

Cultural Heritage, Tourism, and Ethical Management

**Balancing Tourism Development with Cultural
Preservation and Community Welfare**

Student Name: Sameer Thapa

Student ID: PBT26008

Submission Date: 24th May 2026

Table of Contents

Abstract

Introduction

Literature Review

Methodology

Findings

Discussion

Conclusion

References

Appendices

Abstract

This report looks at the complicated relationship between keeping cultural heritage safe and developing tourism, trying to understand how places can get the benefits of tourism money while still protecting cultural sites and making sure local people have a say in how things are managed. I've looked at real places like Angkor Wat in Cambodia, Venice in Italy, and Machu Picchu in Peru to see what happens when too many tourists visit. The research shows that problems like overcrowding, turning culture into something just to sell, and leaving local people out of decisions are pretty common issues everywhere.

Looking at what's already been written and studying different examples, I've found that if we do tourism responsibly and have strong ways of running things, plus actually involve communities, then tourism can help both save culture and help people's economies. The main finding of this report is that heritage sites can't be run the same way as normal tourist attractions – they need a different approach that puts what local communities want first, followed by how to keep the place working sustainably, instead of just trying to get as many tourists as possible. The recommendations include things like controlling how many people visit, making sure local communities get a fair share of the money, giving them more say in how the heritage is explained to visitors, and sometimes just saying no to more tourism development if it would damage the place too much.

Introduction

Over the last twenty or so years, tourism has exploded globally. Before COVID happened, something like 1.4 billion people were travelling internationally every year. What's interesting is that cultural and heritage tourism has become a massive part of that – accounts reckon it's around 40 percent of all international travel. Sounds good on the surface, right? More money, more development, more people getting to experience history. But there's a real problem underneath all this that doesn't get talked about enough – the pressure these heritage sites are facing is actually quite serious.

When you think about it, heritage sites were never designed to handle millions of visitors. A temple that was built five hundred years ago for spiritual purposes suddenly has to deal with thousands of people walking through it every day. Ancient pathways that are slowly crumbling anyway get worn down even faster. Local communities that lived peacefully with their heritage suddenly find their home is basically a theme park. And the money from tourism? Often it doesn't actually go to the people living there.

There's also something deeper that bothers me about how heritage gets treated in tourism. Culture and traditions become products. They get packaged up and simplified so tourists can easily consume them. Instead of being meaningful parts of living communities, they

become performances put on for outsiders. That seems wrong somehow – like taking something that matters deeply to people and turning it into merchandise.

This report tries to work through these issues. I've looked at some specific heritage sites – Venice, Angkor Wat, Machu Picchu – to see what's actually happening when tourism takes over. I've thought about the ethical stuff too, like who benefits from heritage tourism and who pays the costs. And I've tried to figure out if there are better ways of doing this that don't just benefit tourism companies and governments, but actually help the communities and cultures involved.

Literature Review

Heritage Tourism and Destination Development

There's loads of research showing that cultural heritage is really important for tourism and making money. UNESCO World Heritage Sites – and there are over 1,200 of them now – pull in millions of visitors every year and bring in serious amounts of revenue for local areas. McKercher and du Cros (2002) have done work showing that heritage tourism creates jobs and helps develop infrastructure, and it kind of multiplies economically – one job creates opportunities for other jobs. For developing countries especially, heritage tourism seems like one of the few realistic ways to make money and reduce poverty.

But here's the thing – it's not that simple. Heritage sites didn't exist to be tourist attractions. They existed for their own reasons, usually religious or cultural ones. When you turn them into tourism products, you have to change them. You simplify them so tourists understand them. You schedule them so they fit tourism timetables. You market them in ways that appeal to tourists. And all of that changes what the heritage actually means. Instead of being a living tradition that people practice because it matters to them, it becomes a museum display that people pay to see. That's a pretty fundamental change.

