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Abstract
This paper calls into question prevailing arguments within the critical heritage literature that present World Heritage globalisation as an inherently top-down process that overrides locality. Drawing on the author’s ongoing engagement with the Indigenous landowning community of Vanuatu’s first World Heritage site, Chief Roi Mata’s Domain (CRMD), it is demonstrated that global and local forces are in actuality being interpreted and applied simultaneously in a process characteristic of glocalisation. World Heritage at CRMD (or Wol Heritij, as it is rendered in Vanuatu’s national language) is increasingly understood and valued at the village level because of the extent to which it can be transitioned and transformed into new glocalised ideas and expressions which place local economic development opportunities at the heart of World Heritage management. Given that it is the local Indigenous community – and not the state – that is primarily responsible for World Heritage in Vanuatu, it is vital that this glocalised brand of CRMD’s Wol Heritij (with all of its complexity, fluidity and unpredictability) is seriously recognised and adequately supported by the heritage scholarship and UNESCO.

Introduction
There is a tendency within the growing critical heritage literature to view the globalisation of World Heritage as a process that overrides locality. The prevailing argument is that a singular Western elite set of cultural values associated with heritage preservation is being naturalised under the guise of universality. Drawing on the author’s ongoing engagement with the Indigenous landowning community of Vanuatu’s first World Heritage site – Chief Roi Mata’s Domain (CRMD) – this paper seeks to unsettle this narrative by arguing that global and local forces are in actuality being interpreted and applied simultaneously. The author’s involvement at CRMD began as an Australian Youth Ambassador for Development on a 12 month posting between July 2008 and July 2009, and has since continued as one of several volunteers on the CRMD International Advisory Group.

That the globalised heritage discourse is increasingly affecting local cultural expressions and heritage management measures is beyond doubt. However, as exemplified here through the experience of CRMD, equally beyond doubt is that World Heritage (or Wol Heritij, as it is rendered in Bislama, the national language of the Republic of Vanuatu) is continually and reciprocally constructed and reconstructed through intercultural encounters across the global-local interface, and that this is simply part and parcel of the ways in which villagers are negotiating the complicated and multifaceted (and somewhat contradictory to the outsider) push and pulls of contemporary hybrid village life. The global and local are in a constant state of merging, a process of cultural borrowing, that is characterised here as glocalisation (Robertson 1995).

The principal contention of this paper is that World Heritage is increasingly understood and valued at the local level, not so much because (as the prevailing discourse suggests) the local community has absorbed the global doctrine of World Heritage and its central emphasis on heritage protection, but because of the extent to which it can be glocalised; combining ideas and expressions of both development and conservation in terms of the local idiom, Wol Heritij. Due to the extraordinary constitutional power bestowed upon local customary landowners in Vanuatu post-independence – which has made local landowning villagers largely self-autonomous political agents, beyond that of the nation-state and the state’s apparatus – the ongoing maintenance of World Heritage at CRMD can only be sustainably achieved under rules set collectively (and at times tumultuously) at the village level. The landowning communities of CRMD are actively selecting and adapting global and local principles of both economic development and heritage conservation according to their local aspirations, interests and knowledge. Like every exogenous project, agent and force relating to development or conservation, the landowning chiefs and communities of CRMD are actively employing UNESCO’s World Heritage to express and forge new glocalised cultural identities.

These emergent glocalised cultural identities principally manifest via the tremendous agency local villagers have and exert over what is effectively their own sovereign lands. They are exemplified in the relationship that community members hold with World Heritage at CRMD, which is concurrently defined and recognised by its current and future local economic potential as well as its role in serving to augment protection of the local cultural values and places associated with Roi Mata. Rather than viewing UNESCO World Heritage and local cultural values as uncompromisingly incompatible, community members’ interaction with their heritage is, as ever, gaining importance in new ways and typified by continuous change and adaptation. A key focus of the ensuing discussion, therefore, is the complex and often ambiguous ways in which the resultant local form of Wol Heritij is mediated by these highly distinct, and just as discursive, local terms. The question of whether there is scope and willingness by UNESCO and the international heritage profession to accept and support these aberrant but efficacious local level divergences from and co-options of World Heritage is also considered.

