

# The Culture of Resource Production and the Production of Cultural Resources: A Preliminary Conceptual Reflection on Cultural Resource Management Pandemic Era

R. Rucitarahma Ristiawan<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Program Studi Pariwisata, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Gadjah Mada

<sup>2</sup>Department of Cultural Geography, Wageningen University & Research

rucitarahma@ugm.ac.id

## Abstract

*The majority of critical cultural tourism studies posit that commodification is a pragmatic process that detaches the essence of cultural property from its proprietors, even if there is no clear ontological demarcation in defining how something appears as culture and cultural resources. This paper aims to elucidate the potential re-conceptualization scheme of cultural resource management by analyzing the emergence of the cultural tourism crisis in the COVID-19 pandemic era through the adoption of the production of nature approach in the critical Marxist study. This paper commences with a preliminary explanation of the process by which cultures are perpetually produced and reproduced by society, thereby becoming a component of nature. This paper also considers the temporality and contextual dimension of cultural resources. Rather than introducing a novel concept for a new cultural tourism product, the current pandemic situation allows for a critical examination of the manner in which resources are being produced. This reflection can serve as a foundation for the continued advancement of cultural resource management practices.*

**Keywords:** *Cultural resources production; cultural resources management; cultural tourism; production of nature; COVID-19*

## Introduction

### Cultural Resource Management and Tourism in the Pandemic Era

By early 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has slowed down the tourism industry's flow, which subsequently impacts many cultural tourism attractions. The pandemic also enables and provides numerous challenges for many tourism practitioners to resolve the decrease in revenue as less intense tourism activities remain. A considerable number of scholars have addressed the opportunity of the COVID-19 pandemic as the right momentum to restart tourism for more sustainable development activity (Brouder, 2020; Romagosa, 2020; Galvani et al., 2020; and

Ioannides & Gyimothy, 2020). In terms of cultural tourism management in the pandemic era, many researchers have also come up with several alternatives to cultural tourism product management (Samaroudi, Echavarría & Perry, 2020; Merritt, 2020, and Rech & Migliorati, 2021). Many also addressed the resilience dimension of cultural tourism management by primarily focusing on the issue of crisis within cultural tourism management (Prayag, 2020; Ntounis, Parker, Skinner, Steadman & Warnaby, 2021; and Adams, Choe, Mostafanezhad & Phi, 2021). However, challenges regarding the sustainability of cultural tourism products remain proliferating.

While many tourism scholars sought to seek many alternatives to cultural resources management during the COVID-19 pandemic period (Adams et al., 2021), I recall that essentially, we know much less about the origin of cultural resources and how those cultural things are perceived as resources generating various benefits both for the sake of society and the industry, including the tourism industry. Arguably, less income generated from cultural attractions, museums, and heritage sites globally results from fewer visitors "purchasing" the cultural attraction as commodities, both tangible and intangible forms. This situation highlights how the political economy dimension of tourism development has been challenged. Many attempts have been elaborated to overcome the decrease in economic income from less intense tourism and visitation activities (Samaroudi et al., 2020). To this, the COVID-19 pandemic has continuously pushed many tourism practitioners to wait for the return of the "normal" tourism industry while at the same time, many also successfully elaborate resiliency strategies in coping with the pandemic fallout (Adams et al., 2021).

By drawing on the intersection between cultural resource management, cultural tourism management, and the production of nature literature, this paper accounts for how cultural resources are being produced, perceived, and used within the cultural tourism industry. This preliminary reflection originates based on how I reflect on the crisis appearing within the cultural tourism sector. Tourism practitioners become more focused on adapting to this new situation due to less intense tourism activities and a sudden decrease in the cultural resource attraction revenue. However, I take the momentum into account as an opportunity to re-examine the way cultural resource management within the tourism industry can have a more sustainable approach to development after the pandemic. Regarding this, the preliminary reflection I suggest starts by questioning the essence of why we, as tourism practitioners, need to transform, adapt, change, or even recreate the way we wrap up the so-called cultural resources. It is indeed a question that led us to the monetary and calculative logic of cultural resources.

