw attention to the problems of tourism exploitation of the WHS brand leading to overuse, capacity issues and management problems but also recognise that one way of judging the success of inscription is to monitor the number of visitors. The need for progressive and positive heritage management is made explicit in several chapters and is an implicit sub-text in all of them. The threat of losing WHS status is ever present but does not appear to the authors to be a sufficient deterrent in most cases.

Sarah Ellen Shortliffe's contribution on the myth of a gender neutral heritage highlights the problem with the UNESCO approach, although her critique may have been directed to a different audience. She thoroughly exposes the gendered nature, not only of the heritage sites, but of the heritage itself – and, by that I mean, of the heritages – plural – and the interpretations of those heritages. This might be

contentious but, once raised, it is difficult to look at the world through a gendered lens again. The gendered heritages are then apparent. To close the loop and connect the two arguments, we have to recognise that gendered heritage is inscribed in the terms of outstanding universal value. Privileging masculine heritages and/or denying feminine heritages are practices which are inherent in the values 'we' are seeking to preserve in our heritage sties. Our conservation and preservation does not easily allow for the critical challenge raised by the gendered lens and therefore we promote the success of a Universal Value which is doomed to be exclusive and demeaning. I wish Shortliffe's notion of gender blind heritage could be resolved as easily as by a trip to the opticians. We need to view the heritages, their management, promotion and, in this case decisions to inscribe as themselves powerful cultural products, bound up in and limited by the taken for granted notions of gender. That may be a first step, small though it may be, to exploring our heritages more openly.

My own interest in values comes through most clearly in the final chapter by Jane Brantom. The exploration of world heritage values and those derived from sustainability, on shared values and value-based management again challenges the visitors to think. Sustainable values are very important but they are not the only ones which run through heritage tourism. We can apply value-based management arguments to the discourses of business themselves (in the same way it is impossible to conceive of gender blind heritage so it is not possible to think commercialisation and commodification of heritage and heritage sites without considering the consequences of the business values built into the logics adopted and implemented. Heritage sites must find ways of fronting values which are sympathetic with those of the sites, in their struggles to find ways of managing the sites without becoming managerial. The most important values must be those which are found in the sites and their host communities. These must be championed when other, possibly contradictory and may be even hostile discourses are brought forward in the business plans and site management arrangements.

Finally, we have promoted the notion of co-creation in our work (Clarke, 2011). The concepts of creating and recognising value(s) through co-developed initiatives can be very helpful in developing sustainable sites. There are many obstacles to co-working as it involves a set of recognition and valuing processes which do not always sit comfortably with traditional management, interpretation and development models. Co-creation focusses our attention on questions of authenticity and consumption studies but as with our sense of gendered heritages so we have problems recognising the values in other cultural heritages.

References

Bourdeau, L., Gravari-Barbas, M. & Robinson, M. (eds.) (2015): *World Heritage, Tourism and Identity*, Inscription and Co-production, Farnham, Ashgate.

Clarke, A. (ed.) (2011): *Exploring Co-Creation*, London, Pearson (available from the author: alanhungary@hotmail.com).

Freeman, R. E. (1984): *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Shortliffe, S. E. (2015): Gendered Heritage in Bourdeau, L., Gravari-Barbas, M. & Robinson, M. (eds) (2015): *World Heritage, Tourism and Identity*, Inscription and Co-production, Farnham, Ashgate.

_____

ALAN CLARKE | University of Pannonia, Faculty of Business and Economics

alanhungary@hotmail.com