Subtheme 11.3   *Interactions between Triple Helix actors and researchers in the social sciences, humanities and fine arts, and their influence on 'transdisciplinary' problem-oriented research*

Title: In Search of Mutual Developmental Path of Heritage Conservation and Cultural Economy

Kingkanok Chawalitthomrong, PhD[1].

Department of Political Science, School of Social Sciences

Kasetsart University, Thailand

Key words: cultural conservation, tourism industry, folklife, local government, development

---

[1] Dr. Kingkanok Chawalitthomrong is a faculty member at the Department of Political Science, Kasetsart University, Thailand. She received the doctoral degree in Political Science (World Politics) from Claremont Graduate University, California. Her research interests include international development, international conflicts over energy, and ethnicity. Contact info: kingkanok@yahoo.com

I.   Introduction

As capitalism has become more globalized, the creative economy has contributed a larger part to countries' Gross National Production. This phenomenon has expanded through and across local and global linkages (Scott, 1997). Cultural heritage has turned into an economic engine that drives national growth. Creative economy is new hope of wealth for rural people around the world.

Similar concept is shown in Creative economy: as a development strategy: a view of developing countries by Ana Carla Fonseca Reis (2008). She emphasizes creative economy as an opportunity to help people by putting them into society and help consumers by putting them into the economy through assets that come from its background, culture and roots. Thus, creativity is a catalyst of economic value. By creativity, Reis refers beyond the ability to create something new. It also means the ability to reinvent, reconnect what has lost, thus bringing us solutions. In terms of economics, creativity is fuel that increases as used. Culture and economy are rooted in our lives even without the presence of the market. We consume cultural and creative goods on daily basis. Producers of cultural goods can live off their own production. The circulation then starts and guarantees access to all especially young people. Mass culture emerges in the force of globalization.

Beginning in Australia in 1994, the term "creative industries" inspired the nation to emphasize the importance of the creative work and its contribution to the economy. Along with the cultural policy, technology part has been included. Later in 1997, Tony Blair realized that to make British comparative advantage in global economy, a holistic strategy was required. This stirred up all sectors under socioeconomic sphere. Industrial sector, economic structure, financial institutions, education system, and urban planning are called for changes.

It is important for each region or country to identify their comparative advantage and their uniqueness and the potential value-added intangibility of their products and services.

By strongly conserving their authenticity, some communities have successfully turned their heritage into economic advantage, while some are struggling to retain theirs as they are shifting to this new economic order.

II.   Three Pillars of Cultural Economy

What causes the different paths? To answer this question, one must look through transdisciplinary conjunction at the three pillars of the cultural economy. Key disciplines comprise of Political Science in terms of local administration and development, Humanities in terms of cultural conservation, and Economic Development in terms of tourism industry. This structure complies with Kneafsey's research (2001). The work states the combination of actors is required to study cultural economy. It explains the importance of policymakers, local entrepreneurs, and local wisdom. The interactions of those three create resilient cultural economy.

The relationship between those three pillars has been laid out by Feltault (2006). According to Feltault, two ways that processes and policies work on traditional culture include the construction the social, economic, and political contexts in which traditional occupations, and their related skills and activities must operate. These contexts may either expand or constrain communities' abilities to adapt cultural practices. This depends on the communities' standpoint in the global-local process and the resources available to them. The structures do not determine cultural tradition, but rather, a struggle occurs within this context. Second, and most important, deindustrialization and globalization are primarily cultural processes, not just economic and political processes. Feltault argues that economic and environmental policy, poverty, gendered labor markets, and economic growth strategies are culturally constructed, embedded in the daily material, political, and social relations of communities and their cultural productions, not vice versa. As such, these global-local cultural relations co-exist within the event sought by folklorists. This requires public folklorists interested in development and cultural conservation to shift the focus from a search for interpretive meaning of expressive culture to the meaning of political economy in relation to local heritage.

Now we turn to the first pillar, cultural specialists with academic positions whose stand points see corporate and marketing of culture as new forms of imperialism in growing industry of tourism. Conflicts between public and academic understandings have caused difficulties in efforts to attract new tourism target groups to the communities. However, some optimistic culture specialists disregard the idea of negative impacts from outsiders and assure that host communities can resist outside invasion to their culture.

The relationship between folklorists and cultural tourism is not a present one. Moreover, their ability to point out larger political economic issues affecting their traditional communities and the ability to examine alternative forms of development are limited due to the highlight on economic growth performance (Feltault, 2006).