## Result and Discussion

### Pandemic, Crisis, and Resilience in Cultural Resource Management

I recalled what David Harvey (2020) elaborates on as the crisis within the pandemic era to critically answer my preliminary reflection. The capital accumulation in every sector within society will undergo such a process that leads to over-accumulation and crisis (Harvey, 2004). In the classic Marxist political economy framework, he states that the crisis results from surplus commodities and surplus labor not yet being absorbed within the capital accumulation circuit (Harvey, 2020).

The surplus labor and money need to find a new outlet to continue its accumulation to overcome the crisis (Harvey, 2020). Over accumulation means that there is a surplus of labor (rising unemployment) and capital surpluses (registered as an excess of commodities on the market lacking outlets for productive and profitable) within a given territorial system (Harvey, 2010; 2004). The accumulation is based on the surplus money capital that lacks an outlet; however, this money capital needs to seek another outlet so the capital owner can realize the money value. Later, this surplus capital can form the outlet to absorb such surpluses by creating many distributional channels of products to the market (Harvey, 2019).

The capitalist seeks other outlets to realize the value of surplus commodities and make surplus labor absorbed in employment for the capitalist's production importance (Harvey, 2004). In this sense, the capitalist needs to disinvest in a particular area and seek another site to invest the capital fixity by building airports, parks, etc. The capitalist will invest in these regions by building fixed capital to use existing production means (Harvey, 2001).

If reflecting on the recent cultural resource management in a pandemic situation, this might be relevant if we see that the surplus of commodities, with the values embedded in it, whether in the tangible or intangible form, are not being realized to be the surplus values (Harvey, 2019). Here, this surplus of commodities needs to find a new outlet to recognize the importance of commodities into surplus value, so many attempts to find a new outlet for commodities' value. In other words, in the case of cultural resource management and tourism attraction, the value of cultural resources also needs to be realized in the market. Therefore, it seems relevant to assume that there are so many platforms or outlets through embedded innovations responding to the pandemic, such as virtual tours.

In the cultural resources' management context, the cultural products, with existing value created, are already consumed through tourism activities. Yet, they have not found a news outlet. This situation makes the value of the cultural product only appear in the potential form. The market should purchase this potential value. The pandemic led cultural resource management into a so-called crisis since the market has not yet realized the value of the cultural product. The pandemic situation only enables the case in which the market as the cultural product consumer cannot purchase them because of the policy restriction on traveling. The purchasing can only be actual when there is a meeting point between supply and demand.

Regarding this, many pieces of research address the capacity of cultural tourism destinations to adapt to the situation in which fewer purchasing activities are still working within this capital accumulation logic in seeing the pandemic situation (Samaroudi, Echavarria & Perry, 2020; Merritt, 2020 and Rech & Migliorati, 2021). The logic is that the cultural product still needs to be channeled using a more adaptive platform/channel to realize its value. Some argue that this adaptive capacity of management to overcome the situation is called resilience capacity (Adams et al., 2021). Resilience is defined here as "the capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while changing to retain essentially the same function, structure, identity, and feedback" (Walker et al., 2004, p. 6).

The way the proposal of cultural tourism products' adaptive capacity becomes urgent in overcoming the crisis in the cultural attraction sector reflects the economic calculus of cultural tourism product value. Consequently, further reflection on what the deal is in what kind of mode of production emerges. Further, I also came up with a consideration of what the so-called cultural resources mean for us. These critical reflections will then be elaborated on in the different sections of this paper.

### The Production of Culture and Cultural Values

Inglis (1993) essentially describes culture as the system of humanly expressive practices by which values are renewed, created, and contested. To this, value refers to the name given to those "fierce little concentration of meaning" in a particular system of thought that is fixed as good or significant (Williams, 1993). Taking this exploration a bit further, the contemporary industrial and post-industrial world, what is considered good and important is primarily determined through some market calculus that makes the production of "fierce concentrations of meanings" be inserted into the logic of capitalist development, becoming an important site for the generation of not just values, but also surplus values or profit (Mitchell, 2000). Regarding this matter, the production of surplus values through knowledge and culture would be different from producing surplus values of tangible commodities. It requires increasingly satisfied divisions of labor; that is, it requires people and, on a large scale, society to do the work of cultural production.

