

Ambassador Bill Lane Jr. Lecture on Sustainable Tourism

University of Hawai'i at Manoa
School of Travel Industry Management
27 February 2007

***Protecting Indigenous Cultures
within a Tourism Environment:
A rights-based approach empowering local stakeholders***

Richard A Engelhardt

Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO

I

Tourism Development and Indigenous Culture Communities: A paradigm of empowerment

Our heritage is under siege. Time, environment, neglect, ignorance, inadequate financial support and unregulated urban development all take their toll on both environmental and cultural resources. This, it may be argued, is the chronic state of the conservation of the world's heritage, having more to do with abstractions such as time and change, than with human agency. However, and most alarmingly, the degradation of the cultural and natural heritage of the Asia-Pacific region has accelerated exponentially during the past three decades, during a period when the countries of the region have, by contrast, experienced unprecedented prosperity brought about by strategies based on capital investment in infrastructure for industry, agro-business and urban renewal.

These development strategies all compete for space with heritage places, but over time, we have devised methods which allow for compromise and the sharing of space between the achievements of the past and the aspirations of the present. However, in respect to one industry – the world's largest and fastest growing – we have found no solution to the conflict between development and conservation. The greatest and most immediate risk to the survival of the heritage comes, from tourism. Ironically, those who most love the heritage are loving it to death.

How have we gotten ourselves into a situation where the world's fastest growing industry – tourism – is consuming the very resources on which it is based at an astonishing unsustainable rate? What can be done to reverse this process which, if allowed to continue, will surely result in the decimation of the world's cultural and natural heritage and, not incidentally, doom the culture tourism industry? These are the questions which we must answer during this conference. Answer, and then find the collective political will to ensure that the necessary changes are made simultaneously and across the board in both the motivation and structure of the tourism industry and in the way we manage the heritage resources on which that global industry is based.

Tourism: fallacies and misconceptions

Our first task is to rid ourselves of false premises. The tourism industry's rhetoric is deceptively soothing. We are told that tourism can generate the financial resources needed to invest in the rehabilitation of historic places. We are told that tourism can help to revive dying traditions, arts and culture. We are told that tourism can provide new livelihood opportunities for large numbers of people in local communities. Indeed, tourism is often singled out as a key economic sector because of its seemingly unlimited potential for growth. But it exactly this capacity for rapacious growth that makes tourism such a danger to sustainable management of the heritage – the very resource on which tourism ultimately depends.

Because growth in the tourism sector can be pursued with little capital pre-investment, government planners all too frequently assume that increase in tourism represents pure profit to the economy, without any related cost. Therefore, and in response to the economic woes of the region, many developing countries in Asia are pursuing a strategy designed to increase tourism activities as rapidly as possible in an attempt to boost their stagnating economies.

Unfortunately, the potential benefits of tourism development are negated by the destructive impacts of this unregulated industry on the heritage resources it depends upon. If not strictly controlled, tourism overwhelms the carrying capacity of sites, robs communities of their ancestral heirlooms, undermines traditional cultural and social values, and alters the physical character of tourism destinations through inappropriate development and infrastructure.

Seen from the vantage point of the recipient community, tourism is an extractive venture conducted by and for outsiders and characterized by quick profit-taking and inadequate reinvestment in both infrastructure and employment.

What is true for tourism generally is all the more evident at World Heritage sites where tourism is heavily promoted, frequently to the point of dramatically and disastrously out-running the carrying capacity of the sites. What should be exemplars of heritage management and sustainable conservation have become examples of the rapacious over-exploitation of one of the world's most valuable but non-renewal resources – the heritage.

Cultural resources -- when they have been considered at all within the development paradigm -- have typically, but incorrectly, been seen as inexhaustible. This has been true especially of built culture heritage: archaeological sites, ancient monuments and historic buildings. Nothing could be further from the truth. Cultural resources, particularly the built cultural heritage, are non-renewable resources, each a creation of a specific time and place, now past, but embedded in a context of memory and space.

At the same time, among the more thoughtful planners in our region, the economic crisis has called into question the wisdom of accepting untested, economic models developed without reference to the unique history and cultures of the region. This has led to a deeper and more reflective introspection regarding the contribution of culture and heritage to sustainable economic development.

And as a result of this assessment, we are beginning to understand that the rapid growth of the tourism industry is a mixed blessing, indeed.

