**Aalborg Universitet**

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

# Conceptualizing coastal and maritime cultural heritage through communities of meaning and participation

Ounanian, Kristen; van Tatenhove, Jan; Hansen, Carsten Jahn; Delaney, Alyne Elizabeth; Bohnstedt, Hanne; Azzopardi, Elaine ; Flannery, Wesley; Toonen, Hilde; Kenter, Jasper; Ferguson, Laura; Kraan, Marloes ; Macias, Jordi Vegas; Lamers, Machiel ; Pita, Cristina; da Silva, Ana Margarida Ferreira ; Albuquerque, Helena; Alves, Fátima; Mylona, Dimitra; Frangoudes, Katia

*Published in:*
Ocean & Coastal Management

*DOI (link to publication from Publisher):*
10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105806

*Creative Commons License*
CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

*Publication date:*
2021

*Document Version*
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to publication from Aalborg University

*Citation for published version (APA):*
Ounanian, K., van Tatenhove, J., Hansen, C. J., Delaney, A. E., Bohnstedt, H., Azzopardi, E., Flannery, W., Toonen, H., Kenter, J., Ferguson, L., Kraan, M., Macias, J. V., Lamers, M., Pita, C., da Silva, A. M. F., Albuquerque, H., Alves, F., Mylona, D., & Frangoudes, K. (2021). Conceptualizing coastal and maritime cultural heritage through communities of meaning and participation. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, *212*, Article 105806. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105806

**General rights**
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Ocean and Coastal Management 212 (2021) 105806

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Ocean and Coastal Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ocecoaman

# Conceptualizing coastal and maritime cultural heritage through communities of meaning and participation

Kristen Ounanian [a,*], Jan P.M. van Tatenhove [a], Carsten Jahn Hansen [b], Alyne E. Delaney [a,c], Hanne Bohnstedt [d], Elaine Azzopardi [e], Wesley Flannery [f], Hilde Toonen [g], Jasper O. Kenter [e], Laura Ferguson [f], Marloes Kraan [g], Jordi Vegas Macias [g], Machiel Lamers [g], Cristina Pita [h,i], Ana Margarida Ferreira da Silva [h,j], Helena Albuquerque [j,k], Fátima L. Alves [h], Dimitra Mylona [l,m], Katia Frangoudes [n]

[a] Centre for Blue Governance, Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Denmark
[b] Danish Centre for Spatial Planning, Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Denmark
[c] Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University, Japan
[d] Port of Aarhus, Aarhus, Denmark
[e] Department of Environment and Geography, University of York, UK
[f] School of Natural and Built Environment, Queen's University Belfast, UK
[g] Environmental Policy, Wageningen University, the Netherlands
[h] Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies (CESAM), University of Aveiro, Portugal
[i] International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, UK
[j] GOVCOPP - Research Unit on Governance, Competitiveness and Public Policies, Department of Economics, Management, Industrial Engineering and Tourism, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal
[k] REMIT - Research on Economics, Management and Information Technologies, Department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, University Portucalense, Porto, Portugal
[l] Hellenic Agricultural Organization DEMETER, Nea Peramos, Greece
[m] INSTAP Study Center for East Crete, Pacheia Ammos, Greece
[n] Univ Brest, IFREMER, CNRS, UMR 6308 AMURE, IUEM, Plouzané, France

ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:*
Cultural heritage
Deliberative governance
Sense of place
Risk
Resilience
Coastal communities

ABSTRACT

Coastal zones are historically rich with unique land/seascapes, tangible artifacts, and intangible cultural heritage. Coastal and maritime cultural heritage (CMCH) contends with various constraining conditions of the sea and shore—both geophysical and socially constructed—which we delineate to identify risks and threats to its sustainable management. In response to calls for the greater incorporation of CMCH in the name of regional development and blue growth, we propose a conceptual framework as a means to identify risks and sustainably manage CMCH. We develop the concepts of *communities of meaning* and *communities of participation* to address how CMCH is created and contested and identify key considerations for its management. Building on theories of space, place, and identity, the paper constructs *communities of meaning* in order to elaborate the various opportunities but also tensions in preserving CH and cultivating reliant enterprises as a part of wider regional development strategies. Working from this understanding of place and identity in degrees of inclusivity/exclusivity, the paper draws upon literature on deliberative and participatory governance, framed as *communities of participation*. These two concepts provide a vocabulary for managers to address calls for the promotion of CMCH and determine appropriate management strategies and governance based on policy objectives and the will of potentially multiple communities of meaning.

## 1. Introduction

As uses of the seas and coasts multiply, folding new and old maritime practices and activities into management tools such as Marine Spatial Planning, Integrated Coastal Zone Management, and Marine Protected Areas, becomes increasingly pertinent yet challenging. Determining

* Corresponding author. Centre for Blue Governance, Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Rendsburggade 14, 1.429, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark.
*E-mail address:* kristen@plan.aau.dk (K. Ounanian).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105806
Received 18 December 2019; Received in revised form 14 December 2020; Accepted 27 June 2021
Available online 3 August 2021
0964-5691/© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

ways to promote—if not at least accommodate—representation, participation, and legitimacy in management tools, processes, and governance structures is not always straightforward, especially when resources are scarce, decisions are contentious, and actors hold diverse and diverging values. Moreover, as changes bear consequences for coastal and maritime communities (both place-based and networked), many encourage consideration of social and cultural consequences of policies. Relatedly, we see articulations of cultural heritage (CH) emerge as the role of fisheries, shipbuilding, and other traditional maritime trades shifts and transforms. The calls to incorporate CH into management plans and blue growth strategies thus encourages examination into how CH is addressed in international conventions and how it is conceptualized.

The protection, conservation, and management of CH is political and has been on international policy agendas since the 1950s. Multiple disciplines, such as archaeology, human geography, (cultural) anthropology and history have elaborated its definition, its purposes, and its conceptualization (Ahmad, 2006; Blake, 2000; Vecco, 2010). CH can be categorized as tangible and intangible. Tangible CH encapsulates the physical and material elements of heritage (e.g., sculptures, paintings, monuments, buildings, archaeological sites, tools). Intangible heritage refers to "Practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—as well as instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith—that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage" (UNESCO, 2003: 2).

Coastal and marine regions are gateways connecting land and sea, with unique landscapes and seascapes and related tangible and intangible CH, such as underwater and coastal antiquities, coastal archaeological sites, traditional material cultures such as fishing, maritime communities, and traditional gear and instruments. Based on Alegret and Carbonell (2014), we define coastal and maritime cultural hertiage (CMCH) as a set of tangibles and intangibles linked to human activities and interactions taking place within coastal and marine (geographical or cultural) areas in the past, the present, and imagined futures. This definition includes tangible CH, such as boats and ships, the skills to build them and other traditional craftsmanship, as well as unique houses and lighthouses (Galili and Rosen, 2010), and intangible CH, such as the ethos and identity of places, such as a fishing village (Nadel-Klein, 2003; Martindale, 2014; Urquhart and Acott, 2013). Specific to CMCH are the constraining conditions of the sea and shore, which affect the preservation, protection, utilization, and management of CMCH. These constraining conditions include specific and changing coastal, estuarine, and marine environments, the impacts of climate change, expansion of coastal tourism, economic restructuring in key maritime sectors, and demographic changes, remoteness and peripheralization.

