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Abstract

In this paper the key words are; Heritage, Conservation, Development, Leadership are defined. The key words are described so as to be understood in the broader context of geographical location, social and natural settings as well as people’s basic needs.

An attempt has been made to bring out the concepts underlying the governance of natural and cultural heritage. Rather than look at conservation as if it is in contest with development the two have been juxtaposed to elicit deeper thought and understanding why we need both.

Aspects of leadership in a changing socio-ecological environment have been brought to the fore as this is critical for the necessary balancing act that ideally should enable the attainment of both conservation and development goals vital for human wellbeing and indeed all living things.

The reader may be provoked into individually and collectively re-think attitudes, values, actions and roles in conserving our heritage and the benefits derived from it. Concerns have been raised in respect to optimum consumptive levels, resilience levels of natural systems, acceptance of changed and changing values particularly for cultural heritage, acceptable change to natural systems and the fact that change occurs naturally, may not be reversed and is vital for development.

Some illustrative examples as case studies are cited based on history, religion, language and science to further illuminate the inter-linkage between conservation and development and why therefore there should be neither a lacuna nor a contest. It must be recognized that in undertaking both conservation and development conflict is inevitable but the solution is in the ability to resolve conflicts in a timely manner thus the importance of leadership and understanding culture in managing our heritage.
HERITAGE: CONSERVATION VS DEVELOPMENT – CHALLENGING OUR ATTITUDES

1.0 Introduction

A key aspect in discussing this topic is an understanding of the broader meanings of heritage, conservation, development and leadership. Most of the time conservation is juxtaposed with development as if the two are in contest yet in actual fact they are not mutually exclusive. Heritage both natural and cultural does drive development. The rate and nature of development is dependent on the heritage base which in turn ideally determines the conservation levels. Development rates and conservation levels are a function of leadership. Leadership, therefore, is a very critical element for attaining the optimal balance between conservation and development or tipping the balance often with undesirable consequences in the long term, yet leadership is in turn a function of behaviour that is deeply rooted in culture and cultural settings.

In this paper the broader meanings of heritage, conservation, development and leadership are brought to the fore; an attempt is made to examine principles and concepts for managing our heritage to spur development through conservation and a case is made for the complementarity of conservation and development as opposed to one versus the other and the role of culture in so doing.

2.0 Understanding Heritage, Conservation and Development

2.1 Heritage

Heritage is variously understood including an inheritance, birthright, tradition, custom, legacy, beliefs that society consider important. A simple and broader understanding of heritage is: “something passing from generation to generation”. The “something” will obviously differ depending on geographical location and the different societies, but in general these include mountains, seas, lakes, rivers, land, plants, animals, buildings, art, languages, monuments, food, industry and many more. In practical usage heritage refers to something inherited from the past. The word has several different senses, including:

- **Natural heritage**, an inheritance of fauna and flora, geology, landscape and landforms, and other natural resources. The term "natural heritage", derived from "natural inheritance", predates the term "biodiversity." It is a less scientific term and more easily comprehended in some ways by the wider audience interested in conservation.
- **Cultural heritage**, the legacy of physical artifacts and intangible attributes of a group or society: man-made heritage that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and bestowed for the benefit of future generations. Cultural heritage includes tangible culture (such as buildings, monuments, landscapes, books, works of art, and artifacts), intangible culture (such as folklore, traditions, language, and knowledge). Cultural heritage is unique and irreplaceable, which places the responsibility of preservation on the current generation. Smaller objects such as artworks and other cultural masterpieces are collected in museums and art galleries. Under cultural heritage food and industrial heritage stand out.

---

2 Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
o **Food heritage** is a term that encompasses the origins of plants and animals and their dispersal, the sites where people first cultivated plants and domesticated animals, as well as the earliest locations around the world where people first processed, prepared, sold and ate foods. These locations include farms, all types of mills, dairies, orchards, vineyards, breweries, restaurants and cafes, markets and groceries, hotels and inns. Food museums help to preserve global and local food heritage. Many food museums exist in Europe and Asia.

o **Industrial heritage**, refers to the physical remains of the history of technology and industry. It is often used in connection to museums or historic districts, particularly in the United Kingdom, which, as the birthplace of modern industry, has the oldest remains of the Industrial Revolution in the world. The industrial heritage of a region is an aspect of its cultural heritage. Organizations dedicated to the study and preservation of such include The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage.

