Cultural Heritage Management in Thailand : Common Barrier and the Possible Way to Survive

Ratchaneekorn Sae-Wang

Cultural Heritage Management Program, College of Innovation
Thammasat University, Thailand
Corresponding author: ratchaneekorntu23sep15@gmail.com

Abstract

The initiate of cultural heritage management concept has been formulated in the ancient time and progressively developed in term of international organization like UNESCO, directly influencing on Thailand, from tangible to intangible heritage, and also the point of view in term of orientalism explaining the idea of western towards eastern in binary opposition: superiority/inferiority. This internalized concept has likely leads Thai authoritative unit to isolate local community from cultural heritage management. This article then has objective to demonstrate the evolution of cultural heritage management in international level influencing on the Thai one, and to discuss the current situation of Thai cultural heritage management through six-case study : Mahakan Fortress (Bangkok), Hellfire Pass Memorial Museum (Kanchanaburi), Inthakin Kiln Site Museum (Chiang Mai), stone-polished bronze-ware (Bangkok), Surin textile (Surin) and Mon costume and language (Lamphun) to display impacts of participatory process shortage and dramatically social change with recommendations to protect and preserve cultural heritages in Thai context

Keywords: Cultural heritage management; Participatory process; Social change

Introduction

         The concept of cultural heritage management initiated in Europe and the concrete evidence has been accomplished by UNESCO and relevant organizations. Before the first step of cultural heritage management has been imprinted, it has been to wait until World War II because of the ubiquitous lost in Europe. The first implementation has rather focused on tangible elements to recover the architectural damages. This practice has been progressively developed to the World Heritage sites which become the worthlessly cultural assets and can draw attention from tourists. Such success has been broadened to the intangible cultural heritage afterwards, supported by international organization like WIPO signifying intellectual property, and accomplished in form of Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

         UNESCO and the western countries as the pioneer of cultural heritage management , Thailand has then followed their steps by commencement to safeguard the religious properties and archaeological sites consecutively, and finally the accomplishment of local wisdom. These Thai steps may not perform like UNESCO as cultural heritage management has been recently acknowledged in Thailand. There is not only Thai Charter but there are also cultural units to directly in charge cultural heritage such as Department of Fine Arts and the Department of Cultural Promotion. Consequently, western perspective especially management among social change through case studies has been normally exemplified to understand and experience for Thailand. This may lead Thai cultural units have imbued with western mentality unconsciously unlike Japan applies their own cultural heritage management by its socio-cultural context. Cultural heritage management in Thailand has still displayed top down policy corresponding with the western point of view against eastern according to Orientalism concept. Moreover, rapid social change has been continuously carried on. Governmental units and all stakeholders are unable to stop such a change directly impacting on intangible heritages. Technology and science with systematic management may support the tangible heritage while the intangible one is doubtful.

This article has then revealed the western concept through the history of cultural heritage management in international level influencing on Thai cultural heritage management. The current situation of Thai cultural heritage management and six case studies both in intangible and tangible cultural heritage would be exemplified and discussed to propose the possible solution among social change.

Traces and evolution of international idea in cultural heritage management

The idea of cultural heritage management was probably difficult to exactly retrieve its trace but it can be partially investigated through history of Roman Empire in 146 BC after conquering Greece. Roman Emperor who really appreciated Greek art and aesthetic well realized these advantages, commanded Greek artisans to reconstruct Greek masterpieces which were ruined during war such as Monument of Athena Parthenos, Warrior by Polycleitos and etc. to promote great Roman success over Greece and combine Greek art as a part of Roman art (Chaiyasut, 1981). This rebuilding of Greek art can be obviously defined as a primary form of property preservation.

The following period tracing cultural heritage management was in the Middle Ages when the upper class elite of Europe, English spent their free time by visiting historic cities in Paris, Turin, Milan, Venice, Florence, Rome and Naples as the Grand Tour to experience many aspects of culture such as grand buildings, cathedrals and artistic works (Timothy & Boyd, 2003, p. 12). This heritage explore phenomenon can partially imply sense of cultural heritage preservation as their attempt to maintain origin with combination of past and present parallel to keeping essence of sites were their needs to experience them at any time. Grand Tour may firstly raise significance of places along with the growth of economic and industrial revolution drove Sweden to introduce official heritage management in 1616 through a royal proclamation to protect monuments by priest and their assistants (Pearson & Sullivan, 2001, p. 12). It can assume that all Europe countries followed Swedish guideline protection ever since but it was proceeded only at the national level since World War II in the early of 20th

century block international agreements. Each country highly concentrated on defense of people and territory. Consequently, there was no mutual cooperation to protect any heritages during long human conflicts.

As soon as the termination of World War II, the number of loss and damage of cultural heritage encouraged the idea of the preservation. The first international treaty of a world – wide agreement to protect cultural property was implemented by International Committee of the Red Cross (1954) at Hague : "Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict" This convention recognizes significance of cultural heritage as the asset of all people and firstly defines its meaning covering movable and immovable property with protection but it rather emphasizes movable property since transportation is mentioned in chapter three. Furthermore, it underlines physical culture based on military operations rather than civilian needs. However, this convention can be named as a good model of following international agreement on cultural property then activated by UNESCO.

