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Introduction

This Special Issue provides the readers of Alma Tourism with a compelling account of the workshop “Beyond the Great Beauty, Rescaling Heritage and Tourism”, organised by the Center for Advanced Studies in Tourism (CAST) of the University of Bologna from 10 to 12 February 2016 (see also Mariotti, 2016). The workshop was hosted as the major annual event of the former RSA’s (Regional Studies Association) research network on Tourism and Regional Development, which was staged every year in a prestigious international tourism research centre. Capitalising on the germane debate that unfolded across the three days of work, this Special Issue is an occasion for discussing the nexus between cultural heritage and tourism in its multiple and complex manifestations. Indeed, this is a very ambitious goal, especially within a technical-economic tradition that usually frames the relationship between cultural heritage and tourism as linear and unidirectional. Without a doubt, cultural heritage is frequently seen by policy makers as a lever for boosting tourist arrivals and economic revenues. In this view, cultural heritage is frequently assigned a “redeeming role” (Rabbiosi & Giovanardi, 2017, p. 250) by destination managers and urban policy makers, who tend to welcome quick-fix cultural heritage-led regeneration strategies. Cultural tourism is increasingly touted as inherently and ontologically “good”, with heritage becoming the favourite “magic wand” to foster local economic development and social cohesion in developing countries, decayed post-industrial inner cities or stagnating tourist resorts alike. The risk is, however, that cultural heritage becomes another path towards exclusionary forms of urban growth.

From a diametrically opposed perspective, interpretive research within both tourism and heritage studies has often stressed the relevance that cultural heritage possesses, regardless of its direct connection with tourism development. Thus, a specific focus on discourse of heritage production and appropriation prevails among interpretivist researchers. Problems of social exclusion and “semiotic violence” (Gibson, 2005) are more often than not, emphasised as intrinsic features of cultural heritage being ambiguous object of manipulation. If it is no exaggeration to claim that we continuously (re)create the past that we need in the present (Graham, 2002), cultural heritage is never really a “given” asset of a place, but is the result of a constantly ongoing process of identity negotiations where the most powerful social actors can craft hegemonic narratives. In other words, cultural heritage often becomes an object of investigation per se, where tourism is one of the possible contexts.
Both the papers and the three key-note speeches hosted by the workshop have sought to go beyond this compartmentalised approach to the relationship between cultural heritage and tourism. From multiple perspectives, contributors have also sought to examine the pivotal role played by cultural heritage in shaping the agenda of tourist development agencies without ignoring the influences that, in turn, tourism development policies are exerting on the heritage as an identity resource for local communities. This Special Issue identifies the three key-note speeches as the three main gateways whereby the reciprocal interaction between cultural heritage and tourism can be viewed.

1. Heritage and tourism between economics and culture

The nexus between cultural heritage and tourism has been problematised by Roberto Cellini (University of Catania) in “Heritage and Tourism: Rhetoric and Real Evidence from Economic Analyses” (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CwAWvPfyrnI). By discussing the rigour of economic analysis and the role of the interpreters of econometric evidence, Cellini – a rigorous economist himself – considers the function of rhetoric in the realm of numbers and statistics. In doing so, the solipsistic and self-referential tendency often inherent to economics, quantitative approaches – a sort of self-fulfilling prophecies based on models, charts and formulas – is denounced. Cellini’s proposal does not end up in the usual interpretative or discursive approach to narratives, as commonly found in the humanities or the social sciences. What is at stake is actually the survival, dignity (and destiny!) of cultural economy. Resonating with this spirit, some of the papers included in this Special Issue seek to examine the reciprocal interaction of the cultural and economic components of heritage in fostering new paths of regional development through tourism.