There is problem with tourism development that defines development as merely economic growth and thus does not address larger global policy and political economic trends in which communities and their traditions are embedded. This practice of development limits the understanding of root causes of cultural change, while also limiting opportunities for community members to select other priorities and construct other forms of development to meet their needs. To mitigate the problem, Feltault (2006) introduces a "*rights-based or human security-based development paradigm*". In this paradigm, folklorists collaborate with communities to improve their capacity to address political, economic, environmental, and other changes that affect the sustainability of their cultures. The transformation of culture into a value-added commodity for preservation happens when folklore-based cultural tourism projects ignore the intersection of traditional culture with public policy, human rights, environmental management, capital economy, and human security. In this way, folklorists support cultural resources for state-defined economic growth strategies and the separation of culture from development.

The second pillar is tourism industry which includes local people and entrepreneurs. Heritage tourism is believed to be motivated by business purpose than political agenda. The industry furnishes commercial version of heritage. It also covers local people's efforts to make use of their pasts and heightened their self-awareness. Popular interest in cultural conservation thus encourages locals to create or revive traditions that serve their social, political or economic goals.

Similarly, Nancy Moses (2001) suggests that locals are finding that cultural attractions spur new business development. As such, they form new local organizations which presents as a centerpiece of cultural district. Moreover, new cultural entities may be found and used for launching a residential development. Next, communities can invite major institutions to set up satellite operations in their locales. Lastly, communities host promoting-heritage events and give visitors a welcome reason to join.

Communities should also be aware of the influx of new residents with different cultural values as the root cause of cultural change Feltault (2006). To mediate these changes, the goals of development project must include cultural conservation through economic development, which defined as heritage tourism. This emphasized educating tourists and new residents about local cultural traditions.

Moving to the third pillar, government, two works have similarly implied the failed role of government. The relation between cultural and tourism development has been discussed by Wiener (1979). While travel professionals ignore public interest in cultural heritage and emphasize more on tourism marketing label of attraction. As a consequence, they fail to promote cultural heritage thus unlikely to help develop a new market. His work suggests that to promote both, collaboration between cultural and tourism development should be strengthened to mutually nurture new markets. Such cultural industry has evolved yet overlooked by most policymakers. This argument is in accordance with Howell. She further argues that often, as governments set a policy for economic development of host communities, authentic culture is belittled by the goal of tourism promotion. This eventually fades out genuine identity of the host community. At this point, government agencies play an important role in stimulating economic growth and improving quality of life through heritage tourism by attracting new business and industry, while cultural specialists, holding academic position contribute to enhance cultural conservation. Those specialists with in-depth knowledge of locals and cultural tourism should share a similar assessment of industrial heritage resources to counterbalance impacts from outsiders. Therefore, it is the government policies on cultural economy that determine the conservation of culture.

Interrelations between government agencies, private sector, and local people are found in Feltault (2006) and Moses (2001). Moses supports the idea that local governments pushes heritage tourism as an engine that drives their local economies. Furthermore, they should see that cultural organizations can become cultural assets useful in spurring community development, attracting new residents and businesses, and transforming a community into a thriving tourist destination. One urban development strategy is to attract smart entrepreneurs (Moses, 2001). This means that local governments are obligated to develop facilities to accommodate and cultural attractions that appeal to those young people.

However, Feltault has a different view. Changes in zoning laws and the growing power of real estate developers have quickly turned once public property into private subdivisions. The communities' root of causes were embedded in global and regional political, economic, and environmental changes that included state and federal legislation on trade and the environment, as well as racial and class inequalities and prejudices at the individual and institutional level that fit the description of human insecurity.

The concept is in compliance with those of Harrill (2004). He argued the local people are affected by an increasing cost of living and increasing property values. Further, local residents' concern was with tourism's environmental impacts despite economic gains. This eventually leads to antagonism between local people and tourists. They no longer welcome outsiders and the place itself will lose the niche market.

As discussed in Howell's work (1994), government role is to control planning, marketing, and the content of cultural representations. Especially, in the Third world where decisionmakers manipulate local people to develop heritage tourism, it is likely this outside power determine what lifeway is to keep.

