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Abstract
The main aim of this paper is to identify the main elements of a successful cultural tourism product and to what extent the existing relevant power structures in the field and heritage management practice influence cultural tourism development. The paper was prepared on the basis of a review of existing literature on tourism, cultural tourism and heritage management. It is based on the definition of cultural tourism as the form of tourism whose learning function is what makes it different from other forms of tourism. Cultural tourism product includes several elements such as objects and attractions, travel agents and operators, accommodation and catering services, transportation services, souvenir services, business services support and promotional material production. Cultural tourism attraction is a main feature of cultural tourism product that serves as a prime motivation for visiting specific destinations. Paper also provides a brief introduction to the role that supranational organizations like UNESCO and the European Union hold in the process of development of cultural tourism. Reviewed literature demonstrates that the more economic values of cultural heritage are appreciated and visitor economy developed the more sophisticated heritage management is and the better opportunities for cultural tourism development arise.
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1. Introduction
World Tourism Organization forecasts an increase of cultural tourism trips by 18 – 25%, and it is set to assume the leading role globally by 2020. (Montana-Vidilj-Dolj, 2017). By using several examples of the power that different social structures exert on the creation of a cultural tourism product this article will demonstrate the range of both positive and negative consequences that cultural tourism development may produce, as well as what are the main elements of a successful cultural tourism product.

In developing this argument, examples of UNESCO’s approach to the inscription of tangible and intangible cultural assets on to its World Heritage List, as well as the European Union policies aiming to “contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member states, while respecting their national and regional diversity, and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore”. (Barly, 1994, p. 6) will be used. To draw a clear understanding of the way in which the cultural tourism usage depends on those structures that have the power to shape a cultural tourism product, the examples of a very successful and positive cultural tourism development initiatives will be used as an illustration. As Burns & Holden (1995) rightly discern, tourism itself cannot be good or bad. Its socioeconomic effects on society will rather depend on at least two factors: “historic events that frame its current touristic condition and the extent to which its political economy is dominated by exogenous forces.” (p. 126). Globalization and postmodernist tendencythat
allow for multiple voices to be heard, as demonstrated by selected examples, signal a very promising future for cultural tourism to extend its positive impact on an increasing number of people across the globe.

Various understandings of both tourism and culture exist amongst those that research it. Some would consider only high-level culture, including museums, theatres, literature or arts as culture, while others, anthropologists in the first place, understand it as all aspects of life of a given society, including their values, beliefs, ways of life, as well as artistic expressions resulting from it. The third definition includes both of those, in addition to the contemporary manifestations of a specific society’s culture. (Richards, 2011)

The same would apply to our understanding of tourism, which is understood as a social phenomenon (MacCannel; 1999, Urry 2002) or just another market product, subject to supply and demand. (Burns and Holden, 1995; Du Cros and McKercher 2002) In some countries or destinations, cultural policy will dictate the development of tourism, while in others it will be the tourism, and the specific country’s intention to use it for economic development i.e. creation of visitors’ economy (Reddy, 2006:4, State of Victoria, 2016: 6), that will dictate other policies, which will influence the success rate of both economic and social development aspects of cultural tourism. As Duval and Wilkinson (2001) note, the concept of development is also understood in various ways, from it being seen as economic growth expressed in national GDP, to, as he paraphrases Goulet (1993), the adoption of “sustenance of life, self-esteem and freedom” (pp. 62).

Research of cultural tourism shows that there are certain basic elements in it, including attraction, distinctiveness, authenticity, and identity, and, lately, creativity. Consumption of cultural assets has undergone tremendous changes in past few decades, with it becoming increasingly based on the creativity of culture producers ((Richards, 2001)) and its economic value (Lazrak et al., 2011, Ruigjok, 2006, Bowitz and Ibenholt, (2009), rather than on the history or only symbolic value of existing attractions themselves.. As Pine and Gillmore present (1999), visitors want to participate even in those experiences which they know are not based on history, traditional culture or heritage. A unique experience is, in itself, what modern tourists expect.

