

**INTERNATIONAL VISION OF THE SIGNIFICANCE AND AVAILABILITY OF
CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Laura Jeroscenkova, PhD student
Maiga Kruzmetra¹, assistant professor emeritus
Baiba Rivza², Dr.hab.oec., professor
Latvia University of Agriculture

Abstract. Many studies evidence that the modern world is characterised by two quite explicit trends: the expansion of globalisation in the economy, politics, culture, and, at the same time, by the preservation of national identity. The preservation of national cultural heritage and its use in real life are emphasised as significant indicators of national identity. One of the ways towards this phenomenon is the growing interest in cultural heritage and one of the ways of practical activity is the integration of it in cultural heritage products. The present research seeks to find an answer to the question of how representatives of various countries assess and explain the current situation with cultural heritage as well as future prospects in their country. The research findings evidence that in the countries included in the research, cultural heritage preservation is viewed as a very important activity to be handed over to the next generations, and this process is mainly affected by the public attitude to cultural heritage as a value. At the same time, quite significant differences can be observed regarding opinions of the government policy and the public attitude to cultural heritage which relates with the education level of the particular country's population.

Key words: international vision, cultural heritage significance, cultural heritage availability.

JEL code: Z19

Introduction

The earlier research by the authors specifies the entry of cultural heritage as a product into entrepreneurship in the rural areas of Latvia (Kruzmetra M., Jeroscenkova L., Rivza B.). During the course of work, **some** questions arose about individuals' engagement into the field of cultural heritage in other countries, about their view of the simultaneous trends of globalisation expansion and maintenance and preservation of national identity as well as about their assessment of the significance and availability of cultural heritage.

The aim of the research is to assess the national cultural heritage and its availability to the individuals of various countries.

The authors have set two **tasks** to achieve the aim: 1) to determine the common features of all the involved experts' opinions on the phenomena analysed; **and** 2) to clarify the differences in the assessments of the analysed phenomenon focusing on the characteristics of Latvian situation.

Method of the research

In September and October 2013, the authors conducted a structured survey of experts of four countries – Sweden, Lithuania, Serbia, and Latvia – who at various levels were related with cultural heritage applications (popularisation, education, manufacturing, marketing). Comparative analysis was

¹ *E-mail address:* Maiga.Kruzmetra@llu.lv

² *Tel.:* + 371 630 84986; *fax:* + 371 630 84987. *E-mail address:* Baiba.Rivza@llu.lv

employed by analysing the opinions existing in various countries. The use of international comparative information determines an innovative perspective of the study.

Methodology of the research

The theoretical background of the present research was based on the globalisation and cultural capital theories. Globalisation is designated as one of the most significant changes that have taken place on the global scale. The economists (Reinert E.S., Frankel J.A.), sociologists (Gidenss A., Castells M., Jameson F., Luke M., Steger M. B.) as well as national identity researchers (Tomlinson J., Popovic D.M., Muizniece L.) have written about globalisation as an important phenomenon. All the authors designate globalisation as a development process of the modern world that involves interaction among all the spheres and expansion beyond the national scale. One of the leading globalisation researchers Manfred Steger emphasises that **"the transformation powers of globalisation reach deeply into all dimensions of contemporary social life"** (Steger M., 2013). Accordingly, he writes about the economic dimension, the political dimension, the ecological, and other cultural dimensions of globalisation (Steger M., 2013). He notes that **"globalisation is an uneven process, meaning that people living in various parts of the world are affected very differently by this gigantic transformation of social structures and cultural zones"** (Steger M., 2013).

Globalisation is characterised by two directions of change. On the one hand, there are increasing flows of goods and services, capital, money, and individuals among the countries – cohesion trends – that involve taking over techniques and technologies from others, thus, it is usually viewed as a positive trend. On the other hand, a range of negative effects of this process is also mentioned, especially in the social sphere - the increasing movement of labour across geographic areas and the formation of ethnically and nationally mixed societies (Reinert E.S., Castells M.). John Tomlinson writes that **"globalisation has been associated with the destruction of cultural identities, victims of the accelerating encroachment of a homogenised, westernised, consumer culture"** (Tomlinson J., 2003). According to Jan Nederveen Pieterse, the media and cultural studies focus on homogenisation, though, he believes that kind of cultural hybridisation takes place (Pieterse J. N., 2009).

Consequently, the trend of preserving and strengthening the national identity and honouring the cultural heritage to hand it over to the next generations emerges as a response process, emphasising the role of cultural heritage in preserving the local identity. The national identity is closely associated with a national country, one ethnic community, and one culture; whereas, globalisation breaks down these traditional boundaries, believing that the national identity and cultural uniqueness can exist only if associated with some local area; whereas, globalisation as deterritorialisation (diminishing the role of the territory) dissolves the national uniqueness (Muizniece L., 2005).