Chief Roi Mata’s Domain

World Heritage Area

CRMD is a continuing cultural landscape located in northwest Efate, Vanuatu. The Domain consists of three main cultural sites – the former settlement of Mangaga, Fels Cave and Artok Island – that are all associated with the life and death of the paramount chief Roi Mata (see Figures 1 and 2). Roi Mata is renowned for
shaping the social and political landscape of the central islands of Vanuatu during the 16th century through the institution of a system of matrilineal naflak totems (Wilson 2006). In July 2008, the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of CRMD was recognised by the 32nd Meeting of the World Heritage Committee and the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List. CRMD is one of just two properties (together with the Kuk Early Agricultural site in Papua New Guinea) from an independent Melanesian state that has been inscribed on the World Heritage list for its cultural values (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2012).

The Constitution of the Republic of Vanuatu vests the ownership of all land with ‘the indigenous custom owners and their descendants’ (Government of Vanuatu n.d. Article 73). The World Heritage property and surrounding buffer zone of CRMD are, as a result, collectively held under customary tenure by the village communities of Mangaliliu and Lelepa Island (known together as ‘Lelema’). The Lelema community has a combined population of approximately 700 people, most of whom rely heavily on a traditional or subsistence economy for their day-to-day needs. Given Lelema’s close proximity to the nation’s capital Port Vila, however, villages are well within the influence of monetisation. While opportunities to make money do exist, wages for ni-Vanuatu are typically extremely low; a family on one working parent’s income barely suffices to pay for a single child’s school fees. It is not surprising therefore that a key prerequisite to the Lelema community’s World Heritage nomination bid was the ability to use this international recognition to provide alternative and sustainable income generating activities, principally through community-based forms of tourism (Trau 2012; Wilson, Ballard & Kalotiti 2011). This is the primary responsibility of the Lelema World Heritage Committee (LWHC), the overarching community-based management body appointed by Lelema chiefs and community to manage the heritage and tourism components of CRMD.

**Beyond World Heritage Globalisation**

Concerns have long been professed that the spread of a singular Eurocentric approach to archaeological heritage management is a perpetuation of western imperialism (see Byrne 1991; Murray & White 1981; Sullivan 1993; Trigger 1981, 1984; Trigger & Glover 1981). More recently, a growing number of interdisciplinary commentaries and critiques have come to scrutinise what is now more broadly regarded as the globalisation of Western modes of heritage management and protection, with particular attention directed toward the practices, programmes and procedures of UNESCO World Heritage. By far the most dominant contention within this emerging area of inquiry – and one that continues to underpin much of the contemporary debate – is that UNESCO and its system of World Heritage is a top-down, powerful, even perversive, agent of cultural globalisation. The works of several critical heritage scholars serve as an indication of the general tone and direction of this debate, as well as its propensity to overlook the ability of the local to adapt and persevere.

Byrne (1995, 2008) asserts that non-western heritages are managed and preserved worldwide according to Western elitist values and needs, which are spread through coercive universalisms and familiar internationalisms. Logan (2001), Turtinen (2000) and Wall & Black (2004) claim that there is an inherent and incompatible conflict between local traditional cultural identities and global universal heritage values within the UNESCO World Heritage system. UNESCO World Heritage...
criteria and grammar, so their arguments go, likely result in the standardisation and homogenisation of heritage management, and as Logan (2001: 51) states more generally, ‘replace local cultures with a bland, global culture’. Smith (2006, 2007) has put forward the popular thesis of the ‘authorised heritage discourse’. Smith argues that the globalising authorised heritage discourse subversively validates and legitimises Western heritage theory and praxis, and by so doing undermines, even expunges, alternate subaltern notions of heritage. Waterton (2005, 2010) builds on the work of Smith through rigorous critical discourse analysis which refutes the implicit and explicit power of the authorised heritage discourse by proving that ways of seeing and using heritage in Britain are heavily sanitised via the language, ideology and power of the heritage ‘experts’.

The preeminence of local customary tenure in Vanuatu is the overwhelming basis for what is described here as the glocalisation of World Heritage at CRMD. It is also where this paper diverges from, and goes further than, these prevailing arguments of the critical heritage scholarship. Much of the critical heritage literature assumes that World Heritage is principally the issue and responsibility of states, and not local Indigenous communities. As Douglas Kalotti unequivocally affirms below, in countries such as Vanuatu where the majority of land is held under customary tenure, it is in fact local traditional governance and judicial structures that hold greater power and legitimacy than those of the state (see also Cox et al. 2007; Forsyth 2009). Just as being integrated into the global capitalist system does not equate to being dominated by capitalist logic (Escobar 2001; Friedman & Friedman 2008; Sahlins 2000), the inscription of CRMD onto the World Heritage list has not resulted in the Lelena community being dominated by UNESCO’s heritage system.