Where traditional economic activities are on the decline, or where shifts in capital markets have placed stress on local economies, employment in tourism-related activities can offer many new opportunities. Tourism can help stem the out-migration of youth and marginally-employed members of communities, alleviate poverty by providing new employment opportunities, revitalize traditional building and craft industries. It can enhance both the physical and the intangible heritage and offer a positive, peaceful way for communities to express pride in their cultural identity.

Heritage tourism: what it should be

“Heritage’ tourism deals with both culture and nature collectively. This is because our heritage is inevitably a result of humankind’s interaction with nature. However, I have drawn my examples of both good and bad practice specifically from contexts in which culture plays the defining and decisive role in this relationship. I have done this because tourism itself is a cultural construct and a cultural act. To realize of the cultural nature of tourism is the first step towards engendering the necessary changes in the industry. What humankind has created, humankind has the power to change. And culture is nothing if not the ability of humans to adapt to changing social, political and environmental circumstances.

Having said that, we need to be clear that the goal of heritage tourism can not be to develop tourism, but must instead be to develop culture and conserve nature. If tourism does not contribute directly to the conservation, promotion and appropriate development of culture and nature, then tourism does not have any right to having anything at all to do with culture or with nature.

It is also important that heritage tourism should not be should not be conflated or confused with tourism in the larger sense, which is basically recreational in character and depends for its success on mass-market retailing. Retail recreational tourism requires the marketing of theme parks, spas, big hotels, mass transport facilities including airports and access roads, as well as food catering services in order to attract customers to travel to otherwise undistinguished and undifferentiated destinations. This has nothing to do with heritage tourism.

For the tourist, heritage tourism must be first and foremost an *educational* experience in cross-cultural dialogue and understanding of culture and context. The heritage tourist seeks authentic cultural expressions of the community visited.

For the host community, tourism must be a developmental activity – but one of a very special nature – which is to develop the community's culture. Culture and heritage tourism must be an activity which provides socio-economic benefits to most inhabitants and offers a positive, peaceful way for the community to express pride in their cultural identity.

Our objective there must be to engender a paradigm shift in the tourism industry itself, a complete re-invention of tourism, transforming tourism from an industry which merely exploits, into an industry whose ultimate purpose and goal is the preservation and enhancement of society's culture, its physical and intangible heritage and its environment.

The Nam Ha Case Study

There are a few examples where sensitive cultural tourism has been developed. One of them is the UNESCO project on Nam Ha Ecotourism Project in Luang Namtha, Lao PDR, which was accorded the United Nations Development Award in 2001 and was also a Highly Commended Project in the 2002 British Airways Tourism for Tomorrow Awards.

The Nam Ha Ecotourism Project utilized tourism to assist in the socio-economic development of ethnic villagers that otherwise had limited access to market commodities and social services. Not only did the project demonstrate that tourists could help reduce poverty by bringing money directly into largely subsistence communities by paying for food, lodging and village guides. The project also used tourism as a tool for forest biodiversity conservation. By giving villagers a larger economic base, ecotourism helped reduced their reliance on forest flora and fauna resources within Lao PDR's largest national protected area.

The Nam Ha Project established a series of guidelines and practices that sought to maximize the benefits of ecotourism for both the provincial stakeholders and the target communities, and minimize any potential negative socio-cultural and environmental tourism impacts.

The Nam Ha Ecotourism Model is currently being replicated in four provinces in Lao PDR under the Asian Development Bank Greater Mekong River Sub-Regional Project. All are places where there is an interface of indigenous living culture, physical heritage of historic value and natural beauty and biodiversity.

As proven in our experience in Nam Ha, the heritage tourism industry which depends on the existence of a multiplicity of heritage places for its very existence – works best when it works with local communities for the conservation of heritage resources.

Only through community stewardship of the heritage, can it be ensured that the heritage will be protected everywhere, and that its protection will be sustained over the long-term. Sustained, universal stewardship is pre-requisite for the survival of the cultural and natural heritage.

Cultural interpretation

The definition of a community's heritage is something which must be articulated by the community itself. A community's heritage can not be defined by national policy makers and tourism industry personnel who do not know the local culture, history and environment of the communities visited. Attempts to do so are doomed to errors of both fact and feeling. And they are unethical – depriving a community of its basic cultural rights to define its own culture.