In this paper, we argue that sustainable management of CMCH requires understanding CMCH as the product of interactions of actors in communities of meaning and communities of participation. A *community of meaning* consists of a diversity of actors who share a concern regarding sustainable practices of CMCH and who define and develop these practices of CMCH by dealing with and referring to the constraining conditions. In communities of meaning, actors imbue objects and practices with significance. Taking the scholarship on a relational sense of place, however, we can see how boundaries—spatially-constructed and/or identity-based—can work to include or exclude certain actors from determining what is defined as CMCH and best practices for its management. In turn, we supplement communities of meaning with communities of participation. A *community of participation* is the governance setting of CMCH and delineates which actors are included and excluded and how CMCH is managed. The involvement of actors can range from indirect participation to forms of active and direct participation or deliberation (Held, 1996; Warren, 1999; Fung and Wright, 2001; van Tatenhove and Leroy, 2003; Ranger et al., 2016). We build up and discuss these framing concepts and their related literatures later in the paper.

In section 2, the article briefly describes the evolution of the definition of CH and outlines the progression of policies and governance frameworks concerning CH and CMCH. In section 3, the paper addresses the threats, challenges, and constraining conditions of coastal areas, which affect the sustainable management of CMCH. We elaborate *communities of meaning* in section 4 through select scholarship on space, place, and identity. Section 5 addresses *communities of participation,* which are formed on the basis of boundary-making and inclusion/exclusion, and suggests how elements from participatory and deliberative governance can inform management of CMCH. Section 6 presents conclusions on these related discussions. The paper is theoretically driven and thus draws its evidence from scholarship and grey literature.

## 2. Cultural heritage: evolution of concept through international conventions

The discourse on CH developed from the *protection* of monuments and artifacts designated as CH, passing untouched through generations, to considerations on how citizens and societies can *benefit* from their CH (Veldpaus and Roders, 2014; Holtorf, 2011; Mileu et al., 2013). UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) is the primary, international body focused on the protection of CH. Initially UNESCO charters focused on tangible cultural heritage encapsulating the physical elements of heritage: artifacts, architecture, art, tools and clothes. However, the Krakow Charter ("The Charter of Krakow, 2000 Principles for Conservation and Restoration of Built Heritage" 2000) broadened the interpretation of CH, recognizing the value of intangible cultural heritage and CH's connection to memory. The Convention for Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) was a fundamental shift in paradigm recognizing that non-physical or non-material CH was worth protecting (Vecco, 2010).[1] The inclusion of intangible CH in the spectrum of CH in international law facilitates the protection or even revival of local cultural traditions (Alegret and Carbonell, 2014). Table 1 summarizes the significant changes in CH's conceptualization through the progression of UNESCO conventions and influential European Union (EU) and national level statutes.

Paralleling the differentiation of forms of authenticity (MacLeod, 2006), the designation of what was/is CH started as an exercise in expert assessment, building on the assumption that objects held intrinsic value (Vecco, 2010). But as the field has evolved, calls for the democratization or the incorporation of local knowledge and cultural meanings of communities (of the mind and place-based) in what constitutes expertise rose (Parkinson et al., 2016; Vecco, 2010). Thus, selection criteria changed, and historic and artistic values expanded to cultural value in terms of identity and the object's interaction with memory (Vecco, 2010). This democratization of who determines CH should thus be reflected in who determines its management but can be challenging in terms of the tensions and divisions among groups who assign certain objects and practices meaning versus others, a tension we explore later.

### 2.1. Cultural heritage in the coastal and marine realm

Coastal and Marine Cultural Heritage (CMCH) includes underwater and coastal antiquities, coastal archaeological sites and traditional material cultures such as fishing and marine communities, traditional gear and instruments. The uniqueness of underwater CH has been codified in the 2001 UNESCO Charter on Underwater CH and defines underwater cultural heritage as:

> All traces of human existence having a cultural, historical or archaeological character which have been partially or totally underwater, periodically or continuously, for at least 100 years such as: (i) sites, structures, buildings, artefacts, and human remains, together with their archaeological and natural context; (ii) vessels,

[1] Notably, ICH was protected much earlier in Asian countries.

**Table 1**
Chronology of significant changes in cultural heritage governance and implications for conceptualization of cultural heritage.

| Chronology of significant changes in cultural heritage governance and implications for conceptualization of cultural heritage | | |
|---|---|---|
| Statute | Date, Authority | Significance |
| Cultural Properties Protection Law | 1950, Japan | • One of the first systems enacted in the world to protect and preserve intangible CH<br>• Recognized the human skills possessed by individuals or groups who are indispensable for the production of cultural properties<br>• Recognized and included financial support in order to foster the transmission of skills and knowledge |
| Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict ("Hague Convention") | 1954, UNESCO | • First UNESCO convention regarding cultural heritage<br>• Protected CH in the event of armed conflict (post WWII influence)<br>• Dealt with manifestations of CH, using the term "cultural property" for the first time in international law |
| Restoration of Monuments and Sites ("The Venice Charter") | 1964, UNESCO | • Guidelines for selecting and conserving historic buildings and monuments<br>• Recognized the context or setting of CH<br>• Included evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event in the CH definition |
| Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage | 1972, UNESCO | • Recognized geographically and historically unique places and sites |
| The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance ("The Burra Charter") | 1979, ICOMOS | • Exemplified links to the philosophy of the "Venice Charter"<br>• Used as a reference point in promoting community inclusion in CH conservation |
| Articles 149 & 303 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea | 1982, UNCLOS | • Addressed for the first time the protection of marine cultural heritage in the form of tangible, underwater heritage |
| Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore | 1989, UNESCO | • Targeted non-material CH protection in an international instrument for the first time<br>• Took a major step toward formal recognition of intangible heritage and the need to safeguard it |
| European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage ("Valetta Treaty" or "Malta Convention") | 1992, Council of Europe | • Indicated that underwater CH was gaining recognition as a part of archaeological heritage |
| Charter on the Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage | 1996, ICOMOS | • Newly defined underwater CH, supporting the growing understanding of underwater CH as a non-renewable resource with the potential to strengthen national identity and promote tourism |
| Principles for the conservation and restoration of built heritage ("Krakow Charter") | 2000, ICOMOS | • Underscored the importance of *memory* as a reason to protect monuments |
| UNESCO Convention for Underwater Cultural Heritage | 2001, UNESCO | • First time UNESCO protects underwater CH<br>• Underwater CH now primarily understood as a non-renewable resource |
| European Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Traditional Ships in Operation ("Barcelona Charter") | 2003, European Maritime Heritage | • Established an informal but widely accepted standard for maintenance and restoration of historic watercraft still in operation<br>• Developed on the basis of the UNESCO Venice Charter (1964) to include the principles for protection of marine heritage |
| The Convention for Intangible Cultural Heritage | 2003, UNESCO | • Fundamental shift in paradigms recognizing the non-material and non-physical CH as worthy of protection |
| Towards a future Maritime Policy for the Union: A European vision for the oceans and seas | 2006, European Commission | • Addressed marine CH in a broader sense than in the UNESCO context.<br>• Sought to balance economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development and to work as a political instrument in building a common marine identity for Europeans. |
| Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe | 2014, European Commission | • Aimed to pursue the analysis of the economic and social impact of CH in the EU and contribute to the development of a strategic dimension |

