



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Selling cultural heritage?

Groot, B.M.

Citation

Groot, B. M. (2017, September 26). *Selling cultural heritage?*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57990>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57990>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/57990> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Groot, B.M.

Title: Selling cultural heritage?

Issue Date: 2017-09-26

Part I

Chapter 1

The values of the past

“Any creation of heritage from the past disinherits someone completely or partially, actively or potentially” (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, 21).

This chapter presents an overview of the political and economic value of cultural heritage and the MNC perspective of cultural heritage and its value. This is a critical theoretical framework that runs through the entire work to assess the question of the value of cultural heritage for different stakeholders. It serves to set the theoretical context, looking at the values of the past within and beyond the MNC. A case-study of the Bedouinization of Jordan in the 1970s-1980s is presented in the end of the chapter to emphasize the intertwined relationship between political and economic value and the construction of identities.

Cultural heritage experts argue that access to cultural heritage is a basic human need and a human right. Given this importance we would expect the public-sector to protect cultural heritage through necessary legislation and sponsorship. However, a multitude of economic priorities, a decade of difficult economic crises, and an ever-widening definition of cultural heritage all contribute to a lack of resources and funding: cultural heritage managers today cannot secure the resources they need for the protection of heritage, whether financial or otherwise. Cultural heritage is rarely (and potentially never) the first priority within the public sector budget where cultural funds are being increasingly cut and shifted to private-sector alternatives. Despite the loud cries of cultural heritage as a basic need, it still is not a recognized human right.

Realizing cultural heritage as a human right within the UN agenda or within corporate codes of conduct and industry standards may be an impossible endpoint due to the issue of the exclusivity. Cultural heritage is a powerful tool in the hands of many stakeholders in the construction of identity and the creation of meaning and belonging and as a “vehicle” for cultural identity. At its most potent, heritage becomes such a strong symbol of identity that people are willing to live for it, to fight for it, to die for it (Frerks, Goldewijk and Van der Plas, 2011). These struggles are not about a specific monument or narrative, they are about the symbolism: what a song can signify, what a monument can signal, and the perceived shared identity. Cultural heritage, encoded with symbolic and semiotic messages can be a means of communicating a specific identity. But as a specific identity it is also an excluded identity: “any creation of heritage from the past disinherits someone completely or partially, actively or potentially” (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, 21). This divisionism by definition disinherits other groups-social, ethnic, regional, racial, or other-who may be marginalized, discounted, or outright ignored by the construction of a chosen narrative (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, 29).

Moreover, as we continually broaden the definitions of ‘heritage’ to ensure that we do not deny any stakeholders of their inherent right human right to heritage, so we also blur the boundaries between the past and present. New technologies have created a shift in global communication abilities making it possible to imagine a world of limitless connectivity embedded in hyper-complex cosmopolitan networks (even if this is not yet a global reality). There is therefore a need to consider identities across a much more complex network of interactions. Likewise, the scope and definition of cultural heritage is also being stretched: in today’s environment certain mass market cultural goods, brands, and other cultural products

are already becoming definitive cultural products for the Generation X, Generation Y, and Generation Z. Modern cultural goods may become a critical part of the cultural heritage being chosen to be passed down to subsequent generations. Moreover, these goods have a life-cycle that is far beyond the initial relationship of producer and consumer, being constantly re-appropriated by different stakeholders. This research therefore defends on an epistemological change where heritage is no longer considered to be absolute, but contextual, its values not intrinsic but ascribed.

This chapter begins with a contextual framework discussing of the present context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution looking at emerging technologies and their impact on the question of the value of cultural heritage. It then presents a theoretical framework looking at the political value and the economic value of cultural heritage, framing this in the lens of cultural heritage used as a tool in the construction of identity. The research focuses on the terminology or classifications of “political” and “economic” value but it also stresses that cultural heritage is a social good and is important for humanity and for society. The theoretical framework will therefore also discuss the *social value* of visiting and experiencing heritage with others; the *societal value*, of consciousness and contribution to identity; the *cultural value*, aesthetic, artistic or spiritual, and the *personal value* linked to personal goals and aspirations (Klamer 2013, 426) as well as its literal *political values* (for a socio-political agenda), and its *economic values* (financial values). The final chapter presents a case study of heritagization and Bedouinization within the construction of identity in Jordan, focusing on the usage of Petra and of tribal identity in the creation a national narrative.

1.1 Globalization, and the digital, technological and consumer revolutions

Globalization is characterized for MNCs by its opportunities for competition, rapid technological advance and open markets. The boom of neo-liberalism created a new era of democratization, trade and loan agreements, and partnerships that fueled economic growth and development, and MNCs have risen to power as the pioneers of this neo-liberal global expansion. Accordingly, in the past three decades the world political arena has been marked by the constant shifting of game rules, from neo-liberalism to sustainability, to the decline of the nation-state (Anderson 1991, 2010, Bhaba 1991, Pollock and Bernbeck 2005, Van Tulder and Van der Zwart 2006). The flexible shifting of borders and changes in demographics have come with an unprecedented era of cultural exchange: both digitally, led by new technologies, and physically, led by the boom of tourism, urbanization and migration pressures, and the clustering of innovation in city-centers.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution

These changes have come hand in hand with a change in the total theoretical framework of communication, leading Klaus Schwab, founder of the World Economic Forum, to propose that humanity is in the term of a Fourth Industrial Revolution. This Fourth Industrial Revolution is described as a technological revolution which follows from the previous digital revolution. It is defined by the velocity, breadth, and depth of change in the modes of communication, led by the transformation of communication networks through digitalization and mass electronic media (Schwab 2014). Relevant to this research, this new age of digital communication has the potential to empower different stakeholders within the complex networks of corporate and community interactions. The broadening of different communication channels has almost completely annihilated the possibility for information censorship and the role of the state as a controlling institution is slowly shifting to a more multi-vocal empowerment of communities. As states lose their monopoly over the idea of nation” (Appadurai 2010, 156) all other sorts of groups may tend to re-capture some of these logics of the nation. A quarter of a century ago, the cultural theorist Homi Bhabha argued that cultures and identities were being produced more and more from the perspective of disenfranchised minorities (Bhabha 1991, 6) and arguably this is truer than ever in the present term of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

“The Fourth Industrial Revolution has the potential to empower individuals and communities, as it creates new opportunities for economic, social, and personal development. But it also could lead to the marginalization of some groups, exacerbate inequality, create new security risks, and undermine human relationships” (Schwab 2016)

Due to the technological changes, there is an opportunity for increased cultural mobilization across increasingly connected peoples and the potential for the formation of an exponential number of shared imagination landscapes due to the opportunities of hyper-connectivity. At the same time, we need to always remember that hyper-connectivity does not mean limitless connectivity: it is not equally distributed, it is not fully transparent, and the opportunity of this new technology does not reach everyone, everywhere. Following the work of Manuel Castells (cf. Shepherd and Haber 2011, 99) it is necessary to consider the ‘black holes’ that paradoxically also come as part of the information society. And the same cautionary warning can also be made regarding Schwab’s proposed term of Fourth Industrial Revolution that humanity faces today.

However, the prolific expansion of electronic mass media is nonetheless an important change that is directly affecting all types of organizations and their relationships with their stakeholders. Local interests may be better protected due to the potential for mass electronic protest, and local stakeholders may be able to mobilize communities beyond the local geographic boundaries through technology platforms, to circumvent media-controls put in place in local networks or to surpass digital firewalls, to spread cognitive dissonance in support of protests and ideas. For example, the 2014 “Umbrella Movement” in Hong Kong and the 2014 “January 25th Revolution” in Egypt are notorious examples of social media role used to mobilize local and global support (using technologies like Facebook, FireChat, Periscope, Twitter, WhatsApp, and so forth). In a discussion of engagement and new technologies within the archaeological community, Nick Shepherd and Alejandro Haber also emphasize this movement of “accelerated global interconnectivity” discussing its impact on the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) and noting its ability to connect scholars and practitioners and to fuel the growth of the Indigenous Movement:

“Partly in response to these developments, the same period has seen the growth of the Indigenous Movement, and more generally of social movements who organize and mobilize around archaeological sites and cultural heritage, as a route to protecting territory and gaining access to resources, rights, representation, and restitution” (Shepherd and Haber 2011, 100)

Beyond the dimension of political mobilization, this age of new technologies also has an important value and impact for corporations especially related to their relationship among the public, and the changing demands of the ‘digital’ age. According to research in 2011 nearly three quarters of millennials use social media to engage about (social) issues that they care about (Cone Communications 2011). The power dynamic or control of communication has potential shifted away from monolithic institutes like the state and the corporation, to the wider network where consumers are empowered to voice their dislike or rejection of brands and to disseminate this through the network (See Hertz 2001).