There are, of course, different articulations of the components and significance of a community's heritage by different interest groups within the community – and these articulations evolved with time. This on-going dialogue will have to be facilitated by two overlapping interest groups within

the community: (i) carriers of cultures, who are also the inter-generational transmitters of indigenous knowledge systems; and (ii) non-change agents within the community, who are often the informal leaders, i.e. Buddhist monks.

An excellent example of indigenous peoples defining their own heritage is found in the Batanes Archipelago off the northern tip of the Philippines. The islands are being nominated for inscription as a World Heritage Site under multiple criteria -- both cultural and natural -- with the title "Batanes Archipelago and Ivatan Archaeological Landscape" which as a title underscores the conservation management strategy for the region.

The Batanes Archipelago has all the resources, both cultural and natural, that make it extremely attractive for development as a tourist destination – outstanding volcanic landscape and seascape, rich mountain and marine bio-diversity, unique vernacular architecture dictated by the extreme geographic and weather conditions, and archaeological treasures of pre-colonial settlements, mysterious boat-shaped burial grounds and imposing hill fortresses, not to mention their well-preserved oral traditions, a complex intangible cultural heritage of music and poetry, and a sophisticated indigenous knowledge system of navigation, migration and island biodiversity management.

The indigenous Ivatan people are also very much aware of every aspect of their cultural and natural heritage and the role each heritage resource plays in their daily lives. Thus, their identity as a community is dictated primarily by the heritage resources that they are blessed with. Fortunately, they are also one of the best-educated culture groups in the Philippines and thus able to act effectively in both traditional and modern spheres of interaction. Fiercely protective of their heritage, the Ivatan recently rallied against a proposal by foreign investors to put up a casino in one of the islands, despite of massive economic benefits that were purportedly to be plowed back into the local economy by the developers and government officials backing the scheme. During the several stakeholders' meetings conducted to prepare the archipelago for eventual nomination and inscription as a World Heritage Site, the local inhabitants themselves identified each cultural and natural resource that should be nominated and protected as 'strict protection zones', and formulated the mechanisms for their long-term protection and conservation, particularly on how visitors should behave while within each of the identified 'strict protection zones'. During those memorable stakeholders' meetings, the 'carriers of cultures' or indigenous knowledge holders, like the old fishermen, the female singers of the traditional 'laji' chants, among others, were the most vocal in advocating utmost caution in opening up the archipelago to tourism.

Commodification of culture and staged authenticity

In the development of heritage places as tourism "products," the source of conflict is between players of unequal strengths. The tourism juggernaut tends to commercialize the host culture, transforming it into an easily-comprehended commodity for the instant consumption of the large number of tourists trying to escape from their daily routine. Religious rituals, ethnic rites and festivals are everywhere reduced and sanitized to conform to tourist expectations and schedules, resulting in what. Mike Robinson of the University of Northumbria, UK, calls "reconstructed ethnicity".

In the late 1980's some Toraja communities in Sulawesi, Indonesia refused to continue to accept tourists because of the way sacred funeral services were being adapted to meet tourists' needs. The case of Toraja highlights the problem of contemporary culture tourism. On one hand, tourists increasingly seek exotic and unique cultural spectacles and experiences at any cost. On the other hand, tourism can degrade local culture and even re-invent it to fit the needs of the industry. As a result, host communities find culture and tradition under threat from the purchasing power of the tourism industry. Instead of getting rich and authentic cultural experiences, tourists get staged authenticity.

Ironically, both the tourism industry and the heritage profession risk becoming confused about what is real and what is fake. A nomination for World Heritage inscription of the Tana Toraja homeland was put forward recently to the World Heritage Committee, prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (which at that time were part of the same ministry). However, and in spite of the rhetoric about the importance of protecting the cultural landscape and traditional practices, when the nomination maps were closely examined it was clear that the area that was in fact nominated for protection under the World Heritage Convention was limited to only five structures in the compound of the local tourist office, one of which was a totally new construction in modern materials made to look like a traditional house, while the other 4 were moved from their original location and rebuilt to the tourist office premises, with considerable alteration to their form and material – and a complete loss of original function. The rejection of this nomination by the World Heritage Committee caused consternation among both the tourism industry and the heritage management office, neither of which understood what was inappropriate about the nomination – a circumstance which demonstrates just how confused the heritage tourism industry has become about what is real and what is not. Local inhabitants, however, welcomed the rejection of this nomination and took advantage of the confusion caused by this so-called “set-back” to heritage tourism to retake control of how – *and even if* – Torajan heritage is to be shared with visitors.