Carrying Capacity and Site Degradation

One concept that comes up a lot is 'carrying capacity' – basically, how many people can visit before things start falling apart. Not just the buildings, but everything really – the environment, the local community, the meaning of the place. Most heritage sites have a carrying capacity, and honestly, quite a lot of them are way over it already.

Venice is probably the most obvious example. It gets about 30 million visitors a year, but the permanent population is only 250,000. That means tourists massively outnumber residents. And it's destroying the city. The stone on historic buildings wears away faster. The water systems get polluted from all the boats. And real Venetians are just leaving because they can't deal with it anymore. Property gets taken over by tourism businesses

and investors, so local people can't afford to live there anymore.

Angkor Wat in Cambodia gets over 2 million visitors a year, and research suggests it should really only handle maybe 5,000-7,000 per day, but it often gets 15,000-20,000. The sandstone is getting worn down from people touching it constantly. The forests around it are disappearing. Buckley (2011) argues that when sites get too busy, you don't just get physical damage – the communities start to resent their own heritage because they see it as something tourists own, not something that's theirs anymore.

The problem is that especially in places like Cambodia, governments are desperate for tourism money because they don't have other income sources. So even though they know the sites are being damaged, there's massive pressure to keep letting more and more people in.

Cultural Commodification and Community Marginalisation

What really gets to me about tourism is how it turns culture into just another product to buy and sell. And this is where it gets ethically messy. Cole and Morgan (2010) studied this and found that when culture becomes a tourism commodity, it gets simplified and standardised. Complex rituals that have deep meaning get turned into 20-minute performances. Traditional crafts that took years to learn become souvenirs knocked out quickly for profit.

This is particularly hard on Indigenous communities and minority cultures. Say a Cambodian ceremony that has spiritual significance and is performed at specific times for specific reasons – when it becomes a tourism performance, it gets changed. It happens when tourists want to see it, not when it's traditionally supposed to happen. It gets shortened. It gets modified to be more entertaining. And the young people in the community see this 'tourism version' and think that's what the tradition is, so they stop learning the real thing. The tradition basically dies, even though tourists are paying money to see it.

And here's another unfair part – usually the money doesn't actually reach the communities doing the performing. It goes to tourism companies, international hotels, and the government. Scheyvens (2002) calls this 'unequal exchange' – local people provide the culture and bear the costs of having tourists around, but external companies make most of the money. That seems fundamentally unjust.

Community Participation in Heritage Management

UNESCO says that local communities should participate in heritage management. That's the official policy. But in practice? Not really. Agrawal and Gupta (2005) found that what usually happens is 'performative participation' – it looks like communities have a say, but

actually all the real decisions are still made by governments and international organisations and tourism operators.

Real participation would mean communities actually have power over decisions, get a fair share of money, and their values are respected in how heritage is explained. But that often clashes with what tourism operators want. Tourism operators want maximum visitors and maximum revenue. Communities want to preserve their culture and maybe limit how many outsiders get to see it. These things don't usually go together, and when they clash, tourism typically wins because it has more money and political power behind it.

Methodology

I've approached this project by looking at what other researchers have written and studying specific examples in depth. It's a qualitative approach – I'm not trying to get statistics or numerical data, but instead trying to understand what's actually happening and why.

The case studies I picked are different from each other in ways that matter. Venice is a historic city centre that's basically drowning in tourism. Angkor Wat is an archaeological complex that's economically vital for Cambodia but falling apart from overuse. Machu Picchu is an Indigenous heritage site where there are tensions between tourism development and the rights of the Quechua people to their own cultural site. This diversity means I can compare how different places handle similar problems.

I've looked at published research about whether specific management approaches actually work – things like visitor booking systems or community benefit-sharing programmes. But I've also been critical about what "work" means. Some approaches might reduce visitor numbers but harm local economies. Others might fund conservation but displace communities. So I've tried to think about not just whether something technically works, but whether it's actually good for heritage preservation and communities.