One of the results is that corporations and brand are starting to respond with more socially conscious communication, including many communication angles with a strong appeal to cultural heritage. Cultural heritage can be useful for corporations and brands as a means of establishing authenticity and emotional relevance (Gilmore and Pine II 2007) whether linked to a national identity or a historic identity or to a social cause.

Companies that support a cause or transmit a well-matched purpose can trigger brand loyalty and drive purchase intent (Carole, Cone, Feldman, and DaSilva 2003, Kotler and Lee 2005). For example, “when quality and price are equal, social purpose ranks as the most important factor in selecting a brand” (Edelman Trust Barometer Survey 2014). Unsurprisingly then, there has been a parallel shift in brand

communication models to include social responsibility communications either as part of a corporate social responsibility agenda, or as a marketing and cause-related marketing agenda increasingly focused on meaningful impact (Cone Communications 2011). Note, a more detailed implications of corporate social responsibility initiatives and of marketing will also be discussed in more detail in Chapter two.

Debating consumer-citizenship

A closely related phenomenon is around the so-called consumer revolution or consumer citizenship, referring to the ‘new’ power of consumers due to changes in spending power and the technological and communication shifts which have affected the phenomenon of autonomous consumer choice (Johnston 2008, 242). Along this line of thought consumers arguably can “vote” by “shopping” (Hertz 2001, Van Tulder and Van der Zwart 2006, 6), signaling the emergence of a new governance style affecting corporations, states, and consumers as intertwined stakeholders. As described by anthropologist Robert Foster in *Coca-Globalization* (a study of the Coca-Cola organization), “consumers use their market role to act as citizens, and corporations use resources to act like states” (Foster 2008, intro xix).

At the same time there has been a rise of anti-consumption (political consumerism), culture jamming, and ethical consumerism, all contributing to the notion of consumer-citizenship: consumers arguably can ‘vote’ for their values through their purchase choices (Foster 2008, Johnston 2008, Hertz 2001, Klein 2010, Starr 2000).

That said, there is an inherent incompatibility of citizenship (which refers to collective responsibility and the commons), and consumerism (which is inherently related to individual self-interest) (Johnston 2008, 233). Thus, the idea of consumer citizenship and the age of the consumer needs to be treated with some caution. Anthropologist Arjun Appadurai also critiques the notion of consumer empowerment in this context, calling it the “fetishism of the consumer” (2010, 41). He argues that through advertising and marketing the consumer may be perceived as a social agent, but arguably this is only in the moment of choice between already existent options: “the real seat of agency...is not the consumer but the producer and the many forces that constitute production” (Appadurai 2010, 42). Global advertising is a critical vehicle for this communication of consumer agency, but it should not be confused as genuine agency (ibid).

A further critique of this theory of consumer-citizenship is that it pivots on the transparency of information. At the time of making a purchase, consumers consider not only the perceived corporate or brand value, but also many other elements. This leaves little room for genuine consumer-citizenship or true agency in the moment of purchase itself (Johnston 2008). In other words, when information is not equal, and when consumers’ purchases are affected by so many other factors, it is very hard if not impossible to determine the value and impact of the brand or corporate image. And it is even more complex to signal or validate the impact of a social cause or socially-responsible activity and its impact on this overall image by the consumer and its impact at the moment of a purchase decision.

Crowd participation as a fourth sector?

The development of electronic media and the age of new technologies may also mark the emergence of a “fourth sector” for consideration, referring here to systems of *crowd-funding* (sponsorship by crowds) as well as new platforms for *crowd-sourcing* and *co-creation* (communication ideas or project decisions being sourced from crowds directly). One illustration of crowd-sourcing in the cultural heritage sector can be seen in the example of the Westfries Museum in The Netherlands, where the community have solicited funding through crowd-funding to create a virtual reality re-enactment of the city of Hoorn in the twentieth century (Voordekunst 2015). This community involvement can also be seen in grants by the American Express Foundation. For example, the Partners in Preservation program includes a consumer

voting element for the consumer selection of sites that they would most like to receive funding (Kanani 2007). This are many such cases, and it is a clear shift of opportunity with museums, cultural heritage organizations, communities, or even individuals being able to source sponsorship from the general public. It may also provide a new method of stakeholder value assessment, as in this method there is a direct selection and direct ‘vote’ by stakeholder. In other words, through their direct contribution stakeholders also signal the validation and selection of projects that have social value for them.

Similar tools are also being used by the private-sector and again in some cases this involves projects for heritage selection and preservation. One example is crowd-selection platform that was initiated by the automobile company Honda as part of a marketing campaign to “Save the Drive in”. The campaign asked users to select drive-in cinemas in the United States that they wanted to vote for to be protected and digitalized. This process of digitalization would be funded by Honda as part of a social-marketing campaign to protect the Drive-In as an iconic heritage and symbol of the “American” culture. The crowd, limited to specific regional stakeholders (located in the U.S.A but open to customers of Honda as well as non-customers) could enroll on the platform and select their local drive-ins to petition for their protection. Awareness for the campaign was built using social media platforms, and after a few weeks a winning selection was announced. In this way Honda served as the sponsoring platform to allow for awareness, heritage selection, and a program for protection. Of course, this is not for altruistic motives. The campaign helps to drive Honda’s brand awareness and to establish an emotional connection to the brand, as driving authenticity through an appeal to nostalgia for this emblematic heritage icon-despite Honda’s own Japanese heritage that has little to do with this shared “national” American identity.

Communication approaches in a global network

These examples emphasize an important change in the relationship and flow of information between corporations and other stakeholders, but especially emphasizing the changing role of the consumer as a stakeholder within the network. From the 1950s to 1970s consumers were connected to corporations in a one-way dialogue (for example, with the first radio and TV adverts producers would talk at the consumer to convince them of the brand or product value). In the years since, this has changed to a more participatory and consumer-influenced dialogue and network (Moon 2012). Brand culture is in flux, and messages are no longer controlled or controllable (Banet-Weiser and Lapansky 2008). Take for example Coca-Cola, where since 2014 an average of eighty-five percent of the corporation’s communication content has been generated by consumers (Clarke 2014). At its core this type of viral marketing approach is arguably about appropriation and cycles of re-appropriation. Foster argues that at its essence, it is attempt by marketers to encourage the consumer to develop a message and meaning, which the corporation or brand can then re-use and seek to own (Foster 2008, 30).

However, even if consumers apply meaning, and even if corporations then appropriate this meaning, the control of the meaning is changing and in flux and continually being shared along the network. The attempted appropriation and control of meaning is arguably lost the moment that the brand pushes its communication message out into the network (See for example the case of Tahoe’s marketing campaign, discussed in Banet-Weiser and Lapansky 2008).

New media channels and technologies therefore promise both opportunities and challenges for cultural heritage. On one hand, new channels for dissemination and awareness will enable cultural mobilization across geographical boundaries. Whilst connectivity is not limitless, it is closer to a multi-stakeholder inclusion than ever before and has even given rise to an emerging fourth-sector of crowd-funding, crowd-sourcing, and overall platforms for broader stakeholder inclusivity. There is an argument for consumer citizenship, which may gain more support in coming years, but currently it cannot be seen as a viable model of citizenship due to the many other factors affecting a consumer at the moment of a purchasing decision. The consumer agency is only the agency of choice.

At the same time, new media brings the risk of decontextualisation, with cultural heritage being removed from its original cultural context. It also presents many challenges for the protection of intellectual rights to intangible cultural heritage, such as folklore, which by law is part of the public domain and accessible to everyone therefore making it difficult to protect indigenous rights to ownership (Brown 2005, 45).

1.2 Resource pressures, tourism, and the preservation dilemma

Beyond this element of new technologies there are several important global shifts in human migration, urbanization, and economic development, which all impact the value of cultural heritage for different stakeholders. Current migration and Diaspora demographics have changed the borders of identities and post-modern national identity cannot be restrained within the geographical borders of the nation-state (Rowlands 2004, 483). This is hardly a new dynamic in itself, but it is new in relationship to the high velocity, breadth, and variation of communication and the highly complex network of communication that now accompanies these migrations. This new regimen where “moving images meet deterritorialized viewers” questions the power and the salience of the nation-state, and confounds the traditional idea of the nation-state as the key driver of identity (Appadurai 2010, 4).