Staged authenticity is always inappropriate and culturally unacceptable. Because of lack of education and skills to deal with outsiders, Indigenous communities are vulnerable to suggestions which amount to commoditization of non-expendable heritage resources. Frequently, tourists too are unwitting victims, placed into the position of abusers of the hospitality of host communities when they acquiesce to activities which treat indigenous inhabitants like animals in a zoo, or at best actors who are enticed to stage ethnic rituals and, oftentimes, religious ceremonies for tourist consumption. This decontextualization of cultural practice from the physical and social spaces in which the practices evolved is, quite literally, rape of the heritage.

There are, however, several ways in which culture tourists can be provided with ‘authentic’ cultural experiences or with virtual reconstructions thereof. The best of course, are those opportunities wherein the tourist has the opportunity to experience local public culture *in situ*. In certain circumstances direct participation of visitors in public events and festival may be appropriate. In some cases, a separate but equal experience can be provided to tourists, like establishing restaurants serving ethnic delicacies. In most cases, virtual reconstructions are appropriate, such as museums and interpretive centres. There are also cases where staged performances works – but only for performing arts that are specifically designed to be staged, like the Russian ballet, for a discerning – that is to say, *culturally educated* -- audience.

For the mass tourist audience, we have theme parks – such as the one recently built in Jinhong in Yunnan Province in south China. There a Dai village has been built, complete with a set of replica historic stupa evoking ancient Dai kingdoms in Thailand, Burma and Xishuangbanna. Visitors get to strip to their swimsuits and get splashed with water by girls dressed up in Dai costumes, in a daily re-enactment of what traditionally is an annual, religious event. Such theme parks probably serve a need in the tourism sector, but the problem is that they are falsely marketed to the world as an exercise in culture heritage preservation. And they also raise serious issues about who profits from this exploitation of Dai culture – the owners of the theme park, all of their staff, including those girls dressed in traditional costumes, and indeed many of their customers – are all from a construction company based in Shenzhen -- 1000 kilometres away from Jinhong. Protecting cultural rights also involves protecting the right of the culture bearers to control the means of reproduction and, therefore, profit.

The universal protection of human rights, including cultural rights, is the cornerstone of global cooperation and, therefore, of peace. Here again, claims espousing tourism as a vital force for global peace and understanding are grossly exaggerated. The truth is that a host of cultural conflicts have developed around tourism. The most obvious conflict is between the tourist and the host. This is in part engendered by lack of education, and in part by a fundamental difference in goals; while the tourist is engaged in leisure, the host is engaged in work. The host is engaged

in production; the tourist consumption. From the examples cited above it should be clear that there is little evidence that tourism – as it is currently practiced and promoted -- is drawing the world closer together. Indeed, just the opposite is happening with the tourist ever more oblivious of and alienated from the host culture.

Carrying capacity

The cultural heritage sites of Asia and the Pacific may be exotic and seductive attractions for tourists, but there are limits. Unless these limits are respected and visitors are managed carefully, the sites will quickly succumb. Their demise will mean not only the loss of the most sacred and spectacular, historic and scientifically important places on Earth; it will also mean the end of the tourism industry based on these cultural and natural resources.

It is obvious that the exponential tourism growth of the past three decades cannot continue indefinitely. There are limits to this growth imposed by the carrying capacity of a site. When this limit is reached, the site must either be closed to the public or will be degraded beyond repair. In either case, the site is lost to tourism.

Unfortunately, when there is an attempt of the tourism industry to expand the carrying capacity of a site, these efforts frequently take the form, not of conservation, but of promotional activities where complex cultural heritage is simplified, homogenized, packaged and in the end, trivialized for the quick and easy consumption of the tourist. Competitors for the tourism market are forced to undercut one another in the struggle to attract the greatest number of customers, for cheaper and ever-more sub-standard products.