I think it's important to be honest about this – heritage management isn't just a technical problem. It involves questions about values, about what we think heritage actually is, about who should benefit from heritage tourism, and what kind of society we want. So the analysis I've done tries to engage with those value questions, not just treat this as a neutral technical issue.

Findings

Case Study One: Venice, Italy

Venice is probably the most extreme example of what tourism can do to a heritage site. The city is a UNESCO World Heritage Site and one of Europe's most famous destinations. About 30 million people visit every year, but only 250,000 people actually live there. That's kind of insane when you think about it.

And it's showing. The medieval buildings are deteriorating faster than they can be repaired. The weight of constant foot traffic and boat traffic damages foundations that are literally 400 years old. Water pollution from all the boats has contaminated the lagoon and is breaking down the wooden foundations that the whole city is built on. The sewage systems can't handle the numbers. Flooding happens more and more often, destroying buildings and artworks.

But the physical damage is honestly maybe the least of it. The real disaster is what's happened to Venetian life. The local population has dropped from 175,000 in 1951 to 250,000 now. People are leaving. Real estate prices have gone crazy because property investors and tourism companies have bought everything up. Local residents can't afford to buy property or rent apartments anymore. So the young Venetians leave. The Venetian language is disappearing – in tourist areas, everyone speaks English. Venetian restaurants are closing, replaced by tourist trap restaurants that serve mediocre food at crazy prices. It's not Venice anymore – it's Venice the theme park.

I think what's particularly telling is that Venice introduced a ticket charge to visit the city centre in 2023, trying to limit visitor numbers. The fact that they had to do that shows how completely out of control it had gotten. But by that point, the damage to local life was already done. You can charge tourists money, but you can't easily rebuild a community that's been displaced.

Case Study Two: Angkor Wat, Cambodia

Angkor Wat is massive – literally the largest religious building in the world. It's incredibly important to Cambodia, both culturally and for the economy. Cambodia is poor and doesn't have that many ways to make money, so the tourism revenue from Angkor Wat is kind of desperately needed.

But the site is being hammered. It gets over 2 million visitors a year, sometimes 15,000-20,000 a day during peak season. The capacity is probably more like 5,000-7,000 a day. The sandstone temples are getting eroded just from people walking over them, touching them, climbing on them. Some areas are being damaged by visitor trampling faster than archaeologists can study them. The surrounding forest is being cleared for

hotels and roads. Water quality is deteriorating.

What's tricky about Angkor Wat is that it's not just a heritage site – it's an economic resource that Cambodia really needs. The government can't just shut down tourism. So they're stuck between needing the money and knowing the site is being damaged by the tourism that brings the money. It's a genuinely difficult situation.

That said, there have been some positive developments. Cambodia has been investing in conservation – they've built a specialist conservation facility and trained Cambodian archaeologists rather than relying on international experts. That's actually important because it means Cambodian perspectives are being incorporated into how the site is managed and studied. Some tourism companies have started implementing more sustainable practices, like limiting group sizes or preventing access to particularly fragile areas.

But fundamentally, the volume of tourism is just too high. The site would need to handle maybe one-third of the visitors it currently gets to actually be properly conserved.

Case Study Three: Machu Picchu, Peru

Machu Picchu is this incredibly stunning Incan site high in the mountains. About 1 million people visit every year, but it can probably only sustainably handle 2,500-3,000 people a day. You can imagine what that kind of overcrowding does.

The mountain paths that the Incas built 500 years ago are being worn down. Archaeological features are getting damaged from constant touching and walking over them. The water systems that the Incas designed are struggling to cope with modern visitor demand. The mountain ecosystem is being stressed.

But what I found really interesting – and maybe more important – is the cultural dimension. Machu Picchu was built as a royal estate and had spiritual significance in Incan cosmology and in how the Quechua people understand their landscape and history. But the way it's presented to tourists, it's basically a mystery to be solved. "How did they build it?" "What was it for?" The Quechua perspective on what the site means is kind of sidelined. The tourism industry controls the narrative, and the narrative is basically whatever makes tourists feel like they're on an adventure.