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
ICOMOS: International Council on Monuments and Sites.
UNCLOS: United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

aircraft, other vehicles or any part thereof, their cargo or other contents, together with their archaeological and natural context; and (iii) objects of prehistoric character (UNESCO, 2001: Article 1).

CMCH also includes boats and ships, the skills to build them, and other traditional work-related techniques, lighthouses, unique houses and shelters and their construction materials (Galili and Rosen, 2010). Maritime heritage encompasses the unique ethos and identity of places such as a fishing villages (Westerdahl, 2007; Nadel-Klein, 2003). Additionally, the marine cultural land/seascape and its signatures of past human behavior and activities is also embedded in our CMCH (Westerdahl, 1992, 2007). As the types of coastal and maritime activities expand presently and into the future, research has revealed how little CMCH is included in marine spatial planning and integrated coastal zone management (Khakzad et al., 2015; Papageorgiou, 2018).

## 3. Constraining conditions of sea & shore: risks and threats to CMCH

Human interaction with coastal environments influences land and seascapes and has played an important role in the formation of maritime and coastal cultural heritage. Such unique coastal and marine conditions which influence the development of CMCH also play a role in current

and future exploitation. Physical conditions along the coasts, including climate change; the literal, invisible nature of CMCH; its figurative, invisible nature, and the challenges of being "over loved" are four major risks and threats seen in the utilization and protection of this CMCH.

### 3.1. CMCH under threat: climate change, coastal erosion, and increasing storm surge

Given the nature of coasts and the marine environment, CMCH is under particular threat from climate-change related events and conditions such as changes in precipitation, humidity, flooding, increasing storm surges and coastal erosion (Daire et al., 2012; Fatorić and Seekamp, 2017b; Köpsel and Walsh, 2018; Sesana et al., 2018). Climate change is identified as the greatest agent of (environmental) change facing built heritage (Cassar, 2005). Climate change impacts tangible culture (Daire et al., 2012) coastal landscapes (Fatorić and Seekamp, 2017a), and intangible heritage e.g. via forced migration (Maldonado et al., 2013). Such environmental change (e.g., from flooding) can result in abandonment when certain ways of life are no longer a viable means of making a living (Fatorić and Seekamp, 2017). Priorities have changed from solely focusing on estimating impacts and vulnerabilities to including mitigation approaches in the planning process (Wise et al., 2014). Many CH specialists also see a need to move adaptive approaches to climate change from reactive to proactive and planned ones (Wise et al., 2014).

#### 3.1.1. Resilience as antidote?

Nonetheless, climate change policies illustrate that the operationalization of the concept of resilience largely supports the continuation of the *status quo* (Brown,2012). The implementation of resilience policies, therefore, underline recovery to pre-crisis conditions rather than fundamental change and are largely aimed at supporting incremental rather than profound change (Jerneck and Olsson, 2008). Furthermore, by facilitating particular responses to crises, use of the resilience concept may even prevent crucial changes and enable the continuation of practices which are, in the long-term, unsustainable (Brown, 2014).

Another question which arises from considering resilience is the lack of questioning the outcome of resilience. It is critically important to consider what is the desired outcome that is to be created through resilience policies and actions and whose resilience is being developed (Davoudi et al., 2012). If fostering resilience requires social adaptations, then some sections of society will gain, and others will lose in resilience-building processes. In the social context, we, therefore, cannot instigate resilience processes without considering issues of procedural and distributive justice and fairness (Davoudi et al., 2012). This includes the coastal and maritime cultural heritage situation, as well. Which groups will benefit from CH preservation; and which will not? This impacts the society, and in turn, the overall impact and effect of the CH management.

### 3.2. CMCH as physically hidden

Being underwater and hidden from the naked eye are some of the primary attributes differentiating CMCH from terrestrial-based CH. As De Vivo (2012) points out, tangible, currently-located-underwater CH is often unseen and hidden to the wider public. These circumstances are tied to its low retrievability factor, or "the capacity of a cultural object to reach and be accessible to people" (De Vivo, 2012; Schudson, 1989). It takes specialist skills (e.g., scuba diving) or specialist activities (e.g., archaeological excavation; installation of CH in museums; computer-assisted visualizations) to make submerged CH visible. Even so, underwater CH currently faces unprecedented threats in the 21st century (Flatman, 2009) as technology increasingly allows planned access by leisure seekers and salvage hunters alike (Holmes et al., 2017; McCartney, 2017)—and even accidental access by maritime industries (e.g., fishing trawls and aggregate extraction)—with limited protection available for sites spread out underwater. Due to UNESCO's influence and its definition of underwater cultural heritage delimited to "for at least 100 years," many later shipwrecks, especially of the WWII era, are set outside global CH (McCartney, 2017).

### 3.3. CMCH, peripherality, and implications of greater accessibility

CMCH can also be metaphorically hidden from view if it is situated in peripheral areas—understood as geographically, politically, socially, or culturally constructed. Peripherality can be spatial and temporal; it can also involve core-periphery interrelationships (Garrod and Wilson, 2004). Often these places are constructed as "weak regions" characterized by low economic growth, higher than average out-migration and un-employment (Eriksson, 2008: 369). Rural, coastal economies, by being peripheral have turned to developing and advertising their unique attributes, which, for many, includes CMCH and littoral landscapes. Continuing or emerging sustainable tourism can help preserve cultural tradition under threat (Cohen 1988), albeit with varying degrees of sustainability (Gössling et al., 2002). Peripherality and CMCH are also addressed in policy. For example, the EU is working to diversify local economies through a focus on CMCH topics such as pesca-tourism (e.g. Piasecki et al., 2016) and other areas of cultural heritage (e.g. Aytuğ and Mikaeili, 2017; European Council, n.d.; FARNET, 2017). Coastal and maritime tourism is an important sector with over 3.2 million people employed, generating €183 billion (European Commission, n.d.) Nonetheless, the current push for CMCH-based tourism and development comes with some risk. The risk of such invisibility is two-fold; first, from lack of consideration in policies and development; and second, in increasing its visibility, threats arise from new-found attention. Population growth and increased tourism in coastal regions can bring risks due to development and overuse (e.g., garbage destroying seascapes, increased visitors increasing pollution), resulting in ecosystem degradation (Duxbury and Dickinson, 2007) and the loss of associated cultural heritage.

