

University of Massachusetts Amherst

From the Selected Works of Neil A. Silberman

May 10, 2012

Changing Visions of Heritage Value: What Role Should the Experts Play?

Neil A. Silberman, *University of Massachusetts - Amherst*



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/neil_silberman/48/

Changing Visions of Heritage Value: What Role Should the Experts Play?

Neil Silberman
ICOMOS – ICIIP

Are the aims of heritage conservation and commerce converging? Is the voice of the heritage expert now guided by the vox populi? The current evidence for these trends, long considered anathema to heritage purists (e.g. Petzet 2010), suggests that an epoch-making change in heritage practice is now underway. The announcement of a Memorandum of Understanding between the World Bank and UNESCO to provide “very positive input for the improvement of aid effectiveness, and make the most of culture as a motor for social development and poverty alleviation, through employment and job creation” (UNESCOPRESS 2009) and the theme of the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly, “Heritage, a Driver of Development” (Mouton 2013) are both clear indications of a pressing new concern: that heritage contribute to the economic—not only cultural—well-being of contemporary society. No less significant is the emphasis on public rights and responsibilities in the formulation of heritage policy, once the exclusive prerogative of antiquarians and professional conservators. This turn to the public as full-fledged heritage stakeholders is expressed clearly by the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (2005) and the efforts of UNESCO to promote the active participation—and economic advancement—of traditional practitioners of intangible cultural heritage (UNESCO Media Services 2013).

Economic development was certainly not among the original motivations for the 19th century historic preservation and folklore documentation movements (Jokilehto 1999; Bendix 1997). Both were aesthetic-ideological reactions to the rise of modern industrial society (Matsuda 1996). At a time when life had increasingly become a series of anonymous monetary transactions and mass immigration from farms to factories threatened time-honored lifeways and social relations, an appeal to tradition through the monuments and memories sought to restore some measure of social harmony. Since—or so it seemed to cultural elites in Europe and North America—that stable historical standards of significance and value were needed, a professional class of experts and administrators was empowered to establish the chronological and stylistic criteria for the kinds of cultural remnants and relics that needed to be saved. (Jokilehto 1999, chaps. 4-8). Seeing themselves as the saviors of national and civilizational tradition, the early professional conservators of both tangible and intangible heritage assumed the public responsibility to discover, document, and honor the legacies of pre-modern eras, be they architectural monuments, art objects, regional dialects, völkisch costumes, dances, or fairy tales. (among many sources: Ashurst 2007, Bendix 1997) Those identified heritage elements became modernity's symbolic "other" and in the sense that modernity was perceived to be all about change and movement, those antithetical, premodern heritage elements were endowed with the seeming quality of permanence and timelessness.

In the 19th and most of the 20th century, public participation in heritage was considered best when passive; the unchanging, elite values of each nation's cultural heritage were seen as a cultural vitamin that would enhance the citizen's patriotism or cultural literacy (e.g. Dietler 1994, West 1999, Glassberg 1990). The distinction between high and low culture was clear and

inviolable; the cultural experts, empowered by increasingly complex bureaucracies and cultural institutions guarded the borders and determined the priorities (Levine 1988). Yet with the economic and social disruptions of the 1960s and the rise of history “from-the-bottom-up,” culture was recognized a legitimate political battlefield, not a fact of nature that had only one correct and authoritative reality (Starn 2002). The 1972 World Heritage Convention adopted a universalizing, global perspective, yet minority and indigenous communities in former colonial societies began to associate the right to designate and control their own heritage places as a demonstration of political legitimacy (Smith 2006).

Indeed the celebration and protection of the diversity of cultural heritage—rather than the acceptance of a single eurocentric heritage standard—became a token of faith (Ashworth, Graham, and Tunbridge 2007). Following the lead of the environmental movement in instilling the value of biological diversity in the public consciousness, the protectors of cultural diversity—through varying notions of “authenticity” (Larsen 1995) and the formalization of Intangible Cultural Heritage (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004)—similarly impressed upon the international development community the socio-economic value of preserving a wide range of regional and even local variants of cultural heritage (Bandarin, Hosagrahar, and Albernaz 2011). And just as biological diversity was promoted not as an abstract value but the source of as yet undiscovered pharmaceuticals and the precondition for the “sustainable” human exploitation of the environment, so too did culture and its tangible and intangible expressions become seen as the medium for “sustainable” social development and a cornucopia of economically valuable places, commodities, and events. Far from being hermetically sealed from the present, the legacies of the past have now become a preoccupation of contemporary society, in its quest to

deal with change, sustainability, and the enhancement of human welfare (Labadi and Long 2010, Licciardi and Amirtahmasebi 2012, Barthel-Bouchier 2012, Galla 2013)

DO HERITAGE EXPERTS HAVE ENOUGH EXPERTISE?