Peru has tried some management strategies that are actually pretty interesting. They introduced a reservation system that limits daily visitors and controls when people arrive. They've been training local people as guides, which means they can incorporate local knowledge and perspective. There's been some effort to support Quechua language and cultural practices connected to the broader landscape, so it's not just tourism

commodification but actually living heritage.

Still, the fundamental problem remains. The site gets way too many visitors. And whilst Peru is doing better than Venice or Angkor Wat at incorporating indigenous perspectives, it's still primarily controlled by government and tourism operators, not by the Quechua communities themselves.

Discussion

The Fundamental Tension

Looking at these three places, I think there's actually a fundamental problem that management techniques alone can't fix. Heritage sites weren't built for tourism. They were built for other reasons – religious reasons, residential reasons, ceremonial reasons. When you turn them into tourism commodities, you're fundamentally changing what they are.

Tourism's logic is that heritage is something that can be packaged up, sold to paying customers, and consumed. But heritage's actual logic – at least for the communities that created it – is that it's meaningful, that it connects them to their past, that it's part of their identity and culture. These two things don't naturally fit together. You can try to manage the conflict, but it's still there underneath.

What I've seen in these cases is that governments and tourism operators have financial incentives to maximise visitor numbers and spending. They make more money the more tourists come. Communities and conservation have no equivalent financial incentive – there's no money in limiting visitors or preserving cultural meaning. So when it comes to actual decisions, tourism typically wins. That seems unfair, but it's just how the incentive structures work out.

Another thing I noticed is that even when sites are being physically conserved well – buildings are being repaired, structures are being stabilised – the heritage is kind of dying anyway. Not in a physical sense, but culturally. Venice's buildings are still standing, but Venice as a living community is being destroyed. The authentic Venetian culture is being replaced by tourism culture. That's still heritage loss, even if it's not physical loss.

Physical Conservation versus Cultural Preservation

I think it's important to distinguish between two different things that often get mixed up – physical conservation and cultural preservation. Physical conservation is keeping buildings from falling down, preventing erosion, preventing further deterioration. That's important and valuable. But cultural preservation is different. It's keeping heritage meaningful within the communities that created it, maintaining knowledge systems,

keeping traditions alive, maintaining the connection between people and their heritage.

Looking at the three cases, I see significant investment in physical conservation. Venice spends money on structural repairs. Angkor Wat has a major conservation programme. Machu Picchu is being carefully maintained. But in all three cases, cultural preservation is struggling. The communities' relationships with their own heritage are being eroded by tourism.

This matters because a heritage site that's physically perfect but culturally dead has arguably failed as heritage preservation. Heritage is not primarily about preserving old buildings. It's about maintaining connections to the past that matter to communities. If you save the buildings but kill the culture, that's not really a win.

This raises a pretty uncomfortable question about heritage management priorities. If the real goal is heritage preservation, then sites need to be managed in ways that maintain cultural meaning, even if that means limiting tourism revenue. But if the real priority is actually tourism revenue maximisation, then maybe heritage sites shouldn't be presented as primarily preservation projects. Maybe they should be honestly marketed as heritage-themed tourist attractions with conservation components. That would at least be honest about what's actually happening.

Key Ethical Issues

When I think about what's ethically wrong with how heritage is currently managed, several things stand out. First, the benefit distribution is really unfair. Communities host heritage sites and experience environmental damage, cultural disruption, and social change from tourism. But they don't get much of the money. The money goes to international hotel chains, tour operators, and government bodies. Local communities might get jobs, but they don't get an equitable share of profits. That's unjust.

Second is the question of who gets to decide what heritage means and how it's presented. Usually it's tourism operators and governments, not the communities that produced the heritage. So heritage gets interpreted through a commercial lens rather than through the perspective of the people it's actually important to. Indigenous perspectives, local knowledge, authentic meanings – these get replaced with simplified narratives designed to sell heritage as a tourism product. That's a form of cultural domination.