Guy Debord (1992) elaborates that culture is the overall and general form of knowledge and representations of lived experience. In culture production, the most critical aspect is the power to generalize, existing apart, as an intellectual division of labor and as the intellectual labor of division (Mitchell, 2000). It can be a basis for us to understand further that a better understanding of cultural production can focus on who possesses this power to generalize and stabilize what they called "culture" of their own or the others (Dicks, 2004). In the contemporary social process, the point is that values, meanings, knowledge about good and bad, truth and falsehood, and moral ways of life are embedded in capitalist value production (Fraser, 2014). Hence, culture production represents a system production of meaning as ways of life directly integral to the capitalist system (Harvey, 2019). In other words, the production of culture results in cultural products, for example, punk, arts, and heritage, that are ready to be farmed for profit (Mitchell, 2000). Regarding this, political constellations beyond the production of culture therefore also appear as the product of social production.

Considering the social dimension of culture and the way society elaborates on the idea of culture extends the debates on the ontological aspect of culture by describing that the idea of culture is not what people are doing (Mitchell, 2000). Instead, it is the way people make sense of what they have done. The re-conceptualization starts with the assertion that there is no ontological thing as culture. Still, there is only the powerful idea of culture that has been developed under particular historical conditions and was later broadened as "a means of explaining material differences, social order, and relations of power" (Mitchell, 1996). It is the way their activities are reified as culture. Hence, the abstraction of culture is more in the way the maintenance and domination of power through culture metaphor are being described (Mitchell, 2000).

The idea of culture emerges from regularizing the activities and contradictions within production and consumption systems (Mitchell, 1996). Regarding this, culture appears as the idea from the various schemes of political economy that are represented as culture (Mitchell, 2000). Hence, the idea of culture emerges as something contextual, rooted in specific production systems (Dicks, 2004). The idea of culture functions as a tool to differentiate and judge the other societies, other localizations, and factions of the related society (Castree, 2003). Therefore, the judgments of different localizations and societies are mainly structured within a specific socio-economic system (Mitchell, 2000). By specifically putting particular social interactions and activities into somewhat as cultures, an examination of how the idea of culture is being structured will enable us to see the universalizing and globalizing process of the idea of culture to be the discourse of culture.

Getting back to my earliest thoughts and questions, I would argue that cultural appropriation only appears as the idea of culture, as commodities, as resources, will end within a crisis that might happen. In overcoming this issue, the capitalist mode of production needs to find a new outlet to absorb those surpluses. It is precisely represented by the way the cultural heritage resource management is currently in the middle of a crisis as the surplus commodities are not absorbed appropriately by the market.

However, I would like to recall what Rodney Harrison states in his book entitled *heritage: a critical approach* regarding his idea that there is no such thing as heritage (Harrison, 2010). Mitchell (2000) also adds that even there is no such thing as culture. Instead, it is just different arrays of power that organize society in this way or that. By examining this, Mitchell (2000) suggests that there is only the idea of culture, an idea that has developed under specific historical conditions and was later broadened as a means of explaining material differences, social order, and relations of power. We can see that here, the idea of culture has been developed and deployed in the modern and postmodern world as a means of attempting to order, control, and define others in the name of power and profit (Dicks, 2004). Concerning this, the way we see culture simply as in its material representation as works of arts, heritage, religious beliefs, clothing styles, music, ideologies, literature, popular media, etc., will possibly ignore the way we call culture ongoing hidden discourse (Mitchell, 2000).

However, culture is essentially a modernist concept that carves the unruly world as an object of knowledge (Haraway, 1989). In this sense, the idea of culture itself demands boundaries. Culture must become a bounded object that differentiates the world in order to be analyzable (Mitchell, 2000). Here, if culture is assigned as its ontological status and is "thinkable", it must be coherently and inclusively definable.

As the idea of culture leads to infinite regress (Haraway, 1989), therefore there is no solid ontological basis serving as the foundation for culture. Powerful social actors, however, persist and behave as if there is something called culture. Then, instead of focusing on the ontological aspect of culture, to extend the scientific inquiries of cultural studies, Mitchell (1994) suggests concentrating on how powerful social actors have deployed the idea of culture. As culture is the human appropriation of nature (Smith, 2010), the prolonged exercise of power and domination

through the metaphor of culture is precisely an aspect that constructs the abstraction of culture in the everyday world (Mitchell, 2000).