In 1972 the World Heritage Convention was established by UNESCO whereupon heritage resources, such as plants, animals, art, architecture, monuments etc became the common heritage of mankind or as was expressed in the preamble: "need to be preserved as part of the world heritage of mankind as a whole."

An important site of natural or cultural heritage may be listed as a World Heritage Site by the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO. The UNESCO programme, catalogues, names, and conserves sites of outstanding cultural or natural importance to the common heritage of humanity. As of March 2013, there are 936 World Heritage Sites: 725 cultural, 183 natural, and 28 mixed properties, in 153 countries.

2.2 Conservation

The deliberate act of keeping heritage from the present to and for the future is known as conservation. Conservation is an ethic of resource use, allocation, and protection. Conservation is the act of preventing injury, decay, waste or loss of both natural and cultural heritage. Conservation may also refer to the careful utilization of a natural resource in order to prevent depletion and the preservation and restoration of works of cultural significance. Conservation is better understood as a concept but not as a defined word.

In the past conservation has been used interchangeably with preservation. In recent times, conservation has been understood as the “wise-use” including extractive use of natural heritage; although the “wise-use” of cultural resources may not necessarily include extractive use. Conservation as a concept recognizes the fact that heritage provides opportunities for economic, ecological, educational and social benefit based on the principle of wise-use. The concept promotes planning, control, coordination and monitoring in the use and management of the heritage to spur development for the benefit of mankind.

The policies and legal frameworks on heritage management in many countries worldwide do capture the concept of conservation and the notion of wise use quite clearly.

2.3 Development

Whereas development may be understood in many different ways, the most enchanting in the context of this paper describes development as the process of economic and social transformation that is based
on complex cultural and environmental factors and their interactions. Development may also be understood as, the systematic use of natural laws (science) and cultural knowledge to meet specific objectives or requirements of a society\(^3\). In both respects heritage (natural and cultural) are the drivers of development. So, the key issue is balancing conservation with development.

3.0 Underlying Concepts

Heritage is that which is inherited from past generations, used and maintained in the present (development), and bestowed for the benefit of future generations (conservation).

A more practical understanding of heritage, conservation and development therefore would be: wise use of natural and cultural resources for the socio-economic transformation of society for better living conditions without compromising the needs of future generations.

(i) The Concept of Sustainable Development

In 1980 the World Conservation Strategy of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) coined the concept of “sustainable development” to mean improving the quality of human life while living within the socio-ecological ability of the supporting environment (natural and cultural heritage) to do so for the present and future generations. In other words sustainability is all about meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs from the same environment where we live. This concept was strengthened by the World Commission on the Environment and Development in 1987 when they released the report “Our Common Future” (UN 1987) United Nations. 1987\(^4\).

The three main pillars of sustainable development include economic growth, environmental protection, and social equality. The concept is built on participatory principles and direct involvement of local stakeholders in the design and joint management of natural and cultural resources for their social transformation at local and national level. While many people agree that each of these three pillars contribute to the overall idea of sustainability, it is difficult to find evidence of equal levels of initiatives for the three pillars in countries worldwide. Often priority is on economic growth at the expense of environmental protection and social equity because important cultural aspects and values for different societies are left out such that even where there is double digit economic growth the majority of the people are slum dwellers and the rural poor.

(ii) The Concept of Public Trusteeship

Sometimes referred to as Public Trust Doctrine, this concept relates to national or international collective ownership, protection and use of essential natural and cultural resources enforced by law. The purpose of the trust is to manage the resources in a manner that makes them available to the people for their common use and benefit for present and future generations.

In many countries the Public Trust Doctrine is enshrined in the national constitutions and or other national laws by stating that “The Government ...shall hold in trust for the people and protect national

\(^3\) [http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/development.html#ixzz2bSjjXpzQ]

heritage for the common good of all the citizens”. The ownership and responsibility for management of national heritage is by the State although the citizens and foreign visitors may access and use these resources in a prescribed manner. This has many times been misinterpreted though, with the State mostly denying the people access and use; while the people forcefully (illegally) partake of the resources often leading to unwarranted conflict between development and conservation sometimes between State agencies of the same governments.