Third is the question of consent and participation. Communities don't usually consent to having their heritage turned into a tourism commodity. They don't participate meaningfully in decisions about how tourism is managed. These decisions get made by external organisations, and communities are kind of positioned as background scenery rather than as the people whose heritage it is.

Fourth is environmental stuff. Heritage tourism drives deforestation, water pollution, soil degradation, carbon emissions from transport – the environmental impacts extend way beyond heritage sites themselves. So tourism-funded conservation of heritage sites sometimes comes at the cost of broader environmental damage. Is that a net gain? It's not clear.

Moving Towards Better Approaches

The cases do show some possibilities for doing this better. Machu Picchu's visitor reservation system works – it reduces crowding and allows for better management. Training local guides so that heritage interpretation includes community perspectives is genuinely important. Investing in Cambodian conservation professionals rather than just bringing in foreigners means local knowledge and values get included. Venice's discussion about resident welfare shows awareness of the problem, even if it came too late.

So better heritage management probably needs several things. First, it has to recognise that heritage sites are embedded in real communities and have meaning within those communities. They're not abstract monuments. Second, it has to actually prioritise community welfare and cultural preservation over tourism revenue maximisation. That probably means accepting lower tourism revenue than sites currently generate.

Third, communities need genuine participation in management decisions – not just being asked their opinion but actually having power over decisions. And fourth, tourism benefits need to be distributed equitably. Communities that host heritage sites should get a significant share of tourism revenue, and that revenue should be used for community priorities, not just for tourism infrastructure.

Would this be less profitable? Probably. Heritage sites might earn less money if they limit visitor numbers and prioritise community welfare over tourism growth. But that money would be coming from somewhere – heritage sites are making loads of money currently because they're being operated at unsustainable levels that are damaging heritage. Accepting lower but more sustainable revenue might be necessary to actually preserve heritage long-term.

It's also worth noting that this isn't really a choice between heritage preservation and tourism revenue. It's a choice between heritage preservation and maximum tourism revenue. There can still be tourism, still be revenue, still be development – but at levels that don't destroy the thing that makes heritage sites valuable in the first place.

Conclusion

So I've spent this whole report trying to work through how heritage sites can manage tourism without destroying themselves. And what I've found is genuinely complicated, and honestly a bit depressing.

The core issue is that tourism's logic and heritage's logic are in conflict. Tourism wants to grow, maximise visitors, and maximise revenue. Heritage wants to maintain meaning, preserve culture, and sustain communities. These aren't easily compatible. You can manage the conflict to some extent – visitor controls, interpretive practices, community consultation – but you can't eliminate the fundamental tension.

The three places I examined – Venice, Angkor Wat, Machu Picchu – show what happens when tourism growth is prioritised over heritage preservation. Sites survive physically, maybe even look well-maintained, but culturally they're degrading. Communities are displaced. Traditions are commercialised and simplified. Authentic meanings are replaced by tourism narratives.

So what would better management look like? It would mean heritage sites being managed primarily to preserve heritage, not to maximise tourism. It would mean limiting visitor numbers even if that meant lower revenue. It would mean ensuring communities actually benefit from tourism and actually have power over how heritage is managed. It would mean respecting community values in how heritage is interpreted and presented.

Would this work? Maybe. Would it be profitable? Probably not as profitable as current approaches. But current approaches are destroying heritage, even if they're making money in the short term. Long-term, if we want heritage to actually be preserved – not just physically, but culturally and meaningfully – we probably need to accept lower tourism revenues and genuine constraints on visitor numbers.

The uncomfortable truth is that heritage preservation and tourism maximisation are often incompatible. Destinations have to choose which one matters more. And honestly, if heritage preservation doesn't matter more, then maybe heritage sites shouldn't be presented as preservation projects at all. Maybe they should just be marketed as themed attractions, and we should stop pretending that mass tourism is compatible with authentic heritage preservation. At least that would be honest.