Another important trend that has come with the digital revolution and the shifts in industrial production is that of urbanization. A huge percentage of the world population has moved into urban centers, and social theory increasingly predicts an increased tendency for employment and for innovation clustered in global city-centers. Within only one generation the number of urban dwellers in developing countries is predicted to increase by 2.5 billion, a number equal to the current urban population of the entire world (Ratcliffe and Krawczyk 2011, 642). At the same time the last decade has been marked by significant world development challenges with several periods of global economic crisis and with dramatic changes in the global macro-economic dynamics, including development agendas around global poverty. To this end, the number of poor has fallen in the past half-decade due to the growth of emerging countries, and this creates new resource pressures and a change in power dynamics. One implication is that it generates a new classes of consumer-citizens putting potential pressure on corporations regarding their societal roles and responsibilities.

Another implication is that as world development standards improve it provides more room for ‘secondary’ human rights, such as the right to cultural heritage, to mark their place in today’s sustainability and development agendas. In the past, cultural heritage rights have struggled to gain such recognition due to the prioritization of other basic human needs, and the lack of the universal recognition of cultural heritage as a basic need. In a world where millions are starving or without basic sanitation and health care the *relative* importance and value of cultural heritage can be harder to prioritize within a development agenda, despite its intrinsic cultural value.

Another resource pressure that affects cultural heritage is the acceleration of infrastructure development such as civil engineering projects, which often place high risk on the diversity of natural landscapes in addition to sometimes infringing on cultural landscapes. Reduced availability of land and natural resources means that cultural and natural heritages are increasingly threatened by contested ownership between governments, communities, and corporations. There are many examples of the exploitation of land and resources affecting archaeological sites, indigenous peoples, and sacred landscapes (Gould and Burtenshaw 2014).

Tourism, the “cultural component of globalization” (Evans 2003, 418) likewise deserves its own discussion and is especially important for this theoretical framework because tourism can provide an anchoring for identity within an increasingly de-centralized world (ibid). Again, the breadth and scope of change has been dramatic in the past decades with tourism increasing from 25 million international

tourism arrivals in 1950 to an estimated 806 million international arrivals in 2005 (Evans 2004). Due to the high potential economic inflows that accompany tourism, and due to the importance of cultural heritage within tourism agendas, there is a recognized economic value and political value stemming from heritage tourism and its impact on national development agendas (Gould and Burtenshaw 2014). On an urban level there is a related phenomenon of urban rivalry between cities vying for economic inflows and competing for tourism awareness. This also plays out for cultural heritage in the arena of World Heritage Listings both within nations and universally within the global development agenda and ethical questions of bias and balance. For example, Frey, Pamini, and Steiner, 2011, look at the unequal global balance of World Heritage Sites across developed and less developed markets, and the value and competition for economic resources that this can create.

These diverse pressures have affected cultural heritage managers in their role as ‘preservers’ of the past. On one hand, the desire to protect all potential valuable landscape has stimulated an increasingly broad definition of sites, landscapes, and intangible heritages for preservation. However, the negative impact of this blanket-approach to preservation is that it creates a resource and budget challenge of its own. Heritage managers today either need to find more resources to handle the increasing number of sites, landscapes, and heritages for protection; or they may need to consider alternative models of management: for example, through delisting of heritage sites, searching alternative sponsorships or patronages, or even encouraging tourism and merchandising as a means of self-subsistence (Benhamou 1996, 123).

Tourism, and its commodification through advertising, films and novels, popular media, marketing, postcards, social media, and so forth all also affect cultural heritage in terms of the conceptions of authenticity and the issue of (de)contextualization. The branding of tourism sites has become almost a mandatory but in this process of “selling” it also risks the creation of a specific “place” myth and narrative re-enforcing an isolated and potentially marginalizing concept of authenticity or of “reconstructed ethnicity”. In other words, showing the impression and narrative of what is expected, even if this is a “staged” representation and lifestyle (Leite and Graburn 2009, 44-47).

1.3 Authenticity and the “authorized heritage discourse”

Authenticity is not a new discussion in the theme of archaeological and cultural heritage management, as experts in the field have argued that the historical colonial and ‘Western’ concept of cultural value has dominated the heritage discourse and has created unbalanced power relations affecting what constitutes heritage and value (and especially in a tourism context). In this explicit context of heritage and the heritage discourse, authenticity can be seen through three understandings: *objectivist or museum authenticity* (relying on an ‘expert’); *constructivist authenticity*, where it is a socially constructed label and *existential* (focused on the feelings of tourists) (cf. Wang 1999 in Leite and Graburn 2009, 43). These understandings all directly contribute to the (economic) value of tourism sites and the process of their ready and more easy consumption and exploitation: “everywhere, authentic culture is put on display” (Leite and Graburn 2009, 44).

Closely related to this is the problem of what constitutes heritage, and heritage according to whom. Whereas not so long ago archaeologists and heritage experts assigned themselves the job of both managing and interpreting the archaeological heritage, this has been challenged by an influx of diverse interest groups seeking their own interpretations and towards their own agendas and leading towards increased stakeholder inclusion and rights (Skeates 2000, Cleere 2000, Meskell 2004, Hodder 2004). This has come hand in hand with the development of a discourse of unity and diversity emphasizing post-processual multi-vocality and the active promotion of minority groups instead of simply allowing their inclusion (Ucko 1994, 257). Thus, the political “right” to heritage has increasingly shifted towards a multi-vocal and multi-stakeholder conceptualization that challenges the notion of “expert” authority.

The questions of authenticity from a heritage perspective can especially be seen in the process of World Heritage site selection and tourism, whereby state- and international-bodies adopt an ‘expert’ power to make decisions related to heritage preservation. As described by archaeologist Laura Jane Smith, “the authorized heritage discourse (AHD) focuses attention on aesthetically pleasing material objects, sites, places and/or landscapes that current generations ‘must’ care for, protect and revere so that they may be passed to nebulous future generations for their ‘education’, and to forge a sense of common identity based on the past” (Smith 2006, 29).

This has a direct impact on the use of cultural heritage and the questions of preservation, as it affects the question of *who* has the right to determine what to preserve or to be involved in the process of meaning-making. Especially in the case of the selection of World Heritage sites, the ‘authorized’ discourse is problematically focused on a Eurocentric discourse emphasizing the physical and aesthetic (Smith 2006, Gfeller 2015). Moreover, it tends to enforce the role of a “national” identity above all others due to the singular character of the discourse:

“The heritage discourse, in providing a sense of national community, must, by definition, ignore a diversity of sub-national cultural and social experiences. Ultimately, the discourse draws on too narrow a sense of experience of what heritage is and what it may mean to readily incorporate sub-national identities” (Smith 2006, 30).

Authenticity from the MNC perspective

It is necessary to also contrast this with the understanding of authenticity from the MNC’s brand or corporate perspective, which is also a prominent usage in this research. Authenticity for brands is preoccupied with the consumer and identification with the consumers “self-image” to create a perceived real or genuine experience. Gilmore and Pine II (2007) propose a theory of six key forms of authenticity from this brand perspective. The first to commodities, appealing to that which has not been touched by human hands and which is natural (*natural authenticity*); to goods, appealing to being the first of its design or type and recognized for their design value (*original authenticity* and *authenticity of design*); to services, referring to those done exceptionally well (*exceptional authenticity*); to experiences, referring often to the past or some form of historical authenticity, (*referential authenticity*) and transformations, relating to higher purpose or goals (*influential authenticity*) (Gilmore and Pine II 2007, 49-51).

All of these may draw on the ‘past’ but the most relevant is the case *referential authenticity*, such as in the example of the authentic “Chinese tea ceremony” (2007, 50). This type of *referential association* can be used whether in the heritage industry (staged authenticity related to tourism) or in broader industries such as in the marketing campaign for a tea brand or the use of the tea ceremony to build a narrative associated with and appealing to the Chinese gastronomic heritage. It is particularly through such examples of referential authenticity that brands are able to use cultural heritage for the construction of identity. Cultural heritage therefore can become an important tool due to its utility in the process of authenticity-making and as a vehicle for the ascription of value to a brand or corporate narrative.