Unlike all other World Heritage sites where Government is at the top of the hierarchy, at Chief Roi Mata’s Domain the communities are at the top. The government is nothing. (Douglas Kalotti, late chair of the LWHC, personal communication, 02 October 2009)

Many globalisation theorists (for example Dirlik 1999; Swyngedouw 1997; Tsing 2000, 2003) have long questioned the usefulness of framing globalisation as a dualism between the global and the local, predictably spruiking familiar macro-narratives of static oppositions between the universal-particular, homogeneity-heterogeneity and modern-traditional etc. Notwithstanding prevailing arguments, the critical heritage scholarship is beginning to recognise the importance of moving beyond heritage framed by global-local dualisms. Winter (2011) and Winter and Daly (2012) have argued that the global and local are ‘mutually constitutive’ and urgent heritage scholars to move away from often casual and overly simplistic polarisations of the global and local. While elsewhere Logan (2002, 2008) has acknowledged that heritage protection does not solely depend on global and national interventions. Logan has instead referred to the emergence of a ‘counter-tendency’, or the potential synchronicity of globalisation and localisation through the increased involvement of local Indigenous communities within all aspects of the management of World Heritage.

However, as the highly common response from a CMRD buffer zone landowner serves to illustrate, World Heritage management in Vanuatu goes far beyond the concession by external agents (whether the state or international parties) to ‘take into account’ (UNESCO 2006: 4) or ‘understand, respect, encourage and accommodate’ (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2004: 9) local Indigenous communities within existing heritage processes and frameworks. Local community control of land is the starting point for World Heritage management planning in Vanuatu, and for that matter, throughout all of independent Melanesia (Ballard & Wilson, 2012). It is therefore essential that heritage scholars and practitioners move beyond current understandings of World Heritage as a purely globalising force and attempt to unpack and comprehend some of the more powerful localising forces also at work. This means acknowledging World Heritage as an inherently glocalised entity; or in other words, as much a global force for heritage protection, as it is a local force for economic development, and vice versa. The reality is that World Heritage status is being drawn upon in support of a range of locally important conservation and development ideas and initiatives at CRMD, such as buffer zone conservation measures congruent with locally acceptable land-use practices and cultural heritage tourism calibrated in an attempt to maximise improvements to community living standards (for further information, see Trau 2012; Trau, Ballard & Wilson 2012). So while it is irrefutable that Western heritage theory and praxis pervades the adoption of or labelling as ‘World Heritage’, it is equally true that the Lelena community are actively using, even manipulating, UNESCO’s global agenda to further their own interests and desires particularly in the form of increased economic development, though also somewhat ironically as a tool to revitalise kastom (a Bislama term diversely referring to local customary principles and practices). This is precisely where arguments of binary global-local oppositions by those who Askew (2010: 32) rather frankly refers to as ‘self-appointed representatives of the ‘subaltern voice’ tend to oversimplify or obscure these more complicated and difficult to comprehend on-ground realities.

Translating and Transforming World Heritage

Yumi nao yumi Wol Heritij / It’s us, we are World Heritage now (CRMD buffer zone landowner, Mangaiiliu community meeting, June 2009)

In the same way that global products undergo transformations in local marketplaces – in what Classen & Howes (1996) and Kraidy (2005) among others refer to as the creolization or hybridisation of consumer goods – World Heritage is being creatively and resourcefullytranslated and transformed by the Lelena community into something which they value and can use (as the quote above suggests). This is principally being achieved by actively employing the branding of important aspects of their kastom as World Heritage to increase local tourism development. The following discussion demonstrates that for UNESCO’s World Heritage to wholly transition into CRMD’s Wol Heriti, and be accepted and respected by the Lelena communities into the long-term, development and conservation must be integrated and complementary features of locally appropriate models of World Heritage management (however counterintuitive and contradictory this may appear to
the international heritage profession). This is not to say that the Lelema communities do not value their kastrong and the international recognition of its OUV, but rather that for most community members income generation to support schooling, health and transportation, is the overwhelming priority. That is, decisions taken by communities, living in cash poverty, to become part of the World Heritage system are strategic and pragmatic, driven by the need for enhanced standards of living as much as they are conservation-driven, despite the intent and purpose of the World Heritage Convention. As an illustration of the closely interwoven and globalised nature of tourism development and cultural heritage conservation in particular at CRMD, Figure 3 shows youthful learning how to be tour guides to (hopefully) earn income for themselves and their families while also reviving the stories of and their associations with Roi Mata.