The carrying capacity of most, if not all of the World Heritage Sites, is obviously exceeded. In one article published in the Far East Economic Review, the author mentioned that affluent cities with significant heritage resources in China are spending millions of dollars to prepare the nomination dossiers of their sites for possible enlistment in the World Heritage List. According to the author, this investment is justified by local governments because the economic rate of return generated after their cities get inscribed in the World Heritage List, in terms of tourist arrivals, and foreign investments by international chains of hotels and fast-food franchises.

Despite the best attempts of concerned stakeholders to protect their sites against the unregulated and irresponsible tourism industry, not much has been achieved to strike a balance between heritage conservation and tourism development. And it is now becoming ever more common to observe that inscription on the World Heritage List is the quickest and easiest way to destroy a heritage site.

It is therefore essential for policy makers to set the limit of tourist activities in fragile sites. This is being done with considerable success on a site specific level in Australia, New Zealand as well as in remote and isolated natural heritage sites in some other parts of the region. However, the only country which has tackled this issue on a national level has been the Kingdom of Bhutan, where the individual's cultural rights within a well-preserved environmental setting are enshrined in the country's constitution and enforced by law. Tourism numbers are strictly controlled, tourist behaviour is rigorously regulated, and profits are kept in-country. The future of heritage tourism is clear – strict regulation or swift demise.

II

Culture, Heritage Management and Tourism: *a rights-based community approach to heritage tourism*

Through the community-based participatory appraisal techniques of UNESCO activities and as identified by the participants in the various UNESCO workshop/conferences, heritage tourism has been recognized as an economic sector with significant potential for growth, but also as the sector which is the most problematic for long-term sustainable management. Because of the potentially valuable but delicate balance between culture, heritage and tourism, UNESCO project activities place emphasis on developing the capacity of local communities to better manage their cultural and natural resources, so that tourism development based on these assets is sustainable on a long-term basis.

As outlined in the above analysis, local communities, heritage conservationists and tourism industry professionals operating in the Asia-Pacific region are acutely aware of the problems confronting them, and in particular that the development of tourism as an economic sector is being threatened by the lack of articulation of interests and cooperation between the parties involved. Increasingly, these groups are seeking assistance from UNESCO as well as other bodies, to provide workable solutions to find common ground between stakeholders and to help develop models for mechanisms that will create a sustainable cultural tourism industry that is beneficial to all and preserves the heritage resources of the community.

This search for assistance by concerned stakeholders led UNESCO to undertake a four-year, multiple-phase project on “Culture, Heritage Management and Tourism: Models for Cooperation among Stakeholders”, funded by the Government of Norway from 2000-2003. The project was implemented with the participation of the following 8 test pilot sites:

- Bhaktapur, Nepal
- Hoi An, Viet Nam
- Kandy, Sri Lanka
- Levuka, Fiji
- Lijiang, China
- Luang Prabang, Lao PDR
- Melaka, Malaysia
- Vigan, Philippines

The four-year project was implemented in five phases:

- During **Phase I**, test sites were identified and on-site analytical studies of both the tourism and heritage sectors were conducted.
- During **Phase II** of the project, the results of these analyses were presented at a workshop held in Bhaktapur, Nepal which took place in April 2000, at which time test Action Plans were drawn up by the Pilot Sites to address the problematic issues of communication and coordination between the tourism and heritage sectors identified during the Phase I studies.
- During **Phase III** of the project, these Action Plans were under experimental implementation at each test site.
- During **Phase IV** of the project, a workshop in Lijiang, China was organized in October 2001 to evaluate the results of the pilot sites' implementation of their Action Plans, to reformulate the pilot sites' Action Plans to sustain their gains over the long term, and to define the “UNESCO Lijiang Models of Cooperation among Stakeholders for the Sustainable Development of Culture Heritage Tourism”.
- During **Phase V** of the project, a workshop in Penang, Malaysia was organized in January 2003 to provide the opportunity for pilot sites to self-evaluate the impact of the project in their communities and to mainstream the lessons learnt from the pilot site

activities into government policy at local, provincial and national levels, thus transforming the Lijiang Models into action-based policy applicable and replicable throughout Asia and the Pacific region.

During the Lijiang Workshop (Phase IV) the following ‘UNESCO Lijiang Models of Cooperation for the Development of Sustainable Tourism in Asia and the Pacific’ were constructed, based on the outcomes and analysis of the results of implementation of action plans in each of the eight pilot sites.