So what is the proper role of heritage professionals in a world of globalization, identity politics, and economic development priorities? I would argue that despite the heritage community's current rhetorical turn toward the goals of environmental sustainability, regional economic development, poverty alleviation, social cohesion, and urban regeneration, the heart and soul of heritage practice remains firmly wedded to the far less instrumental, humanistic disciplines of aesthetics and historiography (e.g. Petzet 2010). While the sentiment of cultural heritage professionals contributing to and even driving the improvement of public welfare is noble, much needs to be done to equip a new generation of heritage professionals with the complex expertise in development economics, community engagement, and regional planning that a slogan like "heritage as a driver of development" requires (Diduck 1999). The simple fact is that most existing heritage laws, conventions, and charters standing at the very core of heritage conservation and management, deal with formal categories of significance and states of physical preservation, not wider economic, social, or political aims (Blake 2000). Likewise most university conservation curricula and professional training deal with conservation science, architectural and archaeological site management, and interpretation, with, at most, only a brief introduction to development theory, urban studies, or community economic policy (Avrami, Mason, and de la Torre 2000).

There are still some in the heritage profession who see the current socio-economic and public-engagement preoccupations as little more than a destructive fad. As former ICOMOS President Michael Petzet put it with characteristic bluntness:

Values are here now dominated by those *previously unrecognized stakeholder communities* [italics in the original], minority groups, aborigines, unspecialised professionals etc., who somehow will take care that heritage is subsumed *into a process that is inherently dynamic by responding directly and constantly to the evolving needs of society at any given time*. Obviously, it is accepted that in this wonderfully dynamic process the classic values of conservation will perish in no time and that “managing change” will replace the efforts to save our cultural heritage. (Petzet 2010: 9)

That is the reason why heritage conservationists and private sector interests have traditionally been implacable foes (Van Oers 2008). But here is precisely the paradox before us: conservation (i.e. “saving our cultural heritage”), on which the structure of the officialized heritage is based, is identified with resisting change, while change is the primary object of the socio-economic development embraced by a growing number of heritage professionals. And this paradox is not simply theoretical but poses a serious challenge to the future role of cultural heritage within society. On the international and national levels, the traditional forms and structures of heritage conservation (or “safeguarding” for intangible heritage) remain intact, with specially trained and officially qualified experts 1.) adopting universal criteria for

significance and value; 2.) categorizing and studying the physical types; 3.) creating inventories of specific vessels of significance and value; 4.) establishing guidelines and codes of protection, and 5.) protecting the extant physical manifestations that are recognized as “authentic” or expressive of traditional values from transformatory change. Yet tolerance for and even encouragement of far-reaching change lies at the heart of the new development imperative (Araoz 2011). Indeed the idea of “heritage and development” is seen by its supporters not only as a necessary matter of social relevance for the heritage profession but—no less important—as a source of funding ambitious heritage initiatives at a time when governments are slashing their culture budgets and when traditional subventions from private and corporate philanthropy are harder than ever to find (Borwick and Bacon 2012).

So the market—not collective memory, not ars gratia artis—has become the mechanism on which the promotion of cultural heritage conservation increasingly depends. On the one hand there are those who believe that heritage professionals should never compromise with market forces, even if a commitment to defending unchanging values against the “creative destruction” of the neoliberal global economy proves to be a disastrously quixotic strategy (Cowen 2002). On the other hand there are those heritage professionals who see collaboration with development agencies and organizations to be of great mutual benefit, without precisely documenting or even articulating what measurable benefits they bring (Silberman 2013, Labadi 2008). Following the model of the 2009 Memorandum of Understanding between UNESCO and the World Bank, some heritage professionals envision their skills and expertise as an underutilized resource to bring prosperity, pride, and a higher quality of life to inhabitants of neighborhoods, cities and regions (e.g. Hampton 2005, Feltault 2006). Likewise, venture

capitalists, consultants, and planners see cultural heritage as a base for “city branding,” “attraction creation,” and inner-city real estate booms (Rypkema 2012, Misiura 2006).