For developing countries that have starting a journey to this new economic success, there are lessons learn from other communities. In attempt to search for developmental paths, there exist at least three different scenarios. One enjoys economic prosperity and keeps their authenticity intact. Many developed countries well balance between cultural conservation and tourism

industry. On the other hand, though economy thrives, communities struggle to conserve their heritage. The last path, and seemingly more sustainable for developing countries, is where communities take part in the local development plan with technical and financial supports government agencies and private enterprises.

III.   Methodology

In this work, I used documentary research method. It involves systematic collection of data and the techniques used to categorize, investigate, and identify the limitations of sources. The type of documents used in this work is secondary documents whether in the private or public domain.

The list of public document sources includes government publications such as Local Administration Development Plan, census reports, statistical bulletins, etc. Private documents include action plan of civil society organizations such as private sector businesses, trade unions, as well as from private individuals. They include advertisements, personnel records, training manuals, interdepartmental memos and other annual reports.

Using five keywords, cultural conservation, tourism industry, folklife, local government, development, the list of databases including in this research for finding materials are book databases, journal databases and public-access search engines. To be named JSTOR, Wilson Web, and OmniFile with limited to scholarly works during the period of 2000 to present.

IV.   Different paths that lead different destinations

Models of Development

1.   Hanasaku Village Model

Japan presents one of the best practices of cultural economy. Among several, the village of Hanasaku located on the northeastern end of Gunma prefecture has transformed by economic changes since World War II. As many other villages, agriculture in Hanasaku suffered from migration of its population to industrial sector. By the mid-1960s, under-population in rural areas

had become the major issue in Japanese society. However, the village had decided to go on a different path from others. In early 1960s, a ski resort in the village had been a starting point of alternative income in the winter time. Also, shops and country inn had joined the path. It eventually curbed the population outflow and was able to keep the young at home (Okpyo, 1998).

Minshuku, Japanese term of Homestay, had sprung after the opening of the Olympia ski resort in 1964 of Tokyo Olympics. The number of tourists had outnumbered the lodging capacity. Thus the Olympia owner encouraged local people to start *Minshuku*. Due to the nature of the business, it has maintained the traditional character of household as an economic unit. They combined agriculture with other works so that the whole household survived. The young inherited not only land but also the *Minshuku*, which secured a better position. Some of those young had been trained or had working experience in culinary, or hotels business. This new generation of business entrepreneurs are young, thus understand the growing- number young tourists' needs. This makes them suit better in the newly developed tourist industry. The community successfully maintained the character of the traditional household as economic unit as it has become one of the country's most renowned ski resorts.

2. **Clarke Quay Model**

Clarke Qauy, a famous Singapore River Waterfront, is losing its once charm. Chang (2008) pointed out the difference of Clarke Qauy from other waterfronts like Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco and Darling Harbourplace in Sydney. This prominent Singapore River lacks a distinguish factor that pull public interest. The reason is the community has overly adopted brand names and cultural cues from around the world, thus causes a confusing image of the river. His discussion further showed that decision-maker (i.e. Singapore's Prime Minister) believes that Singapore must reinvent itself and its landscapes to match with other competing cities in this globalizing world. However, this resulted in a city with worldly landscapes that locals and visitors feel there is nothing local or unique left. In short term, this of course attracts international high skilled people, which could result in economic growth. But in the long run, communities that lack cultural and historical capital will fail to remain attractive. Chang ended his work citing

Richard Florida that as Florida (n.d.) has argued, in today's knowledge economy, 'quality of place matters'. Cities that appear generic will lose their populations to cities that balance personal and commercial spaces, neighborhoods that filled with heritage, street-level activities along with people-oriented places.

3.   **Pak-Prak Model**

Pak Prak of Kanchanaburi is located in the western region of Thailand. This 177-year old community has a total population of a little more than 20,000. Most local people are unskilled labor relying on occasional employment. The architecture along with the landscape remains mostly intact since the colonial era. Despite the fact that one of the most attraction place of Thailand, the River Kwai Bridge, is nearby, this community has been barely heard of. To emphasize, there are only two hotels in the neighborhood. As tourism economy grows fast, some local folk now see an opportunity. However, the development project in Pak Prak shows some pattern.

Unlike other places that set a plan rather after the fluctuation of outsiders, tourist and entrepreneurs alike, Pak Prak emerges in the market with a plan. On March 14, 2008, the community has launched "177 Year-old Pak Prak: Street that tells Story of Kanchanaburi". The main concept is to develop tourism that serves both visitors and the hosts. Main concerns are placed on environment, folklife, and local culture. Out of the community need, the strategy is set to develop tourism. The tourism must represents local identity to make local proud of their heritage, thus eager to preserve it.