(iii) The Concept of Common Property Rights

This concept is embedded in the traditional heritage management practices in many societies worldwide. It is premised on the philosophy of community collective ownership, protection and benefit/use, unlike the legalistic Public Trust concept where ownership and protection is vested in the State and the people can only access and use with permission of the State and sometimes the State has denied access and use leading to conflict or even given away the resources to external groups or to itself with minimal benefit or common good for the people. The concept is based on goodwill and societal norms without necessarily any legislation. This concept has been practiced for millennia among indigenous people communities. The heritage is managed according to cultural/customary ethos passed on through generations. The concept has worked well for many agricultural, livestock and fishing communities even with exponential population growth.

4.0 Challenging Our Leaders

Since the coming into force of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, concepts of cultural and natural heritage have expanded. There are now areas recognized and described as cultural landscapes with mixed heritage as opposed to individual sites or properties. In practice it is difficult to draw lines between heritage, conservation and development. They all go together, yet we find different leaders or leadership for each category and there are changes inevitably happening every day. Human population increases, more food is required, more water is required and more infrastructure is required yet we need to keep our inheritance for future generations as well – this is the leader’s dilemma.

Scharmer, 2011, in his paper for establishing a Global, Green, Generative Leadership School notes that across the planet we see widespread evidence that the same problem is affecting most of society’s traditional institutions: there is a huge void in the leadership necessary to address the many challenges/crises that confront us locally and globally. These include crises related to climate change, water, food, health, education etc. The current generation of leaders faces challenges that require more than habitual reactions and quick fixes.

The reality is that our institutions need leaders who can practically and collectively respond to the systemic root issues that underlie the current landscape of crises. The current leaders need to prepare the next generation of leaders to address these crises in a way that is more innovative, inclusive and intentional. In order to harness our heritage for development for current generations and allow for the benefit of future generations as well, we need places in society that are dedicated to creating cross – sector and cross- cultural entrepreneurial leadership. Currently these places (dedicated to creating cross – sector and cross – cultural entrepreneurial leadership) do not exist or if they do, they are too few to create the desired impact. Our institutions of higher learning are fragmented into academic disciplines, organizational training and leadership development programs are often narrowly focused on single organizations or sectors or on single individuals. This scenario has to be addressed and centers for cross – sector and cross - cultural entrepreneurial leadership established or recreated nationally and internationally.
Another scholar, Mark Dent, in his Leadership Letter 113, argued that if he were Minister of Water and Environment Affairs in South Africa he would task all the relevant agencies in government and the private sector to recognize their collective role in water management rather than leave it to just the department of water. Water is part of our natural heritage and it cuts across all sectors in society, including agriculture, local government, mining, industry, forestry, wildlife, livestock, education, health. By all these sectors recognizing their collective role in water management which is itself critical in their development programs, ALL the skilled knowledge resources will be focused on the common system & not just the skills in department of water and a few consulting firms, acting in fragmented isolation. Such an arrangement allows for a systemic approach because there is interdependency. Of course the argument here is the practical management of such a system. Many heritage resource management institutions do have Boards of Trustees ostensibly drawn from relevant agencies and stakeholders from communities and private sector, but how many such Boards live to the task? Again in theory there is multi-sector technical collaboration and cooperation but in practice each of the sectors act selfishly within their narrow sectors. In this era of improved communication by way of technological advancement leaders in different sectors can not afford not to engage with each other on various topical issues. The mobile phone, the i-pad, the computers and the ever widening internet coverage are tools that leaders should effectively put to use to engage with each other as opposed to expensive face-to-face meetings, workshops, seminars and conferences – which in many cases leaders attend as tourists. Again Mark Dent, in his Leadership Letter 116, demonstrates the practicability of such an engagement, he reports a cyber conversation among 16 professionals drawn from different sectors engaging on the subject of water management. It all started with an e-mail from one leader on listserve, but the conversation revealed the latent potential there is to address severe water issues, the candour, knowledge and insights as well as the gracefulness of the discourse was most encouraging, says Mark Dent.