But can either reliably provide what they promise? Here we come to some central questions of cause and effect. The assumption that heritage can be an effective driver of local and regional development; that it can make a meaningful contribution to the challenge of poverty reduction; and that it can regularly and reliably help rejuvenate declining communities and heal serious social fractures is an ambitious, utopian ideal that in its very instrumentality profoundly changes what cultural heritage is. The economics of heritage is a field fraught with uncertainties and disagreements about even the most basic methods of valuation (Mason 2008); the term “Cultural Capital” is itself an import of market-based calculations of investment and return (Throsby 1999). In terms of urban regeneration, the proportional share in benefits of development projects by various classes of investors and stakeholders is problematic, if not grossly unequal (Porter and Shaw 2013). Sustainable tourism remains a subjectively defined watchword whose real value in jobs and stimulation of the local economy often disrupts or disappoints those whose lives it promised to improve (Caserta and Russo 2002). And while the problem of gentrification may dramatically raise real estate values, the social cost of those rises in broken lives, demographic replacement, and social disruption remains uncalculated even in monetary terms (Herzfeld 2010).

What we have is a continually widening range of tangible and intangible *heritage*, *patrimoine*, *patrimonio*, *erfgoed* and *erbgut* transformed from an essentially embodied object of cultural significance to a marketable commodity whose value lies at least partially in how well its exploitation stimulates a faster circulation of money in certain sectors of the

community. Commodification is not in itself necessarily bad and in some cases can be a vehicle of agency and cultural assertion (Ertman and Williams 2005). Thus, it is a fateful instrumental decision for the future of development-oriented heritage which sites will be chosen as objects for investment and which will be resigned to neglect and oblivion, judged by their relevance for socio-economic development. If we wholeheartedly accept the definition of heritage as “Cultural Capital” and its goal to serve as an engine of regional and urban development, wouldn’t free market logic suggest that we concentrate on protecting and promoting the heritage that offers the greatest return? Or shall we search for a new path that avoids a binary approach—and the associated zero-sum conflicts—between those who consider cultural heritage to be the private preserve of connoisseur experts and those who see heritage elements as exploitable resources whose value can be measured only in monetary gain?

Are we to accept the wisdom of investment in potentially profitable cultural tourist attractions while neglecting a more balanced (yet increasingly de-funded) public policy of long-term conservation of the entire range of heritage resources? And if only some heritage resources prove useful for economic development, what shall be done with the rest? Shall the imperatives of development require the triumph of attractive, visitor-attracting nostalgia over historical reflection? And if local communities, minorities, and indigenous groups are encouraged to promote their own heritage for socio-economic reasons are they not susceptible to the same culturally corrosive marketing urge? (Butler and Hinch 2007)

These are some of the problematic questions to be asked, not ignored, by heritage professionals who recognize the inevitability of engaging in the globalized realities of the 21st century. Before signing MOUs or participating in regional planning initiatives, today’s heritage

professionals must, first of all, have the expertise to identify and assess various heritage-related development processes, who precisely they benefit, and whether they reinforce or undermine a community's ontological security (Grenville 2007). Are we speaking only of economic revitalization, in which the generation of revenue, numbers of jobs created, and overall increase in economic activity are the benchmarks of success? Or are we talking about the much quoted goal of "social cohesion"? How can we define it? How can we measure it? How can we establish there is even a link? (Perkin 2010) The answer is neither simple nor automatic to any of these questions. In fact—to the simplest and most commonly repeated assertion that heritage enhances local identity and pride, a recent report by the Heritage Lottery Fund in Great Britain suggests that while active volunteers in local heritage projects feel a personal satisfaction in this work, their personal connection to the community actually becomes less, not more committed, after dealing face-to-face with historical misconceptions and mass-market cultural preferences of their neighbors (Clark 2006). Shall we allow our own misconceptions of cultural diversity at the everyday level and wishful thinking about the general economic benefits determine the focus of our professional efforts to safeguard tangible and intangible heritage?