The body of the project committee comprises of delegates from local entrepreneurs and local people in Pak Prak, while various sectors tip in to secure the budget. Main sponsors are government agencies, to be named, Thailand's Authority of Tourism, and Local Administration of Kanchanaburi District. Business organizations take a part in the project. To name a few, Commerce Chamber of Kanchanaburi, Kanchanaburi's Industry Council, and etc. Moreover, a local vocational college has participated in the project. Roles that those non-local organizations

play are closely advising, providing managerial guidance and financial supports to the project committee.

V. Conclusions

Previously, three different models have demonstrated situation, principal agents, and the end each model leads to. In Model I and Model III, tourism development goes along with local needs while local administration and business enterprises play supporting roles. Similarly, Reis (2008) concluded that it is necessary for countries to seek a new socioeconomic structure that fits into their own cultural, social, and economic realities.

In the first model, though originally from a developed country, the community was struggling to survive economic change that brought about difficulties to local people life, which is similar to current situation in most developing countries. The urge for development came from local people. They perceived heritage as asset that leads to prosperity. In the second model, the community successfully blends in globalization. Visitors will not be estranged in the neighborhood. However, there is caution that this attraction will not last long. Eventually the place that loses unique heritage and culture will lose the market as there are no longer attractions. All point at policies from top decisionmakers who sets the goal to be globalized. The last model came from a developing country. Its development plan started out of local initiation. The community has formed a committee to steer the plan, with support from government agencies and business enterprises.

VI. Policy implications and directions for further research

Findings from this study should guide developing local communities which are economically poor, yet rich in culture. Implication for those locals is to promote the role of local governments as spearhead to foster cultural economy while conserve their heritage. If culture is an engine that drives economic development, thus hope of many developing countries, one must learn to utmost utilize it without losing the authentic identity of the community.

<u>For further research</u>

As this research is the initial step toward a more rigid theoretical finding that explain more thoroughly on cultural economy, further research will explore more cases, successful or struggling alike. It should encompass both communities in the global north and their counterparts in the global south. Next, communities should be categorized into the models discovered. Then each should be studied and compared. The methods extend to in-depth interviews with key stakeholders in communities along with local people. Moreover, statistical analysis of relevant data, e.g. migration rate, real estate pricing, and etc. should be included.

References

Chang, T. C. and Shirlena Huang (2008) Geographies of everywhere and nowhere Place-(un) making in a world city. *IDPR*, 30, 3.

Feltault, Kelly (2006) Development Folklife: Human Security and Cultural Conservation. *Journal of American Folklore* 119 Winter.

Harrill, Rich (2004) Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: a Literature Review with Implications for Tourism Planning. *Journal of Planning Literature* 18, 3.

Howell, Benita (1994) Weighing the Risks and Rewards of Involvement in Cultural Conservation and Heritage Tourism. *Human Organization* 53, 2.

Kneafsey, Moya (2001) Rural Cultural Economy: Tourism and Social Relations. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28, 3.

Moon, Okpyo (1998) Is the ie disappearing in rural Japan? in *Interpreting Japanese society: anthropological approaches*, Hendry, Joy **(ed).** London: Routledge.

Moses, Nancy (2001) Have a plan, and make the most of arts and culture. *Public Management* 83, 11.

Reis, Ana Carla Fonseca (ed.). (2008) *Creative economy: as a development strategy : a view of developing countries*. São Paulo: Itaú Cultural.

Richmond, Holly (2006) Whose City Is It? *Contract* 48, 9.

Scott, Allen (1997) *The Cultural Economy of Cities*. Blackwell Publisher, Oxford.

Wiener, Louise (1979) Cultural Resources: An Old Asset – A New Market for Tourism. *Paper presented at the International Symposium: Tourism and the Next Decade*. The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

References in Thai

จิตตินทร์ ฤทธิรัตน์, **๑๗๗ ปี ปากแพรก ถนนเก่าเล่าเรื่องเมืองกาญจน์**
http://www.thailandwisdom.com/index.php?lay=show&ac=article&Id=538681040&Ntype=6

เทศบาลตำบลปากแพรก. แผนพัฒนาเทศบาลตำบลปากแพรกสามปี (พ.ศ. ๒๕๕๔ – ๒๕๕๖).