However, the way knowledge of culture shapes how society is also determining the so-called culture. The production of knowledge, such as culture-related knowledge, is a process in which an unstable list of activities is always contested by some parties seeking to define the world on their terms (Latour, 1987). When one party is more dominant than the others, their claim of knowledge becomes reified, precisely what Gramsci states as "hegemony." Here, knowledge is always contested, but some forms of knowledge inevitably become more powerful than others, and therefore they become hegemony.

At this stage, culture represents "others," which reifies and solidifies as some powerful group gives its objective reality within social relations. It becomes clear that the idea of culture is not what people are doing. Instead, it is the way people make sense of what they have done. It is the way activities are solidified as culture. Here, further reflection appears as our task here is not to determine what culture is but to determine how the idea of culture works in society. To be more precise, the job is to determine how cultural resources work in society.

### Reflecting on The Present's Day Cultural Resource Management

It is widely known that the COVID-19 pandemic has considerably hit the arts and heritage sector. UNESCO (2020) declares that 90 % of museums globally should close their services for visitors for around one week to several months, due to the measures to minimizing the spread of COVID-19, with 10% of them being at permanent risk of closing for good. Overall, 70 – 80 % of income losses occur even when the cultural attractions still operate during the pandemic because of the inter-country travel restrictions and the frequent blocks within state mobility (NEMO, 2020). Considering this sharp decrease in cultural attraction income, it is necessary and worth asking about the future approach to cultural attraction development that mostly depends on the availability of cultural products as resources.

Based on the previous elaboration of culture and how cultural meanings and values are being constructed, we can see that cultural meaning is located and written within the landscapes, streets, buildings, pedestrians, walls, screens, objects, artworks, et cetera. In the cultural tourism development context, with the growing influence of cultural attractions in shaping the characteristics of tourism destinations and tourist experience, cultural tourism employing many forms of cultural resources appears as a specific case of cultural consumption (Lascio et al., 2011). Consequently, this mode of consuming cultural resources also has an immense impact on how cultural assets and activities influence the tourism capital flows and quality through cultural tourism attractions establishment (Herrero-Prieto & Gomez-Vega, 2017). Subsequently, cultural attractions within the tourism development framework also directly influence the local development progress in general (Girard & Nijkamp, 2009).

However, we also find the idea of culture has flourished within specific places, for example, museums. The way museums can represent how societies walk through exhibitions of material artifacts seems relevant. These heritage sites transform an entire historical era (Dicks, 2004). In

this sense, things that are previously seen as ordinary and mundane are exhibited as something exotic and exceptional in the display. It is related to the cultural mosaic which refers to the idea that culture belongs to a place and a people, marking them as unique and distinct (Mitchell, 2000) states as a . It can be discovered, described, documented, and displayed. Within this logic, the way culture is expressed consists of the particular intention of powerful actors related to the economic calculation logic (Dicks, 2004).

Take an example of how heritage can be seen both as an encouragement of a particular identity for the tourist gaze and a provider of a public platform for local memorials (Henderson, 2016). This way of politically initiating and using heritage to meet specific needs will mainly relate to how underlying economic motives appear (Sushartami & Ristiawan, 2018). Regarding this, it seems appropriate to recall the way crises emerge within the management of cultural resources. It is worth asking how the recent capitalist mode of cultural resource production, framed in cultural tourism attraction, tries to hinder the crisis. The capitalist mode of production of cultural resources essentially triggers this event.

Cultural attraction as tourism attraction has often been linked to image branding and marketing of a particular area, encouraging the specific establishment of regional policy (Servillo, et al., 2012; Ristiawan, 2018). Moreover, there is only a limited understanding of the policy framework's political economy factors (Bertacchini & Dalle Nogare, 2021). It seems relevant to see that the social establishment of something as cultural resources also employ power relations and political contestation beyond the institutional framework of that establishment. As every politic is a political economy (Swyngedouw, 2006), every attempt at political negotiation, power delegations, and exercise will end in capital accumulation importance.

Based on the capital accumulation logic in producing the culture, I pick an essential elaboration of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. They declare that culture is not entirely reducible to the circulation of capital or commodities. Still, it cannot be separated from it precisely because it is through "production" that the idea of culture circulates (Adorno & Horkheimer, 2020). Therefore, culture appears as a part of a sophisticated integrated system of social reproduction (Dicks, 2004). In the current cultural resource management context, the industry-based importance mainly induces social reproduction as deemed to profit from dissimilarity maintenance within people and society (Mitchell, 2000). Regarding this, the process of profit-making from the perceived dissimilarity terminates the culture's infinite regress.