1. A model for fiscal management of heritage conservation, resource maintenance, and asset development at the municipal level, achieved through

- review of the impact of income generating mechanisms
- identification and implementation of new income generating mechanisms

This model is given operational reality through a process involving undertaking a econometric analysis of income generating mechanisms and the identification and utilization of new opportunities.

This model for fiscal management is based on the premise that the heritage, particularly cultural heritage, is a form of inter-generational capital held jointly by a cultural community. Therefore, cultural heritage asset protection is mainly a public responsibility and should be publicly managed. However, the principal use of cultural heritage is within the private domain and therefore the costs related with the use of the heritage must be borne in the private sector.

The strategy of mainstreaming this model into policy starts with a comprehensive financial planning exercise based on an agreed conservation management programme, which should include budgeting, fees and taxes, collection and accounting, spending and expenditure control, monitoring, evaluation, auditing and publishing the results to community stakeholders. Any programme for heritage management should therefore be supported by a well-established legal, administrative and institutional framework. Sources of funding for the core programme – the purpose of which is to ensure equitable community access to heritage resources -- may come from government sources at all levels (municipal, provincial, national) and other public sources. However, sources of funding for development work – such as heritage conservation and interpretation -- should be sourced externally from users and thus, mainly from the tourism industry. External debt can also be considered, particularly if the programme has significant socio-economic benefits. However, it is important that in the formulation of the programme, the following should be considered:

- regulation of environmental, physical and social carrying capacity
- risk management, preparedness and assessment
- asset development, as well as conservation and maintenance
- public-private partnerships aimed at building business within the community
- maximum local retention of revenue

The core programme should take into consideration the following:

- conservation incentives and financial support systems for private conservation efforts
- restructuring of tourism revenue collection for conservation and site maintenance
- transparency in revenue collection and expenditures
- revenue capture from special events and other innovative activities.

An important step in implementing this model is a focus on raising the cultural awareness among policy makers and the community members, and in having a clear understanding of the impacts and risks of tourism development. With a good understanding of the culture resource base and its economic potentials, the local government unit can plan on how to best retain tourist revenue to

sustain the heritage resources, in particular, and the support the services that the municipality is required to provide to sustain tourism.

2. Model for investment by the tourism industry in the sustainability of the culture heritage asset base, achieved through

- education of tourism operators on the value and conservation needs of the heritage
- formulating mechanisms by which the tourism industry can contribute financially and in other ways to preservation activities

This model is operationalized through (a) education of tourism operators on the inter-relationship of the economic and social value of the heritage resource and (b) by instituting mechanisms by which tourism industry investment in conservation activities can become a revenue-enhancing strategy (principally, through the local development of human capital for the expanding industry.)

The premise on which this model is based is that as tourism is the principal user and main economic beneficiary of the tourism resource base – although it does not in any sense “own” these public resources – it is good business practice, as well as an ethical obligation for the industry to invest in the conservation maintenance and upgrading of these resources.

Reinvestment by the tourism industry into the community is required to finance the following ‘material goods’:

- heritage capital to maintain and restore built heritage and to improve heritage site presentation
- tourism capital to enable the community provide more convenient parking spaces, public toilets, food and accommodation facilities
- ‘carrying capacity’ capital for the provision of electricity, water, waste management to accommodate the strategy, and so the site can accommodate increasing visitor loads

Capital to finance these reinvestment costs should be accumulated from the tourism industry (and its ancillary industries) through a municipal system of local taxes, user fees, licenses or other use-based mechanisms. Commercial models can, in some cases, also be explored. (Refer to attached flowchart.)

Accompanying this model, it is important to institute clear and strict rules regulating tourism activities in the community. These regulations should be community-derived and transparently enforced. The tourism industry should understand the regulations and the reasons for them, and be satisfied that the fair and equitable enforcement of the rules of these rules, and well as the uses of the revenues levied from the industry are used to promote the industry through the development of necessary infrastructure.

3. Model for community education and skills training leading to employment in the heritage conservation and culture tourism sector, with emphasis on opportunities for women and youth achieved through

- identifying new businesses and employment opportunities which can be made available locally
- designing programmes of skills training plus financial incentives to turn these potential opportunities into reality at the local level

This model is given operational reality by identifying equipment applications and training needs and by designing programmes to meet these needs (refer to attached flowchart).