UNESCO contribution

Following 2 years, UNESCO tried to implement such a kind of cultural property convention but it can introduce only Recommendation on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations" (UNESCO, 1956). Some content has been similar to Hague Convention referring to the surest guarantee for the preservation of monuments and works of the past but some has differences especially the significance of archaeological sites in term of individual and international connection. Generally, it consists of 7 articles supported by 33 detailed series. Many new interesting issues are proposed such as concept of history, museums, regulations and direct preservation with systematic documentation.

Although this UNESCO recommendation has been unable to develop to a convention, it can draw attention from many countries to follow this UNESCO practice by cooperatively draft guidelines and principles of heritage conservation in the form of charter. Europe also considered cultural heritage as a human treasure and protection. They represented their ideas

and reflected consciousness through many conferences and early initiated their charters and cooperatively established a non-governmental professional organization : "ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites to closely link to UNESCO based on philosophy, terminology, methodology and techniques of cultural heritage starting from Athens Charter (1931) and the remarkable one is the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites", well known as Venice Charter (1964). This charter emphasizes narrow scope of historic buildings with set of principles for architectural protection. In the fact that Venice Charter was held in Venice, the ancient center of commerce and the mostly committee are European, it has been referred world wide as a benchmark concept of development, conservation and documentation by Florence Charter (1981), Washington Charter (1987), Lausanne Charter (1990), Valetta Convention (1992) and so on.

However, UNESCO is finally able to implement convention which has been practiced through world wide country and its detail has been broaden to not only archeological sites, monuments, buildings and cultural property but also to natural heritage in "Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage" (1972). Definition of cultural property seems combination of Hague convention and Recommendation on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavations but it is definitely categorized into two meanings: "cultural heritage" and "natural heritage." while movable and immovable meanings were ignored to ensure that groups of building and urban setting are well protected. The basis of this text has been drawn up by various countries such as Netherland : Amsterdam Declaration (1975) and Australia : Burra Charter (1979).

According to development of cultural heritage management, it can be noticed that importance of tangible heritage is rather underlined more than intangible heritage in the primary step. UNESCO has well aware of this weak point. The attempt to implement and raise consciousness of intangible heritage has become international organization mission later on.

Official consciousness of intangible heritage was raised in 1973 by Bolivian government whose their culture expressing folkloric music, baroque craftsmanship and devil dances and oral heritage (Asia-Pacific Cultural Center for UNESCO, 2007) in form of proposal to be added to Universal Copyright Convention but it was unsuccessful. However, Bolivian's effort was not loss, it implied the initially significant step to motivate intangible idea at the international perspective.

It was unlucky that UNESCO was unable to implement formal strategy to identify and protect intangible heritage as global circumstance at that time was surrounded by oil and regional crisis, and cold war directly effecting to formalize this recognition (Bouchenaki, 2008). UNESCO still kept this mission which was finally undertaken by joined assistance of WIPO to draft "Model Provision for National Laws on the Protection of Expression of Folklore against Illicit Exploitation and Other Prejudicial Action" in 1982 by defining expression of folklore (WIPO, 1982)

This model was adopted by UNESCO afterwards in the form of "Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore" in Paris (UNESCO, 1989) stressing folklore as a universal humanity arising cultural diversity identity and role of all countries to protect folklore from any threats. Folklore significance has been coherently underlined as UNESCO joined Smithsonian Institution project on Living Human Treasures and Proclamation of Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Heritage Humanity (Asia-Pacific Cultural Center for UNESCO, 2007, p.8). This project has influenced on the implementation of the list of The World Heritage Convention. Finally, UNESCO hard afford was successful and led to intangible heritage convention in 5 years later in term of Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, which was implemented in Paris and adopted in 2003 (UNESCO, 2003). This convention broadened the meaning of intangible heritages with five-domain: oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, knowledge and traditional craftsmanship

This remarkable success establishes the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, the List of Intangible

Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and a Fund for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage. It also explained close relation between tangible and intangible heritage as "*the intangible heritage must be seen as the larger framework within which tangible heritage takes on its shape and significance*" (Bouchenaki, 2008, p. 6). However, the attempt of UNESCO has not only focused on cultural heritage but also human in term of cultural rights. The awareness of cultural rights as human rights has been promoted to assure that all people can access cultural activities and its components with equality and non discrimination (UNESCO, 1970, 105-107). These cultural rights have been supported by Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO, 2001) confirming that cultural rights as human rights are common heritage of humanity which can guarantee cultural diversity and pluralism with freedom of expression.

Moreover, UNESCO has attempted to integrate culture into other vast knowledge sphere to respond social change and contemporary issues. Consequently, the later conventions, policy or report has tendency to concern with tourism for example : Tourism, Culture and Sustainable Development (UNESCO, 2006A) displays significance of culture as the key resources of tourism and the role of government to balance between development and protection of cultural resources, Towards Sustainable Strategies for Creative Tourism (UNESCO, 2006B) defines the meaning of creative tourism and link to creative cities network.

The dawn of cultural heritage management concept in Thailand

In Thailand, the initial concept of cultural heritage management has differed from the Western one. Thai notion rather focused on temples and a place of worship than monuments and ruins like European idea as Buddhism has greatly influenced on Thai lives and beliefs. Hence, all artifacts, handicrafts, sculptures and architectures were always invented by religions inspiration. Normally, when all these sacred items were damaged, they would have been fixed, maintained or restored with their basically native methods in order to make merit and follow the path of the

Buddha. Unluckily, there were unavailable written principles or systematical management to demonstrate their techniques and capacity. The oral narration and practice were their way of succeeds from generations to generations. However, the oldest evidence of cultural heritage management was found in stone inscription in term of Buddha image restoration (Kanchanatthiti, 2009, p. 18).