Due to the impact of COVID-19 on everyday lives that continuously transforms people's activities, digital media consumption increases dramatically since people immensely change their work, social, and educational activities into online-based platforms to meet the requirements of social distancing to manage the pandemic. As a result, different flows and forms of leisure activities continuously change with the more and more creative invention of the cultural tourism industry to channel cultural products into the market. However, during the pandemic, as the cultural resources product cannot be absorbed optimally by the market, the state of income loss and

bankruptcy happening in many cultural tourism attractions globally represents the state of crisis within cultural resource management.

The so-called crisis offers more space to reflect on how we produce and are produced by cultural production and reproduction within society. The reflection can start by rethinking the role of cultural industries in controlling the meaning of what is being (or can be) represented by working rigidly to organize audiences and manage the diverse everyday and some spectacular acts. Here, the contradiction appears. As there are contested meaning-making processes based on the way ideas of culture are constantly undergoing production and reproduction processes, the possibilities of revolt must be minimized (Mitchell, 2000). Consequently, there is a need to consider marginalized social actors, and their discourse of cultural resources, as the threat to the dominant power. Later, the categorization of particular social actors as the threat to dominant force will engender the struggle of justice and rights of culture within social reproduction in a capitalistic society, in the form of cultural struggles, rebellion, et cetera. To be more contextual in the cultural resource's management, displaying a particular culture based on the dominant power interest will marginalize the so-called subversive form of culture. We can see the actual example in the way contested discourse is happening within certain museums, monuments, et cetera (Sushartami & Ristiawan, 2018; Henderson, 2010; Prameswari et al., 2021).

The struggle for justice is related to what is virtuous, what is right, and for whom, within the space of cultural and social production (Mitchell, 2000). In this sense, the struggle for justice is about how and in what spaces representation of justice can be possible. However, the struggle for justice representation/being represented in specific cultural reproduction spaces is the struggle to be acknowledged by the capitalist space (Fraser, 2014). Capitalism as an institutionalized social order (Fraser, 2014) also comprises broader struggles over socio-cultural productions, making it possible for struggles over justice and rights as a locus of further capital accumulation within capitalist society. Social reproduction, in which struggles over justice are also situated, is an indispensable background condition for the possibility of capitalist production (Harvey, 2004). As a result, these struggles over justice tend to overlook the fact that "their favorite practices are not only sources of critique but also integral parts of the capitalist order" (Fraser, 2014: 70).

The prestige game is won by the country that best tells what it does, independently of what it does, indicating the extent to which display powers have become central to the global competition among places and corporations for economic success (Eco, 1986). The country achieves success by getting visitors to queue up, marvel at what they see, and get this reported to attract further visitors (Mitchell, 2000).

Take an example of overcoming the situation of crisis in cultural resource management in Yogyakarta. A massive slot of the funded project covered by *Dana Keistimewaan* (Special Funding) has been allocated to support the art and culture production in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. This state-supported fund seeks to support the cultural development labeled as having *Otonomi Khusus* (Special Autonomy) in governing the region's growth. The Special Region of Yogyakarta has its special autonomy status based on UUK DIY No. 13/2012, considering the



historical aspect of Yogyakarta as a Kingdom existing before the Independence of Indonesia in 1945.

In 2021, the government of The Special Region of Yogyakarta received 1.32 Trillion-rupiah fund allocation. More than half of it will be allocated for the cultural sector. However, as the pandemic hit the industry in 2020 – 2021, many cultural programs were postponed, resulting in fewer funds being absorbed for the cultural sector in Yogyakarta. The main aims of using the fund in the cultural sector are mostly related to the development of the art, mainly to support the image of Yogyakarta as a Cultural Destination for tourism development purposes (Sakir & Mutiarin, 2015). Hence, in this sense, culture is interpreted by the responsible institution as something ceremonial, not as something related to the idea or state of mind of Yogyakarta residents.