CMCH can also be at risk from the CH designation-process itself, which can thereby "freeze" the heritage in time (Campbell, 2008). Communities can become "museum" towns when maritime activities cease or are pushed out (Ounanian, 2015, 2019). In some cases, the growing number of cultural and heritage "consumers" has produced shorthand, reductive, and inauthentic representations of identity. Additionally, due to globalization and resulting "MacDonaldization" and "Disneyfication" of cities, many coastal, urban centers are at risk of losing their uniqueness as waterfronts and high streets are increasingly designed to resemble each other and are disembodied from their coastal heritage (Rossi, 2017; Lee, 2017).

In addition to understanding and responding to these risks and threats to CMCH, sustainable management of CMCH requires understanding CMCH as the result of interactions of actors in communities of meaning and communities of participation.

## 4. Theories on identity, space and place to construct communities of meaning

CH draws its meanings and importance from its invocation of memory (Vecco, 2010; Parkinson et al., 2016; Burström, 2009; Antonova and Rieser, 2018), a sense of shared identity and/or experience (Parkinson et al., 2016; Holtorf, 2011; Claesson, 2011), and community building and maintenance (Holtorf, 2011; Palmer and de Carvalho, 2008). In connection to coastal tourism, heritage narratives have become an increasingly important means of distinction although in different local iterations (Egberts and Hundstad, 2019). Therefore, to better understand the multifaceted character of CMCH, scholarship on identity, space, and place sets CH in the wider social science debate on meaning, memory, and the juxtaposition of commonality and diversity. In the following sub-sections, we discuss the developments of the concepts of identity and space and place and the connections among them.

### 4.1. Identity

Kluckhohn (1954: 694–695) stated that "culture is to a society as memory is to a person." Identity construction can therefore be seen as a culturally mediated choice in terms of identification with one's own culture and self-reflection on how to live in a given sociocultural environment (Golubović, 2011). However, the concepts of culture and identity are sometimes mixed and difficult to distinguish. According to Grimson (2010: 63) "Culture is related to sedimented practices, beliefs and meanings" and "Identity refers to our feelings of belonging to a collective." These differences in scope, pose a theoretical problem related to cultural homogeneity, that is to say, the members of a social group, with feelings of belonging, are not necessarily homogenous (Grimson, 2010). With increasing statements and policies valorizing CH, its value or purpose in society can be taken for granted with assertions that it provides identity and connection among people. Policies and doctrines on CH often remark on its intrinsic connection to identity, but this link has not been adequately examined. Primarily, calls for unity through CH gloss over a somewhat fraught history of CH and its capacity to exclude or nullify the memories of groups, especially those marginalized or in the minority. Fojut (2008: 18) observes, "Heritage can build bridges, but it can also emphasize gulfs." Designation of CH is not innocuous, as Holtorf (2011: 10) underscores the origins of CH in connection to 19th century nation-state building in Europe; CH was to "support an exclusive collective identity for each nation, by providing it with a distinctive origin and evolution to the present day."

### 4.2. Space and place

Tuan (1977: 6), makes a simple, yet elegant distinction between space and place: "If we think of space as that which allows movement, then place is pause; each pause in movement makes it possible for location to be transformed into place." Places gain appellations, which indicate that cultures and/or societies have come to some agreement on significance and meaning; although, different cultures may assign different names or deem some places more important or sacred than others. Referring to Lukermann (1964), Relph (1976) identifies six components of the concept of place:

1. Place as location
2. Place as the integration or ensemble of nature and culture
3. Places as interconnected and the notion of circulation
4. Place as localized and part of larger areas
5. Places as emerging and becoming and having histories
6. Places have meaning

From this list above, conceptualizations (2), (3), (5), and (6) are especially relevant to discussions of CMCH. Indeed, coastal landscapes and seascapes are ensembles of nature and culture, as well as being interconnected through the movement of people, especially via the sea and waterways. Furthermore, coastal places are under flux and have both unifying histories (e.g., maritime trade, shipbuilding), but also embody local distinction as an amalgamation of their particular shorelines, connections to inland communities, and inhabitants. Sense of place, also referred to as place attachment, connects emotional, behavioral, and cognitive aspects of the relationship between people and the places where they live, work, recreate, or visit, (Cheng et al., 2003; Jorgensen and Stedman, 2006). Theoretically and empirically supported, sense of place recognizes that people can feel bonds with a place that they do not wish to break, derive a sense of identity by association with a particular location or region, or recognize their dependence on a place in the fulfillment of goals or needs (Williams and Vaske, 2003; Kyle et al., 2005; Jorgensen and Stedman, 2006; Cross et al., 2011).

The conceptualization of place within CMCH takes different forms. First, perspectives on the coasts and seas can be oriented toward a universality in connection to the experiences of seafaring, fishing, foraging alongshore, etc., but at times such monolithic representations miss the differentiated experience based on gender, class, race, ethnicity, occupation, and the overlay of multiple identities. Second, the tension between boundaries and scale addresses what is included or not within particular borders, and the tension between the local and the global in many coastal places. The third and fourth points connect to each other—place as security versus challenge and place coopted by reactionary political movements. Place can offer feelings of home, connection, rootedness, much of which is considered and discussed in both phenomenological geography (Relph, 1976; Cuba and Hummon, 1993; Tuan, 2001) and investigated quantitatively in environmental psychology and sociology (Stedman, 2003; Jorgensen and Stedman, 2001, 2006). But in some instances, place can be used to protect turf, nullify difference, and exclude (Massey, 2018).

### 4.3. Political implications of place: borders, boundaries, and the other

In one way, places have borders and boundaries, and designations of space as place center on histories, historical continuity, and unique identity. Articulation of "placelessness" (Relph, 1976) and concerns for increasing homogeneity and aesthetic uniformity due to globalization and the West's cultural dominance (Casey, 2001) harken to feelings of loss and fear that local or regional distinction will erode. Acknowledging the problems with an arch defense of feelings of security and sense of place, Massey (1992) endeavors to find a middle road by advocating we "Face up to—rather than simply deny—people's need for attachment of some sort." Central to Massey's concerns about place is its conceptualization as a bounded or closed entity. "Attempts to fix the meaning of places, to enclose and defend them; they construct singular, fixed and static identities for places, and they interpret places as bounded enclosed spaces defined through counter-position against the Other who is outside," (Massey, 2018: 170). Thus, there are political implications to designations of place.

