Re-ordering & after: Editing ecosystems & history in the restoration of heritage landscapes under globalization

ABSTRACT
The reconstruction of entire neighbourhoods and landscapes is of growing interest for the fields concerned with conservation of material culture. Similarly, ecosystem restoration is a topic of increasingly central importance to both conservation biology and landscape architecture. While there has been a shift away from naïve atavism to more contemporary notions of constantly re-interpreted nature and history, the theoretical frameworks for setting goals for ‘landscape restoration’ remain weak. This is partly because the bodies of knowledge and practices for valuing and intervening around nature and culture continue to be largely separated. In addition, the cultural ‘playing field’ under globalization is far from ‘even’. This discussion explores new frameworks for conceiving of both goals and interventions for restoration of ecosystems, landscapes and neighbourhoods within a framework critical of the power relationships that result from the globalization of capital, natural resources, information, and culture. Five examples of contentious settings for landscape and neighbourhood conservation and restoration under globalization are explored including urban and rural examples from the United Arab Emirates and the West Coast of Canada, and the Salt Range of Pakistan.
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INTRODUCTION
It has often been said that ‘history is for the victors’. But who has ‘won’ and ‘lost’ under globalization of the flows of capital, natural resources, labour and culture? How have such victories, if they can be conceived as such, been played out in heritage conservation initiatives or lack thereof for landscapes that invariably contain a wide range of signs and relicts from more localized tribal and other traditional cultures to those of societies more national and globalized? This discussion explores alternatives to the often limited set of possibilities for heritage conservation that are perceived where there are pressures for commercialization of historical landscapes under globalization. Too often, if restoration of a heritage site cannot be linked to some kind of short-term income generation, its historical significance is ignored. In this stark dichotomy, heritage interpretations are often reduced to cartoons in highly commercialized cultural market places referred to derisively as “theme parks.” Michael Sorkin’s 1992 essay was something of a manifesto for public space and life. Two passages have been particularly influential.

Finally, this new realm is a city of simulations, television city, the city as theme park. This is nowhere more visible than in its architecture, in buildings that rely for their authority on images drawn from history, from a spuriously appropriated past that substitutes for a more exigent and examined present.¹

He later argued that,

“The theme park presents its happy regulated vision of pleasure – all those artfully hoodwinking forms – as a substitute for the democratic public realm, and it does so appealingly by stripping troubled urbanity of its sting, of the presence of the poor, of crime, of dirt, of work. In the ‘public’ spaces of the theme park or the shopping mall, speech itself is restricted: there are no demonstrations in Disneyland. The effort to reclaim the city is the struggle of democracy itself.”²

Since Sorkin’s comments on American cities over a decade ago, other processes, more directly associated with globalization, made some forms of heritage landscape conservation more difficult while providing some new opportunities for protection of material culture, in situ.

Globalization and heritage conservation involve a re-ordering of material and human resources that can only be partially contained in market-based transactions. Today, much of the heritage conservation in the world is in spite of the globalization of market places. Yet there are still numerous opportunities to forge initiatives for the conservation of material heritage that rely on and foster other kinds of transnational and intercultural relationships. Through beginning with the phrase, ‘re-ordering and after’, we suggest that after this period of preoccupation with the cultural commodity in transactions that underlay heritage conservation initiatives, there may well be new forms of globalization for less dependant on the market place.

The structure of this discussion turns on its title. Both conservation of traditional landscapes and neighbourhoods and globalization involve re-ordering, reorganization and revaluation of cultural sites and certain historical interpretations. This re-ordering involves a transformation in modes of social production notably transmission of historical and cultural perspectives. The second half of the title is based on the argument that restoration of heritage landscapes under globalization is the editing of both ecosystems and history. Another way to begin this exploration of the re-ordering through conservation and restoration of landscapes in the context of the re-ordering of production and respective areas in this period of a certain kind of globalization is that some historical sites are being renovated in certain ways and other places with comparable cultural resources are being obliterated. The answer to asking why would involve a tome on the relationship of history and
landscape to globalization. In this discussion, centred on Dubai and Sharjah as spaces of discourse about material culture, landscapes, and globalization, we explore ways to engage in more nuanced and expanded modes of conservation of landscapes and neighbourhoods. The end goal is to identify a wider range of interventions for assessment, identification, planning, design, rebuilding, and restoration of cultural and historical sites.

The central argument of this paper is that the notion that there are only stark alternatives for material culture and what can be protected, between theme park commercialization and obliteration, is erroneous. We argue that there is a wealth of other possibilities. Developing approaches, and beginning to codify methodologies, to identify a wider range of workable configurations, practices, and interventions for landscape conservation is the focus of this essay. We then explore a secondary argument that the wide array of possible interventions for landscape conservation constitutes a distinctive form of contemporary cultural production. While focused on restoring the past, landscape conservation is derived from constructing new interpretations of today’s culture and dialogues between social groups.

How can the fields and guilds of environmental planning and design, from architecture, landscape architecture, urban design and ecology be re-ordered to better serve alliances between local and more globalized groups in pursuit of celebration, preservation and renovation of heritage sites? The starting point in this discussion is the axiom that landscape restoration begins with some perceived need to re-order the present through re-establishing a subset of sites, objects and relationships that occurred at some preferred pointed in the past. This line of thinking continues as we explore relatively transparent processes for setting restoration goals for landscapes as form of cultural editing (indeed as forms of cultural expression) that can recognize and does not necessarily destroy problematic aspects of nature and history. We sketch frameworks for restoration of aspects of nature and history where unresolved perspectives on culture and history can be openly recognized and in some cases highlighted. Certain aspects of nature, culture and history remain so unresolved and antithetical to political economies under globalization that ‘restoration’, when it is discussed or carried out, can often function more to further obscure past (and potentially future) relationships across communities. We are particularly concerned with the problematic collision of some aspects of globalization with local history and culture which can lead to the obliteration of localized experiences of place.

In exploring a theoretical framework for conceiving, organising and carrying out interventions to conserve and restore heritage spaces in this time of intensified globalization of capital, we explore the contexts and prospects for five landscapes:

- a pedestrian corridor along a reconstructed shoreline with historically and ecologically oriented public art in the recently re-developed False Creek area of Vancouver, Canada (“False Creek, Vancouver”) (FIG. 1 & 2);
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FIG. 1 satellite image of central Vancouver, Canada, with False Creek in the centre of the image

FIG. 2 Vancouver’s False Creek in 2004 with the 1997 public art piece by Bernie Miller and Alan Tregebov, ‘Street Light’ (photograph by Ingram)

a traditional aboriginal food production landscape, Belly-Rising-Up on the Indian Reserve of the Tsawout Nation on Vancouver Island, at a time of increased interest in aboriginal re-engagement in traditional areas (“Belly-Rising-Up”) (FIGURES 3 & 4);
For tracks 1. Post Traditional Environments & II. The Post Global Condition
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FIG. 3 Belly-rising-up, 2004 (photograph by Ingram)

FIG. 4 satellite image of the suburban, Saanich Peninsula, north of Victoria, British Columbia on Vancouver Island, with Belly-rising-up in the centre of the image

- the contrasting treatments of two of the older neighbourhoods of Dubai: the Bastakaya and Satwa neighbourhoods (“Bastakiya and Satwa, Dubai”) (FIGURES 5 to 10);
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FIG. 5 satellite image from central Dubai: the urban context of Al Bastakaya

FIG. 6 satellite image from central Dubai: the urban texture of part of Al Bastakaya
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FIG. 7 restored sikka, Al Bastakaya, Dubai in 2004 (photograph by Ingram)

FIG. 8 satellite image from central Dubai: the urban context of Al Satwa
For tracks I. Post Traditional Environments & II. The Post Global Condition
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FIG. 9 satellite image from central Dubai: the urban texture of part of Al Satwa

FIG. 10 Al Satwa landscape, 2004 (photograph by Habib)

Makbarat al Sahabi, a battlefield and cemetery straddling the border of the United Arab Emirates and Oman which is of considerable significance in the early development of Islam (FIGURES 11 to 13); and
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FIG. 11 context of Makbarat al Sahabi on the borders of the United Arab Emirates and Oman from the International Space Station

FIG. 12 one of the cemeteries of Makbarat al Sahabi in 2004 (photograph by Habib)
the efforts to conserve and restore the natural and cultural sites of the Salt Range of the north-western Punjab of Pakistan with its dense configuration of Islamic and Hindu sites (along with those of Buddhism and Sikh movements) with a recent proposal from a group with associated with the Government of India to restore some Hindu sites (“Salt Range”) (FIGURES 14 – 16).
In exploring opportunities to re-instate and re-inscribe certain material elements of the past for the future, we use a number of terms for locale and configurations of interventions. Most of these terms have recent usages that remain contentious and unresolved – in part because of the global changes described above. This list of terms that includes, “landscape,” “ecosystem,”
“neighbourhood,” “site,” “conservation,” “rehabilitation,” “renovation,” “reconstruction,” “preservation,” and “restoration,” constitutes a kind of template of inquiry for the discussion’s case studies. And while all of these terms are relevant to envisioning how to protect and re-establish material culture in these locations, it remains easier to use some more than others for particular areas. These semantics, themselves, are telling.

We use ‘landscape’ in two ways. First, there is the physical space, which is larger than a site and smaller than a district. In this way, a landscape is a spatial unit that might include part of a neighbourhood or several of such, as well as being a cultural construct. In this later concept of a landscape as a cultural and ultimately politicized signature of “collective experience” and place, we are influenced by Denis Cosgrove’s seminal essay, from 1984: “The landscape idea and the modern world” along with his subsequent essays on social constructions. Similarly, we acknowledge the institutional construction of notions of particular landscapes and especially valuable landscape sketched by Michel Foucault in his 1984 essay, “Space, knowledge, and power.”