Research results and discussion

The associations of the experts with cultural heritage

The associations of the experts with cultural heritage are relevant in making out their opinions. That is why two questions related with the research aim were asked to the experts by applying a structured survey: whether the experts personally engaged in exploiting the values of cultural heritage were in entrepreneurship and what kind of cultural heritage their business was associated with.

Table 1

Participation of the experts in the utilisation of cultural heritage values in entrepreneurship

Country	Participation in integrating the values of cultural heritage into entrepreneurship			Total
	I am not directly involved in entrepreneurship	Not yet but I'd wish to do it	Yes, I do it	
Sweden	0	6	4	10
Lithuania	0	3	7	10
Serbia	4	4	3	11
Latvia	1	5	5	11
Total	5	18	19	42

Source: authors' construction based on the survey

The survey results showed that the surveyed women might be considered competent to give their view on the situation in the country and make a forecast of the preservation and use of cultural heritage. Almost 90% of them did it or prepared for doing it. Handicrafts, cooking, crafts, herbs, souvenirs, and traditional events were their most characteristic activities, which, under today's circumstances, are quite typical directions in producing goods or services of cultural heritage. Accordingly, one can assume that the experts were sufficiently aware of the problems related with cultural heritage in their country and were able to assess it.

Preservation and handing over of cultural heritage to the next generations

It is useful to analyse the information obtained in the structured interviews in two aspects: what is in common, according to the experts' opinions, in all the countries under the present circumstances of globalisation expansion and national identity rise and what differences can be observed if viewed through the prism of cultural heritage. The data included in Table 2 show that, according to the experts, paying attention to the preservation and popularisation of cultural heritage is mostly caused by the wish to retain knowledge of the nation's past and hand it over to the next generations.

Table 2

Factors affecting the preservation and popularisation of cultural heritage

(The respondents had multiple answer possibilities, thus, the number of responses in this and the next coming tables may exceed the number of respondents)

Country	Attention to cultural heritage is paid because of			Total
	expansion of globalisation in the world	need to preserve the evidence of the nation's past for future generations	expansion of entrepreneurship to gain income arising as a result of intensive activity	
Sweden	8	7	3	10
Lithuania	0	10	1	10
Serbia	5	6	3	11
Latvia	4	8	2	11
Total	17	31	9	42

Source: authors' construction based on the survey

This is a common feature. However, certain differences can be observed among the perspectives of the countries.

The experts of Sweden and Serbia assigned almost the same significance both to the effect of globalisation and to the wish to ensure that cultural heritage is handed over to the next generations. In contrast, the experts of Lithuania and Latvia explained this inclination by the wish to inherit the nation's heritages. M.V.Cloonan and D.R.Harvey point to the inheritance of cultural values as a widespread wish, writing that cultural heritage preservation is currently a subject of considerable interest to a wide range of stakeholders and this increasing inclination may be justified by the wish to save the past while making the past accessible and usable (Cloonan M.V. & Harvey D.R.).

Table 3

Factors affecting the development of cultural heritage products

Country	Most important factors				Total
	Government policy	Education level of people	Scientific discoveries	Overall attitude of the public	
Sweden	2	6	1	9	10
Lithuania	6	5	0	4	10
Serbia	4	5	2	6	11
Latvia	6	4	3	9	11
Total	18	20	6	28	42

Source: authors' construction based on the survey

The opinions expressed by the experts of Lithuania and Latvia might be associated with the influence of the Soviet period. Whereas, the opinions of the experts from Sweden can be explained by the fact that attention to cultural heritage has been paid in this country already for a quite long period, besides, the Heritage Conservation Act has been in force there since 1988 and a special government agency is responsible for this work (The Swedish National Heritage Board).

Sweden's experts associated the prospects for preserving and popularising the cultural heritage mainly with the public's overall attitude to this heritage. According to the experts, the dominant aspect in Lithuania and Latvia is government policies. In Lithuania, the law on preserving and popularising the cultural heritage has been passed only a few years ago, while Latvian policy makers are still drafting such a law. The views of the experts on the situation in Serbia may be assessed as being something in the midway between the situation in Sweden and in both the Baltic States.

Table 4

Prospects for cultural heritage as a good or a service

Country	Quantity and quality of a cultural heritage product		Total
	Yes, of course	Maybe	
Sweden	9	1	10
Lithuania	7	3	10
Serbia	11	0	11
Latvia	7	4	11
Total	34	8	42

Source: authors' construction based on the survey

According to the experts, the demand for cultural heritage as a good or a service will increase in all the countries in the future. Nevertheless, their levels of confidence are different. The most confident were

the experts of Sweden and Serbia, while the least confident were those from Lithuania and Latvia. If assessing the situation in Latvia, one can express an opinion that tendencies to imitate the outside world (in terms of fashion, lifestyle, traditions, choice of names for children) explicitly prevail among the public; for this reason, the experts assigned so much significance to handing over the cultural heritage to the next generations.