Massey's warning of the (ultra) conservative co-opting of place and sense of place speaks directly to CH. Massey warns of heritage centers: they "seek the identity of a place by laying claim to some particular moment/location in time-space when the definition of the area and the social relations dominant within it were to the advantage of that particular claimant group," (Massey, 2018: 171). Although Massey may be stark in this criticism, it presents a consideration when navigating remembered pasts, challenging presents, and cultures that have been cultivated and those that have been discarded in previous decades/centuries. For example, the redevelopment of sections of Belfast, Northern Ireland with the Titanic's dominating narrative has ignored other forms of maritime heritage including shipbuilders and the role of women. Tuan (1977) proposes three criteria for preservation: aesthetic, moral, and morale-boosting. Within society the agreement on what is meaningful in the aesthetic or moral is subjective and what is morale-boosting for some, may be oppressive for others.

#### 4.3.1. Reflections on inclusion and exclusion

Scholarship on identity provides insight into different forms of connection people make to others, especially the contemporary insight on intersectionality or the overlay of multiple identities. Boundaries and enclosure enable an "invasion discourse" whereby dominant political and/or cultural forces claim history to set singular designations and preclude new or marginal groups (Massey, 1992). A relational understanding of space/place (Massey, 1992) pushes back on the universality of experience and an essentialism that can emerge from calls for "unity" and helps us question hegemonic narratives that deserve examination and critique. Furthermore, discussions within space/place/landscape address challenges in understanding and operationalizing connection to the environment. In many respects, tangible CH has an analogue in the concepts of materiality and intangible CH relates greatly to discussions of identity.

A *community of meaning* consists of a diversity of actors who share a

concern regarding sustainable practices of CMCH and who define and develop these practices of CMCH by dealing with and referring to the constraining conditions. In communities of meaning, CMCH is actively used to construct or challenge place narratives and place identities (and vice versa), which is reflected in the way CMCH is taken up in political and policy-making processes. For example, CMCH can be instrumental in building a meaningful sense of place and political in relation to the perception of boundaries, power relations and democracy. Hence, CMCH is intertwined with the social and political fabric of places, and of place-making activities, in ways that arguably require significant attention to aspects of knowledge sharing, participation, empowerment and mutual social learning processes. In turn, we explore what we have termed *communities of participation* to explore how the degree of inclusion/exclusion of identity and place can then translate into the management of CMCH.

## 5. Communities of participation

A *community of participation* forms the governance setting of CMCH and gives insight in the (possible) involvement of actors who define and conceptualize CMCH through processes of inclusion and exclusion. To understand the dynamics of communities of participation we make use of participatory and deliberative governance theories. "Participatory theories emphasize inclusiveness as a condition for policy effectiveness and legitimacy, deliberative theories stress the importance of public discussion for the same purpose, and both theories are sensitive to issues of transparency and accountability" (Papadopoulos and Warin, 2007: 454). While participatory governance may then seem to be mainly concerned with inclusion and equal participation as a virtue in itself, deliberation is more concerned with expanding and using reasoned debate in decision-making processes, as opposed to decision-making based on the balance of power of different interests (Orchard-Webb et al., 2016). Concerning the latter, public or a wider (deliberate) discussion is considered a virtue that leads to more reflected, shared and meaningful choices and trust and commitment to decision, as long as the deliberation is well-orchestrated (Kenter et al., 2016). It aims to provide more reasoning in decision-making processes, and it focuses on the communicative process of shaping opinions and will, particularly in the qualitative aspects of conversation. Deliberation is concerned with careful thought, consideration, and discussion.

Communities of participation range from indirect participation on the one end of the continuum to communities of direct participation on the other end. In communities of indirect participation, governmental agencies define CMCH. They designate the tangible artifacts and related identities based on specific conceptions of place and space. In these communities of indirect participation, possible involved, affected and/or interested actors are excluded from the processes of defining and selecting CMCH. This is different for communities of direct participation, where public and private actors are involved in defining, framing, electing, and designating CMCH. Various scholars have identified a shift in the management of cultural and natural heritage from government- and expert-led decision-making to more participatory forms of governance (Darbas, 2008; Courtney, 2017). Based on forms of participatory and deliberative governance (Cohen, 1988; Warren, 1999; Dryzek, 2000; Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003; Fung and Wright, 2001) different communities of direct participation can be distinguished. In these communities building of legitimacy in broader settings of actors and interests is essential, and carefully tailored approaches of participation and interaction are considered more efficient (i.e., helps implementation) and effective (i.e., creates better results).

Communities of participation based on the principles of participatory governance are mainly concerned with the rights of participation and a representative configuration of all actors who should be involved in the definition and selection of CMCH. Communities of participation based on principles of deliberative governance do not attend as much to equal representation and obstacles of inclusion, but focus more on the "throughput" dimension of policy-making (Papadopoulos and Warin, 2007: 450), and hence the ability "to get things done, and done well." Such communities emphasize the actors' capabilities, which are seen as fruitful and productive for discussions and deliberation. Agreements among actors do not necessarily involve all actors equally, but to find effective and legitimate solutions. These deliberations could result in shared values and meaning as well as a recognition of each other's differences in values and preferences (Lo, 2013; Ranger et al., 2016) and the possibilities to develop "collective problem-solving capacity, and creating public spaces for engaged pluralism" (Escobar, 2017: 433). This "implies that difference and disagreement can be productively engaged through deliberation insofar they are communicated in terms that others may recognize as legitimate" (Escobar, 2017: 427).

However, participation and deliberation in communities of participation are not necessarily the powerless fora idealized by theorists of deliberative democracy (Orchard-Webb et al., 2016). In these CMCH communities, actors have the capability to achieve outcomes by using resources in interactions (*relational power*) (Arts and Van Tatenhove, 2005). This could be the capability of deliberation or to make decisions about "what is heritage, and for/to whom" (Fatorić and Seekamp, 2018; Baird, 2014; Cochrane, 2013). Moreover, relational power also refers to the capability of actors to challenge and change existing CMCH discourses, concepts of place, and the reformulation of CH identities (Courtney, 2017; E. W. Cheng, Li, and Ma, 2014; Walsh, 2019). However, actors do not have the same capacities to influence outcomes, due to an unequal distribution of resources. This unequal distribution of resources defines and positions actors vis-à-vis each other (*dispositional power*) (Arts and Van Tatenhove, 2005). The positions of actors co-determine what agents may achieve in terms of relational power. Rules and resources mediate the process of positioning. The unequal distribution of resources, the positioning of actors in policy and planning processes are the result of *structural power* (the way in which macro-societal structures shape the nature and conduct of agents) (Clegg, 1989; Arts and Van Tatenhove, 2005).