In typical usage today, the ‘ecosystem’ is a less overtly spatial and cultural term, than “landscape,” and describes the totality of relationships between a set of organisms and biophysical processes. But ‘ecosystem’ is no less social constructed than ‘landscape’ and reflects certain power dynamics and typically projects of privatization not only of space but of notions of nature and ecosystems processes. Unless referring to globalized biophysical relationships through a term such as “biosphere”, “ecosystem” is also defined spatially for a particular area and set of populations. Coined recently in the 1935 essay by A. G. Tansley, the “ecosystem” still appears, at the beginning of the Twenty-First Century, a deceptively technical and apolitical in relationship to landscape. But just as nearly all landscapes have been partially formed through cultural factors, few ecosystems, even those that were recently pre-industrial, with low human populations and that appear relatively pristine, have not been marked by particular cultural, economic and political processes.

The terms “neighbourhood” and “site” involve notions of community and space more defined by overly communal and political economic processes. A neighbourhood is a contiguous unit of human habitation, defined in communal or spatial terms, though such a locale might well include a range of more incidental ecosystems and landscapes not particularly consistent with particular social or political identifications. A “site” much like human sight is far from a regular and consistent portion of a broader landscape unit. A site is typically less than what one can see from a particular point. Paradoxically, it is at this finer scale that much of the decision-making leading to the conservation of material culture, beyond the exterior of buildings, are made.

If the lines between and overlap with the four major spatial descriptors in protection of outdoor (and respective indoor) material culture are irregular, the relationships between the six terms most commonly used to describe interventions for protection of such resources can be even more problematic. “Conservation” involves an accurate inference that only a small part of the aspects of the material culture of a given area can be protected or re-established. “Renovation” suggests a still existent set of human made structures or remnant infrastructure will be improved and made more secure without major forms of reconstruction. “Rehabilitation” is typically used for landscape and ecosystems, and not buildings, and can include relatively superficial allusions to past conditions as well as more profound interventions. “Reconstruction” can be use for work on both buildings and outdoor space and infers major interventions when little of past landscapes are obvious or functioning. In contrast, “preservation” infers that at least some aspects of buildings
and landscapes can be protected without major forms of reconstruction. In contrast, “restoration” is typically used in two divergent ways whether discussing aspects of buildings or more fundamental components of ecosystems. Thus, repairing a wall or an aspect of a building could be considered an architectural “restoration” as in a similar way would be replanting a garden in terms of an original design. “Ecosystem restoration” suggests re-establishing biophysical processes in a way as to make a set of conditions relatively self-sustaining.

With these irregular semantics in mind, we structure this essay through a progression of problems and solutions. Our problem statement centres on finding ways to conceive of new kinds of interventions for the conservation of heritage landscapes under the peculiar set of processes associated with this phases of globalization. In particular, we explore ways to identify critical forms of interventions under globalization: approaches that might not necessarily support or defer to the dictates of global capital but rather which can support us to better conceive of and provide sufficient protection to vulnerable sites and resources. Through the five landscapes that have yet to have cohesive landscape protection strategies, we explore uncritical and more critical forms of conceiving of protecting the material culture in landscapes and the related notion of cultural editing grounded in political economy. In delving into social editing, we explore the related question of why are efforts to construct some social and historical narratives, under globalizing capital, are successful than others. As a partial explanation to the stark unevenness of protection of landscape with cultural resources, we explore the almost schizophrenic relationships between protection and the consumption and sometimes near obliteration of heritage landscapes.

In response to the didactic tensions in efforts to protect heritage landscapes, we explore a more overt politicization as a partial antidote to extreme commercialization. We argue that both landscape restoration and neighbourhood preservation are not primarily technical exercises, or simply ways to attract or generate capital, but rather social movements centred on asserting local perspectives for redirecting capital in contrast to be passive and neutralized in ‘redevelopment’.

Of course, such an approach suggests a far less consistent and volatile set of landscape protection goals – varying greatly with ecosystems, cultures, histories and aspirations. Finally, we expand on our second argument that assessment, conception and planning and design interventions for protection of aspects of heritage landscapes constitute forms of cultural production with some affinities to architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, and land and public art but which involves forms and modes of representation well beyond these more established disciplines.

PROBLEM STATEMENT:
CONCEIVING OF CRITICAL INTERVENTIONS FOR CONSERVATION OF HERITAGE LANDSCAPES UNDER THE CURRENT PHASE OF GLOBALIZATION
The reconstruction of entire neighbourhoods and landscapes is an idealist goal of growing interest for the fields concerned with conservation of material culture. While there has been a shift away from naïve atavism to more contemporary notions of constantly re-interpreted nature and history, the theoretical frameworks for setting goals for and choosing viable interventions what is sometimes called ‘landscape restoration’ or ‘landscape preservation’ remain weak. Three dynamics are at work. First, this gap in intervening around landscapes as material culture is partly because the bodies of knowledge and practices for valuing and intervening around nature and culture continue to be separated, sometimes intentionally. Secondly, there are chronic pressures to reduce heritage landscapes to commercialized theme parks – with histories and sites that can be easily commercialized ‘restored’ and areas and events with less marketable interpretations often being ignored, destroyed and converted to other uses. Thirdly, the cultural playing field,
especially under this phase of globalization of markets, is far from even. Remnants of nature, culture and history across landscapes remain so vulnerable to pressures from political economies under globalization that advocacy for restoration, when it is discussed or carried out, can appear irrelevant or oppositional.

With the dynamics above as recognized obstacles, how can we envision protection of material cultural across landscapes and begin to conceive of viable interventions? How can we construct an integrated framework for identification of possible interventions of landscapes, typically holding buildings and other human structures, in a manner that is critical to the power relationships that result from the globalization of culture, capital, natural resources and information? Is it possible to construct a relatively transparent process for setting restoration goals for landscapes that acknowledges cultural editing (including as a form of cultural expression) while recognizing and not avoiding, obscuring or obliterating problematic aspects of landscapes and history?

Another way to explore this problem statement is with the question of which aspects of material culture are not protected unless broader landscape-wide conservation strategies are developed. A related question, not explored fully in this discussion, is that of whether or not configurations of material culture stretching across landscapes is more vulnerable to destruction under this phase of globalization. So if we begin to consider what is lost if heritage conservation initiatives are limited to the traditional concerns of architects, landscape architects and ecologists, a list of vulnerable elements of material culture can highlight some kinds of new modes of conceiving of interventions. Configurations of buildings with several or more land use activities and open space defy the confines of the cannons of architecture, landscape architecture and ecosystem management. In another example, visual resources, such as heritage vistas and panoramas, are difficult to protect without recombining various disciplines of conservation of material culture. In a third example, traditional varieties of crops require a series of micro-environments and treatments that the requirements of which to recreate extend well beyond since disciplines. In exploring the needs for a new framework for landscape preservation, the following five examples highlight how approaches based on single disciplines, focused on small sites such as buildings or gardens, will not be able to protect enough of the range of material cultural necessary to reconstruct the narratives to make sense of local history.

FIVE HERITAGE LANDSCAPES BEING RE-ORDERED
If the obstacles to protection of configurations of indoor and outdoor heritage resources have not become evident so far, the following examples confirm that landscape preservation, outside of well-known historical sites, remains a marginalized and constrained set of practices. In fact, a new set of relationships, which have often intensified in this phase of globalization, can often function to obscure nuanced interpretations of heritage and history.

False Creek is a marine inlet in central Vancouver, a metropolitan area over 2 million on the West Coast of a Canada. On the north side of the False Creek is a recently constructed promenade with a series of public art of pieces marking local ecosystems and history. Over the last decade, a historical narrative, about multiculturalism in the founding of the city, has formed. While this arc of historical sites is not complete or fully representative of the groups that built the modern city, if such a concept were even applicable, the public art spaces reassert older experiences of the area, centred on modest livelihood in resource extraction. One of a number of pieces that emphasize the modest, diverse, and colourful life of the old natural resource towns is the 2001 sculpture
installation, ‘Lookout’, by Christos Dikeakos and Noel Best (FIG. 17). At times, these inscriptions contrast markedly with those of the new architecture of the globalized economy. At other times, the local ‘colour’, as in multicultural histories, becomes a marketing vehicle with a large number of overly similar condominium units and for an increasingly diverse set of potential home-buyers. One of scores of new neighbourhoods, that have been established rapidly as mega-projects, throughout the world in recent decades, these redevelopment initiatives have tended to produce neighbourhoods indistinguishable similar areas in other parts of the world. Observance of history and heritage on small sites, in this context, takes multiple relationships to the heavy infusion of global capital (in this case often linked to Hong Kong and other parts of China) and the massive scale of redevelopment projects. At times the art is perceived as oppositional. But for many, the art largely functions as humanizing decorum with its historical content largely neutralized. Managing and expanding these public art and associated pedestrian spaces as a heritage landscape will be difficult especially when there are constant pressures to recover higher levels of profit which often translates into strategies of urban design that optimize decorum and minimize historical content.