Reflecting on this, the way cultural products are being produced within the "cultural development program" funded by *Dana Keistimewaan* will end in mostly the monetary calculus logic of tourist visitation, experience, and promotion. If we envision this relationally, the image development of Yogyakarta as a cultural tourism destination will engender the development of the tourism industry through its service sector development, for example, accommodation, transportation, and supporting amenities. However, as the so-called cultural products themselves, with many transformed as cultural commodities, are not being absorbed by the market, a crisis within cultural industries appears. To take this a step further, I reflect on what kind of developed cultures that the funding supports. For whose importance? Who is going to get benefits from all the cultural development in the framework of tourism development?

It is widely known that access to resources is the key for every actor to receive benefits from every kind of state-led development program (Scott, 1998; Katz, 1998). The main essential aims of cultural resource development are to promote the unique value within the cultural product that subsequently will be consumed by the market. Hence, to engender this unique value, there is a need to market its uniqueness by promoting tourism that, in the end, will determine some practices of infrastructure development and the resurrection and invention of local traditional cultural and environmental values (Harvey, 2001). This promotional effort will subsequently impact how other actors involved in this cultural commodification (i.e., the market, local community, government sectors, etc.) claim the cultural resources based on their particular interests and needs using a different mode of claim-making practices (Ristiawan, 2018). These claim-making practices also comprise various institutional collaborations to achieve their institutional goals towards the resources (Benegiamo, 2020).

### Alternative Approach?

Here, I recall what Castree (1995) elaborates regarding the way science appears as an inseparable field from social production. Science and theory, in this sense, are the culture itself, based on the way it constitutes concepts of objects (Castree, 2003). In other words, science is not the objects but rather the constitution of concepts of the objects itself. In this sense, I would borrow the terminology of "cerning" and "discerning" the knowledge from Neil Smith (2010). "Cerning" refers to the way we make a boundary, acknowledgment, and border. On the contrary,

discerning is related to the openness of the border or the boundaries itself (Castree, 2003). The notion of "discernment" (as Smith suggests) only makes sense as the necessary twin of "cernment." As Castree (1995: 28) suggests:

"The condition of possibility of discerning the subject is that theory routinely and necessarily cerns the subject and fixes it precisely under its particular cognitive lenses. To discern the subject, therefore, is not to abandon a substantive account of the subject, but to become self-conscious about theoretical cernment and to explore and take responsibility for its consequences."

Here, the most critical aspect of this approach is the reflexivity in each mode of theoretical construction within every knowledge production process in academics' debate. Employing this approach to determine the knowledge regarding our assumption on resources and how we articulate it within the broader scope of social production can be a critical aspect in acknowledging our positionality. We, as academics, will also contribute to the proliferation of knowledge, discourse, and the power in which potentially dominates and subordinates the others. Here, I would like to recall the critical reflection based on James Scott's (1998) work in his book, *Seeing Like a State*, which elaborates the failure of the so-called improvement based on how superiority appears even within the discourse of science and knowledge production. This elaboration is assumed to expand the scope of knowledge and sciences. It will be more participative and emancipative towards social production and, in this case, cultural resource management.

To make this reflection a bit further, we finally end up in how those science and knowledge developments within the social production undergo rhythmic processes contextually in a particular space. Here, space is seen concerning material events and social and natural functions (Massey, 2005). In other words, cultural space is a space where the social production of nature that undergoes a dialectic process should be seen more relationally. To understand the space of cultural resources production, we can rely on what we call resource itself and how social production and material events in their relations construct what we assume as resources. The absolute space is not entirely conquered or vanquished, but rather it is rendered relational (Mitchell, 2000).

It is not the relationship between human beings and the land that governs their social organization, but ultimately their relations with each other in the course of production (Cosgrove, 1998: 180) explains that. The production of nature suggests the political question: how do we want to produce nature (and culture), and how will these decisions be made? Reflecting on the way crises appear in cultural resource management, I suggest that it is doubtful that cultural resources have an essential effect on socio-economic development as the cultural resources availability and scarcity themselves are socially constructed.