The western concept was officially spread over Thailand in the reign of King Rama IV who interested in new modern knowledge such as astronomy, science and foreign languages since he was in monk hood. He realized the importance of this new body of knowledge which could be advantages of Siam. On the other hand, it would become disadvantages if Siam was not enough and good aware of colonial threat terrorizing neighboring countries in the beginning of 19th century (Thawornthanasarn, 2002). Hence, he then tried to carefully modernize Siam in all aspects. Definitely, the concept of preservation was also internalized. This concept was begun as he personally interested in Thai architecture. When he made pilgrimage through the ancient cities like Srisatchanalai, Sukhothai and Nakhon Pathom, he found damages everywhere and tried to fix them particularly the largest pagoda in Nakhon Pathom by commanding to construct a bell shape to cover the original one and renovate surrounding area when he ascended to throne (Chanphangpetch, 2000). Consequently, it can be said that concept of cultural heritage management was formally initiated in the reign of King Rama IV.

The concept of preservation was proceeded by his son, King Chulalongkorn starting to survey damage of mural painting at Wat Rakhang due to fire. He established the interim commission to collect data and find out proper technique to renovate this painting led by Prince Damrong and Prince Naris. Then, the basic skill was adopted by imitating the former basis of Thai traditional style (Tangphan and Werasuksawad, 1990, p. 162). King commission has been transformed into the permanent unit, the Department of Fine Arts in the reign of King Rama VI to preserve Thai heritage (Fine Art Department, 1995, p. 162). However, this department faced many changes and difficulty, and its role was also lessened due to economic crisis

and revolution in 1922. After 16 years, this department was revived and became a key role to preserve and safeguard archeological sites as national treasure and physical evidence based on aspects of art, history and archaeology compatible with economic, social, traditional and cultural context such as the excavation on Sukhothai Historical Park in 1965, the preservation of Buddha images and mural paintings and so forth. Consequently, main responsibility and tasks of the Department of Fine Arts normally focuses on "*Archaeological sites: immovable property on the basis of age, construction style and historical evidence benefiting art, culture, history and archaeology. It also includes attached objects or ornament*" since then (Fine Art Department, 1985).

Accordingly, the major role of Department of Fine Arts has rather underlined the preservation of archaeological property to protect, preserve, conserve and restore art, culture, tradition, state and royal ceremony being the national identity as the foundation of development, to succeed, created and publish art and culture, to innovate systems and dynamic of cultural management, to manage body of knowledge and improve cultural heritage as a source of learning and tourism and to provide specific knowledge to preserve, succeed with sustainable development (Fine Art Department, 2016) by maintaining significance and value with sciences and proper techniques. The function of this department has probably inspired by international charter like Venice Charter, the first charter drawing inspiration on heritage preservation and Florence Charter, preservation of historic garden. It also enlarge perspectives and run project by adopting Washington Charter, importance of historic town and urban area, Lausanne Charter, management of archaeological protection and Mexico Charter, issue of the built vernacular heritage afterwards.

Thailand cultural heritage management has similar step to UNESCO starting with tangible cultural heritage and followed by the intangible one. The Department of Fine Arts is responsible for archaeological sites while the Department of Cultural Promotion focuses on local wisdom. The Department of Cultural Promotion is the new agency of Ministry of Culture which is recently reborn in 2002 A.D. by Restructuring of Government

Agencies Act after collapsed in 1958 due to political crisis. This unit establishes culture as philosophy to be strategy strengthening social consciousness, morality and virtue of Thai people, basement motivation to develop society, economic and quality of life and key element to consolidate national and international union. Currently, Ministry of Culture has a main task dealing with culture in various elements and this made this national organization has to divide its responsibility into ten agencies : the Office of the Minister, the Office of Permanent Secretary, the Department of Fine Arts, the Department of Religious Affairs, the Department of Cultural Promotion, Bunditpatanasilpa Institute, the Office of Contemporary Art and Culture, the Princess Maha Chari Sirindhorn Anthropology Center (Public Organization), the Film Archive (Public Organization) and the Moral Promotion Center (Public Organization) (Ministry of Culture, 2016).

The new agency like Department of Cultural Promotion was established in 2010 according to restructuring of government agencies act. It was the Office of National Culture Commission with the task to recommend cultural policy and planning, enhance cultural activities and research, monitor and evaluate cultural action programs and promote Thai culture. After transformation into the Department of Cultural Promotion, its mission is also changed into to encourage with integrity of cultural essence in creative economy development, develop cultural learning resources as the centre to disseminate and exchange culture in all levels, enhance participatory process in preservation, restoration, transmission and protection of local wisdom and culture, research and manage knowledge of culture and encourage and monitor films and video (Department of Cultural Promotion, 2016).