FIG. 17 The 2000 public art piece entitled ‘Lookout’ by Christos Dikeakos & Noel Best, False Creek, Vancouver (photograph by Ingram in 2004)

Belly-Rising-Up is a traditional aboriginal site with an extraordinary number of food plants on the ‘Indian Reserve’ of the Tsawout Nation in Central Saanich north of the small city of Victoria on Vancouver Island, Canada. Because of its mild winters that rarely ever go below 0C, the region is one of the most rapidly urbanizing (and ‘suburbanizing’) regions of Canada (FIG. 18). These landscapes of traditional aboriginal food production have been poorly documented even, in the case of this site, which was the focus of treaty negotiations with the British Empire a hundred and fifty years ago. Today, the focus on biological and landscape conservation, and the funding lines for programmes, are dominated by concerns for protection of the over one hundred species at risk in the drier parts of southern Vancouver and the adjacent islands. These days, there has been little cultural space to discuss traditional aboriginal food species, genotypes and culturally modified sites. This situation is in no small part because of under recent court decisions such that
documented traditional presence, outside of Indian Reserves, could allow aboriginal governments to have increasing involvement in the management of adjacent lands.12

Moving half way around the world, the Bastakaya and Satwa neighbourhoods of Dubai are some of the oldest continuously occupied urban neighbourhoods in the south-eastern part of the Arabian Peninsula. Al Bastakaya has been the focus of a careful conservation and restoration programme for over two decades. A port-side neighbourhood of merchant homes, the concerted civic effort, indeed the depth of the social cooperation, for keeping Al Bastakaya a living neighbourhood is a model for the region and the world (FIG. 19). In contrast, many of the modest features of Al Satwa, another Dubai neighbourhood of more modest houses now squeezed between two of the most expensive neighbourhoods in the Middle East, are being purposely obliterated through policies of Dubai Municipality. Al Satwa’s housing stock was never as well-constructed and complex as Al Bastakiya but it did constitute a Twentieth Century Arab neighbourhood, reliant on local approaches and resources (FIGURES 20 & 21), in contrast to much of the urban texture of Dubai which was built after the 1960s and the domination of urban design by international modernist styles. But does conserving Al Bastakaya rather well constitute sufficient neighbourhood conservation for a rapidly growing metropolis? Given the relative under-use of Al Bastakaya at the present time, re-establishing urban life, on a sustainable basis, may require taking on some trappings of more commercial theme parks or at least historical districts. In contrast to the almost over-privileging of historical aspects of Al Bastakaya, other neighbourhoods that also can show us a great deal about local culture can be ignored and under-valued. Given the sometimes conflicting pressures for better, low-cost and centrally located housing, can Al Satwa be integrated into a highly strategic point in the global economy while having some of the most modest aspects of neighbourhood space retained?
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FIG. 19 old shop that is scheduled for renovation and re-use, Al Bastakaya, Dubai, 2004 (photograph by Ingram)

FIG. 20 Al Satwa landscape with old car and an older house that is well-maintained, 2004 (photograph by Habib)
The Makbarat al Sahabi battlefield and cemetery is from the first decades of the establishment of Islam. Outside of the town of Dibba on the Indian Ocean, the Makbarat al Sahabi straddles the border of the United Arab Emirates and Oman. Makbarat al Sahabi is split into three jurisdictions:

1. Dibba Hisn, part of the Emirate of Sharjah and the United Arab Emirates;
2. Dibba Muhallab, part of Fujeirah, another of the emirates; and
3. Dibba Bayah, which is part of the Sultanate of Oman and its northern enclave of Musandam.

The sun and fire-worshiping tribes of south-eastern Arabia converted to Islam at the time of Mohammed the Prophet. But a decade after his death, a number of communities in Arabia reverted to their older religions and a series of Apostasy Wars raged. Another reason for the Apostasy Wars was the unwillingness of some tribes to continue to pay the taxes instituted as part of the establishment of Islam. One of the largest and most decisive battles in this part of the region was in response to a revolt at Dibba in 632 AD (11 AH). At least a thousand people, on both sides, are thought to have died and been buried on site. One contemporary description on the world-wide web notes that,

*When the Omanis rejected Islam, Jayfar, their ruler, took refuge in the mountains. Meanwhile, Abu Bakr sent two leaders, Huthayfah and Arfajah, to subdue Oman and Mahrah...At first, it seemed as if Laqeet was going to win the battle, but help came to the Muslims from Bahrain at the critical moment. 10,000 rebels were killed, and much booty was taken by the victors.*

13

Another account chronicles that,

*The Battle of Daba [sic] was fought towards the end of November 632 (early Ramadan, 11 Hijri). At first the battle went badly for the Muslims; but at a critical moment a force of local Muslims, who had clung to their faith in spite of Dhul Taj, appeared on, the battlefield in support of their co-religionists. With this*
fresh addition to their strength the Muslims were able to defeat the infidel army. Dhu'l Taj was killed in battle.  

This complex landscape around Dibba includes cemeteries with what is thought to be one thousand tombstones as well as the probable battle sites. In this primarily un-built landscape, there are undoubtedly other material heritage resources as well. And there are small communities, some with fairly traditional residents. “Makbarat al Sahabi” refers to a cemetery of ‘companions’: people who lived at the time of and may have known The Prophet. But in the case of Makbarat al Sahabi some of those ‘companions’ would include people fought against either Islamic teachings or how certain principles were being applied after the death of The Prophet. The particular burial sites Makbarat al Sahabi are near a major battlefield in the Apostasy Wars. There has been a movement in Saudi Arabia, associated with an al-Muwahhidun interpretation of Islam, to destroy these sites that were once the source of a particular reverence. However, this particular Makbarat al Sahabi landscape is relatively intact. There are rural people making livings generating some deleterious impacts on material culture and there is often respectful, all-terrain-vehicle movement to a remote beach favoured by scuba divers. More problematic is the wear of time and weather. Given the size of the area and the richness of the resources, we can begin to imagine the risks of inaction after reviewing the second author’s notes from a visit on the 25th of June, 2004. 

Makbarat al Sahabi is to the north of the main town of Dibba in the United Arab Emirates. Going north and crossing the international border into Oman border, one of the more well-marked graveyards is another three minute drive. The graveyard is on the side of the one main road at the base of the mountains. Surrounded by a white wall with a few gates, one can easily enter by an open gate at the rear or by jumping over the wall. There are hundreds of tombstones that appear to be local pieces of stone put upright. A lot of the ground is flat between the tombstones but the logic of the positioning of the graves remained unclear. Every grave appears to have a tombstone at both the head and the feet to define its length. There seems to have been so much settling and erosion that remains are often in raised humps. In recent years, there has been work to maintain the graveyard; to define and protect tomb sites with rings of blocks and planted cactus. The majority of the ground surfaces are comprised of small pebbles. There are other tombstones under trees. 

At the rear of the most maintained grave areas are some small huts with goats. Near the graveyard are abandoned stone houses. There were two types of structures. The first were structures of normal stone laid over each other in a square or oval plan with timber. The second type is stone that once was covered in plaster. Some of the remains of the houses suggest that they were surrounded by walls that had entrance gates. The houses were clustered and suggest the remnants of a village. 

The Salt Range of Pakistan is in the north-western Punjab and contains some of the most intact forests and woodland in this dry, subtropical, lowland region along with a dense configuration of Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist and Sikh sites. Until 1947, the area had large populations of Hindus and Sikhs. Ketas is the third holiest Hindu site. After the migrations to Indian and the subsequent depopulation, the area absorbed Moslem adherents of Shia as well as Moslem refugees from what is today India who were displaced in the Partition. In the process, large areas of well-protected forest were lost to erratic expansions of cultivation on marginal land. A national park concept, involving further protection of the remaining forests and heritage sites, has been discussed for over two decades. Progress on a conservation strategy has been slow because of the limited government resources available for the conservation of both forests and material culture and the
difficulties of coordinating a range of government agencies. Amidst this institutional inertia, Hindu groups in India have successfully lobbied to begin the restoration of Ketas, supervised by the Archaeology Department in Pakistan's Punjab province, while many of religious sites and broader landscapes remain at risk of deterioration and obliteration.

CONSERVATION, PRESERVATION & RESTORATION AS CULTURAL EDITING

Protection of material culture, in situ, and any more comprehensive programmes for landscape restoration begins with some perceived need to re-order the present through re-establishing a subset of relationships (and things) that are thought to have occurred at some point of interest in the past. In returning to the heritage landscapes that are already being re-ordered under this phase of globalization, there are forms of cultural editing taking place today with no new conservation initiatives. In this way, heritage conservation is a response to some perceived vulnerability of a resource in the present through establishment of relationships between the past and the future. In similar ways, neglect and wilful ignorance, also can function as forms of re-ordering and of editing cultural memories across landscapes.

The cultural editing that invariably takes place through new conservation initiatives typically warrants some kind of revision or revisiting of history and new information and metaphors that cause ruptures in the previously dominant view of an event, social history, and landscape. We can begin to examine the sometimes contradictory editing processes at work on the five landscapes in this discussion through identifying the threats to resources and present gaps in heritage conservation. While considering the prospects and potential obstacles created by both the global marketplace and the efforts of particular communities to re-assert their local experiences, we can begin to detect some trajectories, generating either cooperation or conflict, between these markers of the local and the global.

Rarely is heritage conservation operations as complete or comprehensive as advocates and professionals would like. A set of goals, with a subset of priorities whether stated or inferred, begin to emerge. These priorities, and how they are applied, constitute forms of cultural editing of material culture. In deed, the differential between theoretical goals and implementation constitutes the effective power in the present over the cultural resources of the past. Typically, priorities are set by groups with power and resources – or in strong oppositional positions. And different social groups, albeit ‘stakeholders’ can be concerned about different heritage resources for the same areas.