2. Theoretical framework

Cultural tourism has come to mean so many different things so that it can become meaningless or encompass too many forms of tourism simultaneously. Thorne (2009:3) identified cultural tourism as “about the experience of ‘place’. Accordingly, place-based cultural tourism identifies, and then capitalizes on the unique cultural character and sense of place that distinguishes one place from another.” (cited in Smith, S., 2015:222)

There are many definitions of cultural tourism, so that Smith (2015:221) records Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) collecting as many as “166 definitions of the word from English-language sources.” However, they all come to a common description that identifies it as trips being undertaken to experience “a mixture of history and traditional and modern-day culture” in another place that is different from one’s own. (Morrison, 2014:482) According to the conceptual definition of cultural tourism developed by the ATLAS research team (Richards, 2001) cultural tourism implies “The movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural need.” (p. 37) Therefore, this paper has based its understanding of cultural tourism on the definition of Richards, who posits that “the distinction between cultural tourism and other forms of tourism is basically to be found in the learning function. Cultural tourists can learn about the culture of a destination and on the forms of culture they consume” (Richards, 2001:7). Ritchie and Zins (1978:357) have usefully provided a list of elements of culture that could be seen as attractive to tourists, including language, history, tradition, arts, history, life of residents, architecture, religion, gastronomy, dress, leisure times. (cited in Burns and Hildern, 1995:114).

Taken in this sense, cultural tourism includes both heritage tourism and contemporary cultural
productions, such as arts. It relates closely to place marketing and it is based on a city’s attractions, distinctiveness, authenticity, identity, and, lately, creativity. For this reason, the paper will provide description of some of the main elements of a successful cultural tourism product, including the sense of place, cultural attractions, and usage of stakeholder approach in the development of cultural tourism products.

3. Research methodology
This study employs qualitative literature studies approach. Review of existing literature related to tourism, cultural tourism and heritage management has been prepared as a basis of defining cultural tourism and differentiating cultural tourism from other forms of tourism. It is based on the definition of cultural tourism as the form of tourism whose learning function is what makes it different from other forms of tourism. Existing literatures regarding the role of stakeholders involved in cultural tourism development were used to deliver comprehensive analysis.

4. Research findings

4.1. Developing cultural tourism
As we will see from examples provided below, tourism is still heavily influenced by different social and political powers and its development and effects cannot be assessed without taking that into consideration, which is very much in line with the understanding of tourism as a system and a process (Burns and Holden, 1995).

Tourist is at the basis of cultural tourism. Some sociologists, like MacCannel (1999) think cultural tourism is an expression of post-industrial and postmodern human search for identity and a facilitator of social differentiation. And, as more people gain a higher income and more leisure time, there is a need to provide them with opportunities for that. On the other hand, Richards (2001, p. 243)) explains how the growing offer of the leisure sector is de-differentiating that sector and leading to an increased pressure on the cultural sector to compete with it. Whatever the reason, there is an ever-growing number of people travelling, and UNTWO forecast a steady increase of 5% annually. Apart from the tourists’ search for identity, there is also the issue of identity of states, regions, cities, and sites, as they all attempt to establish themselves on an ever more competing international and globalized market. To do that, they need to be distinctive, to have something that is authentic and can be provided only by a specific location and/or increasingly local communities. Cultural tourism is perceived as “the holy grail of quality tourism that cares for the culture it consumes while culturing the consumer. Cultural tourism has therefore been embraced globally by local, national, and transnational bodies.” (Richards, 2011: 364) As it relies heavily on heritage of societies the professional management of heritage sector is the most important element of development of cultural tourism.

4.1.1. Role of the UNESCO
UNESCO uses its World Heritage list inscriptions to foster a better understanding between nations and cultures, but its lists are under exclusive influence of professional circles, which assess value of attractions based on a very precise and predetermined set of criteria.

Sholze (2008) provides a valuable review of all the contradictions and potential problems arising from UNESCO’s cultural heritage protection policy, as well as details of the process and various actors involved in it. It includes making culture a national property and, in that way, overlooking diversity within nations. The criteria for assigning the “universal value” status to cultural heritage under protection is being questioned as arbitrary, creating an unjust hierarchy between the nations that have some property under protection, those in Europe and North America leading the list, and those that do not.

For example, Taj Mahal, although celebrated as a piece of Islamic architecture built by a Mogul ruler to demonstrate love for his wife, which is an image created already during British rule over India, it is, at the same time, perceived as the place of an old Hindu temple and a symbol of conquerors.

It is true that UNESCO is trying to reconcile this with including immaterial heritage, but the same applies to that aspect too. It is quite visible from examples of Croatia that had “nijemo
kolo” inscribed into the list (UNESCO, 2016), although an almost identical dance is practiced by what is now perceived as another community i.e. non-Croats. There is insufficient space here to list all potential cultural, economic, and, maybe the most importantly, political implications of such a policy, but we should be aware of them. Sholze (2008) raises, amongst others, one very good question: “Are there conflicting memories involved?” We also need to think about one more aspect of “celebrating” culture in this way. Are all sites really properly researched, do they provide a critical view of cultural property under protection?