The idea of governance for CMCH in communities of participation, with particular (potential) communities of meaning, must not only be tailor made and attentive to local variety, but also dynamic and relational. It must be place-sensitive and situation-specific while at the same time inviting and using perspectives from the outside (or so called "Others"). As such, it mirrors and expands on Massey's call for a progressive or relational sense of place. Deliberation of CMCH, along the lines mentioned, holds promise to be more cross-boundary and proactive/transformative. Hence, it may not only appeal to a static "frozen" preservation of CH, but also to a yet unknown version of "future" or imagined CH.

## 6. Conclusion

There are multiple constraining conditions for the sea and shore, from environmental threats and resultant risks, and to changing economic, political, and social conditions in many societies. The paper discussed modes of resilience and adaptation to risks and threats originating in climate change, coastal erosion, and other geophysical threats. CMCH can also be categorized as hidden from public view, as many sites and artifacts are underwater and require specific technologies to access. Risks and threats are not only from the geophysical realm, but also have economic, social, and cultural origins. Metaphorically, CMCH can also be hidden in the sense that it inhabits physical, social, cultural or constructed peripheries. Furthermore, consideration of the desired outcome created through resilience policies and actions and whose resilience is being developed is central to management of CMCH.

With calls for the sustainable utilization of CMCH in the name of regional development and blue growth, there is a need to reconsider its management and governance. We claim that such an endeavor ought to be framed, initially, on the basis of *communities of meaning*, consisting of a diversity of actors sharing concern for CMCH in relation to risks and

sustainability and who view the CMCH as having sociocultural significance. We have argued how the concepts of identity and space and place are particularly useful in anticipating tensions built-in to CH designations. Defining what constitutes CMCH may be considered both constrictive/dividing and enabling/uniting, depending on its use in social and political settings.

Mirroring a call for a progressive and relational sense of place, we argue how CMCH governance activities are becoming increasingly relational and deliberative. We recommend thinking through the management and governance of CMCH through the concept of *communities of participation*. The concept encourages an initial and broad identification of actors, but also recognizes the power plays that can emerge in participatory processes and deliberation. These two concepts provide a vocabulary for managers to address calls for the promotion of CMCH and determine appropriate management strategies and governance based on policy objectives and the will of potentially multiple communities of meaning. Sustainable management of CMCH requires attending to diverse and at times diverging experiences of the sea and shore and attending to risks and threats specific to marine and coastal environments.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Acknowledgements

This work was completed in connection to the EU Horizon2020 Research & Innovation project, Preserving and Sustainably Governance Cultural Heritage and Landscapes in European Coastal and Maritime Regions (PERICLES), grant no. 770504.

AMFS was supported by Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) with a PhD Grant (SFRH/BD/145485/2019), and CP was funded by FCT 2020.02510.CEECIND. Thanks are due to FCT/MCTES for the financial support to CESAM (UIDB/50017/2020+UIDP/50017/2020) and GOVCOPP (UIDB/04058/2020) +(UIDP/04058/2020), through national funds.

## References

Ahmad, Yahaya, 2006. The scope and definitions of heritage: from tangible to intangible. Int. J. Herit. Stud. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250600604639.

Alegret, Joan Lluís, Carbonell, Eliseu, 2014. Introduction. In: In *Revisiting The Coast: New Practices In Maritime Heritage*, vol. 18.

Antonova, Anna S., Rieser, Alison, 2018. "Curating collapse: performing maritime cultural heritage in Iceland's museums and tours. Maritime Studies 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40152-018-0128-2. November.

Arts, B., Van Tatenhove, J., 2005. "Policy and power. A conceptual framework between the '"Old"' and '"New"' policy idioms. Pol. Sci. 37, 399–56.

Aytuğ, H.K., Mikaeili, M., 2017. "Evaluation of hopa's rural tourism potential in the context of European union tourism policy. Procedia Environ. Sci. 37, 234–245. https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20173327372.

Baird, Melissa F., 2014. Heritage, human rights, and social justice. Herit. Soc. 7 (2), 139–155. https://doi.org/10.1179/2159032X14Z.00000000031.

Blake, Janet, 2000. On defining the cultural heritage. Int. Comp. Law Q. 49, 61–85. https://doi.org/10.1017/S002058930006396X.

Brown, Katrina, 2012. Policy discourses of resilience. In: Pelling, M., Manuel-Navarrete, M., Redclift, D. (Eds.), In *Climate Change And the Crisis Of Capitalism*. Routledge, Abingdon, 37–50.

Brown, Katrina, 2014. Global environmental change I: a social turn for resilience? Prog. Hum. Geogr. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513498837.

Burström, Mats, 2009. Looking into the recent past: extending and exploring the field of archaeology. Curr. Swed. Archaeol. 15–16, 21–36. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279439590_Looking_into_the_recent_past_Extending_and_exploring_the_field_of_archaeology.

Campbell, Claire, 2008. Global expectations, local pressures: some dilemmas of a world heritage site. J. Royal Nova Scotia Histor. Soc. 11, 1–20.

Casey, Edward S., 2001. Between geography and philosophy: what does it mean to Be in the place-world? Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr. 91 (4), 683–693.

Cassar, May, 2005. Climate Change and the Historic Environment. London.

Cheng, A.S., Kruger, L.E., Daniels, S.E., 2003. "'Place' as an integrating concept in natural resource politics: propositions for a social science research agenda. Soc. Nat. Resour. 16 (2), 87–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920309199.

Cheng, Edmund W., Li, Anthony H.F., Yun Ma, Shu, 2014. Resistance, engagement, and heritage conservation by voluntary sector: the case of penang in Malaysia. Mod. Asian Stud. 48 (3), 617–644. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X1200087X.

Claesson, Stefan, 2011. The value and valuation of maritime cultural heritage. Int. J. Cult. Property 18, 61–80. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739111000051, 01.

Clegg, S.R., 1989. Frameworks of Power. Sage, London.

Cochrane, Janet, 2013. Exit the dragon? Collapse of Co-management at komodo national park, Indonesia. Tour. Recreat. Res. 38 (2), 127–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2013.11081740.

Cohen, Erik, 1988. Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. Ann. Tourism Res. 15 (3), 371–386. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X.

Courtney, Richard A., 2017. Network governance in the heritage ecology. J. Manag. Govern. 22 (3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-017-9399-z.

Cross, Jennifer Eileen, Keske, Catherine M., Lacy, Michael G., Hoag, Dana L.K., Bastian, Christopher T., 2011. Adoption of conservation easements among agricultural landowners in Colorado and Wyoming: the role of economic dependence and sense of place. Landsc. Urban Plann. 101 (1), 75–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANDURBPLAN.2011.01.005.