What cultural resources are conserved today and tomorrow very much represent a kind of operational map of the stakeholders of the present: some local, some national, some global. How effectively are sets of resources conserved largely reflect of the accumulated interpretations, technical expertise, resources, power and linkages with other groups of particular stakeholders in heritage conservation. In fact, certain heritage sites and concerns for particular resources, including some that we explore in this essay, become lightning rods for conflict between different groups with their unresolved conflicts around historical interpretation, social identity, and cultural privileging.

The northern side of False Creek in Vancouver was one of the oldest neighbourhoods in a relatively new city. Vancouver was incorporated in 1886 and the initial urban form was codified and the city was effectively segregated by a series of racist riots that took place over several subsequent years. British Columbia became one of a number of parts of the British Empire
where early urban planning was bound with attempts to legislate a kind of separation of social
groups with people with heritages from north-western Europe on the west side and then all groups
in the east. The Western European majority in the area was never much more than half of the
population with the prospects of power-sharing and multiculturalism creating anxieties for
nascent power structures dominated by the British. Today’s public art passage spans that
contentious and shifting line between east and west.

Today Vancouver is one of the more culturally diverse and tolerant city in the world. The seeds of
that society were sown along areas such as False Creek over a century ago. However, under the
recent infusion of capital, much of it from East Asia, a formerly working-class neighbourhood of
small factories and residential hotels was obliterated. The area first became the site of Expo '86,
which signalled a more global attitude for the city, and since was redeveloped as one of the
highest density neighbourhoods in North America. Much of the redevelopment capital and
direction came through a single Hong-Kong-based development group that in the same period
became more integrated into the Chinese economy (and government). In this spectacular and
sometimes controversial redevelopment, pressures mounted for maintaining public space and
sense of place. Public art, that often engages in themes related to the local environment and social
histories, became something of a concession to community activists. A programme was
established where a tiny portion of a budget for a new building (of which there have been
numerous) was paid for by a developer and allocated for process of public art proposal, selection
and construction. This work was sometimes associated with planning processes where a
developer was given a variance, such as for a higher tower, in return for giving the city small
pieces of land to make for more expanded and functional public space. In addition, both poles of
the north-shore False Creek arc of public art are bounded by two public art sites developed by
activist community groups. At the east end of the arc is the ‘Marker For Change’ a memorial to
over a dozen women engineering students who were massacred in Montreal in 1989 by a
deranged man who resented females obtaining higher education. At the other end is a memorial
to people who have died from AIDS – on a site that was chosen as a compromise after an
extended controversy. After its experience with the establishment of two such controversial
monuments oriented to such specific social groups, the bureaucracy of the City of Vancouver
reacted by making it more difficult, for a few years, to have such projects, oriented to identity
politics, approved.

Today, the accumulated public art, and associated sites, on the north side of False Creek
constitute a rich resource of open space and culture. There are some unique cultural memories in
this public open space. In just one example, there is a work, Henry Tsang's, Welcome to the Land
of Light, which contains the only text of the Chinook language remaining in public space (FIG.
22). Chinook was a trading dialect in the region, a combination of English, French and aboriginal
languages, which developed and then died in a hundred and fifty year period. But how much
history and heritage, especially with much is related to the Nineteenth Century, is appropriate for
one harbour promenade?
Is it worthwhile to identify cultural gaps and to propose to fill them with other works of historically oriented public art? What would be the role of identity politics and what might be some other frameworks for proposing additions in order to further develop the cultural infrastructure? How could an enhanced art of local history be made attractive to prospective homebuyers and tourists without marking these sites with increased commercialism? And would too much history become didactic and self-defeating in terms of ‘turning off’ less knowledgeable audiences? And should be the responsibilities of the various levels of the state, with rigorous constitutional obligations to equally protect the cultural heritage of different groups, to enhance and nuance cultural narratives and associate spaces?

In contrasting example from Canada, at Belly-Rising-Up, the questions of enhanced availability of information on heritage for which groups and at what price to local residents becomes even more prominent. This site is not particularly about multiculturalism or modern Canadian history though it was the subject of extensive negotiations between the Tsawout people and the British colonial government in the early 1850s (FIGURES 23 & 24). Today, Belly-Rising-Up is one of the best examples of a heavily harvested and managed aboriginal landscape in the region. This highly intimate and vulnerable cultural landscape is protected largely because it is not advertised. Yet the site is open to the public as indicated by one sign. And that qualified access represents an exceptional level of graciousness – as a statement to politely contrast with the broken promises of the governments of the colonial area and after.
Belly-Rising-Up is or was an important site in a local spirituality which, where it survives, has been increasingly adapted to global, consumer values. The interests in the foods and cultural values associated with Belly-Rising-Up are largely associated with traditionalist perspectives that
are often at odds, within aboriginal communities and governments in Canada, with the priorities of modernists concerned with increasing income levels and establishing standardized forms of infrastructure such as running water and indoor plumbing. In this equation, some aboriginal political positions are sometimes even invested in redirecting public attention away from the old ways. However, the implications of Belly-Rising-Up have tremendous implications for reinterpretation of treaty obligations, control of land and natural resources, and the emerging aboriginal level of government in this part of the West Coast of Canada.

In the rapid expansion of the British Empire in mid-Nineteenth Century, the aboriginal nations of what was soon to become British Columbia were to be protected by the crown from the genocide going on in the territories controlled by the United States of America just to the south. The relationship with the tribes of what is today the British Columbia coast where originally envisioned to be similar to the treaties forged in the same years with the Arab tribes of the Trucial Coast and of Oman. Land and resources were to remain the property of local residents. But in the case of the Crown Colony of Vancouver Island (which was soon to be amalgamated with the Crown Colony of British Columbia), a series of small ‘Indian Wars’ provided an excuse to appropriate and alienate most lands and to displace local populations. Part of this legal and institutional shift had a weak link that comes back to haunt owners of alienated lands today. Cultivated and demarcated ‘fields’ were automatically the possession of aboriginal communities. Belly-Rising-Up was one of the last of these traditional landscapes, in the region, that was protected under imperial law. Its continued existence is in stark contrast to the scores of similar sites that were quickly obliterated by settlers. And if this site could be studied sufficiently, there could be a legal basis for extending the jurisdiction of some aboriginal governments over degraded sites, long alienated by settlers, that hold some key characteristics indicating ‘cultural modification’ by aboriginals. In this context, knowledge around Belly-Rising-Up has a great deal of power; that for aboriginal communities would be highly problematic (and disrespectful) if it were misused. So for Belly-Rising-Up, increased attention could be problematic. The explosive implications for a small community struggling to modernize and integrate into Canadian society could be uncomfortable and inflame old cultural conflicts. And for people still harvesting and engaging in the site, more attention from outsiders could distract from and disrupt traditional cultural experiences.

The stark contrast in the treatment of two of Dubai’s oldest neighbourhoods warrants a closer examination of cultural editing through urban planning and design. In today’s highly prosperous Dubai, it remains easier to celebrate the heritage of the merchant in the building of Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Dubai than of people without property. And merchant houses were often larger and better built such as some of the houses that remain in Dubai’s Al Bastakaya. In contrast, many other social groups, associated with the building of early Dubai, were forced to emigrate after the collapse of the pearling industry soon after The Great Depression of 1929. This unresolved pain of this great emigration and depopulation continues to exert itself today. For most of today’s Emirati, the huge loss of human resources 75 years ago was very long ago. What is left of their material culture, and their often heroic efforts to survive in their own countries, often seems obscure to a youth culture schizophrenically weaned on consumerism and shopping malls, on one hand, and fundamentalist religious principles that are probably some of the strictest in recent history, on the other. While Al Bastakaya fits into the new Dubai, somewhat snugly to the point of claustrophobia, the relevance of historical narratives embodied in conserving aspects of Satwa is not so clear.
These days, few urban planning agencies and consulting offices in the West will admit, outright, to wanting to obliterate neighbourhoods and heritage resources. Though conscious, and typically under-published and even secret, decisions to this effect take place in many cities in the world every week or month. Dubai, however, has been quite open about its plans to obliterate the older urban fabric of Satwa as in its 2001, Planning Studies Part Number 2 1998 – 1999. In fact, Satwa may be one of the last central neighbourhoods in a rapidly growing city, anywhere in the world, where the stated policy is to greatly lower population densities.

Why is Al-Bastakaya receiving considerable attention as a representative of traditional Arab urban space while Satwa is being obliterated? Is there a relationship to capital? The renovation and rejuvenation of Al Bastakaya is part of a strategy to maintain and increase tourism in the historic core of Dubai as the growth in commercial space and new housing units is decidedly to the south. In contrast, Satwa, which is scarcely a two kilometre walk to the south is between two neighbourhoods of markedly increasing value: Sheik Zayed Road the epicentre for the Middle East’s most dynamic financial district and the northern end of Jumeirah Beach with its increasingly symbolic space of leisure, tourism and consumption. What compounds the marginalization of old Satwa is that today few local citizens, or better paid expatriates for that matter, will live in those modest and sometimes slum conditions. Today, Satwa is a thriving centre for South Asian workers and businesses. In fact, Satwa invokes anxieties in Dubai Municipality officials as a zone of crime with some residents thought to be living in the country illegally; as an unnecessary slum in a now affluent country. And at a time when slums are coming to dwarf the other areas in Third World cities, Dubai has built a marketing identity around being an oasis of wealth. In contrast to the current housing which is often in disrepair, building large, new villas, at much lower densities might attract citizens of Dubai back to the new ‘downtown’ of the metropolitan area. And if not Emirati families, wealthier expatriates would be pleased, and be willing to pay high rents, to live so close to their workplaces and a fine beach. The problem in such a scenario is that South Asians, particularly single males, are central to the service economy of both Jumeirah Beach and Sheik Zayed Road. Forcing them out of their centrally located homes would not only cause hardship but could compromise the low costs of labour so crucial to Dubai’s competitive edge in the global economy. On the other hand, an island of relatively modest commerce and housing, surrounded by very expensive neighbourhoods, is bound to get squeezed in (globalizing) urban land economics.