As previously mentioned that the Department of Cultural Promotion is rather responsible on local wisdom, the concrete outcome to confirm its successful task is managing and categorizing the intangible cultural heritage in Thailand which is divided into seven-domain; performing arts, traditional craftsmanship, folk literature, folk games and sports, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practice concerning nature and the

Universe and languages. The nomination list of intangible cultural heritage will be approved and endorsed by committee, and annually disseminated. There are many local wisdom manifested in this list such as the mask dance, Mat Mi cloth, text on Thai cats and Thai boxing (Department of Cultural Promotion, 2016). Moreover, this significant step has been supported by Act of Promotion and Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage 2559 (A. D), which is lately promulgated in February 2016. The main essence of this act is to primarily found and extremely encourage significance of intangible cultural heritage in Thailand which has never been before. There are 26 sections which has been roughly divided into three elements; section 1-4 displaying definition of intangible cultural heritage and related bearers, section 5-17 exhibiting qualification and task of committee of each province and Bangkok ,and section 18-26 demonstrating Department of Cultural Promotion as the secretariat task force and authority of committees. Noticeably, this act powerfully authorized Department of Cultural Promotion and strongly raise significance of community, especially the participatory process in intangible cultural heritage but lacking detail of the method of preservation and safeguarding.

There are not only mentioned agencies having a role to manage cultural heritage in Thailand. The supreme law like the constitution has absolutely involved in this cultural heritage. The cultural mission is appeared in The Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand. (2550 B. E), Community Rights, section 66 mentioning that "*persons assembling as to be a community, local community or traditional local community shall have the right to conserve or restore their customs, local wisdom, arts or good culture of their community and of the nation and participate in the management, maintenance and exploitation of natural resources, the environment and biological diversity in a balanced and sustainable fashion*", section 67 "*the right of a person to participate with State and communities in the preservation and exploitation of natural resources and biological diversity and in the protection, promotion and conservation of the quality of the environment for usual and consistent survival in the environment which is not hazardous to his health and sanitary condition,*

welfare or quality of life, shall be protected appropriately..." and section 80 Religions, Social, Public Health, Education and Culture Policies affirming that "*the State shall act in compliance with the social, public health, education and culture policies by encouraging and instilling the right awareness of national unity and learning, and instilling and making known of arts, tradition and culture of the nation as well as good value and local wisdom*"

Thailand has full elements and associated laws to conduct cultural heritages. However, bare experiences and insufficient expertise of cultural heritage management make Thailand face difficulties and confusions to properly deal with heritages and social changes.

Current situation and impacts in Thailand

The situation of cultural heritage management seems better if compare to the previous era as there are particular agencies taking responsible for cultural heritage management supported by the constitution and other agencies like Ministry of Education educating and raising awareness of Thai cultural heritage preservation (Ministry of Edcation, 2016), Designated Area for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) advantaging culture in term of creative tourism and Tambon Administrative Organization (TAO), the smallest administrative unit displaying decentralization. However, there are some case studies reflecting cultural heritage management in Thailand divided into two aspects: tangible cultural heritage and intangible cultural heritage. The first three-case study concern tangible cultural heritage while the latter three ones display intangible cultural heritage as follows.

Case study 1: Mahakan Fortress, Bangkok

Mahakarn Fortress, one of the fourteen fortress constructed by King Rama I, was of course surrounded by neighborhoods which was found along the canal and next to the Golden Mountain Temple. It was very important as Thai traditional life mostly relied on waterway which became the center of transportation and commerce. This small community

was also a source of Thai traditional musical instruments, theatre troupe (Likay), fireworks and bowls for Buddhist monks. Now, Mahakarn Fortress community was no longer important. It was unpleasant and disordered. This reason makes the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) would like to remove this community to turn this area into a park and restore the monuments and ruins according to a conservation and development plan of the Bangkok inner zone for tourism purpose (Glumsorn, 2006).

However, the dwellers refused to be evicted. They tried to compromise by asking one-fourth of land of the public park be set apart to build and make it an example of a community of conservation and development in a form of living museum. Their requirements well get along with the study by Prakitnonthakan (2003) suggesting that this area can be a living museum where locality and identity are attractive to tourism. Besides, his study also argues that this area is improper to be a typical park as it is not open space where crime can easily happens. Anyway, their proposals and the study seem ignorable as BMA insists to go on the project (Wangsrangboon, 2016).

Case study 2: Hellfire Pass Memorial Museum, Kanchanaburi

Hellfire Pass Memorial Museum was built and cooperated by Australian government, opened in 1998. This museum dedicated to Allied soldiers, especially Australians and British who were forced to remove rock with bare hands to continue railway route from Bangkok to Rangoon in World War II. All these labors were suffered and died many thousands. The museum was then founded to commemorate them with reflection of their suffering. There are two main sections to display human brutality. The first section is the memorial museum chronologically displaying through authentic utensils, photos and film taking during terrible construction of this railway. The second section is the walking trail, 500-metre-long, 26-metre-deep and 17-metre-wide showing several cuttings, the remain of bridge and Hin Tok station where the trains passed each other in the quite narrow railway, and depicting difficulty of rock

landscape which visitors can well absorb and experience (Tourism Authority of Thailand, 2016)

This museum can draw attention from visitors in each year. However, there is argument about cultural heritage management of this museum in term of prosperous western concept as the universal standard. This western management is proceeded through the appearance of building which has hardly reflected Eastern or Thai characteristic. This action can be implied the exclusion of local lives. Hence, the story and existing of local community in museum is sightless. The combination of cultural context into local participatory probably lessen the independent management concept (Arrunnapaporn, 2011: 13)