The premise behind this model is that for members of the local community to be able to take advantage of the new employment opportunities which arise from the development of a heritage tourism industry, there must be an opportunity for members of the local community to acquire the new skill sets required, at increasing levels of technical competence and managerial skill. Without the educational and training opportunities which allow local inhabitants to take advantage of new opportunities (either for salaried employment or as self-employed entrepreneurs), the economic benefits attendant upon tourism development will not impact significantly in the local community. The result of neglect of this sector is net revenue out-flow from the community, as jobs are out-sourced or go to economic migrants into the community.

Mainstreaming of this model requires the following:

- commitment among the policy makers
- formulation of a human resource development plan, based on the demand of the tourism industry
- preparation of educational and training programmes

While government support is vital (considering that support to education and training typically constitutes a large share of local revenues), to finance training programmes, there is a need for partnerships and apprentice opportunities within the private-sector tourism industry (hotels, accommodation facilities, etc.). The establishment of a preferred employment scheme for trained members of the local community, in the tourism industry facilities located within the community is also part-and-parcel of this model.

4. *Model for conflict resolution among tourism promoters, property developers and heritage conservationists, achieved through*

- providing a structured venue where all stakeholders can raise and discuss situations and concerns, as well as receive education and information about heritage conservation needs and tourism development plans
- empowerment of local stakeholders through joint participation and implementation of both heritage conservation projects and culture tourism activities

This model is given operational reality by encouraging group participation in the formulation of activity implementation, and by providing a structured and moderated venue where all stakeholders can raise and discuss their situations and concerns (refer to attached flowchart).

The premise behind this model is that it will be in the best interests of both the tourism industry and the heritage conservation advocacy within the local community to find win-win solutions to the conundrum posed by heritage tourism development. If not, the downward spiral in which both are trapped will continue. It is the responsibility of government to facilitate this dialogue, assuring that there is informed public debate and that all voices are able to be heard equally. It is also the responsibility of government to negotiate solutions which are in the long-term best interests of the community and best safeguard the community's assets, including the heritage.

Public education is vital to the successful implementation of this model. Pro-active ways to inform the public must be established using the media. Another possible way to achieve this is to establish interpretation and tourist information centers. These information centers should explain how tourist contribution/fees are spent in terms of improvement of site presentation and interpretation, tourist facilities and infrastructure and conservation of heritage resources, including the natural environment.

Mainstreaming of this model into policy should consider the following principles:

- *Community education and awareness*
Through community education and awareness rising, the community is provided political strength.

- *Building partnerships early*
Get all the stakeholders involved in planning and strategizing. Look into best practices.
- *Consensus Building*
Requires giving everyone equal access to information, enough information to make good choices, transparency, respect for each and everyone's ideas, neutral mediator, etc.
- *Sequence development*
Keep the pace of development slow, as this gives an opportunity to limit mistakes. When a problem arises, the community can adapt and adjust in pace with the development. This helps mitigate negative effects as well as spreading both risks and benefits.

Toolkit

The models developed and tested in the UNESCO project on "Culture Heritage Management and Tourism: Models for Cooperation among Stakeholders" provide the framework for sustainability of the results of the project, at the pilot sites and other heritage sites. The models provide the practical guidelines for reconciling the differences between heritage conservation and tourism development.

To facilitate practical implementation of this theoretical material, a comprehensive toolkit has been compiled, consisting of:

- **Publication and dissemination to a wide regional audience of the "Workbook for Heritage Site Management in the Asia-Pacific Region"**

The user-friendly workbook will provide practical guidelines to local stakeholders on how the Lijiang Models on the development of sustainable culture tourism industry can be mainstreamed into local policy.

- **Preparation and publication of a reference book on conservation and heritage issues facing Asian cities and towns.**

In press is a reference book entitled "Streetwise Asia" which focuses on practical aspects of heritage conservation and management, and will incorporate examples from the eight pilot sites. The book will be a relevant companion document to the Workbook. While the Workbook will focus on processes which communities can adopt in their management of cultural heritage and tourism, 'Streetwise Asia' will provide practical examples of heritage conservation in Asia which can be used by a broad audience of heritage towns and cities as inspiration for their own communities. Through demonstration examples, the book will deliver the message on how historic districts can be revitalized, not only to improve site presentation for tourists but also to enhance the livability of historic cores.