To understand the forces at work on Satwa, we can look at the matrix, the connecting fabric, of traditional Arab urbanism: the alley or sikka. A key form in urban organization of the old Dubai was the sikka which through history has been recorded repeatedly to mean ‘road’ and which has often been meant to include the pedestrian alley. The word has been recorded as an urban element language in various places of the Arab world such as Libya, Iraq, and the Levant. Although not a commonly used word, according to the Arabic dictionary sikka is used, typically, to mean the kind of ‘road’ associated with urban space before reliance on mechanized transport. Other definitions of sikka suggest ‘cul-de-sac’ and many of the urban heritage resources in Satwa are as much associated with its network of sikka as the neighbourhood’s modest houses, courtyards and tiny gardens. In is through obliterating the alleys and creating automobile-oriented roads that Satwa is being transformed from an old Arab urban space inhabited mainly by South Asians to a primarily North American and fossil-fuel-driven suburb re-inhabited by a still small number of local Arab families. As the sikkas are edited out of the neighbourhood so too is traditional Arab urban space. But since there is Al Bastakaya, which is a finer and more romantic example of traditional Arab urban space anyway, should there be any efforts to protect and even re-inscribe
Satwa’s spaces that reflect modest lifestyles involving walking, a few domestic animals and few automobiles?

How can professionals and would-be urban activists lobby for the protection of aspects of Satwa? But how could the city preserve some of this heritage while further integrating Satwa into an elite land economy? On one hand, a deep and well developed rationale is needed to encourage Dubai Municipality to instruct its urban designers to maintain some aspects of the urban space. Conversely, some heritage conservation would be achieved under the rubric of redevelopment if ways were found, in this aggressively market-based economy, to further reward landowners and developers. Perhaps one rationale goes back to the persisting problems in the redevelopment of Al Bastakaya. By largely encouraging the historical families of Al Bastakaya to move to villas on the outskirts of Dubai, the maintenance of the old neighbourhood economy and the fabric of civic relationships has not been difficult at times. And such vacated public spaces may prove to be far more conducive to criminal activities than neighbourhoods dominated by service-workers. In conceiving of a neighbourhood preservation-oriented alternative to obliteration-as-redevelopment, it will be necessary to further explore the most important narratives of urban form and community articulated by the decision-makers of Dubai Municipality, through the global marketplace and how it uses and engages in the city, as well as in Emirati culture?

Today, the lack of will for a conservation strategy for the landscapes of Makbarat al Sahabi is leading to a de facto kind of cultural editing: the obliteration of both local social memory and the actual material culture that might help us understand the years directly after the time of Mohammed: the Apostasy Wars and the times of Khalid bin al Walid and the first Caliph Abou Bakr al Sidiq. But to conceive of how to map or even slightly mark some of the sites, or to strategize on how to maintain the integrity of the entire landscape, remains problematic because of a number of regional and global forces.

The current condition of the Makbarat al Sahabi battlefield and cemeteries has some similarities to similar famous battlefields in Saudi Arabia such as at Uhd and Badr. In all of these cases, there are no memorials built to commemorate the battlefields but that there are plates explaining the location and the battle that took place. In the same heritage site, one can see the burial places of famous people killed in action. As we can see in Dibba, graves in all of these sites are marked by two stones and a small mound along with enclosing ring. Based on practices and interpretations of many Moslems, further marking, interpretation of, or interest in such graves would be an inappropriate commemoration of burial locations. In much of the Arabian Peninsula decorum associated with grave sites is frowned upon. Clerics in the Arabian Peninsula worry that further attention to grave sites would inspire some people to start praying to edifices attempting to make such sites as Makbarat al Sahabi holy thus breaking proscription against giving physical objects divine meanings. So to some extent, the minimal, crumbling status of the heritage resources here is part of the heritage; decay, as well, becomes material culture.

Apostasy remains a controversial issue within Islam and in relations with other religious communities. Similarly, what might be considered heritage restoration and education to Westerners might be considered a dangerous preoccupation with Islamic relicts for some fundamentalists. And emphasis on a particularly violent moment in the spread of a relatively peaceful religion, particularly at this point in history, raises concerns about the reduction of complex social processes across landscapes to simplistic historical interpretation; to little more than theme park cartoons.
While Makbarat al Sahabi is not being promoted as a destination within the region, the area has considerable attraction for cultural tourism. Already the Lonely Planet guide for the area, part of a series not known for clarity or promoting inter-cultural understanding, provides a half a page mention noting that the graveyard of Dibba is an “amazing site with 10,000 headstones” (something of an exaggeration) because of the battle at Dibba for re-conquest of Arabia after the Prophet’s death and the rise of the Apostasy. The authors do not have a reference of where they obtained this information. While the odds of hoards of tourists descending on anything but the relatively pristine beach nearby remain remote, the area will probably see more interest and visitors. And the prospect of visitor-related damage to material culture in this landscape will increase. But even this kind of reactive maintenance may seem inappropriate for some; particularly those who identify zealously with the religious conflict that was the source of the deaths of so many.

Today, the cultural editing processes on the Salt Range have curious and sometimes ironic relationships to those that divided India of the British Raj a half century ago. With an exceptionally rich set of ruins in cultural landscapes illustrating points over the last three thousand years, cultural editing takes place through inaction with every new initiative privileging some small period in a rich chronicle. While the old Hindu and a few Buddhist ruins are especially in need of repair, there are many other sites that though perhaps less spectacular also warrant attention. All these issues of organizing heritage conservation priorities and programmes are complicated by unresolved aspects of the Partition of 1947, independence soon after, and a number of wars that have followed. In 2004, some local villagers in the Salt Range still like to share grisly recollections about how they destroyed Hindu religious sites. These macabre recollections are, nonetheless, heritage resources and could give clues for restoration strategies if those were ever called for. Today, small aspects of the third holiest religious site in Hinduism, at Ketas, are being restored for pilgrims who come for religious purposes. And the subsequent and probably intermittent operation of the Hindu religious sites while give Pakistanis some of the first glimpses of a religion that was wide practiced in what is their own country little more that half a century ago.

Just as restoration of religious sites can be used for education and better intercultural and international dialogue, such initiatives can serve to mark, in deed punctuate, new sagas in the internationalization and intrusion of capital. Today, Pakistan and India both have nuclear arsenals that are comparable. But India’s population is nearly ten times larger. There are now more Moslems in India than the entire population of Pakistan and the Indian middle-class is also larger than the entire population of Pakistan. Perhaps more problematic for striking a balanced geopolitics in heritage restoration for a complex area such as the Salt Range, there is much more capital, and economic power in general, in Bombay and New Delhi than in Lahore, Karachi and Islamabad. In a poor country such as Pakistan, capital is power and what is restored is what a stakeholder with money wants to pay for. Globalization, in this context, suggests the eventuality of theme park zones, most likely heavily policed, where Hindu Indian pilgrims make brief visits. But in such processes of injection of capital for heritage conservation, the broader historical landscapes, where Moslems, Hindus, Buddhists, and Sikhs interacted, cooperated and infrequently found, remain obscured and in some cases will be further obliterated.
CONSUMPTION & PROTECTION OF HERITAGE LANDSCAPES UNDER GLOBALIZATION

Has the playing field for initiatives for conservation of heritage landscapes changed fundamentally with this phase of globalization? Certainly, there have been attempts to constrain the role of the state along with the political influence of citizen groups and related nongovernmental organizations. But the prospects of the project of making the power of the market supreme over politics remain unclear. The theoretical work on heritage landscapes under globalization remains under-developed. And even with all of the talk about the growth of the cultural sectors of economies, and the growing currency of information, trends in the status of protected and unprotected heritage landscape remain highly debatable.

One theoretical framework for examining the implications of globalization on the ongoing re-ordering of heritage landscapes is provided by the celebrated, almost paradigmatic, Empire by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri.35 The core of the book is the description of the “general passage from the paradigm of modern sovereignty toward the paradigm of imperial sovereignty.”36 Certainly in both phases of political economic development ethnically, religiously and historically charismatic and intriguing landscapes have their roles in support of identities that enhance the prospects of accumulation of capital and power. The authors foresee a new kind of racism, profoundly different from the older colour lines where,

“Imperial racism, by contrast, looking forward perhaps to the twenty-first century, rests on the play of differences and the management of micro-confictualities within its continually expanding domain.” 37

Hardt and Negri argued that the current movements of religious fundamentalism are largely recent inventions, and responses to modernity and after, and not a recurrence or even a return to Medievalism.38 In this way, the authors predict of new kinds of political economies of simmering and supposedly un-resolvable conflict, rather than earlier forms of imperial conquest and domination, over ethnicity and religion. What does triumph, at all social costs, in this phase of empire is the market. And like Sorkin’s notion of the city reduced to a theme park, Empire suggests that heritage landscapes may be made irrelevant (and obliterated) if not part of a process of generating new cultural products and profit. Hardt and Negri explain these dynamics as,

“More often than not, the Empire does not create division but rather recognizes existing or potential differences, celebrates them, and manages them within a general economy of command. The triple imperative of the Empire is incorporate, differentiate, manage.”39

In this new life-world when can management of heritage landscapes be pre-emptive, expansive and inclusive in its mandates? And when does being overwhelmed by cultural conflict and the redistribution of resources away from social infrastructure lead to a negative combination of consumption of some heritage landscape through commercialization along with obliteration of other material culture through neglect?