1.4 Cultural heritage and the construction of identity: from MNCs to nation-states

The usage of heritage as a tool in the construction of identity is not unique to any one stakeholder, and this section discusses the construction of identity as used by corporations, by nation-states and political agents, and by other communities. There are several characteristics of heritage, both intangible and tangible, which have made it particularly suitable to codification and symbolism that can be ascribed to identity (Appadurai 2010, Azaryahu and Kooks 2002, Bernbeck and Pollock 1996, Ucko 1994). First heritage is often perceived as a historic resource that is ‘located’ in the past. The temporal space between past and present provides room for ambiguity in interpretation and possible to readjust the ascending or

descending anachronisms to create cultural continuity between otherwise anachronous events (Bernbeck and Pollock 1996, S140). This is seen often in historical examples: it is common practice of the political elite to isolate the remote past from the more recent past in order to highlight a desired historical moment or cultural period (Ucko 1994, 238). Reference to cyclical histories or analogies to past events is another benefit of this temporal gap, and can be used to enforce the sense of cultural continuity. Not all stories are equally convincing and so some tales will be more useful than others (Kohl and Fawcett 1995, 6).

For tangible heritage, its materiality sets it apart from history, anthropology, or other disciplines seeking to codify national identity (Meskell 2002, 293). Intangible heritage is particularly effective as a tool in the construction of identity because of its materiality: it is physical and often visually impressive making it evocative and particularly effective as a symbolic marker; it is ambiguous and versatile therefore allowing different interpretations; and it is old and durable therefore credible (Skeates 2000, 93).

Intangible heritage stands in explicit contrast to this emphasis on materiality, but this can also be an advantage. For example, it benefits from the absence of a fixed resource endowment and this provides greater possibility for codification, symbolization and identity building due to a greater selection of symbols and stories to choose from (Kohl and Fawcett 1995, 6; Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, 9). The lack of materiality also allows for easier transfer between communities, and to even evolve as a reflection of the communities who have selected it:

“In fact, such a heritage has the intrinsic capacity to modify and shape its own characteristics in parallel to the cultural evolution of the communities concerned, and is therefore capable of representing their living heritage at any moment” (Lenzerini 2011, 118).

Unsurprisingly then, in many cases heritage management deals with contested ownership of intangible heritages. For example, Egberts, 2015, discusses the identities of Nijmegen and Arnhem in The Netherlands competing with two narratives: one of the green, creative city of the future, and the other of the war-time past. Munasighe 2005, analyses how Vilnius in Lithuania has used the line of royalty to disassociate from its Soviet history and to conceptualize the nation along the lines of a liberal and free-market identity. Rao, 1994, and Bernbeck and Pollock, 1996, show the usage of heritage to create ascending and descending anachronisms to support ownership claims in the conflict of Ajodhya mosque, India.

For cultural heritage managers there is a further conflict in the question of safeguarding heritage and the dilemma of preservation as a process for heritage protection. “What counts as heritage is changing all the time” (Lowenthal 2011, 31) and cultural heritage managers face the ethical dilemma of what to preserve, and what not to preserve, and importantly, who decides? (Mignosa 2005). For example, Chinua Achebe describes how the Nigerian conceptualization of cultural heritage and its protection is focused in renewal, and not in preservation: “when the product is preserved and venerated, the impulse to repeat the process is compromised” (Lowenthal 2011, 31). A similar approach has been recognized in the Japanese approach to heritage conversation that has a focus on intermediate transfer of skills (Goto 2013). In the approach to living treasure the process of training is valued so that the ‘holders’ of skills can pass these to the next generations:

“[...] the national living treasure does not own skills as intangible heritage properties, but holds them. A national living treasure inherited the skills from the past and transmits them to the future generation” (Goto 2013, 574).

This type of approach to intangible heritage protection is of course in explicit juxtaposition to the concept of preservation in-situ. Indeed, preservation in-situ has been increasingly being challenged in recent years due to the potential over-emphasis on the scientific agenda above over values (Willems 2012, 2014). Whilst there are many risks of heritage abuse and exploitation, there is also the reverse risks of complete dissonance: for example, preserving pre-historic sites that nobody even knows exist (Willems 2014, 106);

or overloading museums with so many artefacts that their collections live in storage rooms without being shown to the public (Lowenthal 2011, 31).

The construction of (national) identity

Nation-states and governments have long been concerned with heritage selection and interpretation, often using heritage as a tool in the construction of (national) identity (Steele 2005, 5, Silberman 1995, 25). This can be seen historically for example with the reference to the “census, map and museum” forming the three main institutions through which the colonial state imagined and thereby controlled its dominion (Anderson 2006, 163). Indeed, the emergence of cultural heritage management and its codification through the first excavations, museums, and protection laws, is also rooted in many countries to a colonial background linked to the legitimization of power (Anderson 2006, 178-85, Hodder 1998, 125). Moreover, Anderson’s focus on ‘print capitalism’ can today be updated to the fourth industrial revolution concept of electronic capitalism and electronic mass mediation. Like print capitalism, this new method of ‘electronic capitalism’ can be shared collectively with an even more powerful effect as it works a network and imagination landscape beyond the limited frame of the nation-state (Appadurai 2010,8).

The mobilizing power of heritage has likewise been seen time and again, whether to uproot colonialism, re-enforce and realize minority rights, raise ethnic awareness, combat slavery and racism, foster legitimate national pride, provide communal solidarity, and develop group security (Kohl and Fawcett 1995, 5, Meskell 2004, Pollock et al. 2000, 578, Silberman 1995, 250-251, Steele 2005, 58, Trigger 1995, 277-279). In the post-colonial era new stakeholders have taken control of heritage symbols and their interpretation, often “replacing master narratives” in favor of oral or other histories (Skeates 2000, 95). In many cases the social elites of the independence movements adopted many of the same tools to re-assert a new anti-colonial national identity (Norton 1989, 144-145) or to appeal to (often Western) notions of conservation, sometimes disassociating from traditional know-how, skills, and processes, as part of the movement away from a colonial label of backwardness (Evans 2003, 2004, Pollock, Bhaba, Breckenridge and Chakrabarty 2000, Silberman 1997, Wen-Chiang 2012).

Other communities have aimed to create a disassociation away from a specific heritage or constructed symbolism. For example, the indigenous community of Aymara in Chile have promoted the material heritage of modernization through the symbolic meaning of and association with the local ex-mining town instead of a focus on the Aymara origins and archaeologically founded identity, which would risk creating a link to a non-Chilean identity, associated with the bordering Peruvian and Bolivian populations: “Archaeological remains which elsewhere are central to the economy of tourism and national identity (in Peru for example) might be turned against the very people whose closest ties are to the remains” (Dodd 2007, 8).

The codification and symbolic value associated with cultural heritage can also put it at risk as a target for intentional destruction, accidental destruction, deliberate neglect of specific heritages, ‘memorycide’ and ‘historical forgetfulness,’ theft, repatriation, annexation and acquisition of lands, military conquest and loss of lands, forced exile, migration, exodus, abandoned heritages, spatially extended heritage, and so forth (Burtenshaw 2014, Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, 55-57).

Whilst many risks and conflicts are more visible when they involve tangible cultural heritage, they are no less dominant in the struggle for the ownership of intangible heritage. Ask any Peruvian about the origins of the national liquor “pisco”, versus the claims made by neighboring Chilean to the liquor as part of their own national heritage; or similarly the ‘conflict’ between Greek coffee and Turkish coffee. History could produce many similar examples ranging from dance to gastronomy to building techniques, linguistic roots, and legends and stories of ancestry and famous personages and events. The past itself cannot define identities, and new heritages are continually built within the ongoing process of modernization. For

example, modern architecture has been a key contributor in the shaping of community dynamics and identities (Lahoud 2008) and many ‘modern’ heritage elements are also used as popular symbols of national identity, such as flags, processions and parade, statues and monuments, postage stamps, design of coinage, street-names (Azaryahu and Kooks 2002).

The utility of the arts and cultural heritage to construct certain images of the nation also has been demonstrated recently in an assessment of nation-branding by Ahn and Wu (2015). Nation-branding research has also looked at how cultural heritage is used a tool in contemporary geo-politics between nation-states, such as in China with the construction of the “Shanghai Expo” exhibition, a construction which towered over rival exhibitions (Barr 2012). The same is also true beyond the limits of the nation-state. Cultural production plays a key role in shaping imaginations, and this can be used as a tool for communities imagine alternative geopolitical relations and to share these imaginings.

The construction of corporate identity

The usage of cultural heritage by corporations is a less researched theme, but there are some notable cases across the industry where corporations have seemingly selected a brand or corporate communication focus and narrative centered around cultural heritage. History and nostalgia are powerful and useful tools in the process of identity and imagination and this continue to drive their utility for different stakeholder agendas. Indeed, “rummaging through history has become a standard technique of advertising” to draw on nostalgia but also to underline the speed of change affecting the present (Appadurai 2010, 78).