- ***Publication of best practices under the UNESCO series on "IMPACT: the impact of tourism on the culture and environment"***

The project has resulted in a significant number of positive changes in the eight pilot sites, which can be replicated in other heritage sites in the Asia/Pacific region. Professional writers have been commissioned to draft the best case practices in the pilot sites.

- ***Heritage Home Owner Manuals***

Produced for the sites of Kathmandu, Vigan and Hoi An, with two special editions; one for owners of traditional Asian shophouses; the other for caretakers of Buddhist temples with specialized editions for both the Theravadin and Vajrayana traditions.

- ***UNESCO Asia-Pacific Awards for Culture Heritage Conservation***

In 2000 UNESCO launched the Asia-Pacific Awards for Culture Heritage Conservation, recognizing best practice in the private sector and encouraging the integration of economically viable heritage conservation and adaptive re-use projects into urban development and renewal strategies.

- ***Cultural Impact Assessments: Developing a Regional Methodology***

Under development is a regional methodology for cultural impact assessment on any physical intervention within protected zones in cultural heritage sites before they are implemented. As an instrument, the culture impact assessment is intended to avoid, protect and mitigate adverse impacts on cultural heritage assets from destruction or irreversible damage resulting from competition for space with modern infrastructure development. The cultural impact assessment will have to consider the heritage site's: (a) environmental carrying capacity; (b) the cultural and social carrying capacity; and (c) psychological carrying capacity. Physical interventions can impact on the integrity and morphology of the site, built heritage, historic and social settings, non-movable and contextual art, cultural spaces and landscapes, archaeology, as well as the cultural, social and traditional economic processes and practices.

- ***Lining Tourism Development to the Preservation of Endangered Buddhist Cultural Heritage***

The multi-year regional project, "Cultural Survival and Revival in the Buddhist Sangha Mobilizing Tourism to support Documentation, Education and Training to Revitalize Traditional Decorative Arts and Building Crafts in the Buddhist Temples of Asia" demonstrates in concrete and visible ways how tourism can catalyze a revival of traditional arts and crafts so necessary for the continued authenticity of Buddhist cultural traditions across the length and breadth of Asia.

Conclusion

The Lijiang Models have an explicit and overt objective to change the currently destructive competitive relationship between tourism and heritage conservation into a constructive partnership. The models show how tourism can become an effective tool for heritage conservation as well as for job creation and income generation, by promoting local custodianship over the heritage and by empowering local communities to manage culture tourism in their communities for their long-term benefit. Through this strategy, tourism is transformed from an extractive enterprise into a development activity that stimulates economic opportunities by using traditional skills and indigenous resources available in the community.

Sustainable heritage conservation depends upon the commitment and involvement of local communities. Conservation policies, if they are to be successful, need to promote local community stewardship of the heritage as well as provide socio-economic benefits for local communities. If not, then we are all talking nonsense, and there is no meaning in the concept of tourism as a sustainable development strategy. Therefore a direct link must be made between the safeguarding of the heritage and socio-economic development.

For those communities which expect tourism to play a significant role in their development strategy – and here we can count all communities which host a significant heritage site – tourism must establish a direct and positive feedback loop to benefit heritage conservation and stimulate culture and cultural creativity.

“The preservation of cultural heritage is essential for two separate sets of reasons: because of its universal aesthetic and historic value on the one hand and because of its importance to the societies and cultures that are its custodians on the other.

“Cultural heritage provides a link between past and present and as such boosts individuals’ and communities’ sense of identity and social cohesion. In this way it also cements the foundation on which societies build their future.” [Koichiro Matsuura]

Culture is not a static relic from the past. Culture is at the very heart of development. Cultural values determine the priorities a society sets for its future economic and social development. Ways must be found to balance the development of a thriving tourism industry with the equally important need to protect and nurture the unique cultural and natural heritage upon which the tourism industry is based. Tourism has within itself the resources necessary for its development into a universal engine for international understanding, resource conservation and grass roots community development. It is a question of mobilizing these resources and directing them towards sustainability and for a truly sustainable future.

It is UNESCO’s vision that in the 21st century, tourism will transform into the leader and a driving force in Asia and around the world for the safeguarding and preservation of the cultural and natural heritage. If this paradigm shift can be realized, tourism will be the agent through which society will be able – as enjoined by Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention – “to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community.”