Along these lines, we can locate the essay of Pezzi, “When History Repeats: Heritage Regeneration and Emergent Authenticity in the Marche’s Peripheral Areas”. Historical re-enactments are expressions of intangible cultural heritage that can provide a new ground for cultural tourism and territorial cohesion. Through an ethnographic study, the accent is posed on how local development policies impact the micro-scale. At the same time, local policies are nurtured, enhanced, and sometimes disregarded once performed on the ground. Outside a policy framework, Cannizzaro, Corinto and Nicosia focus on the importance of a variety of stakeholders to shape the interface between economic regeneration and the maintenance of a traditional festival in “Saint Agatha Religious Festival in Catania: Stakeholders’ Functions and Relations”. Food and foodways, and music and soundscapes, are realms of intangible cultural heritage recently enhanced as providers to new, connected, production, distribution and consumption cycles. Del Pilar and Medina’s essay about the “Effects of Cultural and Tourism Policies on Local Development: the Case of Food Trails in Medellin (Colombia)” shows some insights into food cultural routes intended as linking devices among small and medium-sized food enterprises, while Morales Pérez and Pacheco Bernal focus on music events. In their contribution, “Residents’ Perception of the Social and Cultural Impacts of a Public Music Festival in Catalonia” the accent is posed however on residents-as-stakeholders who value the music festivals enquired for the positive
economic impact they generate.

2. Participatory place branding and heritage management

The role of residents-as-stakeholders is somehow at the core of the idea of participatory branding that has been presented by Mihalis Kavaratzis (University of Leicester) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7z4vrlD62xc]. Place branding is playing an increasingly pivotal role in contemporary place management and regional development, which are one of the main cornerstones in cultural heritage. Place branding always corresponds to a selective thematisation of a place’s multiple identities. The concept of participatory place branding represents a viable manner to come up with a more inclusive and democratic outcome, by grounding place regeneration into a bottom-up process of civic involvement. Other scholars have taken on the relevance of place images and the role of community engagement. A theoretical report of the need to prevent civic disengagement in place marketing is highlighted by Sazhina and Shafranskaya in “Residents’ Attitudes Towards Place Marketing: Tourism Marketing Focus”. The importance of being branded as a UNESCO’s World Heritage Site is discussed by Sziva and Bassa in “World heritage sites through the eyes of new tourists – Who cares about world heritage brand in Budapest?”. While Sziva and Bassa offer a sort of an ex-post research note, since Budapest was included in the WHS List in 1987, Bonadei, Cisani, and Viani offer an ex-ante account in their essay “City Walls as “Historic Urban Landscape”: a Case study on Participatory Education”. In this case, the process of obtaining the prestigious WHS brand has been associated with a participatory and empowering process focusing on children. Pashkevich, in her wider discussion of “Processes of Reinterpretation of Mining Heritage: the Case of Bergslagen, Sweden” reminds us that obtaining the World Heritage status can also limit the diversity of “performances of place”. As a brand, the WHS is evidently not so participatory. Managing cultural heritage is indeed becoming increasingly difficult, something requiring professionals with both hard and soft skills. Accordingly, the relevance of training in cultural heritage management is explored by Epifani, De Siena and Pollice in “Training for Beauty. Training as a Strategic Axis for Tourism Enhancement of Cultural Heritage”.

3. Ordinary “urban scenes” and new forms of tourism off the beaten track

As a result of the differentiation of cultural tourism, tourist experiences that qualify as valuable due to their ability to grasp an (idealized) ordinary sense of place seem to redesign tourism social and spatial articulation. This avenue has been explored in the key note speech entitled “Off the Beaten Track: French Experiences of a Different Tourism” [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yrotJQbHf1U] by Maria Gravari Barbas (University of Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne). Apparently, the content of tourist experiences is becoming less tangible and more mobile, enabling creative and cultural combinations within a variety of contexts. For instance, the hegemony of museums and
other institutional sites decreases, while public spaces, cafés and restaurants become attractive “urban scenes” beyond those traditionally exploited by tourism. A set of tourist/cultural projects, jointly addressing and involving local communities and visitors, have recently been proposed by various civic networks. While on the one hand, these experiences may provide new grounds for developing social innovation, on the other hand they are still to be understood in terms of social/spatial inclusion, reproduction of territorial stereotypes or neocolonial gazes. The contribution of Baldarelli, falls along these lines in “Accounting, creativity and charity in hospitality enterprises”, focussing on a new typology of restoration in which guests can pay as they feel, along with Le Bel’s “Literary heritage and place building for communities: the case of Allier, France”, focussing on the imagery potential of literary heritage as fostered by citizens’ associations. What is at stake here is also the co-creation of tourist places as jointly enacted by a variety of social actors, as Ouellet discusses in her “Sharing Space in Tourism Places: A Study of Interrelationships in Sarlat (France)”. The case presented is located in a tourist “well beaten” track, but the approach chosen shows how fuzzy some distinctions are becoming.