History and the past can be an important tool to establish the notion of (corporate) authenticity and in such the use of historic representations and associations is a well know tool of corporate advertising and propaganda. This is especially evident in the realm of multinational corporations looking to justify their presence in varied home and host locations, and likewise for brand units looking to appeal to different target audiences again in a global and local context.

An important research on this is the work by anthropologist Dinah Rajak 2011, looking at the case of Anglo American in South Africa. Rajak looks at how narratives are used to express and build a specifically “national” identity (2011, loc 1463). She describes the process of “monumentalizing” the past with nostalgic memories of the early years of operation in South Africa within her interviews (Rajak 2011, loc. 1529), and likewise a slogan of “Proudly South African” as an explicitly ‘local’ response that does not occur in the company’s operations in Brazil and China (Rajak 2011 loc. 2037). As flagged in her research there is a huge ethical risk in the de-contextualization of local interest and local heritage as part of this story this story.

The case of American Express is also notable as a corporation that has used cultural heritage to construct its corporate brand identity (Kanani 2012, Starr 2013). In the 19th century the corporation sought a cognitive association with the iconic symbol of the Statue of Liberty, organizing employee-projects such as philanthropic donations to repair the pedestal of the statue in 1885. The American Express Foundation, the philanthropic pillar of the corporation, has been associated with historic preservation since the creation of the foundation in 1954, and the foundation has a pillar focused on heritage preservation. The American Express corporation’s emphasis on cultural heritage is explicitly called out in its annual reports and public documents such as the below statements for the American Express 2007/2008 Social Responsibility Report:

“Responsibility to the world around us. We strive to be good citizens and neighbors wherever we do business. We help strengthen our communities by funding philanthropic efforts such as cultural heritage and historic preservation, as well as actively encouraging community service and volunteerism” (American Express 2008, 5)

“Preserving and Protecting Sites Around the World. Over the years, American Express has contributed millions of dollars to historic preservation-related projects and helped to preserve more than 100 iconic sites across the globe...In 2006, American Express announced the launch of a \$10 million, five-year commitment to the work of the World Monuments Fund and the National Trust for Historic Preservation” (American Express 2008, 41).

It follows that cultural heritage images are being decontextualized and translated to various commodity forms not only for the creation of national identity-such as stamps, and flags-but also to various modern commercial products towards the creation of corporate and brand identity. For example, heritage symbols have often been re-appropriated into new contexts such as the Luxor Hotel in Las Vegas. The ironic competitive reality is that the Las Vegas Luxor Hotel receives many more visitors than the Egyptian city of Luxor. This has spurred a discussion in Egyptian broadcasting, questioning for example whether the Luxor Hotel should provide some financial compensation for this use of heritage to its own gain (Starr 2013, loc. 1300).

Research has also emphasized the heliacal relationship between corporate media and cultural production, and even the appropriation of cultural goods into the local imagining. For example, Foster 2008 discusses how modern cultural goods, such as a beer brand design, can be internalized and appropriated into local culture (2008, 16). Emphasized here is the delusion of consumption ending with the moment of purchase. Indeed, as shown in Foster’s examples, and as discussed by Appadurai, there is an illusion that consumption is the “end of the road for goods and services” and this is an illusion that needs to be dispelled (2010, 66).

Furthermore, there are multiple examples of MNC operations and communication activities that directly use, support, or impact cultural heritage. This includes philanthropic investments, sponsorships, partnerships, employee volunteering, marketing and public-relations or communications outreach, and cause-marketing and corporate responsibility. Philanthropic activity refers to a gift or donation: for example, in Italy a €25 million restoration of the Coliseum was sponsored solely by Diego Della Valle, head of the Todd’s leather-ware business (Allsop 2012) and philanthropic ‘adoption’ and clean-up of monuments have been published in the press for successive years in India (Business Standard 2013, Financial Express 2014). Sponsorships refer to an activity that is non-recurring and with little commitment beyond the pure funding mechanism, sometime more for prestige or advertising goals rather than commitment to a vision or goal. Partnerships in contrast suggest not only funding but also on-going transfers, labor, capital and human resources, and a common cause (Seaman 2013, 117, 125). As defined by UNESCO, partnerships are the ways the private-sector “contribute to finding solutions to global issues and fulfill their corporate social responsibilities” (cf. UNESCO in Seaman 2013, 117).

The growing trend of corporate museums also exhibits this value of cultural heritage and the use of similar tools, such as museums, in the construction of (corporate) identity. For example, the Saab Museum, the Heineken Museum of Amsterdam, and the Coke Museum (McKay 2007). These museums are important not just for the experience and identity of the visitor but also for the identity formation for the corporation itself (Nissley and Casey 2002) especially those open to the public where they serve a dual goal of educational advertising and authenticity building (ibid). Ironically these corporate museums also act as a competitive cultural good competing against traditional cultural heritage sites for attention within the cosmopolitan tourist agenda. Consumer-foods corporation Nestle has also announced plans to support the preservation of several monument buildings in its headquarter town in Vevey, Switzerland, to celebrate heritage of the company located for 185 years in the same town. The plans include the restoration of factory and administrative buildings, an example of a common trend of industrial work-sites becoming quickly incorporated into the collection of cultural heritage sites. Industrial heritage landscapes and their protection may therefore have a close and direct link to the corporate heritage and its

authenticity. Volkswagen has also preserved many of its heritage sites dating to the Nazi German occupation, and developing substantial documentation and archival evidence behind the forced labor of their factories (Kocks and Uhl 1999).

1.5 Cultural Heritage in the Popular Media

Media representations, including literature, film, cultural goods and products, nationally derived and corporate derived propaganda, are an important further influence both on the construction of identity, and on the perceptions of cultural heritage and its value. Media representations of cultural heritage, such as the use of a historical place in a famous TV series, or the use of a cultural heritage site in a brand advertising campaign, will have myriad implications for the decontextualisation of cultural heritage: “Fiction, like myth, is part of the conceptual repertoire of contemporary societies” (Appadurai 2010, 58). From Lara Croft’s Tomb-raider to Indiana Jones to the British TV series Time Team, the power of archaeological and cultural heritage as a story-telling discipline has been a well-discussed, with prominent debates about the ‘Disneylandization’ of the scientific agenda. Archaeologist Cornelius Holtorf has brought this discussion to light in several articles focused on popular archaeology recognizing the almost inevitable appeal of history with its “tropes and plots” as a story-telling device (2007) or of archaeologists providing stories in demand (2010), and of archaeological heritage as modes of cultural production (Pearson and Shanks 2001). The portrayal and representation cultural heritage in magazines, novels, on television, and now on new digital medias, all have a profound impact on the meaning of cultural heritage and its relationship with wider stakeholders.

The power of the past as a story-telling advice, whether fact or fiction, has been consistently re-confirmed in popular media of the past decade, expanding beyond television into new social media channels and other media platforms. As just one such example, consider the proliferation of video and cinema copies and the representation of cultural heritage herein. In prior decades the creation of ‘blockbuster’ movies were limited to large funding of a few key corporations like DreamWorks, Warner Bros or Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (“Gladiator”, “Tomb raider” Ben Hurr”, to name but a few). This scene has changed today with popular media providers like Netflix rolling out bespoke series and documentaries (“Marco Polo”, “The Last Kingdom”, and many more) that both interact with, and affect, the popular awareness of cultural heritages, histories, and identities and its supra-national popular imagining.

Appadurai draws attention to a further dimension of nostalgia and reminiscence in cultural productions, which have emphasized a social *imaginaire* of the past via re-runs and *retro* imagery. He argues accordingly that post-industrial cultural production has already moved into a “post-nostalgic” phase (2010, 31). What is meant by this post-nostalgic representation? Appadurai proposes that media productions allow for a complete disruption of the chronologies of history and its stories, allowing for “nostalgia of the present”, in other words, “nostalgia without memory”, an affinity for imaginations that have never been physically lost (describing in this example the affinity for American popular music in the Philippines) (Appadurai 2010, 76-77). In such in the context of new technologies there is an argument for a fluid concept of cultural heritage and its meaning, that defends beyond both geographical and temporal borders. Communities can be nostalgic for a past they have never experienced; and for a geographic location they have never experienced.

The tendency of nostalgic and retro-production may also be seen in the case of multinationals and their construction of corporate identity and its image. Retro-branding is for example a common strategy applied by brands such Volkswagen, with its iconic “Beetle” model, and a focus on nostalgia can be seen in many corporate materials from gift-order catalogues to adverts: “these forms of mass advertising teach consumers to miss things they have never lost”; “buy now, not because you will otherwise be out of date, but because your period will soon be out of date” (Appadurai 2010, 77).