THE CHALLENGE OF REMEMBERING FORWARD

Cultural Heritage is, almost by definition, the tangible and intangible remains of urban and rural cultures that may still be honored, but are no longer the dominant ones. Regional declines and transformations are caused by changing economic and social conditions, shifting technologies

of manufacture, agricultural production, services, and trade. In many parts of the world, the disintegration of subsistence farming in the face of industrialization and urbanization, has given rise to both rural depopulation and the crowded, poor quarters of cities—often historic quarters—by new waves of rural and foreign immigrants (for one example among many, (Dinçer 2011). Heritage can only help change the status of a region if it contributes to bringing it from a peripheral status into the mainstream of the present global economy. But if heritage is used as a mechanism for modernization, can it really be considered heritage at all? The cruel irony is that the problem of urban and rural deterioration will not be solved by declaring decimated areas cultural landscapes or inner cities as prime targets for rehabilitation, but rather by recognizing and trying to understand the structural, historical conditions that have caused the decline in the first place and working with local communities to avert or at least soften regional development's often destructive cultural effects.

Indeed an increasing number of international development agencies, the World Bank among them have recognized that “culture matters,” (Da Costa 2010), especially in the wake of the enormous demographic dislocation and social fragmentation caused by the mega-projects of the 20th century. They have recognized the great mistake to assume that central planning and physical rehabilitation of heritage landmarks, monuments, and historic centers can uniformly and successfully contribute to the process of “development” without enormous social dislocation and heritage loss. Gentrification, commercialization, transfer, or emigration of traditional populations—in fact many of the elements that work against the cause of cultural heritage as a common inheritance—are all too often the result of centrally planned development schemes (Scott 1998). Heritage development may indeed help to maintain the

superficial visual presence of ancient or traditional cultures, but if the process of development completely transforms its economic and social foundations and excludes or ignores the rights of “non-modern” or “undocumented” populations, it may exacerbate, rather than reduce, the growing social divide between ethnic groups, religious communities, rich and poor—in rural areas and in city centers alike.

When ICOMOS President Gustavo Araoz issued his call for “tolerance for change” (Araoz 2011) that evoked such a hostile reaction from traditionalist circles in the ICOMOS community, he was accused of counteracting “the core ideology of our organization,” since, as his predecessor asserted, “conservation does not mean ‘managing change’ but preserving—preserving, not altering and destroying: ICOMOS, the only global international organization for the conservation of monuments and sites, is certainly not the International Council on Managing Change.” (Petzet 2010: 7) But in fact, that is the 21st century reality, not only for ICOMOS, but for the heritage profession as a whole. What does preserving tangible heritage mean when public funds to support strict conservation are being catastrophically restricted, and the areas with monuments, architectural ensembles, and cultural landscapes in most need of conservation are precisely places where economic downturn, illegal immigration, poverty, agricultural decline, or deindustrialization are also the most severe? How can we realistically rely on the assumption that public or private investment poured into these areas to conserve their architecture or to present their archaeological sites to cultural tourists will in fact prevent the social reactions and dislocations that will render the commemoration of these monuments just another entertainment venue or themed upscale residential development? (Silberman 2007) That is why I think Araoz’s soul searching is so important, to reinvent—yes reinvent the

field of public heritage as a revival of peoples' sense of belonging and participation in a living cultural community, not just the preservation or safeguarding of symbolic heritage elements. But that requires something other than the two diametrically opposed alternatives of "fight development at any cost" or "development is our new rationale."

The heritage profession must reflect deeply and seriously before transforming itself into an instrument of top-down social engineering on a global scale. That applies equally to those who seek to perpetuate intolerance for any change whatsoever, or those who incautiously accept participation in development actions—in the standard frameworks of commodification and infrastructural investment—that may radically devalue the creative, cultural possibilities of heritage conservation and interpretation as a shared public activity. New factors of globalization, mass migration, and sub-national identity politics have dramatically undermined traditional, essentialized criteria of "significance," "authenticity," and "place" and have led to new emphases on local, relational construction of collective memory in whatever (changing) form it may take (Gracia 2003)—and community empowerment that facilitates a wide range of locally based social, cultural, and economic activities (cf. Ruiz-Ballesteros and Hernandez-Ramirez 2010) These do not depend on the delineation of heritage "properties" as tourist destinations or the public perception of the past as a "visitor experience."