Case study 3: Inthakin Kiln Site Museum, Chiang Mai

Inthakin Kiln Site Museum was founded in Lanna plateau, the museum was developed from the archaeological site accidentally found in area of local inhabitants. The excavations was then implemented and revealed that this area was the large ceramic kiln site where there were plenty of light green glazed stoneware and greenish brown glazed stoneware. The radiocarbon dating affirmed that these ceramic could be traced to Lanna Kingdom period, and the quality of soil was as good as Srisatchanalai site. This kiln site does neither manifest the historical and archeological evolution nor the process of Lanna ceramic production but also the prosperity and the complete kiln site which has never found before in the upper northern area. Muangkaen Municipality well considered all these significances, the establishment of archeological museum with documentary interpretation to preserve kiln site with Lanna ceramics and develop to learning center and cultural tourism (Muangkaen Municipality, 2013)

This museum has been supported by Muangkaen Municipality to encourage community participatory and regularly held activities concerning ceramics: demonstration of Lanna ceramics production, youth camp and cultural study. Moreover, there was an effort to enhance Lanna ceramics product with Muangkaen identity to compete with celadon of Lampang

but it failed due to high cost of material, unattractive patterns and unsuccessful marketing. Muangkaen ceramics were then frozen, and had affected museum and community which there were barely activities and visitors (Sookkasem & Bhattarabhatwong, 2016).

Case study 4: Stone-Polished Bronze-ware, Baan Bu Community, Bangkok

Baan Bu Community is located in Bangkok Noi on Thon Buri Bank of the Chao Phraya River since the beginning of Rattanakosin era. The ancestors were believed that they had migrated from Ayutthaya after its downfall. This community was surrounded by two temples: Suwannaram Temple and Amarinthraram Temple. Inhabitants had earned by stone-polished bronze-ware which were significant utensils especially the water dipper and monk's alms bowls. The authentic technique had not been continued but also transmitted for generations in this community. The key characteristic of stone-polished bronze-ware of Ban Bu is strength and beauty. Moreover, it can be applied to other utensils such as rice container or musical instrument with particular technique and material can more enhance some feature. For instance, a stone-polished bronze-ware rice container makes rice more aromatic while the musical instruments are orotund.

Nowadays, the role of plastic utensils in household is dramatically replaced while the popularity of stone-polished bronze-ware has gradually declined due to high cost and complicate hand-made process. The authentic local wisdom of stone-polished bronze-ware and craftsmen are then rarely found. Also, there is only one family by sixth generation endeavoring to preserve this local wisdom through OTOP products and overseas market as Thai authentic souvenir. However, this job has hardly drawn attention from labor market especially the new generation due to unattractive workplace and unpleasant image like a labor. Furthermore, these elder craftsmen would like to transmit this knowledge to Thai youth only. The wisdom of stone-polished bronze-ware has been taken at risk of succession. (Anonymous craftsman, 2016)

Case study 5 : Surin Textile and Natural Process, Baan Natang, Surin

Baan Natang, the local village in Khwao Sinarin district, is located the north of Muang Surin district. There are approximately 200 families with main source of revenue from the paddy fields. There is some further income from silver-smithing and weaving, which would be operated after the harvest. The coming of tourism has benefited to the weaving and textile as the popular and interested products due to natural material, remarkable technique and unique pattern. This village has intrinsic knowledge and high skill to dye with natural materials such as red by lac, yellow by *maclura eochinchinensis* and *garcinia*, and blue by indigo. The particular technique by using other natural materials to encourage deep colour dyeing like purple bauhinia, tamarind and coconut juice has also been underlined. Furthermore, the historical relationship and geographical border with Cambodia has had a great influence on Baan Natang texitile which inevitably refer to Khmer patterns through Khmer language like *Hol Lalun Siem,Umprom* and *Phaka-Om*.

The popularity of Surin textile has been motivated not only by tourism but also green concept. However, this concept always comes with high cost and time consuming if compares to chemical textile which become preferable souvenir for mass tourists. The unique technique and patterns also has affected since it has not served tourists' demand and it is unfashionable. The authentic Khmer pattern has been provided for elder inhabitants. Moreover, mostly young female generation prefers studying in University to have a modern knowledge with good job to staying home for weaving with less income. Baan Natang has currently faced the succession and authenticity. (Sae-Wang, 2015, p. 96)

Case study 6: Mon recipe and costume, Baan Nong – Doo Bo Kaw, Lamphun

Baan Nong-Doo Bo Kaw has occupied by Mon, intrinsic ethnic group which was believed that they emigrated from the southern of India and move to Burma to found the Kingdom which the Burmese troops

invaded afterwards. This collapse drove Mon people move to Siam where they have scatteringly dwelled since then including Lamphun. According to the archaeological evidence at Wat Koh Klang, it affirmed Mon existence through long glory and wealth since 15th century (BE), the Kingdom of Hariphunchai until the present. The Mon has unique culture, especially the recipe, language and costume which they have endeavored to revive and preserved through Mon festival and special occasion. The Mon recipe has been gathered, printed and widely published. The Mon language has been activated in Mon prayer books which were firstly applied on Religious day with the Mon costume, and developed to textbook for everyday life conversation.