So, having in mind the weight that the UNESCO protection status gives to selected sites, practices, and rituals, and tourism activity being created on the basis of this, we have to be aware of all potential implications coming out of this policy. It is certainly encouraging to see that, just before this paper was submitted for publication, UNESCO has demonstrated its readiness to modify its approach. It has been published by media on 19 October, 2017 that UNESCO will consider opposing views in world heritage register which, according to Japan Foreign Ministry official responsible for international cultural cooperation, “is a major step forward in shaking off political exploitation of the registration system.” (Kyodo news, 2017, par. 4)

4.1.2. European Union

The European Community also has a special role in cultural tourism. Culture was mentioned in its official documents for the first time in the Maastricht Treaty, adopted in 1992. (Barley, 1994). Ever since, it has been providing a set of measures and programs aiming to strengthen the role of culture in European countries.

There are different programs being funded and implemented by EU, from the creation of thematic international and cross regional trails, like the Roman baths trail, the Phoenicians trails, the Salt trade trails, industrial heritage regions, etc. Being a part of European trail brings to destinations a certain type of label that draws both tourists and local population to them. It serves the role of a brand which, if adequately used, can lead to economic and social improvements of regions. For Ibiza, for example, it is a great tool to diversify their tourism offer – from being perceived as just a place of “sun, sand and fun”, now it can market itself as home to many different civilizations, as a land of history and culture, too. (Spain info, 2017). These kinds of initiatives have far reaching implications in upgrading tourism offer, as well as improving existing and developing new knowledge and skills needed to design, maintain, promote, and “sell” destinations and their offer. They can contribute to an increase of inward investments, employment opportunities, and strengthening of self-esteem of the population.

European-wide Viking Festival has grown from being only a product of Scandinavian countries to a Europe-wide network of museum, events, festivals, and different programs that “individually can attract up to 15,000 visitors daily” (Hannam and Halewood, 2014, p. 17). Benefits of European Union-wide projects include improvements in tourism offer in specific regions, creation of regional, cross-regional and cross-national networks of all involved in design of cultural tourism products, from policy makers, heritage conservation professionals, to accommodation and catering service providers in the field. They provide for an exchange of experience, good practice, improvement of skills and knowledge and reduction of marketing costs, which is very often one of the biggest obstacles to smaller cultural tourism service providers. Focus on regional projects design provides many local people living in the areas with opportunities to use their traditional intangible heritage, such as crafts, skills, and knowledge, to reclaim ownership of heritage, increase their own self-esteem, and increase opportunities to make additional income.

Although there is some criticism of such European Union policy in developing cultural tourism (Lähdesmäki, 2012, Hannam and Halewood, 2014) its policies and projects have a much wider range, including many more local, regional and national development goals, thus including an enormous number of people in projects they can benefit from both economically
and socially. Richards (2001) suggests the European Union should adopt even more inclusive policies to include into its programs contemporary cultural manifestations, along with narrowly defined historic and traditional culture based products.

4.1.3. States, cities, and indigenous communities

Countries that see tourism as one of their economic growth priorities (Reddy, 2006, State of Victoria, 2016) tend to be more inclusive when designing cultural tourism products and related industries. In some states, material heritage is still the primary focus, directed towards nation building and ideology or religion promotion, while, as many authors confirm, the visitors’ expectations have already moved to a more abstract concept of “experience” and visitor economy and it is encouraging to see more and more countries accommodating their policies to such expectations.

For example, Indonesia and Ireland have recognized tourism as one of their development priorities and are aligning their legal framework and other policies with this determination. Sugiyarto, Blake and Sinclair (2003) provide a good insight into Indonesia Government’s policies designed to use economic benefits from tourism to better cope with globalization pressures. This policy is reflected in other aspects of society, like travel guide practice. Although the travel guide profession is officially regulated by the Government, it has been thinking about deregulating it, as the research has shown that unlicensed guides actually have more business than licensed ones. Salazar (2005) analysed a group of tour guides employed by Traveller’s bar (a part of wider global network) and how they, in “glocalising” tourism offer, actually reformulate “what counts as culture and heritage to include the everyday and that which has not yet been memorialized in guidebooks and official histories, another kind of Javanese experience is constructed and becomes available to the tourist” (p. 642).