Cousins and Pollard (2008) describe another familiar scenario in heritage management involving a much wider socio-ecological landscape traversed by the Sand River (South Africa, Swaziland, Mozambique). Much of the area is communal land with important wetlands critical to the whole socio-ecological system. The wetlands are however being desiccated through agriculture thus impacting on other values and developmental projects including a brick factory. To address such a scenario, Cousins and Pollard (2008) conclude, the leaders must understand the dynamics of the institutional environment, and also the complexity of the socio-ecological system. The community level is critically important and appropriate linkages need to be made with other levels, in order to have integrated planning and capacity for implementation of agreed approaches.

Our leaders of necessity, therefore, have to re-think the training modules for leadership, the attitudes and perhaps most importantly the varied cultural settings in which heritage is found and developments are craved for.

It may be worthwhile for our leaders to be reminded of some of the principles below that are relevant for heritage conservation and development.

a) The Precautionary Principle

The principle is based on the assumption that there is always a risk for any action or decision taken especially where available information is inconclusive on the extent or impact of risks. There are many times when decisions and actions taken relating to economic development result into irreversible
damage to the heritage resources. In any case planning and decision-making often occur within a context of uncertainty and therefore a level of risk.

The precautionary principle therefore is about avoiding potential irreversible or irreparable damage or impact to our natural and cultural heritage at site or landscape level. It may mean that a given resource be it a wetland, river, lake, grassland, woodland or forest or portions of it be left intact or used minimally because of other high values of say water supply functions (hydrological cycle), biodiversity, breeding grounds of say fish, archaeological site, historical city, national monument etc. This principle is found in many country legislations globally.

The principle is the basis for present day requirements of Environmental Impact Assessments **before any** decisions are made about new or additional developments in any land/seascape or change of land use practices. In practice however, sometimes leaders make decisions on development and the Environment Impact Studies come later, more or less to justify the decisions. It is this principle that sometimes leads to the misunderstanding that heritage conservation is anti-development and therefore the erroneous perception of competition, i.e. Conservation vs Development.

**b) The Principle of Equity**

The principle of equity recognizes the fact that heritage resources go beyond individual, family and political boundaries at local, national and international level and that every individual has a right to a healthy and clean environment as well as to the basic necessities of life regardless of age, gender and status for present and future generations. So people beyond our own boundaries too have a right to benefit from the heritage resources in the same way as those in our boundaries of jurisdiction. In the same way those unborn have a right to benefit from the same resources and therefore we should guard against any tendency to selfishly destroy our heritage. This principle is enshrined in many country legislations as well. This principle is also the basis of several international agreements and conventions for heritage resources whose benefits transcend boundaries.

**c) The Principle of Prior Informed Consent**

Prior informed consent allows for exchange or dissemination of information regarding the benefits, risks and dangers of using or not using our heritage. It allows sharing information and soliciting for approval from all stakeholders on existing heritage resources and how they should be managed, used or transformed for the common good of the wider society and the associated risks as well as how they can be mitigated.

Put to use, this principle would be a powerful tool to avert conflict and catastrophes, yet this is probably the most abused principle if not in the past but even today. Heritage resources are public goods or common property and often state agencies or some elected/appointed leaders make decisions on behalf of the wider beneficiary groups. Although some attempts are made to involve the stakeholders in decision making, they are not **informed** enough and many a time have either withheld their consent or made a u-turn. The result is that sometimes conservation efforts for our heritage have met strong resistance and so have development projects because they have been “imposed without consent”. Many protected areas, national monuments etc in many countries were created without prior informed
consent. Likewise many development projects are implemented without prior informed consent. The leaders think for the people and rarely take into account the all important cultural values and factors.

This principle allows for a two-way dialogue, top-down and bottom-up. It allows for meaningful exchange of information and builds on traditional/indigenous knowledge. It builds trust and allows for creativity. Using this principle is of course time consuming and may be expensive, but in the long run there is guaranteed success.

5.0 Challenging our attitudes

In this section an attempt is made to put to test our way of thinking or outlook in respect to heritage, conservation and development. A number of arguments or perceptions are common in our outlook that we must re-think. A few are listed and discussed as a basis to provoke our thinking about these issues.

Heritage is culture – Not really. In common usage many people understand heritage as culture. Yes culture is a component of heritage. As described in section 2.0 above heritage is far broader as to include natural features and resources.