References

- Agrawal, A., & Gupta, K. (2005). Decentralisation and participation: The governance of common pool resources in Nepal's Terai. *World Development*, 33(7), 1101-1114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2005.04.009>
- Buckley, R. (2011). Tourism and environment. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 36, 397-416. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-041210-132637>
- Cole, S., & Morgan, N. (Eds.). (2010). *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects*. CABI Publishing. <https://www.cabi.org/search/?q=tourism+inequality>
- McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2002). *Cultural tourism: The partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*. Haworth Hospitality Press. <https://www.routledge.com/Cultural-Tourism/McKercher-du-Cros/p/book/9781560221524>
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for development: Empowering communities*. Pearson Education. <https://www.pearson.com/en-gb>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>
- Venice Municipality. (2023). *Visitor management policy for Venice historical centre*. Municipal Policy Document. <https://www.comune.venezia.it>

Appendices

Appendix A: Case Study Comparison Matrix

Characteristic	Venice, Italy	Angkor Wat, Cambodia	Machu Picchu, Peru
Heritage Type	Historic City Centre	Archaeological Complex	Archaeological Site
Annual Visitors	30 million	2+ million	1+ million
Capacity vs Reality	10,000-15,000/day vs 80,000+/day	5,000-7,000/day vs 15,000-20,000/day	2,500-3,000/day vs 3,000+/day
Primary Challenge	Resident displacement, cultural loss	Physical degradation, limited community control	Indigenous rights, community participation

Appendix B: Key Concepts and Definitions

Carrying Capacity: The maximum number of visitors a heritage site can sustain without experiencing unacceptable environmental, physical, or social damage. Sites regularly exceed this.

Cultural Commodification: The process of transforming cultural practices and traditions into commodities to be bought and sold, typically resulting in simplification, standardisation, and loss of authentic meaning.

Over-Tourism: Tourism at levels exceeding destination carrying capacity, resulting in physical degradation of sites, environmental damage, community stress, and loss of authenticity.

Community Participation: Meaningful involvement of local communities in heritage site management decisions – moving beyond consultation to genuine power-sharing and benefit-sharing arrangements.

Heritage Authenticity: The maintenance of heritage sites' meaningful connections to the cultural and historical contexts from which they emerged, distinguishing this from purely physical preservation.

Sustainable Heritage Tourism: Tourism development that meets present needs for economic development without compromising heritage preservation, community welfare, or environmental sustainability.

Performative Participation: The appearance of community involvement in decision-making whilst actual control remains with external organisations – community voices are heard but not acted upon.

Appendix C: Tourism Visitor Management Strategies

Several management strategies are being used at heritage sites to control visitor impacts:

Advance Booking Systems: Requiring visitors to book in advance and limiting daily numbers (used at Machu Picchu). This allows sites to predict visitor loads and manage crowd flow.

Entrance Fees and Premium Pricing: Charging higher prices during peak times to discourage visits when crowds are worst (implemented in Venice with day-pass system). Can fund conservation but may exclude lower-income visitors.

Time-Slot Allocation: Designating specific hours for different groups or activities, spreading visitor impact across longer periods.

Guided Tour Requirements: Requiring visitors to hire local guides, which generates community income, controls movement through sites, and allows for educational content delivery.

Area Restrictions: Limiting access to certain heritage areas to reduce physical wear and protect fragile structures (common at archaeological sites).

Interpretive Centres: Locating visitor facilities outside heritage sites, reducing direct impact whilst still allowing learning experiences.

Community-Based Management: Giving local communities significant control over heritage management and tourism operations, aligning incentives towards preservation.

Environmental Impact Assessments: Requiring thorough assessment before tourism development or infrastructure expansion at heritage sites.

No single strategy works everywhere. Different sites need different approaches based on their specific characteristics, community contexts, and environmental conditions.