Ireland had a comprehensive program of tourism development based on culture when, during period from 1987 to 1993, it managed to more than double the number of attractions charging an admissions fee and double the number of visitors within only two years. Browne (1994) presents the Ireland’s program in detail, which had clearly been well planned, included a wide range of stakeholders and facilities, and showed a good understanding of the usage of cultural assets and attractions in the beginning of the 21st century. Good illustration of countries moving from a traditional understanding of cultural heritage as something to be only conserved to understanding it as a more dynamic, economic resource is the case of Korea, which developed one of its cultural tourism programs around Buddhism, using existing temples and monks to create a “Temple stay” product. The program allows temples to earn additional income for their sustenance, provides training to monks in different aspects of tourism operations, and serves as a channel for facilitating a better understanding of Korean Buddhism.

Glasgow might be the best example of how, by using cultural heritage, cities can successfully rebrand themselves, increase the number of visitors, revenue from tourism, employment opportunities, inward investment, and number of citizens. (Myerscough, 1991) However, the main difference when it comes to assessing the success of such initiatives is in the extent to which each implementing party included the wider community in initiatives to make a long-lasting change. Maitland (2011) provides a very detailed review of how the creation of new tourism areas in London (Islington, King’s Cross and the South Bank) helped in regenerating the areas through reconstruction of selected infrastructure and an increase in the number of visitors and, at the same time, relieving the usual tourist spots in London from tourism over usage. Research conducted throughout the project revealed that there are, indeed, new types of tourists, who will not blindly follow the promotional material, but will rather seek advice from friends and relatives, because they want to experience true uniqueness and sense of place.

Experiencing a true sense of place and uniqueness brings the next subject – indigenous communities, which are perceived as authentic and “original”. Hinch and Butler define indigenous tourism as “indigenous people are directly involved, either through control and/or by having their culture serve as the essence of the attraction”
As tourists are increasingly looking for new attractions and authenticity, indigenous communities are increasingly becoming the focus of their interest. Pereiro (2016) lists several such examples, the Kunas community from the island of El Porvenir, Panama being one of them. Thanks to their initiative to control their own culture, they managed to generate better benefits to its members, mitigate potential negative impacts of tourism, and provide an opportunity for the community’s adaptation to the local-global relationship.

The quality of indigenous communities’ involvement with tourism will depend on what Burns and Holden defined as “historic events that frame their current conditions”. Byrne (2013) illustrates this in detail when describing the “Balinisation” policy of the Dutch colonial government, which made sure, back at the beginning of the 20th century, that the Balinese did not have access to modernity because they wanted to keep Bali’s authentic culture intact. It brings up the issue of “culture” and the current practice of selecting indigenous communities as tourism attractions. Shennan summarized it by saying “there are not such entities as “cultures” but simply the contingent interrelations of different contributions produced by different factors”. (cited by Wolferstan and Fairclough, 2013, p. 44), which actually can be basis for diversification of tourism offer. By creating attractions based on different historical periods and events communities can create cultural tourism offer interesting enough for various members of public.

4.2. Main elements of cultural tourism

4.2.1. Sense of place

Many states, regions, cities and sites try to establish themselves on the ever more competing international and globalized market by drawing attention of potential outside visitors, including tourists and potential investors. The only way to achieve this is to be distinctive and have something that is authentic and can be provided only by the specific location.

The sense of place is closely tied to concepts of identity and authenticity of a place and its attractions, on which the development of a place’s image is based. Sense of place does not simply refer to a locale or a site, but rather to an “interrelationship of values, beliefs, experiences, social and political history, natural environment, economic and political practices, rituals and traditions of a geographically defined region or community that characterize a place.” (Smith, 2014:220)

Rebranding and image changing is the prime aim of many cities’ strategies since, in the case of restructuring cities’ economies, they all wish to attract new talents and businesses to their cities. It therefore deserves to be designed very carefully. “A destination is both a geographical place and a metaphysical space determined by a network of meaning and values that are attached to it.” (Campelo et al., 2014:154) It is not sufficient to create a few tourist spots or even a series of local cultural venues artificially, hoping that they would serve as symbols of the place for both visitors and residents. To design and manage a place’s image, it is necessary to uncover the sense of place and that can be done only through involving local communities in the planning process throughout all of its stages. As Banerjee (2007:312) points out, while discussing connections between cultural heritage and branding in a country, “A right marketing strategy for any country requires a deep analysis of the set of values, beliefs and behaviour patterns of the people of that country.”