## Conclusions

### Towards Participative and Emancipative Cultural Resources Production

I would like to propose a more participative and emancipative approach to cultural resources management. Reflecting on it, I presume that the crisis complexity could open more space for discussion based on our cooperation in remembering how we produce knowledge and science in the academic environment. It might induce the prolonged processes of marginalization and subordination within the scope of cultural resource management. Regarding this, academic projects framed in cultural resources management can also extend the inquiries into considering how the idea of culture functions in society. It can be started by questioning who reifies it. In whose interest the idea of culture is being deployed? What relations of power are maintained by invoking this idea? How does the idea of culture become operationalized and made real through the ability of powerful social actors to halt its infinite regress externally? Indeed, there would also be endless discussion regarding the improvement of the approach. Still, I assume it can contribute to the participative process in extending cultural resources management improvement. By examining this, the way we construct the idea of culture would address some stake points.

I assume perceiving cultural resources as something embedded in our everyday life, instead of “spectacularization” through many platforms, would accommodate and expand the way we function with culture as something more than commodities. Subsequently, it will also co-productively transform the way we engage with cultural resources as something more important than commodities, as something we live in and for. Lastly, as a reflection of our positionality as academics, sometimes we are trapped within the room of superiority where we can be the domain of power in producing knowledge regarding cultural resources. In this context, the transition proposal from privatized expert technocratic to standard democratic engagement refers to the way the opportunities for shared understanding, production, and most importantly, the learning process can be opened in a broader sense. Finally, in critically reflecting on how I elaborate my perspective on cultural resources management and as an academic working in the cultural studies field-related research, I propose the idea I delivered as a part of the co-learning process for the future learning process.

## References

- Adams, K. M., Choe, J., Mostafanezhad, M., & Phi, G. T. (2021). (Post-) pandemic tourism resiliency: Southeast Asian lives and livelihoods in limbo. *Tourism Geographies*, 1-22.
- Adorno, T.W. & Horkheimer, M.(2020). The culture industry: Enlightenment as mass deception. In *Dialectic of enlightenment* (pp. 94-136). Stanford University Press.
- Bec, A., McLennan, C., & Moyle, B. D. (2015). Community resilience to long-term tourism decline and rejuvenation: A literature review and conceptual model. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(5), 431–457.
- Bertacchini, E., & Dalle Nogare, C. (2021). The economics of cultural tourism: New topics and methods. *Tourism Economics*, 1354816621993662.

- Brouder, P. (2020). Reset redux: Possible evolutionary pathways towards the transformation of tourism in a COVID-19 world. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 1–7.
- Castree, N. (1995). The nature of produced nature: materiality and knowledge construction in Marxism. *Antipode*, 27, 12-12.
- Castree, N. (2003). Commodifying what nature?. *Progress in human geography*, 27(3), 273-297.
- Cosgrove, D. (1993). *The Palladian landscape: geographical change and its cultural representations in sixteenth-century Italy*. Penn State Press.
- Cosgrove, D. E. (1983). Towards a radical cultural geography: problems of theory. *Antipode*, 15(1), 1-11.
- Cosgrove, D. E. (1998). *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. Univ of Wisconsin Press.
- Debord, G. (1992). *Society of the spectacle and other films*. London: Rebel Press.
- Dicks, B. (2004). *Culture on display: The production of contemporary visitability*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Di Lascio FM, Giannerini S, Scorcu AE, et al. (2011) Cultural tourism and temporary art exhibitions in Italy: A panel data analysis. *Statistical Methods & Applications*, 20(4): 519–542.
- Galvani, A., Lew, A., & Perez, M. (2020). COVID-19 is expanding global consciousness and the sustainability of travel and tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 1–10.
- Girard LF and Nijkamp P (eds) (2009). *Cultural Tourism and Sustainable Local Development*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of capital: Towards a critical geography*. Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (2004). The 'new' imperialism: accumulation by dispossession. *Socialist Register*, 40, 63–87.
- Harvey, D. (2010). *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. London: Profile.
- Harvey, D. (2019). *Marx, capital, and the madness of economic reason*. Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2020). Value in motion. *New left review* (126), 99-116.
- Henderson, J. C. (2016). Remembering Lee Kuan Yew: Politics, heritage and political heritage in Singapore. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 22(1), pp. 59-69.
- Herrero-Prieto LC and Gomez-Vega M (2017) Cultural resources as a factor in cultural tourism attraction: Technical efficiency estimation of regional destinations in Spain. *Tourism Economics*, 23(2): 260–280.
- Ioannides, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2020). The COVID-19 crisis as an opportunity for escaping the unsustainable global tourism path. *Tourism Geographies*, 22, 1–9.
- Inglis, F. (1993). *Cultural studies*. Wiley.
- Katz, C. (1998). Whose nature, whose culture?. In Braun, B. and Castree, N. (Eds.). *Remaking reality*. London: Routledge, 46–63.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. Sage.