The question to be confronted urgently at this crucial moment is not to discover more effective techniques to confront the forces of development or to collaborate with them as "drivers." It is, I believe, rather more important to reassess the socio-economic value we place on the historical landscape and intangible traditions as the basis for community well-being, whether that community is local and fixed, or a diaspora scattered across the world (Gustafson

2001). Unless we seek to understand what kinds of basic changes are now occurring to the very concept of heritage, we will never understand what is being lost or what is being gained. There can be no return to the age of high culture and the public funds to support it. Yet we must resist an uncritical acceptance of what I have elsewhere called a discourse of development, a seductive folktale, in which the well-intentioned technocrat and plays the hero who shields the economic assertions about the value of heritage from deeper scrutiny (Silberman 2013). And we must avoid at all costs helping to construct a brave new world in which cultural heritage—far from being a driver of development is just an exploitable object in an unceasing search for expansion and profit. For in that world, economics will become the principle driver, creator, and shaper of what we, our children, and grandchildren will learn to identify as “Heritage.”

REFERENCES

Araoz, Gustavo F.

2011 Preserving Heritage Places under a New Paradigm. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 1(1): 55–60.

Ashurst, John

2007 *Conservation of Ruins*. Amsterdam; London: Elsevier/Butterworth-Heinemann.

Ashworth, G. J, B. J Graham, and J. E Tunbridge

2007 *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London; Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Avrami, Erica, Randall Mason, and Marta de la Torre

2000 *Values and Heritage Conservation*. Getty Research Report. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Bandarin, Francesco, Jyoti Hosagrahar, and Frances Sailer Albernaz

2011 Why Development Needs Culture. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 1(1): 15–25.

Barthel-Bouchier, Diane L

2012 Cultural Heritage and the Challenge of Sustainability. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Bendix, Regina

1997 In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies. Madison, Wis: University of Wisconsin Press.

Blake, Janet

2000 On Defining the Cultural Heritage. International & Comparative Law Quarterly 49(01): 61–85.

Borwick, Doug, and Barbara Schaffer Bacon

2012 Building Communities, Not Audiences: The Future of the Arts in the United States. Winston-Salem, N.C.: ArtsEngaged.

Butler, Richard, and Thomas Hinch

2007 Tourism and Indigenous Peoples: Issues and Implications. Amsterdam: Elsevier /Butterworth-Heinemann.

Caserta, Silvia, and Antonio Paolo Russo

2002 More Means Worse: Asymmetric Information, Spatial Displacement and Sustainable Heritage Tourism. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 26(4): 245–260.

Clark, Kate, ed.

2006 *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage*. London: English heritage.

Da Costa, Dia

2010 Introduction: Relocating Culture in Development and Development in Culture. *Third World Quarterly* 31(4): 501–522.

Council of Europe

2005 *Faro Convention - Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*.

Cowen, Tyler

2002 *Creative Destruction: How Globalization Is Changing the World's Cultures*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Diduck, A.

1999 Critical Education in Resource and Environmental Management: Learning and Empowerment for a Sustainable Future. *Journal of Environmental Management* 57(2): 85–97.

Dietler, Michael

1994 "Our Ancestors the Gauls": Archaeology, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Manipulation of Celtic Identity in Modern Europe. *American Anthropologist* 96(3): 584–605.

Dinçer, İclal

2011 The Impact of Neoliberal Policies on Historic Urban Space: Areas of Urban Renewal in Istanbul. *International Planning Studies* 16(1): 43–60.

Ertman, Martha, and Joan Williams

2005 Freedom, Equality, and the Many Futures of Commodification. *In* RETHINKING COMMODIFICATION: CASES AND READINGS IN LAW AND CULTURE 303. Martha Ertman and Joan Williams, eds. New York: NYU Press.

Feltault, Kelly

2006 Development Folklife: Human Security and Cultural Conservation. *Journal of American Folklore* 119(471): 90–110.

Galla, Amareswar

2013 *World Heritage*. Cambridge University Press.

Glassberg, David

1990 American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century.
Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Gracia, Jorge J. E

2003 Old Wine in New Skins the Role of Tradition in Communication, Knowledge, and Group Identity. Milwaukee [Wis.]: Marquette University Press. <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10022590>, accessed September 5, 2013.

Grenville, Jane

2007 Conservation as Psychology: Ontological Security and the Built Environment.
International Journal of Heritage Studies 13(6): 447–461.