The public art spaces of False Creek, Vancouver represent a particular kind of public – private partnership that emerged, in North America and Europe, in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Developers began to aggressively market the public spaces and cultural amenities associated with real estate, partially as a response to overproduction. In the case of the adjacent Yaletown neighbourhood, little was left of the previous neighbourhood and the redevelopment was brutally pervasive. The sense of place was so weak that interesting points of cultural heritage became crucial to marketing apartments and townhouses to the middle-class. Today, over ten years after much of the development was completed with occupancy at near 100%, contemporary and avowedly multicultural public space continues to be an amenity that attracts homeowners and
support the steady rise in estate values. In this formula, the consumption of the old heritage spaces and the allusions to those sites through redevelopment has generated a great deal of profit and more art and historical allusions, in public space, than in most comparable urban spaces. But while spaces of diversity and a comparable demographic have been established, much of the remaining material culture of the area remains unmarked and effectively obscured. The many public art sites, while impressive, still functions as crumbs, as small reminders, of a neighbourhood that was nearly totally demolished in the service of global capital.

Curiously, the inference from *Empire* that identity politics becomes a source of on-going social conflict, which could be exploited by capital, might seem, at first, to not have a corollary in the public spaces of False Creek. But markets often function to exploit what is in short supply. So that in a world where religious intolerance and cultural chauvinism persists is rampant, the relatively small urban oases of Canada’s central Toronto and Vancouver, with effective human rights protections and multiculturalism, become valued commodities, as destinations and communities.

Less than 100 kilometres to the south-west of False Creek, the relationships between heritage landscapes, globalization and prospects for conservation at Belly-Rising-Up have more similarities to the Third World. The Tsawout Nation, a small band of several hundred people nearly all of whom are related by blood, has struggled with a hundred and fifty years of poverty. Since signing its treaty with the colonial government, the tribe were progressively denied access to traditional hunting and gathering sites leading to low levels of health and life expectancy. Families were often traumatized by the state forcing children into residential schools and this, in turn, disrupted the transmission of traditional culture (including knowledge of food plants). Blatant segregation ended in the 1960s and eventually the beach community just north of Belly-Rising-Up had access to municipal infrastructure. In the same period, Federal programmes improved the quality of the housing and drinking water and sewage systems. Traditional shamanic observance continued until as late as the 1970s and some plant gathering appears to have continued through probably at reduced levels. The Tsawout ‘Band’ gained some notoriety in the same period for renting out the far side of their reserve, along the main expressway into the provincial capital, to billboard companies. For a time, the public beach just south of Belly-Rising-Up was a favourite haunt for rogue nudists and perhaps as something of a response the Tsawout government built a now abandoned teahouse in the style of traditional structures. Today there are a number of political factions in that aboriginal community, some more traditional and others more assimilationist, with varying investments in revisiting the heritage embodied in the Belly-Rising-Up site.

The current problem with any new intervention for conservation of this heritage landscape is that more knowledge and people present would threaten the intimacy and traditional activities on the site. And while highlighting the site, as part of a broader strategy in negotiating more treaties for aboriginal communities in the region, might be advantageous for some, the Tsawout might not see much benefit. The current situation is intriguing. People find their way to the site, are effectively welcomed by the Tsawout Nation through signage, maintain great care and reverence, and then do not linger. A traditional plant gathering landscape as a kind of aboriginal theme park would quickly see the numbers of visitors to generate permanent damage. A book might be nice for people who read books and likewise a video documentary. But these might not be media of particular relevance to a group such as this struggling to maintain a rich oral culture and performance arts.
It would be easy to assume a simple didactic for Bastakaya and Satwa under globalization with Al Bastakaya being ‘spared’ and Al Satwa being consumed. But Al Bastakaya might be under more of threat that many would want to realize. Converted to an effective theme park with a subset of its material heritage over-emphasized and contorted, there could be so many negative impacts intensive tourism that many resources could be permanently destroyed. For example, Al Bastakaya has a series of vestigial heritage gardens, of considerable importance for understanding traditional agriculture and urbanity in this part of the Arabian Peninsula. These spaces are under pressure to be converted into courtyard cafes and bars at the expense of maintaining the traditional varieties (and genotypes) of food and horticultural plants. After twenty years of studies of buildings, the inventory of the heritage garden resources remains incomplete at a time when these gardens will be increasingly obliterated and redeveloped (ironically under the rubric of heritage conservation). And similarly, the situation with some of the heritage resources in Satwa may not be so dire with other globalization processes sparing part of the neighbourhood.

In Al Satwa, there remain hundreds of makeshift shacks made out of aluminium sheets complete with the older window type air-conditioning units (a housing stock only attractive to foreign workers making low pay). It would take a decade for all of the old Arab housing typology with enclosed courtyards to completely disappear – giving time for new studies and the identification of some particularly rich areas. While the area is slowly being surrounded by new private villas and upgraded boulevards, there is no proposal for the wholesale obliteration of Al Satwa’s material culture anywhere nears as destructive as we saw in the 1980s and 1990s along Vancouver’s False Creek. Dubai Municipality is developing a pocket park in the centre of Al Satwa and that design could reiterate and not necessarily undermine the traditional forms of low-income urbanism in the Arab world (FIG. 25). And another ‘saving grace’ for the traditional Arab urban forms of Al Satwa is that behind it is the many current and anticipated towers of Sheik Zayed Road. If Al Satwa were ever redeveloped with towers they would block the views of the Gulf from very expensive addresses just behind them. Thus, some kind of balance development could take place with a strategy that has a cogence based on celebrating the minimalism of the traditional Arab town in this part of the Middle East.

FIG. 25 low income housing on one side of the street across from new, more middle-class housing, *sikka*, Al Satwah, Dubai, 2004 (photograph by Habib)
Globalization can make it easier to obtain capital and overcome the obstacles for certain types of commercial development. How that could play out in Dibba is unclear except that all of the jurisdictions in the United Arab Emirates are particularly committed to the attraction of capital. But capital and religion, especially religious controversy, do not always make for an effective force in social development. Any land use changes in Makbarat al Sahabi could undermine a fine balance in stewardship between local residents, government, recreational users, and clerics (FIG. 26). And planning for the area that is not based on a careful assessment of the area’s material culture could threaten some heritage resources. Of course, the major threat to these resources at the present time is simply neglect. The second threat would be from development of the remote beach nearby and the access that a better road would provide.

Anticipating an eventual expansion of land use activities in the area, there are two sets of manageable obstacles to development of a heritage assessment strategy for Makbarat al Sahabi that could be used to guide decisions to preclude negative impacts. First, this is a trans-border heritage landscape which not only extends across the frontier of the United Arab Emirates and Oman but between two sets of relatively independent jurisdictions within the Emirates. There has been virtually no known contact between the land use planners for the lands on either side of the international border. And there have been few attempts, of at all, to coordinate planning decisions for the portions of Dibba in Fujairah and Sharjah. These divisions are a legacy of the imperial period. Dibba was cut into three juridical boundaries under the British. This was done by giving the lands to the Sheikhdom on the basis of which Sheikhdom the owner of the land came from. This was done in the years of 1954-55 when Dibba had a population of 2500 (pp. 220), hence the present division. Another jurisdictional dynamic is rooted in the major religious differences between the dominant faiths of Oman, Ibadism, for relationships with the typically Sunni civil servants of the United Arab Emirates as noted in a recent web-site,
Considered a heretical form of Islam by the majority Sunni Muslims, Ibadis were not inclined to integrate with their neighbors.44

The other set of obstacles to conservation of the material culture of Makbarat al Sahabi could be viewed in two ways. There are serious theological discourses in Islam that hold sway in both countries around appropriate levels of attention to the physical sites. There are perennial theological debates around the dangers of worshipping material objects. This is not a minor point in Islam but a fissure with huge implications for history of the Middle East and for its contemporary political economies. The al-Muwahhiddun, of Saudi Arabia, have taken this rule to a very extreme extent that they have destroyed all objects of such potential nature. They rationalize this thought by the actions taken by Omar bin Al Khatab when he saw people praying to/near a tree under which the Prophet was officially made a Caliph. Omar simply cut the tree. Likewise, the al-Muwahhiddun in Saudi Arabia have destroyed many heritage sites that have religious significance. But another way to explore this same set of issues, about the appropriate level of conservation of landscapes with Islamic religious history, is around the question of social needs for and benefits from the protection of material culture. Modern historical preservation is a relatively new cultural movement for both planners and theologians. Conservation of heritage landscapes does not necessarily lead to worship of those sites or objects. Fortunately, there is an Emirati movement, based in a national centre in Abu Dhabi that is beginning to make conservation proposals for nationally significant landscapes. But where do concerns for cultural heritage become theological issues? There is nothing is the current phase of globalization that precludes fundamentalism and medievalism that obliterates the sense of place. There is much in the current emphasis on open markets and flows of capital that does contribute to the obliteration of sense of place.