Heritage Conservation is anti-development – Not at all. Conservation is all about wise-use of heritage resources. It is about making the “right choices” in the circumstances to cater for present needs but allow for benefit of future generations as well. This sounds simple and straight forward but the perception that heritage conservation is anti-development has created difficult times for many a leader. Making the right choices and for whom can be quite complicated. A lot has been said about involving stakeholders in decision-making but what has somewhat been ignored or misunderstood is the cultural values of the different societies/stakeholders and how these influence or affect the rate of development.

Culture is static – No. We live in a changing world, our habits, tastes, languages, religion, art do change over time, the rate may be slow but change does occur. The definition of the word culture or its description does allude to change. Guiso, et al. (2006) describes culture as “those customary beliefs and values that ethnic, religious, and social groups transmit fairly unchanged from generation to generation.” Culture has a bearing on economic development and those attributes can fairly be delineated, Porter (2000) defines economic cultural values as “the beliefs, attitudes and values that bear on economic activities of individuals, organisations and other institutions”. Change naturally occurs in the natural environment and there is also the human induced change, and man or humanity of necessity has to adapt to changes in the physical environment, when man adapts to the changing environment the culture does change as well. Culture therefore has a history of change with clear reference points, a good example in religion is Christianity – there have been very remarkable changes over time, the bible has the Old Testament and the New Testament that are used together. What is true, however, is that society is often resistant to change and there is a tendency to cling to what we already know and in many instances this has hampered development. The tendency to resist cultural change made a reknown economist and author, David Landes, at a World Bank conference in 2000: say “…there are cultures that I would call ‘toxic’…[that] handicap the people who cling to them,” provoking disapproval from the audience.

Heritage is a driver for development – yes, but .... There is no doubt that our inheritance in form of water; land (soil, rocks); plants; animals; knowledge; language and technology have been and continue to be powerful drivers of transformation of societies. Indeed the advancement in knowledge and technology which we continue to pass on from generation to generation coupled with the growing human population has now led to fears that we may lose some of our inheritance through extinction, degradation and pollution. Where is the balancing act between heritage conservation and development? What are the optimum consumption levels of say water? Some lakes and rivers are shrinking! Are the natural socio-ecological systems still resilient enough to cope with the advancements in human knowledge and technology used to harness our heritage? Climate change is now a real threat globally. There has been a lot of talk about natural solutions, green economies, green energy etc; in other words turning to our heritage to find solutions to problems associated with using our heritage for development - but is any one listening? Are the leaders and the people cooperating enough nationally and internationally in the use of our heritage for development and mitigation of the resultant adverse effects? These are questions that should not be ignored by leaders at all levels, rather they require a systemic cross – sector cross – cultural entrepreneurial approach with a strong resolve and commitment to collective action.

Culture is important for development – yes Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the former U.S. senator, once observed: “The central conservative truth is that it is culture, not politics, which determines the success of a society. The central liberal truth is that politics can change culture and save it from itself.” Hezel (2009) re-affirms the above assertion when he writes: “... there are ingredients for economic development, more far-reaching and subtler than the conditions usually prescribed, that touch on the national ethos and its traditions. In other words, economic development might well be affected by those intangibles that are collectively known as culture”.

To understand how culture can affect the economy growth, culture must be understood from an economic standpoint. What are the specific indicators of culture that are identified as being relevant for economic transformation? The specific indicators may vary from society to society.

A number of scholars have over time undertaken studies on culture and development worldwide. The great German scholar Max Weber (1904) did find culture very critical in the development of societies. Landes (1999) was later to confirm Max Weber’s theory when he wrote, “ If we learn anything from history of economic development, it is that culture makes almost all the difference”. Harrison (2006) quotes a Japanese economists, Yoshihara Kunio, saying “One reason Japan developed is that it had a culture suitable for it. The Japanese attached importance to (1) material pursuits; (2) hard work; (3) saving for the future; (4) investment in education; and (5) community values.” While Jeffrey Sachs (2005) stated, “Even when governments are trying to advance their countries, the cultural environment may be an obstacle to development. Cultural or religious norms may block the role of women, for example, leaving half the population without economic or political rights. Harrison (2006) illustrated through comparative studies how cultural values such as trust, control of one’s destiny, hard work, respect for others and obedience have shaped economic developments in Europe, Asia and Latin America. The conclusion arrived at after all the comparative studies is that formal institutions have no dominance over culture. Formal institutions responsible for leadership, management of heritage and
promotion of development must of necessity therefore interact with culture so as to shape the actual functioning of these institutions.