The translation and transformation of World Heritage at CRMD is at odds, however, with UNESCO’s universal ideal of World Heritage. As Huxley (1947), and more recently Hall (2011), has affirmed, the very legitimacy of UNESCO is predicated on its role as the defender of the world’s cultural and natural heritage in the face of likely contamination, evenruining, through the imposition of industrial capitalist globalisation. This ties into, and is also due in part, to a long-standing dualism more generally within the heritage scholarship between heritage preservation and tourism development (for further discussion see, for example, Hughes & Carlson 2010; Staiff 2003; Winter 2010). Tourtellot (2007) is a case in point, having stated that tourism is the ‘biggest threat and benefactor’ of World Heritage sites.

While the imposition of development restrictions from either an international agency or the nation-state at CRMD has very little chance of being accepted locally, the act of not directly financially or technically supporting key development opportunities and aspirations of customary landowners has a similar effect in that very few Lelema owned and managed tourism businesses without external assistance have achieved even short-term revenue consistency (Trau 2012). The majority of the tour guides in Figure 3, for example, were and are still unable to find consistent paid work within CRMD, with some even taking up work in the foreign owned and managed hotels of Port Vila under extremely poor employment conditions. While UNESCO has clearly recognised the importance of World Heritage status to sustainable development and poverty alleviation opportunities particularly in Africa (UNESCO 2002), strictly speaking, both the published guidelines (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2012) and relevant articles within the World Heritage Convention (articles 13.1, 13.2 and 19 to 26) concerning UNESCO’s international assistance clearly state that funds are to be used to help state parties protect the world cultural or natural heritage, not support development projects or initiatives. As Bushell & Staiff (2012) attest, while development and poverty are clearly on UNESCO’s public agenda, the language employed by UNESCO suggests a lack of straightforwardness in terms of meaning and usage. This surely adds further credence to Breen’s (2007: 355) call for World Heritage ‘to become embedded within the international development framework where it can become an advocacy voice for community and for poverty alleviation’.

For many World Heritage sites around the world this may be less of an issue considering the state’s clear jurisdiction over its territory. But given the supremacy of local customary tenure in Vanuatu, and Lelema villagers’ increasing need for supplementary cash income to pay for basic services such as schooling and health care, and other necessities such as clothing and kerosene, anything short of the provision of tourism development at levels desired by CRMD customary landowners makes UNESCO’s World Heritage quite simply untenable. Several corroborative studies from Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands have confirmed that local customary landowners prefer to talk about Western development know-how and their own potential pathways to economic prosperity rather than muse over international forms and methods of heritage conservation and resource management (Fler 2004; Foale 2001; Ketan 1998; Stewart & Strathern 1998). Experience from CRMD has repeatedly demonstrated that customary landowners unsatisfied with the lack of development or externally driven development restrictions will either simply disregard, or in some severe cases even threaten to expunge, World Heritage. In the past when this has occurred, it has precipitated moves by some customary landowners toward unsustainable land-uses (in terms of both local livelihoods and environs) such as foreign-owned and managed commercial residential developments (Trau, Ballard & Wilson 2012; Wilson, Ballard & Kaolotti 2011). It would be disingenuous to portray the Lelema community as a single and uniform voice, however. While many Lelema customary landowners value World Heritage as an instrument to provide increased heritage protection and sustainable land-use planning particularly given the rise of new modern foreign-aided development threats, for many others, equally, it is only as strong as the perception of its development potential. Herein lays the crux of the glocalisation process at CRMD: that it is as much about the interaction between local and global as it is about the encroachment of the global on the local. As discussed earlier, and in what some influential theorists such as Escobar (2001) and Sahlin (2000) regard as an affront to local power and agency, too often the critical heritage literature simply ignores the former and is concerned only with the latter.

The translation and transformation of World Heritage at CRMD to a more glocalised entity – where a mixture of locally desired
and sustainable land-use practices and developments associated with the community’s interaction with their heritage exist – is extremely important to not only individual landowners but also the LWHC. In addition to ensuring their own families have sufficient crops in the ground to both feed themselves and earn a small income for education and health services, the LWHC must work with extremely limited resources to maintain and conciliate both UNESCO’s and CRMD’s idea of World Heritage within a highly porous global-local interface. This gives the LWHC the ineluctable task of having to simultaneously satisfy the demands of customary landowners over their World Heritage land on the one hand, while also having to continually justify management decisions and actions against strictly defined international criterion and guidelines on the other. The result being that most often the LWHC struggles to simultaneously uphold the expectations of either customary landowners or UNESCO.