Cuba, Lee, Hummon, David M., 1993. A place to call home: identification with dwelling , community , and region. Socio. Q. 34 (1), 111–131.

Daire, Yvane, Marie, Lopez-Romero, Elias, Noël Proust, Jean, Regnauld, Hervé, Pian, Soazig, Shi, Benheng, 2012. Coastal changes and cultural heritage (1): assessment of the vulnerability of the coastal heritage in western France (later). J. I. Coast Archaeol. 7 (2), 168–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564894.2011.652340.

Darbas, Toni, 2008. Reflexive governance of urban catchments: a case of deliberative truncation. Environ. Plann. 40 (6), 1454–1469. https://doi.org/10.1068/a39252.

Davoudi, Simin, Shaw, Keith, Haider, L. Jamila, Quinlan, Allyson E., Peterson, Garry D., Wilkinson, Cathy, Fünfgeld, Hartmut, McEvoy, Darryn, Porter, Libby, 2012. "Resilience: a bridging concept or a dead end? 'Reframing' resilience: challenges for planning theory and practice interacting traps: resilience assessment of a pasture management system in northern Afghanistan urban resilience: what does it mean in planning practice? Resilience as a useful concept for climate change adaptation? The politics of resilience for planning: a cautionary note. Plann. Theor. Pract. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.677124, 2012.

De Vivo, Caterina, 2012. Revealing the Invisible: a comparative analysis of the underwater heritage management in the Mediterranean context. Advisor: Catoni, Prof. Maria Luisa. Coadvisor: Griswold, Prof. Wendy 530 [IMT PhD Thesis].

Dryzek, J.S., 2000. Deliberative Democracy and beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Duxbury, Jane, Dickinson, Sarah, 2007. Principles for sustainable governance of the coastal zone: in the context of coastal disasters. Ecol. Econ. 63 (2–3), 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOLECON.2007.01.016.

Egberts, Linde, Hundstad, Dag, 2019. Coastal heritage in touristic regional identity narratives: a comparison between the Norwegian region sørlandet and the Dutch wadden sea area. Int. J. Heritage Stud. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1570310, 1–15.

Eriksson, Madeleine, 2008. "(Re)Producing a 'peripheral' region – northern Sweden in the news. Geogr. Ann. B Hum. Geogr. 90 (4), 369–388. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0467.2008.00299.x.

Escobar, Oliver, 2017. Pluralism and democratic participation: what kind of citizen are citizens invited to Be? Contemp. Pragmatism 14 (4), 416–438. https://doi.org/10.1163/18758185-01404002.

European Commission, 2019. Coastal and maritime tourism. https://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/policy/coastal_tourism_en, 24, 4.

FARNET, 2017. A heritage trail throughout port towns give fishing communities a boost" good practice short story, 2017. https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/cms/farnet2/on-the-ground/good-practice/short-stories/heritage-trail-throughout-port-towns-give-fishing_en.

Fatorić, Sandra, Seekamp, Erin, 2017a. Are cultural heritage and resources threatened by climate change? A systematic literature review. Climatic Change 142 (1–2), 227–254. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-1929-9.

Fatorić, Sandra, Seekamp, Erin, 2017b. Evaluating a decision analytic approach to climate change adaptation of cultural resources along the atlantic coast of the United States. Land Use Pol. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.07.052.

Fatorić, Sandra, Seekamp, Erin, 2018. A measurement framework to increase transparency in historic preservation decision-making under changing climate conditions. J. Cult. Herit. 30 (March), 168–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2017.08.006.

Flatman, Joe, 2009. Conserving marine cultural heritage: threats, risks and future priorities. Conserv. Manag. Archaeol. Sites 11 (1), 5–8. https://doi.org/10.1179/135050309X12508566208245.

Fung, A., Wright, E., 2001. Deepening democracy: innovations in empowered participatory governance. Polit. Soc. 29 (1), 5–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329201029001002.

Galili, Ehud, Rosen, B., 2010. Preserving the maritime cultural heritage of the mediterranean, a cradle of cultures, religions and civilizations-the holy land perspective. J. Coast Conserv. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-010-0107-2.

Garrod, Brian, Wilson, Julie C., 2004. Nature on the edge? Marine ecotourism in peripheral coastal areas. J. Sustain. Tourism 12 (2), 95–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580408667227.

Golubović, Zagorka, 2011. An anthropological conceptualisation of identity. Synth. Philos. 57 (1), 25–43.