Those efforts to preserve Mon local wisdom have been currently continued by the elderly people in community but the young generation likely ignored Mon culture as it is limitedly acceptable and enable their image to be obsolete in the contemporary society. Baan Nong Doo-Bo Kaw has currently encountered significant future lost of Mon intangible cultural heritage due to lack of successor. (Sae-Wang, 2012, p. 82-84)

Those case studies display the effort to conceptualize cultural heritage management in two forms: the tangible form in term of museums through first three case studies and the intangible one in term of community endeavor through the latter three ones in different area and contexts. The first case study took place in urban area highlighting complicate issues and conflict between local community and BMA through duplicate policies. The human rights in culture and cultural rights were raised to protect this ancient community and benefit from cultural tourism. Secondly, the case at Kanchanaburi occurred in semi-urban area which outstandingly showed the exclusion of local community as the agreement between Thai and Australian government was dealt in decision making level. The museum is the explicit consequence emphasizing that the memory of World War II was international perception not the local one. Finally, the case at Chiangmai happened in rural area. The local administration, Muangkaen Municipality, the representative of decentralization has high effort to encourage local community to participate in activities about

ceramics to promote cultural tourism. It seemed interesting and attractive in the beginning but a quantity of activities and tourists were declined as soon as Muangkaen Municipality hardly involved this archaeological museum. This situation also implies that the authority of local administration can empower this learning center while local community was dissociated from their cultural heritage Outstandingly, all of these cases happened in different contexts and area but shortage of participatory in common.

The shortage participatory in cultural heritage management dramatically reflects centralization concept which is still embedded in Thai society even there is Constitution in section 66, 67 and 80 empowering community. Practically, those case study show that inhabitants and community are kept from participation process: finding problems, planning, operation and evaluation. The ignorance and loss of intangible cultural heritage in some community is outcome of hierarchy management and top down policy. State and government has major role to conduct policy while inhabitants are submissive and obedient. This manner characterize relationship between governor and people in binary opposition high/low and accord with Orientalism (Said, 1978, p. 204)

> "…Orientalism is fundamentally a political doctrine willed over the Orient because the Orient was weaker than the West, which elided the Orient's difference with its weakness. . . . As a cultural apparatus Orientalism is all aggression, activity, judgment, will-to-truth, and knowledge. Orientalism was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, West, "us") and the strange (the Orient, the East, "them")…"

Obviously, Thailand has inspired by UNESCO in evaluation of cultural heritage management. Though, western discourse is always embedded in the applicable perspective of heritage management against inferior eastern community and others developing countries in form of western/eastern, superiority/inferiority and governor/people. This concept is always reproduced and taken for granted. Regarding Said's study,

western perspective familiarized with superiority, unavoidably transmitted to Thai cultural heritage management. Subjectivity, objectivity and any bias of superiority towards inferiority or people probably tactfully display to devalue their culture and dehumanize them through management like Mahakarn Fortress.

On the other hand, the latter three case studies outstandingly concern community participatory with the high effort to preserve and protect their local wisdom. The concrete evidences have been displayed through products, activities and action plan affirming their safeguard. Stone-polished bronze-ware of Baan Bu, Surin textile of Baan Natang and Mon language and costume of Baan Nong Doo-Bo Kaw have been continuously revived and practiced. However, these selected communities have barriers in common. Firstly, lacking of successors accelerates the lost of local wisdom, especially the young generation, who has better education and job familiar with urban area, has hardly underline the significance of intangible cultural heritage despite of wealthy knowledge and enlightened persons. Secondly, awareness and pride of place has been likely shortage. The attempt to preservation is consequently focused on the elderly not public transmission. Finally, social change, the inevitable factors has perpetually happened and greatly impacted on way of life, beliefs and viewpoints. The change has affirmed that stone-polished bronze-ware are then no longer used, Surin textile is too old-fashioned and Mon language and costume is less acceptable as the plastic, modern costume and widely used language like English are replaced.

According to mentioned case studies, it was revealed that community was excluded due to loss of local wisdom; originated Likay at Mahakarn Fortress , authentic way of life at Kanchanburi and unique ceramics knowledge at Muankaen. Besides, museums, learning centers or tangible cultural heritage with a possible way to maintain with sustainability by science and new technology, there was an effort to enthusiastically revive local wisdom through various cultural tools; festival, costume, books, recipe and so forth strongly supported by community. Anyhow, it was doubtful that how community can resist

the culturally dynamic change to preserve intangible cultural heritage which are obsolete and disappeared.

Cultural heritage management in Thailand like others faces and challenges global change which inevitably effects to culture (Sarashima, 2013 :148). Consequently, change is the powerful element to properly deal with, for protection and preservation based on participation of community for sustainability.

Conclusion

Those mentioned case studies have exemplified cultural heritage management in Thailand and partially reflects perspective of protection and preservation of cultural heritage. Key difficulty is poor participation which is firstly recommended to enforce related law to decentralize and authorize community managing cultural assets with their demand, spirit and sense of place through action and bottom-up policy. Moreover, sense of belonging and cultural awareness should be continuously cultivated in everyday life activity and cultural interpretation to repeat and motivate long life practice

Outstandingly, cultural heritage management in form of museum or learning center in Thailand is the efficient tool and more popular to revive, protect and preserve cultural heritage. However, the perception of museum in Thailand is still expected to involve with governmental sector to financially support and more likely maintain antique objects (Wongthes, no date). This tool is probably neither ample nor contemporary to serve dramatically cultural and social change especially intangible heritage. Department of Cultural Promotion normally enhances significance of intangible cultural heritage through nomination list each year. Noticeably, the outcome in a form of documentary and written evidence, the fundamental method to safeguard cultural heritage of governmental and academic sector, however, it is hardly applicable to community taking advantage of these cultural assets. Commodification (Sae-Wang, 2015: 96-97) is recommendation to commercialize cultural heritage into cultural products, for instance, Thai Boxing, one of well known intangible cultural

heritage nomination list, can attract interested foreigners to practice and entertain Thai Boxing (Muay Thai). Wisdom of Thai Boxing can be transformed into economic value and Thais can earn from it such as Thai Boxing trainers and boxing stadium, Thai Boxing in international television program like Thai Fight (international boxers compete with Thai held by Thai coordinator), Kunlun Fight (international boxers especially Chinese including Thai boxers held by Chinese coordinated with Workpoint Entertainment) and so on, and Thai boxing courses.