- Masten, A. S., & Obradovic, J. (2006). Competence and resilience in development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1094(1), 13–27.
- McKercher B (2002) Towards a classification of cultural tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(1): 29–38.
- Merritt, E. (2020). *Using Scenarios to Plan Your Museum's COVID-19 (Coronavirus) Response*. Accessed July 29, 2020. <https://www.aam-us.org/2020/03/13/using-scenarios-to-plan-your-museums-covid-19-coronavirus-response>
- Mitchell, D. (1996). *The lie of the land: Migrant workers and the California landscape*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Mitchell, D. (2000). *Cultural geography: A critical introduction* (No. 306 M681c). Blackwell.
- Mitchell, D. (2008). New axioms for reading the landscape: paying attention to political economy and social justice. In *Political economies of landscape change* (pp. 29-50). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Moreda, T. (2015). Listening to their silence? The political reaction of affected communities to large-scale land acquisitions: insights from Ethiopia. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3-4), 517-539.
- Neuts B and Nijkamp P (2012) Tourist crowding perception and acceptability in cities: An applied modelling study on Bruges. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39, 2133–2153.
- Network for European Museums Organization (NEMO) (2020) Survey on the Impact of the COVID-19 Situation on Museums in Europe. Available at: [https://www.nemo.org/fileadmin/Dateien/public/NEMO\\_documents/NEMO\\_COVID19\\_Report\\_12.05.2020.pdf](https://www.nemo.org/fileadmin/Dateien/public/NEMO_documents/NEMO_COVID19_Report_12.05.2020.pdf) (accessed 15 November 2020).
- Ntounis, N., Parker, C., Skinner, H., Steadman, C., & Warnaby, G. (2021). Tourism and Hospitality industry resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from England. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-14.
- Prameswari, V. M., Sushartami, W., & Ristiawan, R. R. (2021). Perceived authenticity of the Pancasila Sakti Museum by high school students. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, 8(3), 254-275.
- Prayag, G. (2020). Time for reset? COVID-19 and tourism resilience. *Tourism Review International*, 24(2-3), 179-184.
- Rahmato, D. (2009). *The Peasant and the state: Studies in agrarian change in Ethiopia 1950s-2000s*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Rahmato, D. (2011). *Land to investors: Large-scale land transfers in Ethiopia*. FSS Policy Debates Series No. 1. Addis Ababa: Forum for Social Studies.
- Ristiawan, R. R. (2018). Culture as Tourism Attraction: Commodification and Politicization of Culture in Kembangarum Tourism Village, Yogyakarta Special Region, Indonesia. *Gadjah Mada Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1(1), 12-22.
- Romagosa, F. (2020). The COVID-19 crisis: Opportunities for sustainable and proximity tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 22, 1–5.

- Rech, G., & Migliorati, L. (2021). Social Representations about Cultural Tourism in the Time of COVID-19: A Case Study of Langhe, Monferrato and Roero (Italy). *Sustainability*, 13(11), 6301.
- Samaroudi M, Echavarria KR and Perry L. (2020). Heritage in lockdown: Digital provision of memory institutions in the UK and US of America during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 35(4): 337–361.
- Scott, J.C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Servillo L, Atkinson R and Russo AP. (2012). Territorial attractiveness in EU urban and spatial policy: A critical review and future research agenda. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 19(4): 349–365.
- Smith, N. (1983). *Uneven development: the production of nature under capitalism* (Doctoral dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University).
- Smith, N. (2010). *Uneven development: Nature, capital, and the production of space*. University of Georgia Press.
- Sushartami, W., & Ristiawan, R. R. (2018). The Well of Truth: Managing Authenticity in the Pancasila Sakti Monument. *Asian Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(1), 188-208.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2005). Governance innovation and the citizen: The Janus face of governance-beyond-the-state. *Urban studies*, 42(11), 1991-2006.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Museums Around the World in the Face of COVID-19*. Accessed July 29, 2020. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373530/PDF/373530eng.pdf.multi>
- Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 5.
- Williams, R. (1995). *The sociology of culture*. University of Chicago Press.