Across the entire less-developed world, vastly inadequate resourcing from the State in addition to the highly intermittent and patchy nature of international aid funding means that Indigenous heritage managers such as the LWHC are routinely faced with having to simultaneously make World Heritage management financially viable while also reducing poverty at the village level (Reddy 2009; Timothy & Prideaux 2004). Regardless therefore of international will and desires, one could argue that a certain level of World Heritage glocalisation – that is, the merging of tourism and heritage into one and the same through local manifestations of World Heritage – is happening across the less-developed world to various degrees in order to maintain World Heritage, not to mention community economic viability. At CRMD these processes and pressures are only intensified due to the extraordinary political and legal status of World Heritage land on the one hand, while also having to continually justify management decisions and actions against strictly defined international criterion and guidelines on the other. The result being that most often the LWHC struggles to simultaneously uphold the expectations of either customary landowners or UNESCO.

**The Imperative of the Wol Heritij Brand**

Wol Heritij hem i wan gudfala samting we i save karem inkam i kam long komunit. Be yufala we yufala i stap long komiti i mas mekem plante turis i kam / World Heritage is a good thing that can bring income to the community. But those that belong to the [Lelema World Heritage] committee must make sure tourist visitation increases to high-levels. (Mangaliliu community member, community meeting, February 2010.)

It is now clearly apparent that the ongoing maintenance of World Heritage at CRMD can only be sustainably achieved at the local level under rules set collectively by the customary landowners, and that these rules are influenced by both global and local forces and agents in a rather tumultuous process characterised here as glocalisation. It is therefore imperative, as the quote above insinuates, to incorporate and then maintain what is essentially the glocalised brand of CRMD’s Wol Heritij, or the merging of ideas and expressions of both development and conservation, within local conceptions of World Heritage. As long as World Heritage at CRMD is understood locally as having assumed its local form of Wol Heritij, then the customary landowners of CRMD World Heritage property and buffer zone are accommodating of UNESCO’s external claim to their land as having OUV and of being World Heritage. The word ‘brand’ is used here to not only illustrate a tangible representation or sign value of Lelema’s unique localness (see Figure 4), but also begin to depict a more complicated conceptual self-representation of the Lelema community’s glocality as imagined and constructed using locally recognisable and useful elements of UNESCO’s World Heritage.

Since the nomination process and the resulting inscription of CRMD, it is Wol Heritij that is becoming increasingly important to many customary landowners of CRMD; with this glocalised brand of World Heritage now associated with numerous small but critical projects and initiatives within the Lelema community from infrastructure projects such as water securitisation to livelihood initiatives through a variety of tourism associated enterprises such as craft selling, tours, picnic and camping areas and bungalow accommodation. While all of these projects and initiatives are at very early stages of development – many only just beginning to provide tangible benefits and doing so in a staggered and slow-moving manner (Trau 2012) – it is the local perception of Wol Heritij’s ability to achieve these desired outcomes that is increasingly felt and articulated by customary landowners. It is this brand of World Heritage and its essential hope for a better future through increased economic development opportunities for the Lelema community that has been and will continue to be imperative to maintain at CRMD. Brand maintenance is achieved through not only the provision of tangible benefits but also, due to the protracted nature of community development, by the LWHC constantly advocating within community meetings and other local forums the potential of CRMD’s Wol Heritij and the need, therefore, to accommodate the rudiments of UNESCO’s World Heritage. Although relatively small and staggered in terms of contribution, national and international subsidies of the
community’s tourism business costs such as advertising and insurance has provided a lifeline to the LWHC in this regard. For many customary landowners, particularly those in the surrounding buffer zone, World Heritage only has relevance and use while it is a successful selling point and tourist-marketing tool. In other words, the community is confident (whether accurately or otherwise) about its ability to conserve the cultural landscape of CRMD, so UNESCO’s World Heritage is tolerated only as long as it sustains the local configuration of Wol Heritij and is able to be mobilised freely by landowners to attract and enhance economic opportunities.