Gustafson, P.

2001 Roots and Routes: Exploring the Relationship between Place Attachment and Mobility.
Environment and Behavior 33(5): 667–686.

Hampton, Mark P.

2005 Heritage, Local Communities and Economic Development. Annals of Tourism Research 32(3): 735–759.

Herzfeld, Michael

2010 Engagement, Gentrification, and the Neoliberal Hijacking of History. *Current Anthropology* 51(S2): S259–S267.

Jokilehto, Jukka

1999 *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford, England; Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara

2004 Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International* 56(1-2): 52–65.

Labadi, Sophia

2008 *Evaluating the Socio-Economic Impacts of Selected Regenerated Heritage Sites in Europe*. European Cultural Foundation.

Labadi, Sophia, and Colin Long

2010 *Heritage and Globalisation*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, England; New York, NY: Routledge.

Larsen, Knut Einar

1995 *Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention*. UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM.

Levine, Lawrence

1988 Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America (The William E. Massey Sr. Lectures in the History of American Civilization). Harvard University Press.

Licciardi, Guido, and Rana Amirtahmasebi

2012 The Economics of Uniqueness: Investing in Historic City Cores and Cultural Heritage Assets for Sustainable Development. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.

Mason, Randall

2008 Be Interested and Beware: Joining Economic Valuation and Heritage Conservation. International Journal of Heritage Studies 14(4): 303–318.

Matsuda, Matt K

1996 The Memory of the Modern. New York: Oxford University Press.

Misiura, Shashi

2006 Heritage Marketing. Oxford; Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Mouton, Benjamin

2013 Heritage, Driver of Development: Rising to the Challenge. Paris: ICOMOS.

Van Oers, Ron

2008 SLEEPING WITH THE ENEMY? Private Sector Involvement in World Heritage Preservation. Paper presented at the Xth World Congress of the Organization of World Heritage Cities, Quito.

Perkin, Corinne

2010 Beyond the Rhetoric: Negotiating the Politics and Realising the Potential of Community-Driven Heritage Engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16(1-2): 107–122.

Petzet, Michael

2010 *International Principles of Preservation*. Berlin: Bäßler.

Porter, Libby, and Kate Shaw

2013 *Whose Urban Renaissance?: An International Comparison of Urban Regeneration Strategies*. London: Routledge.

Ruiz-Ballesteros, E., and M. Hernandez-Ramirez

2010 Tourism That Empowers?: Commodification and Appropriation in Ecuador's Turismo Comunitario. *Critique of Anthropology* 30(2): 201–229.

Rypkema, Donovan D.

2012 Economics and Historic Preservation. *Forum Journal* 27(1): 46–54.

Scott, James C

1998 Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.

New Haven: Yale University Press.

Silberman, Neil A.

2007 Sustainable Heritage? Public Archaeological Interpretation and the Marketed Past. *In* Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics. Yannis Hamilakis and Philip Duke, eds. Pp. 179–193. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

2013 Discourses of Development: Narratives of Cultural Heritage as an Economic Resource. *In* Heritage and Tourism: Place, Encounter, Engagement, Russell Staif, Robyn Bushell, Steve Watson, Eds. Pp. 213–225. Key Issues in Cultural Heritage. London: Routledge.

Smith, Laurajane

2006 Uses of Heritage. London; New York: Routledge.

Starn, Randolph

2002 Authenticity and Historic Preservation: Towards an Authentic History. *History of the Human Sciences* 15(1): 1–16.

Throsby, David

1999 Cultural Capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 23(1-2): 3–12.

UNESCO Media Services

2013 Intangible Cultural Heritage: A Force for Sustainable Development.

<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/media-services/in-focus-articles/intangible-cultural-heritage-for-sustainable-development/>, accessed January 2, 2014.

UNESCOMPRESS

2009 World Bank and UNESCO: Expanding Opportunities for Collaboration on Culture and Sustainable Development. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/media-services/single-view/news/world_bank_and_unesco_expanding_opportunities_for_collaboration_on_culture_and_sustainable_development/#.UsNBmkqyqtU, accessed December 31, 2013.

West, Patricia

1999 Domesticating History: The Political Origins of America's House Museums. Washington [D.C.]: Smithsonian Institution Press.