Table 5

Sites for purchasing cultural heritage products

Country	Possibilities to purchase cultural heritage products			Total
	At market places, green markets	At gift shops, kiosks	On farms	
Sweden	10	7	9	10
Lithuania	6	1	7	10
Serbia	7	2	4	11
Latvia	9	3	11	11
Total	32	13	31	42

Source: authors' construction based on the survey

In all the countries included in the survey, a kind of cultural heritage – market places as sales sites – is chosen for distributing cultural heritage products. Even green markets are set up for selling food. A short food chain (direct sales on farms) may also be regarded as a manifestation of cultural heritage. In addition, gift shops and kiosks for selling special cultural heritage products play a quite important role in Sweden; whereas, in the other countries they are not so popular.

According to the experts, the selling of cultural heritage products plays an important role – one can remember an opinion that the values of cultural heritage have to be not only retained but also used in everyday life as much as possible. Accordingly, an important task related with the uses of cultural heritage is to develop opportunities for direct contacts between producers/service providers and consumers of goods and services which would positively contribute to the cash flow of small producers or service providers. The authors believe that it is evidenced by various fast-growing markets in the countries examined. Such activities are held not only in Riga (the well- and long-known fairs at the Ethnographic Open-Air Museum, Christmas fairs at the Dome Square, the green market on Kalnciema street) but also in the towns of Gulbene, Bauska, Valmiera, Dobeles, and many other places. Internet information suggests such sales sites, where a great deal of the products represents the cultural heritage of Latvia as well as of Estonia (Cross-border..., (2011)). A handbook published in 2013 suggests the association of cultural heritage with economic interests. The book stresses that there is a close coexistence of cultural and economic values and relationships between different actors engaged in the production, distribution, and consumption of heritage products and services (Handbook on the..., 2013).

Conclusions, proposals, recommendations

A few conclusions can be drawn based on the information obtained from the survey of experts of the four countries.

1. The preservation and popularisation of cultural heritage in all the countries regardless of their location, economic development level, and life quality is of great importance, especially in relation with handing over this cultural heritage to the next generations.

2. In the preservation and popularisation of cultural heritage, all the countries have common features. These features are as follows:
 - utilisation of cultural heritage as a product or service in entrepreneurship;
 - handing over the cultural heritage to the next generations is the key objective;
 - **the position of cultural heritage is affected by the public's attitude to this value**, the overall education level of the population, and the government policy implemented in the given country;
 - it is forecasted that the significance and utilisation of cultural heritage as a good or a service will certainly increase;
 - the link between the producer/service provider and the consumer of goods and services involves the so called short chain, i.e. fairs, and direct contacts with the producer or service provider.
3. In preserving and popularising cultural heritage, a difference or a special attribute can be observed for each country. Well-arranged specialised gift shops, which focus on cultural heritage products of different nature, are quite popular in Sweden. In Lithuania and Serbia, the development of cultural heritage goods/services is affected by their government policy, the education level of the population, and the attitude of the public towards cultural heritage. The overall attitude of the public and the population's **education level, which focuses on the individual**, are the most important factors in Sweden. In Latvia, two factors are outlined as the most important ones. The attitude of the public in Latvia is as important as in Sweden, while the policy implemented by the government is the next most important factor. In Latvia, compared with the other three countries included in the survey, this opinion is emphasised, which may be due to the slow elaboration of the National Culture Law.
4. Proposals:
 - it is urgent to complete the work on the elaboration of the National Culture Law and to make it functional in practice;
 - certain advantages in trade/service provision have to be created for producers of goods and services of cultural heritage so that, on the one hand, the cultural heritage enters everyday life of the public and, on the other hand, it is necessary to foster the development of small businesses and, along with it, an increase of the wellbeing of the public;
 - it is necessary to conduct further research on the positive experiences of other countries in preserving and popularising their cultural heritage and the advantages and disadvantages of similar processes in Latvia.