1.6 Cultural Heritage and Economic Valuation

This next section turns to the discussion of economic value and the process of the valuation of cultural heritage from an economic perspective. It looks at the macro-economic discussion of cultural heritage as a public good, the individual methods for economic valuation, including the problems of contingent value models, and the problems of economic value within a tourism agenda. The problematic heritagization of cities and sites and the resultant potential decontextualisation of heritage due to its competing economic value is discussed accordingly.

Cultural heritage and its protection as a public good

As a starting context, there is an unsolved dilemma from a cultural economics perspective in the consideration of cultural heritage as a public good or as a social good. Against the context of globalization and shifting power structures both liberals and constructivists have argued (from contrasting ontological and epistemological positions) that national politics is of decreasing importance and that there is an overall shrinking of the welfare state. Research in parallel has described the increased politicization of corporations (Scherer and Palazzo 2010) and have stressed a changing paradigm of corporations, especially MNCs, as both economic and politically motivated organizations. “On the global level, neither nation-states nor international institutions alone are able to sufficiently regulate the global economy and to provide global public goods” (Scherer and Palazzo 2010, 3)

As a quintessential starting point there is therefore the question of whether MNCs should have any right to own or to profit from cultural heritage, and moreover, whether cultural heritage as a public good should be managed only by the public sector. A public good, like a club or religious institution, assumes non-rivalry and non-exclusion, and it is subject to free-riding because nobody can be excluded from its enjoyment (Benhamou 2013, Comer 2014, Wang and Bramwell, 2012). However non-rivalry is always unrealistic when we talk about cultural heritage because one interpretation of the past necessarily disinherits other. Consumption or participation affects the potential consumptions by someone else, either by physically affecting the experience (crowding out at a site) or emotionally (disassociation or exclusion through the selected narratives). Furthermore, the presumption that cultural heritage must be protected as a public good is challenged by evidence of cultural heritage properties and traditions that are being privately-owned and maintained (Seaman 2013, 112). For example, the Kabuki theatre in Japan has been supported through the years by private company support of the Shochiku Company, building and maintaining the theatre and the Kabuki performance. This type of theatre has had a core commercial support through its development over more than four hundred years since the Edo period (Goto 2013, 576). In these examples cultural heritage has arguably been protected because of, and not despite, the private-sector involvement. It follows that there are cases where a private-sector contribution and involvement with cultural heritage is beneficial for heritage preservation. In such, this thesis starts from the presumption that private-sector profit goals are not necessarily in conflict with heritage and its safeguarding and engagement with the private-sector is sometimes positive. Said otherwise, interaction with MNCs should not be disregarded simply due to an ethical principle of non-engagement.

The problem of contingent value

The second discussion relating to economic value is focused on the trade-offs between economic value and other values. The economic valuation of archaeological and cultural heritage is typically approached from a framework of *use and non-use values*. *Use values* refer to the actual consumption. Within this, *direct use-value* includes the value coming from ticket revenues, employment due to excavation at a site, local knowledge returns, local usage benefits and spillover effects. For example, the existence of vernacular culture is often an asset in neighborhood development, with positive spillover effects (Carr and Sevon 2008). This can also be the case for value not directly linked to the historic usage of the site, but

rather to its broader urban or shared-space quality (Van den Dries et al. 2015, 14). *Indirect use-values* refer to economic value gained from less directly related operations, such as attracting new industries to a certain hub. For example, Bowitz and Ibenholt 2009, look at how tourism regenerated the abandoned sections of a heritage town Roros. Likewise, Conesa, Schulin, and Nowack 2008 discuss the re-birth of “dead” abandoned industrial and mining sites. In a slightly different approach Coben 2014, looks at a study of tourism inflows in San Jose, Peru and how tourism has fueled development for this town despite limited local interest in the heritage for its social value, and emphasizing instead its economic benefits bringing employment and tourism revenue to the community.

Non-use values refer to values for future stakeholders, including the bequest value, the ‘option’ value, and existence value. *Existence value* refers to the satisfaction derived from the existence of the heritage such as personal pride, identity, heritage. In other words, it is the “universal value” that is generated merely by existing, even if a person has personally never consumed or participated in the heritage itself. The *endowment or bequest value* refers to the option of enjoyment by future generations (Benhamou 2013, Dutta, Bannerjee and Husain 2007, Klammer 2013, Vileniske 2008). Other research has broken these down into even further classifications (for example, *vicarious value* (option for future generations to have direct access to a resource), the *altruistic value* being the value for the current generation’s visit, and the *educational value* (Benhamou 2011, Klammer 2014, Vileniske 2008). A problematic issue of all of these methods is that there is no clear way to put a price on, or charge, for the endowment value or the existence value; there is no way for the necessary stakeholders, future generations) to be involved.

There are multiple models for the process of economic valuation of heritage but the most commonly used models are contingent value models¹. The challenge for contingent valuation is that it depends on two factors: who is being asked, and what is the available information they can be expected to have. With “ordinary” public goods such as a street lights, it is fairly easy for necessary information to be readily available for any corresponding stakeholders but this is less true of more complex goods like cultural heritage, where many of the values are not explicit or immediately apparent to everyone (Throsby 2003).

Economic value models have also come into much criticism because they almost always involve a trade-off of other values. From a positive perspective, there are many benefits that come with economic value and resultant agendas for heritage tourism and its promotion. On a local level, heritage creates a demand for other cultural as well as non-cultural activities that generate a positive spillover through new jobs, new businesses, the brand and reputational value of the location, community pride, and so forth. One research refers to this (re)generation of cultural infrastructure as the “cultural imagineering” of the city (Yeoh 2005, 946). It may also stimulate a feedback function of entrepreneurialism, bringing even more inflow and a boom of associated cultural programs (Ruijgrok 2009). This is also true on the level of the country economy looking at the recognition of culture and its importance for the stimulation of creativity and of the creative industries (Egberts 2015, 294, Klammer, Mignosa, and Petrova 2013, 37, Snowball 2013, 446). And many other positive economic inflows and spill-over effects have been discussed in further researches (Coben 2014, Egberts 2015, Lane 2009, Plaza 2010, Wen-Chiang 2012, Yeoh 2005).

On the other hand, there are of course many associated costs that come with the increased ‘demand’ and increased inflows due to the economic pull. Any development of heritage also necessarily involves the selection of some heritages over others and this exclusion may affect prioritization choices. For example, non-monumental sites are often left out of the selection process if they aren’t expected to provide the necessary economic gains (Arazi 2011, Evans 2004). In addition, tourism demands have led to mixed policies for the privatization of heritage sites, often adumbrated by the mismanagement of funds and potentially heated conflicts over new mechanisms for funding. For example, a controversial model in 1999 proposed to list the Terracotta Warriors on the Stock Exchange (Starr 2013, loc. 1304-1357). Such economically focused assessments may lead to the exclusion or crowding-out of local communities.

Tourism and the homogenization of the tourism narrative is an easy illustration of this, with a wide array of discussions of over-tourism and its significant counter-effects (Comer 2012, Frey, Pamini and Steiner 2011, Tisdell and Wilson 2002, Starr 2013). Increased tourism through globally-recognized profiling such as World Heritage Site (WHS) labeling may also lead to higher visibility and politicization of sites leading to intentional destruction or the targeting of sites during conflicts. Such listings and selective cultural heritage agendas may also result in funds being “displaced” or substituted from other projects. In other words, there funds may be pushed towards listed sites and thus away from non-listed sites, which may actually mean that heritage is being less well preserved over all (Frey et al. 2011).

A competitive dilemma also exists among tourism sites with traditional urban sites competing with corporate “hard branding” (Evans 2003, 417-420), and in competition for recognition, such as in the World Heritage Sites selection process (Wait and Altschul 2014, 158). Discussions of these competitive dynamics and demand dilemmas can be seen in researches on many of the world’s cultural heritage “super-sites” such as Petra (Comer 2012), Angkor Wat (Starke and Griffin 2004), Preah Khan (Starr 2013), Preah Vihear (Williams 2011) and Machu Picchu (Comer and Willems 2011). The competitive dynamic again highlights the importance of economic value and its impact on the resultant selection and exclusion of heritage in different agendas.