Grimson, Alejandro, 2010. Culture and identity: two different notions. Soc. Ident. 16 (1), 61–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630903465894.
Hajer, M.A., Wagenaar, H., 2003. Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Held, David, 1996. Models of Democrazy, second ed. Standford University Press, Standford, CA.
Holmes, O., Ulmanu, M., Roberts, S., 2017. The World's Biggets Grave Robbery: Asia's Disappearing WWII Shipwrecks. *The Guardian*, 2017.
Holtorf, Cornelius, 2011. The changing contribution of cultural heritage to society. Mus. Int. 63 (1–2), 8–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0033.2012.01758.x.
Jerneck, Anne, Olsson, Lennart, 2008. Adaptation and the poor: development, resilience and transition. Clim. Pol. 8, 170–182. https://doi.org/10.3763/cpol.2007.0434.
Jorgensen, Bradley S., Stedman, Richard C., 2001. Sense of place as an attitude: lakeshore owners attitudes toward their properties. J. Environ. Psychol. 21 (3), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.2001.0226.
Jorgensen, Bradley S., Stedman, Richard C., 2006. A comparative analysis of predictors of sense of place dimensions: attachment to, dependence on, and identification with lakeshore properties. J. Environ. Manag. 79 (3), 316–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2005.08.003.
Khakzad, Sorna, Pieters, Marnix, Van Balen, Koenraad, 2015. Coastal cultural heritage: a resource to Be included in integrated coastal zone management. Ocean Coast Manag. 118, 110–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2015.07.032. December.
Klein, Nadel, 2003. Book Ch 3: Fishing for Heritage: Modernity and Loss along the Scottish Coast.
Kluckhohn, Clyde, 1954. Southwestern studies of culture and personality: comments. Am. Anthropol. 56 (4), 700–708. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1954.56.4.02a00300.
Köpsel, Vera, Walsh, Cormac, 2018. "'Coastal landscapes for whom? Adaptation challenges and landscape management in cornwall. Mar. Pol. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.05.029.
Kyle, Gerard, Graefe, Alan, Manning, Robert, 2005. Testing the dimensionality of place attachment in recreational settings. Environ. Behav. 37 (2), 153–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916504269654.
Lee, H.Y., 2017. "A case of 'disneyization'? The cheung chau bun festival, Hong Kong". Tourism Cult. Commun. 2, 107–117.
Lukermann, F., 1964. Geography as a formal intellectual discipline and the way in which it contributes to human knowledge. Canad. Geogr./Le Géographe Canadien 8 (4), 167–172. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.1964.tb00605.x.
MacLeod, Nicola, 2006. Cultural tourism: aspects of authenticity and commodification. In: Robinson, Mike, Smith, Melanie (Eds.), Cultural Tourism in a Changing World: Politics, Participation and (Re)Presentation. Channel View Publications, Clevendon, GB, 177–90.
Maldonado, K., Julie, Shearer, Christine, Bronen, Robin, Peterson, Kristina, Lazrus, Heather, Pandya, Rajul E., Colombi, Benedict J., Maldonado, J.K., et al., 2013. The impact of climate change on tribal communities in the US: displacement, relocation, and human rights. Climatic Change 120, 601–614. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-0746-z.
Martindale, Tim, 2014. Heritage, skills and livelihood: reconstruction and regeneration in a Cornish fishing port. In: Urquhart, Julie, Acott, Tim G., Symes, David, Zhao, Minghua (Eds.), Social Issues in Sustainable Fisheries Management, vol. 9. Springer, New York, pp. 279–299. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7911-2.
Massey, Doreen B., 1992. A place called home? New Form. 17, 3–15.
Massey, Doreen, 2018. Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place. In: Christophers, Brett, Lave, Rebecca, Peck, Jamie, Werner, Marion (Eds.), The Doreen Massey Reader. Agenda Publishing Limited, Newcastle, UK, 149–57.
McCartney, Innes, 2017. "The battle of jutland's heritage under threat: commercial salvage on the shipwrecks as observed 2000 to 2016. Mar. Mirror 103 (2), 196–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.2017.1304701.
Mileu, Andra Ioana, Jan, Hanspach, Abson, David, Fischer, Joern, 2013. Cultural ecosystem services: a literature review and prospects for future research. Ecol. Soc. 18 (3).
Ounanian, K., 2015. Wither the waterfront: does the United States need federal legislation to preserve working waterfronts? Coast. Manag. 43 (6), 668–684. https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2015.1088764.
Ounanian, K., 2019. "Not a 'museum town': discussions of authenticity in coastal Denmark. J. Tourism Cult. Change 17 (3), 285–305. https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2018.1456544.
Palmer, Lisa, Demetrio do Amaral de Carvalho, 2008. "Nation building and resource management: the politics of 'nature' in timor leste. Geoforum 39 (3), 1321–1332. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GEOFORUM.2007.09.007.
Papadopoulos, Yannis, Warin, Philippe, 2007. Are innovative, participatory and deliberative procedures in policy making democratic and effective? Eur. J. Polit. Res. 46 (4), 445–472. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2007.00696.x.
Papageorgiou, Marilena, 2018. Underwater cultural heritage facing maritime spatial planning: legislative and technical issues. Ocean Coast Manag. 165 (November), 195–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2018.08.032.
Parkinson, Arthur, Scott, Mark, Redmond, Declan, 2016. Competing discourses of built heritage: lay values in Irish conservation planning. Int. J. Herit. Stud. 22 (3), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2015.1121404.
Piasecki, W., Głąbiński, Z., Francour, P., Koper, P., Saba, G., Molina García, A., Ünal, V., et al., 2016. Pescatourism - a European review and perspective. Acta Ichthyol. Piscatoria 46 (4), 325–350. https://www.academia.edu/33223277/PESCATOURISM_A_EUROPEAN_REVIEW_AND_PERSPECTIVE.
Relph, Edward, 1976. Place and Placelessness. Pion Ltd.
Rossi, Ugo, 2017. Cities in Global Capitalism. Polity. https://www.beck-shop.de/rossi-cities-global-capitalism/product/18732283?product=18732283.
Schudson, M., 1989. How culture works? Perspectives from media studies on the efficacy of symbols. Theor. Soc. 18 (2), 153–180.
Sesana, Elena, Gagnon, Alexandre, Bertolin, Chiara, Hughes, John, 2018. Adapting cultural heritage to climate change risks: perspectives of cultural heritage experts in Europe. Geosciences. https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences8080305.
Stedman, Richard C., 2003. Is it really just a social construction?: the contribution of the physical environment to sense of place. Soc. Nat. Resour. 16, 671–685. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920390217627.
Tatenhove, Jan P.M. Van, Leroy, Pieter, 2003. Environment and participation in a context of political modernisation. Environ. Val. 12 (2), 155–174. https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/whp/ev/2003/00000012/00000002/art00002.
The Charter of Krakow, 2000. The charter of Krakow 2000 principles for conservation and restoration of built heritage, 2000. Kracow. http://smartheritage.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/KRAKOV-CHARTER-2000.pdf.
Tuan, Yi-fu, 1977. Space and Place: the Perspective of Experience, eighth ed. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
Tuan, Yi-Fu, 2001. Space and Place, eighth ed. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
UNESCO, 2001. Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. Paris.
UNESCO, 2003. Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. In: The Impact Of Uniform Laws On the Protection of Cultural Heritage And the Preservation Of Cultural Heritage In the 21st Century. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004180444.I-786.6. Paris.
Urquhart, Julie, Tim, Acott, 2013. "Constructing 'the stade': Fishers' and non-Fishers' identity and place attachment in hastings, south-east england. Mar. Pol. 37 (1), 45–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2012.04.004.
Vecco, Marilena, 2010. A definition of cultural heritage: from the tangible to the intangible. J. Cult. Herit. 11 (3), 321–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2010.01.006.
Veldpaus, L., Roders, A.P., 2014. Learning from a legacy: venice to valletta. Chang. Times 4 (2), 244–263. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1643292048/fulltextPDF/FB8AF8003AA648B2PQ/7?accountid=31562.
Walsh, Cormac, 2019. Integration of expertise or collaborative practice?: coastal management and climate adaptation at the wadden sea. Ocean Coast Manag. 167 (January 2018), 78–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.10.004.
Warren, M., 1999. Democazy and Trust. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Westerdahl, Christer, 1992. The maritime cultural landscape. Int. J. Naut. Archaeol. 21, 5–14.
Westerdahl, Christer, 2007. Fish and ships: towards a theory of maritime culture. Deutsches Schiffahrtsarchiv 39, 191–236.
Williams, Daniel R., Vaske, Jerry J., 2003. The measurement of place attachment: validity and generalizability of a psychometric approach. For. Sci. 49 (6), 2003. https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/value/docs/psychometric_place_attachment_measurement.pdf.
Wise, R.M., Fazey, I., Stafford Smith, M., Park, S.E., Eakin, H.C., Archer Van Garderen, E. R.M., Campbell, B., 2014. Reconceptualising adaptation to climate change as part of pathways of change and response. Global Environ. Change 28, 325–336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.002.
European Council." (n.d).