6.0 Case Studies

Case studies abound in the quest for understanding the functional relationship between heritage conservation and development. The case studies also expound on the cultural notions and the reasoned attitudes articulated by respected scholars over time.

Despite all the studies the question as to why some countries relatively do better than others in conserving their heritage and attaining a higher developmental status, even when all the requisite factors seem to be in place still begs an answer. What are the reasons for repeated failure of African nations to develop and manage their heritage better, even when aid in all forms has been in great supply? What would explain the inability of countries like Indonesia and Philippines with a strong resource base and a well educated population to be so resistant to development? Why did China and Japan stagnate for so long and then spring up all of sudden and attain exponential economic growth? Why has Latin America practically stagnated?

Development economists and political leaders might explain these inequalities by listing out issues to do with good governance i.e, the political system should be stable; laws must be clearly promulgated and enforced so that contractual agreements will be honored; government officials should not be corrupt or inefficient; land should be available at a fair rate for business opportunities; foreign investment should be encouraged; and the bureaucratic procedures for applying for a business permit should not be too onerous etc, etc.

Well, the list is intellectually impressive and largely correct but it still doesn’t deal with the more fundamental issue of how culture impacts on development. Hezel (2009) raises the question as to why some ethnic groups do so well in business that they leave others in the dust, even when these ethnic groups are minorities in other countries. At the risk of sounding sectarian and discriminatory, certainly examples abound of ethnic groups that do a lot better in socio-economic transformation of themselves and society than others.

There is evidence to show (Fellner, 2008), that ethnic Chinese in the Philippines who account for less than two percent of the population, control 60% of the nation’s private economy, including the country’s four major airlines and almost all the country’s banks, hotels and shopping malls. The Chinese ethnic minorities have also dominated business in other parts of Southeast Asia including Indonesia, Thailand, Burma and Malaysia and the Island nations of the Solomons, Tonga, and Majuro.

Other “dominant minority” groups that have demonstrated a remarkable ability to succeed in harnessing heritage for development wherever they may live include the Lebanese who have established themselves in West Africa, Indians in East Africa, Jews in Russia, Croats in what was formerly known as Yugoslavia.

Over the last 30 years or so, some countries have attempted to strip the more successful dominant minorities of their economic power with largely negative results. Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, Indonesia sought to reclaim what they felt was justly theirs only to become even more impoverished when the people to whom businesses were handed off could not make them work.
A team of economics scholars based in China have attempted to find answers to this complex question of why some ethnic groups have been successful, in their paper (Khan, et al, 2010), they state that the cultural values of: self-determination, honesty, cooperation, trust, mutual respect, self-improvement, freedom of thought; which all depend on individual attitudes, which, in turn, are based on a set of beliefs, values and norms that change very slowly are the key to the development of any society regardless of the resource base. They therefore, argue that one can devise a series of factors that are defined or influenced by the customary beliefs, values and norms of the society, which have important real economic roles, and include them in the typical neoclassical growth models whose empirical estimation can show their probable effects on the economic growth of a country.

7.0 Conclusion

From history we learn that it took several centuries for Britain, United States of America and now Japan and China to achieve fundamental conditions to achieve real development using not only their resources but those borrowed from elsewhere. Research has shown that culture is a key element in the development process of any country. What then must be done for the others?

Is improved education for the population the answer, certainly not the only answer as the interplay of culture and development is quite strong. Moreover leveling the ethnic factors is a painfully slow process that transcends generations. Hezel (2006) concludes that a growing number of authors seem to agree that development will take more than an infusion of investment capital, more than an import of the latest technology, more than dependable political and economic institutions and more than an endowment of heritage resources. A constellation of cultural values suited for modern business seems to be a critical ingredient as well, although no one has identified these values with precision, to say nothing of devising a strategy for inculcating these values in developing populations. Hofstede and Harris Bond (1988) in their paper titled, “The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots To Economic Growth”, illustrated how fundamental a phenomenon culture really is, noting that, it not only affects our daily practices (the way we live, the way we are brought up, the way we manage, and the way we are managed); but it also affects the theories we are able to develop to explain our practices. They go on to conclude, “Culture’s grip on us is complete”. Meaning the linkage between heritage, conservation and development is strong and positive – there is no gap and there is no contest.
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