Moreover, adaptation is also advised to keep cultural heritage alive in the contemporary era. The well adaptive intangible heritage can be transmitted to later generation, for instance, Surin Kantruem folk music is the one component of sacred rite of ethnic Khmer populations to heal illness which is caused by angry spirits. The folk music accompanied by reed oboe, fiddle, tone drums, cymbals and wooden clappers with Khmer language song will satisfy and soothe them (Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Center, 2013, p. 30-31). The traditional Kantreum has been performed not only in spirit mediumship rite but also the community ritual and ceremonies such as wedding and house-raising rites. However, the situation of traditional Kantruem will likely disappear due to loss of older generations and social change, the mediumship rite significance has been gradually declined, the applied Kantruem by incorporating modern musical instruments such as the electronic guitar and keyboard has draw high attention from younger audiences and has been always performed in cultural events including professional Kantruem folk music.

However, the commodification and adaptation must be aware of authenticity, especially the consideration and assessment of both negative and positive impacts otherwise those solutions will directly devalue significance of cultural heritage which probably becomes fake culture in tourists perception (Timothy & Boyd, 2003, p. 240-244). The outstanding commodification or adaptation can not only transmit cultural heritage like case study of traditional dance of Chiangmai by combining all traditional dances such as sword dance, drawing silk dance and Jerng dance with

reduction of time to serve tourists demand in limited time. This phenomenon gain popularity from tourists and also schools, to encourage and provide courses of these dances for new generations and students to practices and earn from dancing. This action can be a way of revival and transmission of cultural heritage (Sitthilert, 2016). The commodification also can protect and preserve authenticity as an optionally efficient tool like case study of Kwanok (2016) concerning authenticity of archaeological dances in restaurants. The study reveals that the authenticity in Sukhothai dance has been still existed in high level, especially costumes and deployment due to the tourists'perception of Loy Krathong Festival in Sukhothai. Authenticity is main factor of tourists' expectation which encourage tourism entrepreneurs have high awareness after adaptive process.

Finally, Thailand has not officially operated and promulgated its own charter even there is effort to implement through ICOMOS Thailand but, the acknowledgement is likely limited in academic institutions and related governmental sectors. The effective application of Charter is expected to widely conduct both tangible and intangible heritage in form of integrative function.

References

Anonymous craftsman, (2016). Baan Bu Local Inhabitant.Interview, February 22, 2016.

Arrunnapaporn, A. B. (2011). Guideline for interpretation and development of new tourism destinations along the Death Railway, Kanchanaburi, Thailand. *Silpakorn University Journal*, *31*(2), 6-20.

Asia-Pacific Cultural Center for UNESCO. (2007). *Conference on Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property Under the 2003 Convention : Seeking a Collaborative between ICH and IP*. (2007) , p.7, 23-27 March 2007, Maidens Hotel, New Delhi, India.

Australia ICOMOS (1979). *Burra Charter*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Burra-Charter_1979.pdf.

Bhattarabhatwong, P. (2016). Local inhabitants. Interview, May 14, 2016

Bouchenaki, M. (2008). *The 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding the Intangible Heritage: Development of the Convention and the First Step of Its Implementatio*n, Training Course for Safeguarding the Intangible Heritage by ACCU.

Chaiyasut, S. (1981). *Roman Art*. Bangkok: Faculty of Archaeology.

Chanphangpetch, A. (2000). *Temples and Budda Images of King Rama IV.*. Retrieved on on June 9, 2016, from www.arch.kmitl.ac.th/publish/files/journal/2-43/2-2543-1.pdf.

Council of Europe. (1992). *European Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage: Valetta*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from https://rm.coe.int/168007bd25.

Department of Cultural Promotion.(2016A) *Vision, Strategy and Mission*. Retrieved on June 18, 2017, from http://www.culture.go.th/culture_th/ewt_news.php?nid=3.

Department of Cultural Promotion. (2016B). Intangible Cultural Heritage. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from http://ich.culture.go.th/.Fine Art

Department. (1985). *Regulations on Conservation of Archeological Sites (2528 B.E)*. Retrieve on June 9, 2016, from http://www.finearts. go.th/ inburimuseum/plugins/2012-11-27-14-10-05/ระเบียบ/item/ การอนุรักษ์โบราณสถาน-A82528.

Fine Art Department. (1997). *84th of Fine Art Department and Pulpit*. Bangkok: Fine Art Department.

Fine Art Department. (2016). *Task and Responsibility*. Retrieved on June 9, 2016, from www.finearts.go.th/th/history.php? PHPSESSID= 477f6c1fabe8ba84 30f2f552e30d2856.

Glumsom, Pranee (2006). Mahakarn Fortress Community: 'the Past' without the Future in *Ancient Area in Bangkok 2*. Bangkok: Muang Boran Press. pp. 229-247.

ICOMOS. (1975). *Amsterdam Declaration*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/169-the-declaration-of-amsterdam.