Uncovering the sense of a place will certainly involve incorporating most of its heritage, which can be beneficial not only for the development of cultural tourism but also for the creation of a sense of continuity and stability for the local population as according to Hakala et al (2011:447), “One way of dealing with the environmental turbulence is to accentuate historical elements and thereby convey stability and confidence”. “It is the connection to heritage that provides for a sense of continuity of society and towns thus contributing to the creation of security feeling and opening up opportunities for creative actions.” (Banarjee, 2007:313) As towns are increasingly managed as corporations, especially in the field of tourism, the usage of corporate marketing strategies has turned into an indispensable tool in a town management and promotion.

Discussing the theory of place and place
branding, Campelo et al (2014) bring to the attention different approaches to destination branding and promotion. Many cities are applying corporate branding techniques to place branding, thus missing what, from the aspect of both tourism development and local community ownership, presents the most important feature of destination – the sense of place, as determined by those who see that place as theirs. As previously noted, cultural tourists are in search of a learning experience and want to know and consume the culture of a destination to which they have been previously attracted through different information distribution channels (Ury, 1990). Uniqueness, identity and authenticity of a place are what makes a specific place stand out at the market. And, according to many authors, it is all embedded in genius loci itself, “the sense of place which may be composed of many broadly defined cultural attributes, including common sets of values, attitude and thus behaviour.” (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000:55) Genius loci is “the atmosphere of place, as a shared sense of the spirit of the place and relates it to its representation and expression as habitus. The shared spirit includes place attachment, human-place bonding and social context in relation to community ties and ancestral connections.” (Campelo et al, 2014:155) Research that Campelo et al (2014) conducted in Catham Island in New Zealand confirmed there are core constructs of genius loci, or the sense of place, including: time, landscape, history, and community. Although conducted in a micro destination, their research provides a good guideline as to how to approach uncovering the sense of place in local communities. Places already have their brand essence though, as raw material, and all that is needed is to identify and select its pieces to be used for authentic representation of character of the place.

4.2.2. Cultural attractions

In his discussion about tourist attraction systems, Leiper (1990) brings to attention an insufficient scientific description of the cultural attraction and agrees that it is not sufficient to describe it as something that simply draws visitors or something that has an intrinsic attracting value. He rather agrees with MacConnell, (1974:41) who saw an attraction as “an empirical relationship between a tourist, a sight and a marker – a piece of information about a sight. (cited in Leiper, 1990:371) There are a number of different perspectives in the research on tourism attractions. Lew (1987) presents a complex picture of different classifications of attractions depending on the approach taken, including idiographic, organizational, and cognitive. Anything can become an attraction, from a restaurant, coffee bar, to natural landscape, but for a town/destination to motivate a visitor to come for the first time it clearly needs to be something that visitors cannot experience in their own environment. “In essence, tourist attractions consist of “non-home” place that draw discretionary travellers away from their homes.” (Lew, 1987: 554)

Leiper suggest that the most important part of tourist attraction systems is “a nucleus” which can be “any feature of a characteristic of place that a traveller contemplate visiting or actually visits” (1990:372). This would imply that any characteristic of place can be used to make a cultural attraction. However, research about consumers, and in specific, tourist values, motivations and behaviours, shows how complex a task this is. It has already been demonstrated how important, if not decisive, a factor in a town’s appeal to both local residents and visitors is the sense of a place and what a determining role it can have in any of the town’s regeneration or restructuring strategies. This leads to the conclusion that the best option is to use the already existing local attractions.

Since tourist attraction has been hard to define and differentiate from a tourism product in general it is useful to bear in mind definition that Swarbrooke offers stating that “In general terms, attractions tend to be single units, individual sites or clearly defined small-scale geographical areas that are accessible and motivate large number of people to travel some distance from their home, usually in their leisure time, to visit them for a short, limited period”. (2002:4). They are clearly expected to attract not only foreign tourism but also local population living in the region or country. The case studies presented by Swarbrooke (2002) are useful illustration of attractions system. For example, “The Potteries” region in the UK has been famous for ceramics
production turned into cultural tourism product as a part of industrial heritage of the region. Based on this theme the city of Stoke-on-Trent created a whole range of attractions resulting in attracting thousands of visitors from all over the world to “ceramics tourism” (Swarbrooke, 2002:349).

Following MacConnel’s interpretation of a cultural attraction, potential cultural tourism sites will need “markers”. This is the primary goal of presentation and interpretation. It is the interpretation that makes a specific site a cultural attraction. (Hems and Blockely, 2006) Leiper (1990:381) provides a very useful diagram of how a tourist attraction comes into existence, concluding that “tourists are never literally ‘attracted’, ‘pulled’ or ‘magnetized’, but are motivated to experience a nucleus and its markers when a marker reacts positively with needs and wants.”