Heritagization and the economics of tourism

The predictable outcome is often the re-enforcement of heritages that already are well supported or recognized, at the threat of other heritages which have not received the same attention. The power of stories appropriated by tourism and by private stakeholders can lead to a risk of mercantilization and the ‘production’ of heritage only to meet its economic demands (Coben 2014, Foster 2008, Herrera 2014). This relates directly to the process of heritage selection and the risk of “staged authenticity” (Leite and Groburn 2009) in the tourism domain.

“Stories that sell well, and thus help in the production of destinations, raise the additional challenge of trivialization” (Herrera 2014, 72).

In such, the most powerful or perceived “authentic” stories may also become the priority stories to tell and even how and when to tell them. Herrera’s research discusses for example how sacred agricultural rites in Peru have been adopted to fit the peaks of the tourism season. The seasonal pattern of tourism can also upset the national macro-economic structures and put pressure on urban areas (Russo 2002, 165-166) leading in some cases to a so-called museumification of cities (Silverman 2005). Arguably there is a thin line that is consciously being debated by the indigenous community between “sharing” and “selling out” (Leite and Groburn 2009).

In addition, the presence of (foreign) visitors may literally usurp the ‘use value’ for local communities. At many sites local populations are literally out-crowded by external visitors or by steep entry prices, and monetary power imbalances play a role in deciding what narrative is told and who benefits. There may be resultant competition between tourist “rights” and local “rights” to heritage (Evans 2004, 325). Likewise, certain narratives may be selected and produced for tourism toolkits with the popular or fun interpretation winning over inclusive stakeholder interpretations (Egberts 2015, 271).

In some cities urbanization pressures have led to the ‘ghettoization’ of historic city centers such as the market-squares and centers of Quito and Lima (Corzo 1997, Silverman 2006) or the diminished use value for the living communities within the touristic centers of cities like Venice, Florence, London, Paris and Madrid, to name but a few European examples (Evans 2004, 319). This delocalizing of heritage areas has been referred to as the “sterilization” of cultural heritage areas described by more artificial social exchanges, a lack of typical community amenities, and the construction of a privatized or commercial

built environment in place of the original heritage core (Evans 2004). In such situations, the heritage city blossoms but the sense of place is lost.

A contentious arena of modernization by ‘force’ has also been seen in many cities ranging from Mamluk Cairo in the 1300s and the 1860s (Mitchell 1988), to the Russian colonial re-structuring of Tashkent modeled on the wide European-style boulevards of St. Petersburg (Sahadeo 2007, 34) or European reconstructions of Paris, London, and other capitals to create a common ‘European’ feeling (Mitchell 1988). The restructuring of Times Square from an urban ghetto into one of New York’s top tourist attractions was likewise a much contested project when it was first proposed, but it has become a core cultural heritage of the New York Community. Similar trade-offs can be seen in global urbanization projects today, such as the threat to St. Petersburg to lose its World Heritage status due to plans to build a 300-meter tower that will impact the historic heritage city’s skyline. Equally contentious, Chinese policy for conservation has included the demolition of traditional *hutong* housing in preparation of the Beijing Olympics (Abrahamson 2014, Silverman and Blumenfield 2013).

1.7 Development agendas and the World Bank

Another relevant discussion pertaining to economic value is the concept of cultural heritage for development. Whilst many researches have promoted this approach to heritage projects, it is valid only in a context where minimum socio-economic development goals and basic needs are already being provided for (Cleere 2001, McMinn 1997). Increased development is expected to bring positive inflows, but again, these inflows come with trade-offs and potential negative externalities, especially in cases where civil society has not grown at the same rate. For some developing countries uncontrolled development is perceived as the highest threat against cultural heritage (Kankpeyeng and DeCorse 2004, Mire 2011). Ethically, there is therefore a strong risk that mobilizations have less to do with poverty alleviation and more to do with competition between political and economic interests (Lafrenz Samuels 2010).

Government agenda focused on sustainable development are often supported or even tendered by global financial institutions such as the World Bank providing project-based loans. Lending by the World Bank occurs via the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the International Development Agency (IDA), and loans can only be made to the governments of member countries (not to the private-sector). The World Bank is therefore a critical stakeholder in the discussion of the development agenda, and this section looks at the role of the World Bank accordingly.

The World Bank’s (WB) loans are often focused on financing for infrastructural projects, or financing for tourism as an instrument to kick-start economies. Projects seeking loans are monitored by the World Bank to prevent the negative impact of environmental and cultural resources being adversely impacted by the project. The aim is to balance the goals of development with minimal standards for sustainability. The fundamental tool used by the World Bank to guide these loans and their development impact through the obligation for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) introduced in 1986.

The World Bank has been a strong supporter of tourism because of the opportunities for quick restructuring and financial inflows that it offers, being easier to implement than other manufacturing or industrial programs, and providing quick inflows of exchange returns. Since 1977 substantial financing has been directed to tourism projects, mainly in Africa (40%) and Latin America and the Caribbean (29%), including funding for tourism development and cultural heritage projects in Jordan, Georgia, St Petersburg and Albania, all of which involved World Heritage Sites (Evans 2001 cited in Evans 2004). In the past two decades the World Bank has initiated an increasingly strong tourism initiative, driven in part by the 1988 *UNESCO World Decade for Cultural Development* initiative which focused on the role of culture as the basis for all sustainable development and helping culture to be seen as a driving force instead of an obstacle in the development paradigm (Arazi 2011). The WB’s initiative for *Culture and*

Sustainable Development of the same year was in collaboration with UNESCO and the World Trade Organization (WTO) and aimed specifically at funding for at-risk sites in developing countries and post-conflict areas: such as Angkor, Bethlehem, Bali, Spanish Town in Jamaica, and Old Havana (Evans, 2004). In non-tourism related projects, the World Bank has recognized the need to mitigate the negative impacts that occur in conjunction with large-scale infrastructure projects. Since 1986 the World Bank Group has incorporated cultural heritage (also termed cultural property or cultural resources) into its requirements for safeguarding the environment.

World Bank policies for cultural heritage protection through its lending projects

Overall, the World Bank has also been challenged for its lack of participatory policy especially with a history of minimal dialogue with ‘bottom-up’ experts such as anthropologists, archaeologists, heritage experts (MacEachern 2010, 353). There is also room for improvements here regarding transparency of the findings conducted through these various assessments. For example, WB requires that the findings related to cultural heritage be made publicly available but this is not the case for the European Commission, for example. And when there is no legal obligation it results in lower levels of compliance (Arazi 2011, 32).

A policy for cultural heritage was first made explicit in *1986 as an Operational Policy Note (OPN) 11.0*, and this predated the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which was introduced three years later (Arazi 2011, Xie 2010). *Operational Policy (OP) 10.04 - Economic Evaluation of Investment Operations* was agreed on in 2002 obliges the borrowing nations to consider and address the need to preserve physical resources within their economic evaluations that are required as part of the appraisal (Xie 2010).

In the spring of 2006 the World Bank replaced this earlier policy with the updated *OP 4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources (PCR)*² and explicitly stating that cultural resources must be a considered as a component within the environmental assessment process, and within the *Operational Policy 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples*.

Operational Policy 4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources recognizes the value of physical cultural resources for their scientific and historical value, as assets for economic and social development, and for their importance for people’s cultural identity and practices. As per the policy, the borrower is required to identify physical cultural resources that are at risk of being affected and assess the project’s impact. When an adverse impact is expected, the borrower must identify appropriate measure for the avoidance or mitigations, which may range from full-site protection or selective protection such as salvage and documentation in cases “where a portion or all of the physical cultural resources may be lost” (Arazi 2011, para 1). An environmental impact assessment is required to assess the cultural significance of the concerned PCR as categorized by level of importance: important, of uncertain importance, or not important. PRCs do not have to be human-made but can include natural and partly-man made items, such as heritage trees, caves, holy waters, and so forth (ibid). Operational Policy 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples recognizes the inherent link between the identities and cultures of indigenous peoples and the land and resources which they live and depend upon. The policy makes specific stipulations for development impacts and risks related to the loss of identity, culture, and customary livelihoods (Rio Tinto 2011, 115).

Given this critical impact of the World Bank it is hard to understand how it is possible that the cultural heritage community has shown such low levels of engagement with this stakeholder. There has been no archaeological or cultural heritage body previously making representations to World Bank prior to 2014 when a revision was made to the World Bank ‘safeguarding’ framework (Soderland and Lilley 2015). This lack of engagement highlights the potentially isolated environment in which important tourism and development guidelines are being drafted and is again an important argument for a more proactive engagement approach that may be needed.