ICOMOS. (1931). *The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from http://www.icomos. org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/167-the-athens-charter-for-the-restoration-of-historic-monuments.

ICOMOS. (1964). *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter 1964)*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf. available.

ICOMOS. (1981). *Historic Gardens the Florence Charter 1981*. Retrieved from on June 16, 2017, from https://www.icomos.org/charters/gardens_e.pdf. available.

ICOMOS. (1987) Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (the Washington Charter 1987). Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from https://www.icomos.org/charters/towns_e.pdf. access.

ICOMOS. (1990). *Charter for Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage*. Retrieved June 16, 2017, from http:// www.icomos.org/charters/arch_e.pdfthe Lausanne Charter.

International Committee of the Red Cross. (1954). *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*. Hague Convention.

Kanchanatthiti, P. (2009). *Architectural and Urban Conservation*. Bangkok : Chulalongkorn Press.

Kwanok, A. (2016). *The Authenticity of Thai Archaeological Dances in Restaurants*. Master of Arts Program (Cultural Management). College of Innovation. Thammasat University.

Ministry of Culture Thailand. (2016). *History and Philosophy*. Retrieved on June 10, 2016, from http://www.thaiwhic.go.th/en/Content. aspx?pid=2.

Ministry of Education. (2015). *Strategies of Ministry of Education*. Retrieved on June 12, 2016, from http://www.moe.go.th/moe/th/ office/index.php?SystemModuleKey=office

Muangkaen Municipality. (2013). *Tourism Source*. Retrieved on June 28, 2017, from http://www.muangkaen.go.th/index.php?_ mod=dHJhdmVs&no=Mg.

Ombudsman (2007). *The Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand. (2550 B.E)*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from   http://www. ombudsman.go.th/10/documents/law/Constitution2550.pdf.

Parliament. (2016). *Act of Promotion and Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage 2559 (A.D)*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from http://library2.parliament.go.th/giventake/content_nla2557/law19- 010359-1.pdf.

Pearson M., & Sullivan S. (2001). *Looking After Heritage Places: The Basics of Heritage Planning for Managers, Landowners and Administrators,* Melbourne : Melbourne University Press.

Prakitnonthakan, C. (2003). Mahakan Fortess: Preserve or Damage History. *Art and Culture Journal*, *24*(3), 129-135.

Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Center. (2013). *Mapping Intangible Cultural Heritage in Surin Province: Intangible Cultural Heritage and Museums in Surin Province*. Edited by Alexandra Denes.Bangkokk :Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Center.

Sae-Wang, R. (2012). *Femininity in Lanna Architecture : an Interpretative Essay*. Dissertation. Faculty of Architecture. Silpakorn University.

Sae-Wang, R. (2015). 'Spirit of the loom: The Conservation and commodification of Surin's textile cultural heritage', *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, *10,* 85-100.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Book.

Sarashima, S. (2013). Community as a landscape of intangible cultural heritage : Basho-fu in Kijoka, a Japanese example of traditional woven textile and its relationship with the public. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, *8*, 136-152.

Sitthilert, Suphachai (2016). Curator of Royal Museum, Chiangmai. Interview. April 21, 2016.

Sookkasem, Y. (2016). Archaeologist, Regional Office of Fine Arts, Chiangmai. Interview. May 14, 2016

Tangphan, S., &Werasuksawad, W. (1990). *Mural Painting in Bangkok*, Bangkok: Department of Mural Paintings and Sculpture.

Thawornthanasarn, W. (2002). *Thai Elite and Acceptance of Western Culture*. Bangkok: Muang Boran Press.

Timothy, D., & Boyd, S. (2003). *Heritage Tourism*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Tourism Authority of Thailand. (2016) *Hellfire Pass Memorial Museum*. Retrieved on June 17, 2017, from https://thai.tourismthailand.org/ สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว /ช่องเขาขาดพิพิธภัณฑสถานแห่งความทรงจำ--258.

UNESCO. (1956) *Recommendation on International Principles Applicable to Archaeological Excavation*. Retrieved on June 16, 2017, from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13062&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

UNESCO. (1970). *Cultural Rights as Human Rights*. Paris: Instituto Grafico Casagrande.

UNESCO. (1972). *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Retrieved on June 17, 2016, from http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/.

UNESCO. (1989). *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*. Retrieved on June 17, 2017, from http://portal. unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13141&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_ SECTION=201.html.

UNESCO. (2001). *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. Retrieved on June 17, 2017, from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Retrieved on June 17, 2017, from http://portal. unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC& URL_SECTION=201.html.

UNESCO. (2006A). *Tourism, Culture and Sustainable Development*. Retrieved on June 17, 2017, from http://unesdoc.unesco.org / images/0014/001475/147578e.pdf.

UNESCO. (2006B). *Towards Sustainable Strategies for Creative Tourism*. Discussion of the Planning for 2008 International Conference on Creative Tourism.Santa Fe, October 25-25, 2006.

Wangsrangboon, S. (2016). Why eviction from Mahakan Fortess Community is significant?. Retrieve on June 12, 2016, from http:// www.posttoday.com/social/think/424984.

WIPO. (1982). *Model Provision for National Laws on the Protection of Expression of Folklore against Illicit Exploitation and Other Prejudicial Action*, Section 2, p.1

Wongthes, Suchit (no date). *Article of Museum: Wisdom of Museum*. No publish place.