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Heritagescapes of Development: Boundaries and Communities

UNESCO’s World Heritage Center focuses on “the five Cs:” Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building, Communication, and Communities. These concepts are woven throughout their Global Strategy Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT), launched in 1994, and the more recent 2011 Audit Report on the program. The organization calls on heritage practitioners and communities to form “synergies” to work towards sustainable development. The adoption by UNESCO in 2011 of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Paris Declaration on Heritage as a Driver of Development highlights the increasingly close relationship between economics and cultural policies:

“The relationship between heritage and development is to be viewed as an asset to heritage conservation, to the dissemination of its inherent values, and to the cultural, social and economic development of communities. This Declaration and the recommendations are addressed to stakeholders involved in heritage conservation, development and tourism, and more especially to States, local authorities, international institutions, the United Nations agencies and UNESCO in particular, as well as to relevant civil society associations (ICOMOS 2011).”

This focus is aligned with the objectives outlined in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) have supported and continue to support MDG programs related to cultural heritage and tourism in Turkey (alliances for cultural tourism, eastern Anatolia), the Balkans (especially programs in Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina), Cyprus (Supporting Activities that Value the Environment [SAVE] Project), and Jordan (Jordan Tourism Development Project [Siyaha]).

According to the UNDP (2013) and USAID (2011) websites for various programs throughout the Caribbean, cultural heritage is not yet a major, independent component of their programming, nor is it a key element in the various sustainable tourism programs. The natural environment and agricultural practices receive the bulk of the attention; however, the 2013 economic impact report by the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) for the Caribbean confirms that tourism is among the most vibrant sectors there. Cultural and natural heritage are certainly part of a holistic approach to effective and sustainable preservation, conservation, and tourism management. Programs carried out by UNESCO demonstrate this commitment. These include the 2005 workshop held in Santiago, Cuba entitled “Cultural Landscapes in the Caribbean: Identification and Safeguarding Strategies” as well as the slow, yet steady nominations by nation-states in the region of sites to the World Heritage List. The U.S. Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation and the World Monuments Fund (among others) have a history of supporting programs in the Caribbean region. These concentrated efforts, along with the environmental projects under UNDP and USAID, offer prospects for future collaboration and development of holistic tourism opportunities.

Yet, how development moves forward requires a serious commitment to in-country assessments and exploring the potential for regional cultural and natural networks, often referred to as “heritage routes” or “green networks.” In the following essay by Peter Siegel and colleagues we learn about many of the issues that must be addressed for sustainable management practices to be successful in the Caribbean. Among their most salient points is that in order for research and mitigation to be done efficiently, they must also be well supported financially. To achieve these goals the authors stress that it is not only necessary to have regulations but also credibility. Lax enforcement of policies and protocols gives developers little incentive to view archaeological resources as part of a holistic management plan, which has the potential to include long term profits (e.g., tours to archaeological sites, integration of museums in hotels, etc.). Finally, holistic approaches should ensure that the local municipalities and communities are woven into the fabric of the planning stages as well as the economic deliverables so that the “heritagescapes” are part of dynamic research, local identities, and business plans.

Another noteworthy point made in the following essay regards our evolving understanding of heritagescapes as permeable, flexible boundaries. Whether we
speak of place-based performances (intangible heritage such as carnival), legacies of colonialism (coffee plantations), and the Cold War (Cuban landscapes), or the value of object-based exhibitions, careful consideration is required when one defines and marks a heritagescape on a map. International organizations and developers work within the confines of legal definitions of “property,” and thus, boundaries and zones of heritage places must be established with a firm understanding of the respective cultural histories. The role of the field archaeologist could not be more important. Survey, excavation, and historical documentation provide the datasets from which lines will be drawn and zoning boundaries established. As we look towards a Caribbean heritagescape that includes large scale rehabilitation in Haiti and the potential opening up of Cuba, archaeologists could find themselves at the center of a powerful economic engine. This timely essay offers insight into the opportunities—and challenges—that the field archaeologist increasingly faces as part of the larger umbrella of heritage management.

References