If the opportunities for conservation of heritage landscapes in this period of globalization seem contradictory for the other areas, the dynamics of capital, geopolitics and religion are ironic in the Salt Range. As the South Asian national economies become increasingly integrated with power again centred in New Delhi and Mumbai, landscape conservation in Pakistan will be increasingly vulnerable to regional and global dynamics. With a rich set of Islamic landscapes, the money for much of new conservation efforts in the Salt Range will probably be tied to restoring Hindu sites – in part because of the neglect of those resources after 1947. The double irony of the Salt Range is that this was a region of tremendous religious diversity little more than a half a century ago could be conserved in a didactic way under the globalization that will see the interests of New Delhi sometimes privileged those of Lahore and Islamabad.

AND AFTER:
PROSPECTS FOR LANDSCAPE HERITAGE INITIATIVES UNDER GLOBALIZATION
At this point in the discussion, it would be easy to digress into a polemic arguing that the current globalization processes embody, almost inherently, a threat to heritage landscapes. But there is no conclusive evidence to support some kind of essential relationship between specific losses of material culture and the loosening and intensification of the forces of capital. The direst view that we can substantiate is that as the state loses primacy in some decisions over land, not that governments have had total control over such decisions anyway, market forces will further contort, edit and obliter ate various aspects of material culture in order to generate optimal returns on investments. But this dynamic of the market place has gone on well before the current globalization processes and may well continue after. But rather than a permanent obstacle, capital can be managed and sometimes even be appropriated for the conservation of material culture as
part of broader social infrastructure. Along with the primacy of capital, with its emphasis on high rates of return, is a second obstacle: the rapid speed demanded on returns of those investments. Today, the greatest danger to heritage landscapes is the rapid rate that capital can fund destructive activities before cultural resources are fully detected or understood. But as we have outlined some dangers to heritage resources in the current period, there are many new opportunities for the cross-cultural and global exchange of knowledge, perspectives, strategies and interventions.

In considering successful conservation interventions for heritage landscapes under globalization, we believe that the following axioms are relevant.

1. Restoration of heritage landscapes constitutes cultural expression that is inherently cross-disciplinary – as much art as science. Guild-based notions of professions of architects, landscape architects, urban designers, and ecologists have effectively broken down. A conservation initiative that is confined to one traditional discipline is probably destined to be unsuccessful.

2. Realism in stakeholder analysis requires recognition of a broader set of interest groups and bodies that could be motivated to engage around a site.

3. Conservation of material culture, in situ, always involves components of space, divergent cultural and cognitive maps, and decisions that be classified as urban or rural planning and design, what Debord argued was a kind of `dialogue’ between groups that he termed in French as what we call in English, ‘environmental planning’.

4. Restoration of heritage landscapes always involves unresolved questions of ownership.

5. New initiatives in conservation of material culture involve recombining alliances between stakeholders and individuals.

6. Notions of sustainability, as part of conservation of heritage landscapes, must be locally defined.

7. Histories and cultural memories are often so contentious that interventions must recognize and reference competing interpretations.

8. For a conservation and restoration proposal to be successfully implemented, the operational biases of owners and managing agencies will be illuminated, often at the displeasure of certain stakeholders.

The prospects for the conservation of the five heritage landscapes discussed in this essay remain uncertain. Today’s forces of change, associated with globalization processes and responses to the creation of new links often at the expense of older relationships, are often volatile. A citizen’s movement, or even the initiative of a small number of individuals, can put into play major new heritage programmes. But as with much of the trans-regional and transnational flows of money, resources, labour, expertise, and customers associated with global economic relationships, there are few guarantees of sustainability. Rather than the relative continuity of the global marketplace, today’s trans-national processes can shift abruptly sometimes driving discontinuity and revision in heritage conservation programmes.

So in hoping to manage and sometimes even appropriate capital for protection of heritage landscapes, as components of both ecological and cultural infrastructure, we propose three principles for the coming decade (and longer). Effective landscape restoration and neighbourhood preservation and revitalization will require coordinated initiatives that are largely structured and driven as social movements. Secondly, heritage conservation planning and design increasingly constitute distinct forms of contemporary culture that extend well beyond such well-established fields as site-based art, landscape architecture, architecture, public art, and urban design. And the umbrellas of concerns for landscapes and neighbourhoods along with notions of sustainable
heritage conservation create an even more expansive field that becomes as much art as it is science. And thirdly, more critical and self-reflexive formulation of heritage interventions is necessary for proposals to have the support of community members, governments and (private and public) investors. By ‘critical’, we mean the acumen to recognize more fully sets of stakeholders and the plays of power, bias and interests. And by using ‘critical’, we also suggest a kind of ruthlessness in exploring the sometimes contradictory relationships embodied in views of sites, in historical interpretations and in the formulation and implementation of conservation measures. Applying such a template to the five examples would require the writing of an entire book. Until that project is completed, the following are some opportunities in heritage conservation that are often baffling and frustrating but which are rarely hopeless.

Today False Creek and adjacent towers of Yaletown are models, within North America, both for high density urban space and for a diversity of public art, some of which was the product of community-based initiatives. And compared to the wealth of public art that his area has, it is highly unlikely that there will be many new initiatives for public art paid by either the Concord Pacific developers or the City of Vancouver. But some specific social movements could be possible such as around the restoration of native habitats and plants in a few small areas, a bit more historical markers where they can be justified by highly organized stakeholders, and the adaptation of the recent public spaces to more events and performances. The passion to ‘make space’ in the already established narratives of these public spaces will require individuals with as much of the passion of artists and other cultural workers as the motivations of activists and professionals. In terms of critical formulation of interventions for conservation and reconstruction of heritage sites, there is a tension to manage between the tendency for the developer, who own a diminishing number of units, and current homeowners to use material culture to enhance market values and that of historical advocates and artists wanting to make recuperative and transformative spaces (that could class with the ‘mega-project’ ambience).

There are, however, a few areas along the north-eastern side of False Creek, linking the Marker For Change near the old train station to the redevelopments of Yaletown. Where material culture might still be located and where the former sites could be constructed to form more of an identity. The area was called by the Squamish and Musqueam peoples, ‘hole in bottom’, a place where the day-to-day life met the underworld. Later, the area was part of Vancouver’s notorious ‘Celestial land’ of bars, brothels, opium dens, and hotels with enclaves of east and south Asians along with enclaves urban aboriginals, Africans, eastern European Jews, and Italians. But this area, which has been flattened and is now under-used as the location of Vancouver’s annual Indy Races, has almost too much of a rich heritage. It will be a huge job to assess the cultural values and conceive of how to integrate those sites into a redevelopment concept.

Today, nearly all of the material culture in and along False Creek is not original but rather reconstructed. If any remaining landscape elements were ever located and deemed original such as for the north-eastern shore of False Creek, efforts for their recovery and representation would come in conflict with certain patterns of consumption and commerce. At the same time, the public space, behind False Creek is already so commercialized that certain commercial interests might welcome some more public heritage resources as an alternative to repetitive chain cafes and retail stores. Perhaps the most difficult task in critically conceiving of heritage interventions will be in constructing a vision of urban space and site-based cultural resources that is independent of, thought not necessarily always in opposition to, the shorter term dictates of profit and the interests of local owners and merchants. An element of education and a dissemination strategy is necessary and for the area a remarkable cultural trust was specifically established, Roundhouse, that
supports of range of multi-ethnic and innovative cultural initiatives. Strategic planning for cultural resources in public space may well emerge as a citizens movement as the City of Vancouver’s Public Art Committee is under pressure to foster the same kinds of public-art-in-public-space in other parts of the city. And there may well be a need for a separate trust to maintain the many markers and pieces of public art if the City of Victoria were to become preoccupied with other matters.

Today, the most problematic vision of Belly-Rising-Up close-up of Belly-Rising-Up is from the ridge nearby and its new affluent subdivision with its glass lamps vaguely evocative of the Nineteenth Century. And the septic flows from these developments, especially coupled with sea level rise associated with climate change, could quickly destroy much of the vegetation so carefully nurtured by generations of aboriginal women and men. Similarly, some of the vegetation could benefit from occasional low-temperature burning, very much part of local aboriginal heritage, which would be difficult to have approved and to conduct safely. But what remains the most problematic question is of how to further Belly-Rising-Up while giving the families that have been involved historically, many of which still have homes scarcely a hundred metres away, the deserved privacy, respect and support. In many ways, it is easier to talk about this landscape at a conference in Sharjah and Dubai than to worry about the use of this information in British Columbia where tribal communities often still feel isolated, stereotyped, and betrayed.

A more coordinated preservation and revitalization initiative would probably only succeed if it was structured and driven as a local social movement to bridge cultures while being lead by aboriginal communities. A core mission would be necessary such as the re-assertion of traditional lands and resources as a benefit to Canadian society along with the recognition the value of communal lands stewarded by families with long histories of engagement with the same sites. Certainly, schools and universities would be interested in, and would probably pay for, well-guided field trips which, in turn, would require (and could possibly pay for) interpretation and management.

For Dubai, we argue that the cores of strategies to further restore and rejuvenate Al Bastakaya and to protect heritage aspects of Satwa should centre on the fabric of the sikka and liveable pedestrian space in general. If there are any similarities between North America and the United Arab Emirates, Dubai is probably only a decade away from a subculture of youth (and elderly) who will tire of and almost become culturally ‘allergic’ to the metropolitan area’s shopping malls. And even if the heat of the summer makes outdoor space impossible to enjoy, there are nine months out of the year where night temperatures make some pedestrian areas attractive for some uses.