The Wol Heritij brand must also be incredibly versatile and adaptable in order to maintain prominence within the community, consistently responding to the day-to-day ever-changing and non-constant global-local hybrid lifeworld of the Lelema villagers. Indeed, the sheer inevitability of ruptures, disagreements, even conflicts, at World Heritage sites collectively held under customary tenure such as CRMD – where each and every customary landowner is in effect the sovereign authority over his or her landholding – is constant. When measured against UNESCO’s operational guidelines and the World Heritage Convention, the glocalised brand of CRMD’s Wol Heritij may therefore appear to be chaotic, in disorder and even occasionally on the verge of ruin. Blaser (2010: 25) has described such radical global-local differences as ‘ontological conflicts’ that ultimately lead to the reshaping of the forces of modernity according to “the uniqueness of peoples’ experiences of place and self and in their rejection of visions that claim to be universal”. While Friedman (2002: 15) and Isar (2011: 50) respectively have described this process of appropriating Western products outside of Western cultural logic as the forging of ‘Melanesian contemporaneities’ and ‘multiple modernities’ based on global-local interrelations.

At CRMD this is all quite simply judged locally to be the essential nature of collectively owned and managed resources in all of its complexity, fluidity and unpredictability. This is not to say that international heritage scholarship, guidelines and conventions do not have a vital role to play in protecting World Heritage, but that the system and organisations within it must recognise the supreme power and agency of locality in countries such as Vanuatu and the unstoppable emergence of glocalised forms and expressions of development and modernity. Borrowing from Appadurai’s (2000) concept of ‘grassroots globalisation’, or the critical analysis of globalisation from below, Robertson’s (2008) concept of ‘heritage from below’ is extremely pertinent here. Robertson (2008: 143) describes it as ‘the recognition of the possibility of the expression of alternative forms of heritage that ‘work’ from below and within, conceived for, from and by local communities with minimal professional help from without’. The process of glocalisation at CRMD serves to slightly nuance this argument and to point out that while the local and national agents at CRMD are undoubtedly often facilitating the ‘local’ for the ‘global’, this by no means overrides or extinguishes local meanings, values and beliefs associated with their cultural heritage. The requisite of UNESCO and the heritage profession for lengthy and professionally written management documentation, for example, has had little affect on the LWHC or the Lelema community’s practice of managing their heritage via verbal commitments or handwritten reports or sketches in Bislama. In many ways, CRMD World Heritage is just another complex and subtle gameplay with external agents and actors in order to extort some economic benefit from an incredibly economically unequal world. Above all else, the glocalised brand of CRMD’s Wol Heritij has become just another important latching from which to leverage the Lelema community’s highly desired hybrid forms and expressions of development and modernity.

**Conclusion**

This paper has sought to develop a more critical and nuanced account of the discursive spaces of global-local interaction in the context of the inherently variable and fluid customary tenure regime of CRMD. In so doing, it contributes to the emerging field of critical heritage studies, and more specifically that of World Heritage globalisation, by highlighting the need for much greater appreciation and examination of the more complex and ambiguous bottom-up local forces at work, beyond that of simply top-down global perspectives. This has been by no means an attempt to debunk or discredit existing and prevailing arguments from within the critical heritage literature, but to illustrate how overemphasis on the global is often at the expense of the local, ignoring the critical role of Indigenous peoples as active agents in the processes of globalisation writ large. While globalisation is, as Bauman (1998: 1) states, “the intractable fate of the world, an irreversible process” equally unyielding (as the case of CRMD illustrates) is the ability and obstinacy of the local to creatively and resourcefully reconfigure their glocality in order to adapt and endure.

UNESCO World Heritage is just one of but numerous external brands, forces and agents that present the Lelema community with opportunities to further glocalise. By revealing the level and nature of World Heritage glocalisation taking place at CRMD it is hoped that this paper has brought attention to the urgent need for radical new ways of theorising and practising heritage management in Melanesia. As others have variously advocated (Ballard & Wilson 2012; Hay-Eddie 2004; Robertson 2008), this begins by acknowledging that “their reality” (local Indigenous peoples) is of utmost importance for the protection of World Heritage and maintenance of OUV. Moreover, and perhaps more challenging for UNESCO and heritage scholarship, the maintenance and strength of the glocalised brand of CRMD’s Wol Heritij – with the innate amalgamation of global-local ideas and expressions of both development and conservation – must be viewed as intrinsic to sustainable models of World Heritage management. For if World Heritage is to be not only recognised and understood but also valued and protected in regions such as Melanesia, where properties are likely to be held under customary tenure, then it is vital that such naturally non-constant, unpredictable, unceasing, even occasionally unstable, reconfigurations of glocality be recognised, supported and sustained. In a practical sense, this can be broadly achieved by maintaining a mix of sustainable heritage-based financial revenue streams (from community-owned commercial activities and international aid and national government funding) as well as locally resilient and valued World Heritage governance structures and arrangements (such as that of LWHC and their real and emergent partnerships with industry and government).
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