1.8 Heritagization in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

This discussion of political and economic value is brought to life in the below example of Jordan, with a brief case-study of the construction of identity and the usage of cultural heritage in this construction. The case emphasizes the interconnected economic, political, and wider social values, and the exclusionary of any one narrative around cultural heritage and identity. Note that of course this is only one such global example chosen because of the researcher's familiarity with this specific case. Interested readers can also refer to Helaine Silverman's case-study of cultural and archaeological heritage and the discovery of the 'Lord of Sipan' in Peru and similar political and economic influences at play (Silverman 2005).

The case study below looks at the usage of cultural heritage in the construction of identity in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan from the 1970s-late 1980s. In this period, Jordan moved from a narrative with an explicit economic and tourism agenda, combined with a political narrative around tribal identity. This specific case and time period is chosen because of the importance of both tangible and intangible cultural heritage within the national imagining, especially in the 1970s and 1980s period. It highlights how the world heritage site of Petra and the image of the tribal Bedouin have been defined within the national narrative in this period, and how this has been in parallel with an exclusion of other identities. Since the creation of the Jordanian nation in 1921 the Hashemite monarchy has attempted to construct a national identity to validate the Hashemite hierarchy and its rule of the infant nation. Within their newly demarcated borders the Hashemite regime deliberately engineered and promoted the construction of the national identity in a process of "neo-ethno nationalism" (Fathi 1994, 238); in other words, the state making its nation, and making its national identity. The narrative of 'Bedouinization' overlaps with the period of the 1970s and 1980s and showcases the use of archaeological and cultural heritage in the constructing of identity in Jordan at this time (Groot 2009).

The narrative of Bedouinization is marked historically by the 1970 Civil War and Palestinian independence, against which Jordan developed a decidedly non-Palestinian identity, with the heritage site of Petra and the heritage and identity of the Bedouin as key icons and cultural signifiers. It is particularly in this period that 'Palestinians' - or Jordanians of Palestinian origins - became differentiated from 'Jordanians' - or Jordanians of Trans Jordanian origin - in a division that continues until the present day. This separation has been built on the symbolic value of Petra and of the Nabateans as the forefathers of modern Jordanians. Cultural heritage therefore replays a critical instrumental function in the construction of this narrative. The Bedouin and Petra find place in every niche of national identity and its presentation, postcards, postage stamps, and various publications" (Al-Mahadin 2007, 87) as well as music, gastronomy, and transmitted imagery of the nation in the construction of the tourism industry. Music and songs often appeal to a quintessentially 'Bedouin' identity by appealing to archaeological sites³. A musical performance of 'Petra' also took stage during the 1970s and later launched a popular television run-off. The name Petra also has been adopted by the Petra bank and the Petra news agency amongst other less official ventures. All of this cultural production contributes as to the perception that Jordan as a nation and its national symbols have somehow always existed (Massad 2001).

The Bedouin within the national narrative are presented as a generalized tribe in the Jordanian history, despite the fact that the region was also inhabited by Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites and so forth. Official narratives in Jordan constantly reinforce the 'Arab' identity of the Nabataeans, although from numerous inscriptions and graffiti it is accepted that they were an Aramaic speaking tribe⁴ (Al-Mahadin 2007, 99). Indeed, the desert Bedouin have continued to be described as 'Arab' even after the Islamic conquest (Gerber 2004, 259). Despite this, the Bedouin do not feature as part of the 'face' of Jordanian identity: the 'face' of Jordan is the Hashemite face, and this continues to be the case throughout the national narrative (Anderson 2001, 9).

This narrative is also highly exclusionary of relevant ‘other’ identities in the Jordanian context. In tandem with the movement towards a more Bedouin character, there has been an explicitly repression of Palestinian identity from the national narrative. The Palestinian *rabita* or village house became slowly threatened since 1983 when the government stopped issuing licenses for the *rabita*, assumedly in order to avoid their political usage/ affiliation as political organization centers (Fathi 1994, 180). In contrast the Bedouin *madafa* or guesthouse was incorporated into the national identity and strongly promoted as a symbol of tribal hospitality. The same is true of social practices of hospitality and ‘Bedu’ symbols such as coffee-culture (Silberman 1997, 73).

The issue of Bedouin heritage is complex because the ‘ancient’ identity which is being reproduced and marketed through tourism is also part of a living and existent heritage and lifestyle. In creating and embodying a certain socio-historic stereotype the Hashemite rules and political elite (whether intentionally or not) have created a trivialization and certain parody of the nation. For example, the ‘marketing’ of Bedouin hospitality, has been realized by superficial cash-based transactions that regarded not as hospitality but as dirty work (Shryock 1997). International tourism has meant that the national identity is not only being presented internationally, but is also being parroted back to the local population. This is often in a less than desirable image and imagining of the national self, such as the popular representation of Bedouin line-dancing within the national (and international) media:

“...this is a nouveau riche projection of Jordan by the mass media... I don’t think tribes would like to see themselves dancing on the Jordanian television” (interview with Adnan Bakhitin in Fathi 1994, 269).

The image of the Bedouin is therefore being transmitted to the national tourist, and the international tourist beyond this: it is a complex network of local, national, and global perceptions intertwined in a heliacal process of selection, dissemination, and (re) appropriation. Meanwhile the ‘marketed’ face of Jordan remains highly daguerreotype and folkloric building from the expected ‘staged’ tourism authenticity, with a banal image of the local and the Bedouin and the decontextualisation of multiple tribal heritages into one homogenized national narrative. The commercialized picture of the Bedouin and of the archaeological site of Petra are presented to the international consumer with a staged interpretation inherited largely from the romantic Orientalism and conception of the ‘other’ that traces back to the colonial context. The Bedouin as they were painted by early 19th and 20th century travelers are featured as romantic, exoticized, freedom loving, independent and individualistic and little has changed in their current representation (Fathi 1994, 55). This image celebrates the Bedouin but in a manner which fails to reflect the individual concept of the Bedouin ‘self’ and its intrinsic values. In all forms of international representation, the image of the Bedouin has not progressed beyond the colonial impression of the Bedouin ‘other’.

1.9 Discussion

Cultural heritage has been a highly useful tool in the construction of (national) identity by political elites, and it may likewise be used by corporate elites in the construction of corporate or brand identity. Indeed, the many characteristics of heritage that make it so useful in the construction of identity are due to the value of the past and its associational and referential authenticity. Just as political leaders have often sought to build their national narrative related to historicity, brands and corporations also use cultural heritage to justify their geographical operations or to build a perceived shared meaning and value in their relationship with consumers.

Furthermore, this chapter has further looked at the different trade-offs related to political and economic value, but perhaps the most significant is the tourism agenda. The economic inflows from tourism provide opportunities for better archiving and safeguarding of heritage but there is a fundamental trade-off with other values. Cultural heritage tourism (often as part of the development agenda) can lead to negative

externalities for local communities, indigenous peoples, and sacred heritage sites and landscapes through their being usurped, crowd-out, marginalized and exploited. Tourism agendas may risk the trivialization, marginalization, and (mis)interpretation of local cultural heritage in an attempt to find the best ‘story’ to tell. The result is not only the heritagization of entire regions, heritage sites, and landscapes bringing potential tourism inflows and value, but also of a potentially decontextualized and marginalizing narrative.

The starting point and contextual background in this chapter has located the MNC as a stakeholder operating in the term of digital, technological, and even consumer revolution where corporations need to be understood as part of a network. Diverse global impacts have led to increased MNC interactions with cultural heritage, from tourism and infrastructural development to urbanization and migration pressures, to new media and mobilization with the rise of mass electronic media. Mass electronic media and new technologies are drastically changing the nature of connectivity, transmission and exchange. As introduced in this chapter this represents a huge opportunity for cultural mobilization and especially for more multi-vocal inclusion of minority voice and rights and the potential empowerment of the ‘citizen-consumer’. However, it also presents many threats to cultural heritage, with meanings of heritage being decontextualized from their original cultural context, and being appropriated and re-appropriated by multiple-stakeholders in an exponentially broadening network. At the same time this connectivity is not limitless. Whilst recognizing that this does not mean that everyone, everywhere is connected all the time, it does present an exponential increase in the connections between distant communities and it has many implications for corporate-sector involvement in cultural heritage in how MNCs approach and include stakeholders within their construction of corporate and brand identity.

The resultant questions of corporate identity are addressed in more depth in the next chapter, which provides a historical background to the rise of MNCs and the role of corporate social responsibility (CSR), brand social responsibility (BSR) and marketing and branding.