In view of the nature of Dubai as being driven by ‘merchant’ logic, sikkas will have to be considered as being a viable resource for public wealth and a city product that could be marketed to the outsider. Moreover, the re-development of those sikkas, especially in Al Satwa, should be seen as an opportunity to increase the value of the surrounding areas considering the evidence that their existence attracts the potential ‘buyer’. As a marketing tool, the celebration of the sikka could work through the creation of a narrative around their existence and character. As Leonie Sandercock noted,

Both individuals and communities need to find ways to connect to the larger urban narrative.
Urban space in both Al Bastakaya and Al Satwa could be reorganized around sikkas and heritage specifiers would form the basis of narratives. These could be more localized and compelling than many of the new developments to exploit superficial aspects of trans-Arab culture while paying little attention to the specific experiences of this part of the Arabian Gulf. Such heritage sikkas could then mapped and eventually become a valuable entity of the neighbourhood fabric.

The education and dissemination necessary for developing a heritage constituency for Al Satwa will largely come from the successes, perhaps the eventually pains of the successes, of the reconstruction of Al Bastakaya. The coming years hold a crucial opportunity to articulate the pleasures and lessons of the traditional Arab urban space of Al Bastakaya, not as exception in the urban fabric or as a theme park, but rather as an example of humanizing and re-localizing the modernist architecture and public space that was so quickly imposed on Dubai (and Sharjah).

While Dubai Municipality has achieved much, for a city in the developing world, in strategic planning, a much wider set of spatial planning initiatives at various scales are now necessary. And in the case of a large area such as Al Satwa, the setting of priorities for protection, renovation, and reconstruction, while require a few years of heritage assessments (that have not even begun). Perhaps the most problematic gap is the lack of permanent status for many of the local residents of both Al Bastakaya and Al Satwa. The input and ‘feedback loops’ from community input and involvement are lacking. Bringing a few local families back to Al Bastakaya and Al Satwa, even if they use the houses primarily for guests and events, may hold advantages. These residents could then provide the organizational bases for sustained protection and self-management. In this way, re-inhabiting the traditional Arab spaces, in contemporary ways, becomes part of establishing diverse, culturally oriented inner city neighbourhoods, a trend that is occurring in other Middle Eastern cities and that is well underway in Europe.

The prospects of conserving much of the rich heritage sites Makbarat al Sahabi are perhaps the bleakest of the five examples in this discussion. While it might be possible to insert the mild level of marking of the battlefield, as other sites of the Apostasy Wars have been treated in Saudi Arabia, marking ancient cemeteries, of individuals who lived at the time of The Prophet, even if their graves were maintained for much of the last thousand years, remains highly problematic. However, an educational centre, that reconstructs aspects of the battlefield and graves virtually, and that organizes respect tours might not be so objectionable. And given the commercial of tourism in Dubai, residents would have well-founded concerns about the turning parts of their communities into places of attraction verging on a theme park.

Perhaps the first phase in protecting the heritage resources of Makbarat al Sahabi would be a low-key programme of national education and dissemination. However, turning the area into a destination for all-terrain-vehicles could lead to more damage. Clearly, a careful inventory is worthwhile – and that spans the three jurisdiction. None of the three jurisdictions of Makbarat al Sahabi have excelled in strategic planning. But beginning dialogue between two national governments and three local governments, with such a literal and figurative battlefield, could be difficult.

Today in the Salt Range, the sacred baths of Ketas are being restored while many other landscapes with masjids, shrines, temples and sacred trees and forests are being degraded by expansion of agriculture, poverty and related theft, lack of education on the importance of multicultural heritage, and fundamentalist vandalism. Given the level of poverty in the area, a
broader vision of heritage preservation and revitalization would probably be required to be structured and driven as part of community based initiatives for poverty alleviation. Another set of stakeholders might be the intelligentsia and artists of Lahore who one day soon might be inspired to intervene as part of interests in both traditional and contemporary Punjabi culture.

CONCLUSIONS

All heritage resources existing in situ typically are in mixed configurations of indoor and outdoor space that comprise portions of both ecosystems and landscapes. Thus successful landscape preservation strategies must be cognizant of broader ecosystem and landscape processes including regional development trends and specific forms of globalization. A didactic reading of this essay might become preoccupied with the notion that the current forms of globalization tend to over-commercialized and obliterate sense of place; to reduce sites with contentious historical significance to “non-places.”

The five examples we have worked with in this essay are linked in a way that we did not mention previously and which make them particularly appropriate for this discussion. These sites were last re-ordered in the late 1840s and 1850s in a previous wave of globalization. Under the guise of the rule of law and protection of human rights, these five areas were integrated into the British Empire in somewhat different and uneven ways. At the time, the discourses of acquisition were less focused on control of certain groups through the British Empire and more on supposedly opening these areas to certain ways of doing things and trade links. Tellingly, the institutions of civil society, particularly the regulations and programmes necessary for landscape conservation have tended to be much more organized in the United Kingdom than in any of its former colonies and protectorates. Today’s new ordering of power, historical interpretation, and flows of goods and culture, warrant new landscape preservation initiatives and may well be as profound a shift as that of a century and half ago. And any new landscape preservation initiatives for these areas will be marked by and in turn have impacts on today’s various forms and uneven applications of globalization. Of course, we may be in for shorter, and more contradictory, convulsions of global, or at least imperial, re-ordering.

In all five examples, a major obstacle to landscape preservation has been the perceived danger of negative caricature that relate back to specific dynamics the British imperial period. Critical examinations of the content of the historical public art along False Creek could be misused in hollow vestiges of identity politics and crass forms of multiculturalism. The people of the Tsawout Nation already know that their culture relied on a lot of plants and they carefully managed such sites. Excessive attention to the Belly-Rising-Up site could be used to suggest, in some cases rightly so, that they or other aboriginal communities do not manage other areas so well.

Dubai is preserving the sikkas and modest houses of Al Bastakaya while attempting to destroy those of Satwa, with its more valuable real estate (FIG. 27). The significance of the preservation of traditional aspects of Satwa remains debatable as there are a lot of impoverished neighbourhoods in the Arab World. Better preservation of a battlefield, of particular importance in the early history of Islam, remains contentious when there are violent conflicts, sometimes around religion, in the Arab world. While a thousand people died battling each other in Dibba over a millennium ago, other kinds of religious violence have preoccupied the region. Since the coming of Islam to south-eastern Arabia, the majority of those killed in religious violence have been victims of the Seventeenth Century massacres by the avowedly Christian Portuguese. The
atrocities of the Portuguese and the struggle of communities in south-eastern Arabia to defend themselves set in motion certain fundamentalist religious movements not always interested in the finer points of conservation of material culture. Today, with the daily deaths in the Middle East often tied to religious conflicts, commemorating the deaths of a thousand people, some Moslems and some avowedly not so seems, for many, as a low priority.

FIG. 27 Al Satwa shanties (with satellite dished) with the skyline of rapidly expanding towers of Sheik Zayed Road, Dubai, 2004 (photograph by Habib)

As for the Salt Range, the notion of a balanced strategy for conservation of Hindu, Moslem, Buddhist and Sikh sites, in contrast to letting wealthier South Asian groups dominate activities, is overly idealist for many – especially for most who have lived within the contradictions of modern Pakistani. And a closer examination of what may well be a re-privileging of Hindu sites over those of other religions might suggest that the project of the establishment of Pakistan, as a refuge for South Asia’s Moslems, may not have been entirely successful especially under intensifying globalization.

In conclusion, there are many ways to conceive of new kinds of interventions for the conservation of heritage landscapes even under the constraints of the current phase of globalization. It is, in deed, possible to envision critical forms of interventions under globalization: approaches that work with but remain critical, and at times oppositional, to the hegemonies of local political economies. And certainly critical perspectives can assist in generating possibilities that can
sometimes support the dictates of global capital. But such perspectives, grounded in recognizing a range of historical interpretations, stakeholders and relationships to local and global power structures, can just as easily generate perspectives that can further protect heritage landscapes than could commercialization and strategies emphasizing theme-parks. In his 1992 critique of Disneyland and the culture of theme park, Michael Sorkin suggests that one function of the theme park to keep a person moving (and consuming) and disoriented where, “The only logic is the faint buzz of memories of something more or less similar...but so long ago, perhaps even yesterday.”53 But there are many alternatives to this way of funding and paying for entertain and culture and certainly for financing the preservation of heritage landscapes.

The core of developing critical approaches to conservation of heritage landscapes is recognition of both the processes of social editing and of multiple and often contentious cultural and historical narratives. And any landscape conservation process that is preoccupied with only one cultural narrative is far more vulnerable to either failure or appropriation by commercial interests.

Politicization, as in the recognition and inclusion of a range of stakeholders with divergent perspectives, is one antidote to extreme commercialization. Similarly, recasting protection and restoration of heritage landscapes as a distinct set of practices in production of contemporary culture forms the necessary bridges between disciplines to allow for more comprehensive (and potentially sustainable) initiatives. And as with most “postmodern” perspectives, we envision a far less consistent and volatile set of landscape protection goals if only because of the uneven investments of various social groups in heritage and history.54

A question remains of how to preserve landscapes in ways that do not reduce heritage sites to theme-park-type attractions with commercializes that generate high impacts that threaten to both destroy material culture and obstruct experiences and observances for visitors. A related question is that of how open and accessible can sites, such as the five examples, be made, under globalization of capital, populations and power, before localized communities are undermined and traditional experiences and uses obstructed? A more optimistic way of framing this question is that of how can local communities use the new resources and links made possible by these new forms of globalization to reassert their values and better protect their material culture in situ?
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