**4.2.3. Stakeholder approach**

Stakeholder theory was brought forward by Freeman in 1984 in relation to corporate marketing strategies. According to it, any organization’s success depends on its relationship with its various stakeholders. According to Freeman, a stakeholder is “any group or individual that can affect, or is affected by the achievement of corporation’s purpose.” (Morrison, 2013, p. 233, Sautter and Liesen, 1999, p. 313). Stakeholders should be segmented according to their interest, power to influence the success of an organization, willingness to cooperate or to refuse cooperation, as well as their influence in the industry in general. Sautter and Liesen (1999) underline that often “planners underestimate the complexity of this step and default to a cursory report of only the most obvious stakeholders, chiefly tourists, business owners and government officials.” (p. 315) Consultation with all stakeholders in the planning process can only provide benefits and help avoid wasting necessary resources on potential failures. When it comes to the cultural tourism development and heritage management in particular, stakeholder approach is an invaluable tool. Various groups of stakeholders will have different interests in specific heritage depending on their place of living, professions, ownership, and other characteristics. Only through consultations with the local community, as the most important stakeholder group when it comes to the development of the sense of place, can any town’s authorities gain invaluable knowledge about the range of values, beliefs, and customs that could eventually be used for the development of cultural attractions. Cultural tourists, and tourists in general, are interested in the culture of people, just as much as in the history of the place, and can hardly be lured into artificially created tourist sports. “As already claimed by Stevenson (1998), major events cannot be organized at the expense of the local community, nor should they be planned without proper grassroots consultations.” (Garcia, 2007:116) In this sense, the stakeholder approach is a necessary element in any cultural tourism development planning process and is one of the main elements of heritage management.

**5. Conclusion**

This paper provides a review of policies and goals of various organizational structures that have a tremendous influence on both design and practice of cultural tourism development in order to demonstrate that the success of cultural tourism development does not depend only on the potential that culture and tourism have for development. It greatly depends on the policy aims of parties involved, transparency of the process, and inclusion of all relevant stakeholders in initiatives, as well as direct financial benefits perceived as coming out of such initiatives. With continuing globalization, democratization, and information accessibility to all, cultural tourism has a great potential to contribute to sustenance and development of many communities and environments. However, heritage management as the basic tool for cultural tourism development is ever evolving process which the recent UNESCO-announced changes confirm. McKercher and Du Cros (2002:51) remind that the process of sophistication of cultural heritage management goes through different stages depending on the level of development of society. Depending on the level of development of a specific society it will be at one of the five phases: 1. Initial recognition of cultural value and inventory; 2. Initial enacting of legislation; 3) increased professionalism; 4. Stakeholders consultations and 5. Review and
more integrated planning, acceptance of different interests and maturity.

Researched literature shows that the more local population and its needs are included in cultural tourism initiatives, the more of a chance they have to be sustainable. It is clearly related to general approach to cultural heritage in general. Reviewed case studies demonstrate that countries that assign economic value to cultural heritage tend to have more sophisticated heritage management thus providing better opportunities for cultural tourism development. Although cultural tourism products increasingly include specially designed contemporary objects and events such as theme parks, exhibition centres, new art galleries, leisure retail complexes, etc. it is impossible to create sustainable cultural tourism product without taking into account both material and immaterial heritage. So, it is true that any cultural tourism development will have to start from the heritage asset formation and identifying the best way to utilize it. As Howard notes “Formulating heritage policy, deciding which things and place to conserve, where and how to conserve them, what story to tell about them, and to whom, must depend on knowing what is perceived as valued heritage and why it is considered important”. (Howard, 1994: 67). To do it we need to constantly revise heritage policies and involve all interested stakeholders in the process. That is the only opportunity to keep developing and later diversifying cultural tourism offer.

The paper also presents certain core elements of any cultural tourism product, including the sense of place, tourist attraction, and stakeholder approach, as it seems impossible to create a good quality and sustainable cultural tourism product without taking those elements into account. Any cultural tourism development initiative will greatly depend on the primary goal of those pursuing it, as well as on their readiness to constantly modify heritage policies. Finally, the 21st century, with its sophisticated communication technologies and ever-growing access to knowledge being opened to increasing numbers of people, does not allow for old approaches to culture and cultural tourism management to yield any positive and long-term benefits. but are not sufficient for producing sustainable long term benefits for society as a whole.
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