4. The multilevel governance of heritage and tourism

What happens on the local scale is useful for detecting new trends or conflicts in cultural heritage and tourism, as the three keynote speeches have shown. However cultural heritage and tourism are channelled together through a variety of regional, national and macro-regional scales. Fuschi and Evangelista focus on the regional level in “Preliminary Considerations on Cultural Tourism in Abruzzo as a Strategic Tool for the Renewal of the Regional Tourist Offerings”. They stress the need for integrative policies that take into consideration the multidimensional and multi-actor dimension of place. Loda and Macri pursue a similar attempt at the national scale, but in doing so they also try to operationalise the concept of responsible tourism empirically, as they show in their essay “Exploring Responsible Tourism in Upper Myanmar”. Magnani, in her report on “The International, Regional and Local Interaction in the Promotion of Cultural Tourism in Mozambique”, stresses the implications of the transcalarity in cultural tourism promotion while focussing on a single country, and so do Aigina and Aleksandrova in “Modern Aspects of Cultural and Historical Heritage Involvement in Tourism Activities in Russia”. Finally, an assessment of the impact of EU policies is offered by Marinov, Assenova, Dogramadjieva in their essays, “Key Problems and Gaps in the EU Funds Absorption for Heritage Attractions Development: the Case of Bulgaria”, and by Kozak in “Innovations in Tourism Policy: the Case of Poland”. This essay, in particular, focuses on the differences in innovations implemented in the field of tourism policy. The case study presented serves to test the hypothesis that in the countries undergoing major societal transformation, introduction of innovation depends largely on the ability to embrace a new post-industrial tourism paradigm. The variety of perspectives on cultural heritage and tourism featured in this Special Issue is enriched by the presence of specific contributions that, by their very nature, exceed the three themes described above. For example, Guizzardi and Stacchini
present an interesting examination of inbound tourists’ preferences in Italy in “Inbound Tourists in Italy: An Analysis of Individual Satisfaction in the Main Italian Destinations”.

Conclusive remarks

To conclude, this Special Issue touches upon several dimensions of the nexus between cultural heritage and tourism, by offering some genuinely global accounts. The places covered, in fact, range from some of the “hidden gems” of peripheral Italian areas to major resorts located in emerging countries, such as Colombia, to one of the so-called BRIICS countries, such as Russia. Global policies, one could argue, but also local challenges. For example, the ambiguity characterising some of the policies promoted by UNESCO has manifested across continents, inviting local stakeholders to buy into the WHS brand in different places at different times. Multi-locaional perspectives are of course a useful manner to track common challenges and opportunities and to highlight common trans-territorial patterns, and even connections and flows among different tourist destinations. The need to go beyond the so-called “local trap” (Born & Purcell, 2006) should be emphasised in this respect. This Special Issue has sought to move another step forward towards this goal. At the very least, the workshop and the Special Issue have promoted the advantages of adopting a local lense in order to discuss global phenomena. This implies focusing on the micro in its relationship with the macro, in a perspective that should appreciate the dynamics between and among various scalar levels (see Giovanardi, 2015). Perhaps, the contemporary (academic or tourist industry) world is not ready for a thorough and sudden rescaling where traditional administrative boundaries are fully overcome or subverted. But the process is underway.
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