Bibliography

1. Cassar, M. (2006). Evaluating the Benefits of Cultural Heritage Preservation: An Overview of International Initiatives. Centre for Sustainable Heritage. Retrieved:
http://www.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/graduate/csh/attachments/policy-transcripts/evaluating_benefits.pdf. Access: 2 December 2013.
2. Castells, M. (1997). The Power of Identity. Vol. II of *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell, p.538.
3. Castells, M. (2000). *The Rise of the Network Society*. 2nd ed. Blackwell Publishing, p. 594.
4. Cloonan, M. V., Harvey, D. R. (2007). Preserving Cultural Heritage: Introduction. *Library trends*. Vol. 56, Number 1, pp. 1-3. Retrieved:
http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/library_trends/v056/

- 56.1cloonan01.pdf. Access: 7 December 2013.
5. Cross-border Project "Buy Local Goods" Gains Momentum (in Latvian). (2011) Retrieved:
<http://www.ape.lv/Buy%20local.Lindora.htm>. Access: 21 December 2013.
 6. Frankel, J.A. (2000). Globalization of Economy. *National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 7858*. Cambridge. Retrieved: <http://nber.org/papers/w7858.pdf>
Access: 25 December 2013.
 7. Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press, p. 188.
 8. Handbook on the Economics of Cultural Heritage. (2013). Ed. by Lide Rizzo and Anna Mignosa, Edward Elgar Publishing, p. 672.
 9. Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and Locals in the World Culture. *Theory, Culture & Society*. Vol. 7, pp. 237 – 251.
 10. Heritage Conservation Act (1988:950) (including amendments up to and including SFS 2002:1090). Retrieved:
<http://www.eui.eu/Projects/InternationalArtHeritageLaw/Documents/NationalLegislation/Sweden/heritageconservationact1988withamendmentsto2002.pdf>.
Access: 25 December 2013.
 11. Jameson, F., Miyoshi, M. (Eds.) (1998). *The Cultures of Globalization*. London: Duke University Press, p. 393.
 12. Jeroscenkova, L., Kruzmetra, M., Rivza, B. (2013). Enhancing the Competitiveness of Tourism through Cultural Heritage as a Tourism Product. Rural Development 2013: Innovations and Sustainability. *Proceedings of the 6th International Scientific Conference*. Kaunas: Akademija. Vol. 6, Book 1, pp.163-167.
 13. Kruzmetra, M., Rivza, B. Jeroscenkova, L. (2013). Culture Heritage as a Product of Rural/Farm Tourism: the Case of Latvia. *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint World Cultural Tourism Conference*. World Cultural Tourism Association, pp. 27-37.
 14. Kruzmetra, M., Rivza, B., Rivza, L. (2013). Culture Heritage as Important Product of Rural Tourism. Rural Development and Entrepreneurship. Marketing and Sustainable Consumption. *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference "Economic Science for Rural Development"* No 32, pp.83-88.
 15. Liotar, Z.F. (2008). *Postmodern State. An Overview of Knowledge* (in Latvian). Riga: Modern Art Centre, p.182.
 16. Martell, L. (2010). *The Sociology of Globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press, p. 366.
 17. Miri, A. A. (2012). The Concept of Cultural Heritage Preservation. *E-conservation magazine*, No. 24, pp. 177-182. Retrieved:
<http://www.e-conservationline.com/content/view/1082>. Access: 5 December 2013.
 18. Muizniece, L. (2005). National Identity in the Globalization Context. Globalization and Global Policies (in Latvian). *National Research Programme "National Identity"*. Riga: Zinatne. pp. 42-59. Retrieved:
[Http://president.lv/images/modules/.../itm_1696_Globalizacija_Gunda.pdf](http://president.lv/images/modules/.../itm_1696_Globalizacija_Gunda.pdf). Access: 12 December 2013.
 19. Piertese, J. N. (2009). *Globalization and Culture: Global Melange*. Rowman&Littlefield Publishers. p. 183. Retrieved:
http://www.amazon.com/Globalization-Culture-Jan-Nederveen-Pieterse/dp/0742556069/ref=pd_sim_b_1#reader_0742556069.
Access: 15 December 2013.
 20. Popovic, D. M. Globalization (possibility and deficiency) – National Identity in Threat? Retrieved:
<http://www.grupa.org.yu/globalizacija.html>. Access: 14 December 2013.
 21. Steger, M.B. (2010). *Globalization*. Sterling Publishing Company, p. 178.
 22. Steger, M.B. (2013). *Globalization. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, p. 176.
 23. Sumilo, E. (2010). *Globalization in the World and in Latvia* (in Latvian). (e-book). Retrieved:
<http://profizgl.lu.lv/mod/book/tool/print/index.php?id=10569>.
Access: 22 December 2013.
 24. The Swedish National Heritage Board. Retrieved:
<http://www.raa.se/om-riksantikvarieambetet/in-english/>. Access: 25 December 2013.
 25. Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and Culture*. University of Chicago Press, p. 238.
 26. Tomlinson, J. (2003). Globalization and Cultural Identity. Retrieved:
<http://www.polity.co.uk/global/pdf/gtreader2etomlinson.pdf>. Access: 17 December 2013.