SHARED HERITAGE: 
AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY AND METHODOLOGY FOR 
ASSESSING, ENHANCING, AND COMMUNICATING A FUTURE-
ORIENTED SOCIAL ETHIC OF HERITAGE PROTECTION

A Dissertation Presented

by

ANGELA M. LABRADOR

Submitted to the Graduate School of the 
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment 
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

February 2013

Anthropology
CHAPTER 4
MOBILIZING SHARED HERITAGE FRAMEWORKS

The pink sands, tropical climate, and turquoise waters of the rural Bahamian island of Eleuthera\textsuperscript{14} have attracted casual tourists and more permanent vacation homeowners for several generations. However, such tourism has not generated a stable nor profitable economy for local residents and has impacted property relations, access to traditionally public landscapes and resources, fragile natural resources, and the maintenance of cultural traditions. In response to the threat of tourism development pressure, Shuan Ingraham and Michelle Johnson formed a non-profit community organization, One Eleuthera, in 2012 to build capacity for community-engaged sustainable development projects that make use of the island’s cultural and natural resource base. In order to support One Eleuthera’s community building agenda on an island where stakeholders, advocates, and resources are dispersed and not well integrated, I designed and developed a web-based information and communication system for public education, engagement, and fundraising. This online system was the first of several projects proposed by the Center for Heritage and Society in partnership with One Eleuthera following several exploratory visits to assess the islands’ cultural heritage needs (Chilton et al. 2011). One of the strategic goals of the partnership is to shift the focus from a narrowly defined tourism development agenda to a broader heritage development agenda, which certainly includes tourism (but not exclusively so). In this

\textsuperscript{14} The Bahamas is an archipelago of over 700 islands and cays. Most of the population is centered on the islands of New Providence (home of Nassau) and Grand Bahama (home to Freeport). The rest of the islands are referred to as the “Family Islands” (previously referred to as the “Out Islands” prior to independence).
chapter I summarize the current state of tourism development on Eleuthera and in the Bahamas, the major challenges of tourism development in the region, and the creative response to these challenges in the One Eleuthera initiative. I then describe how internet and communications technology (ICT) can support community development initiatives in keeping with shared heritage ethics using the case study of my design and development of the One Eleuthera Web Portal.

Tourism on Eleuthera: “Like a state within a state”

Some put on Sandals
Exclusive vandals
It’s a scandal
The way they operate
Building brick walls and barricades
Like a state within a state.

For Lucians to enter
For lunch or dinner
We need reservations, passport and visa
And if you sell near the hotel
I wish you well
They will yell and kick you out to hell.15

When the cruise ship drops anchor at Princess Cays in southern Eleuthera in the Bahamas, it looms over the horizon in nearby Bannerman Town, once a thriving port and the site of a former plantation whose land was willed to its enslaved laborers and their descendants upon Emancipation. While thousands of tourists are shuttled to the private beach owned by Princess Cruises, a handful of locals open their colorful “shacks” and wait for the tourists to browse their wares (Figure 9). However, to reach the local merchants, cruise goers must exit the all-inclusive island paradise of sand, sun, surf,

booze, food, and souvenirs through a chain link fence and walk past security guards to
the small cluster of wooden stalls (Figure 10). Although outside the gate, local merchants
are still observed and shut down if they offer goods (e.g. alcohol and tobacco) that
successfully compete with the resort. For those tourists intrepid enough to exit the gates,
they must show picture identification to reenter, a formality that prevents locals and non-
Princess Cruise guests access to the beach. When a small research team from the
University of Massachusetts Amherst attempted to enter the resort from the Bannerman
Town access gate, the security guard denied access, informing us that beyond the gate “is
not Eleuthera—it’s Princess Cays,” implying that we were gazing upon a separate,
sovereign land.

This “state within a state” phenomenon was recently critiqued (1994) in Rohan
Soen’s winning calypso of St. Lucia’s Carnival King. Soen observes that amid the all-
inclusive resorts in the Caribbean, locals feel “like an alien—in we own land” and grow
disenchanted with the enclosure of traditionally (and legally) publicly accessible beaches
it really success? If we gain ten billion—But lose the land we live on.” Indeed, many now
wonder whether the economic potential of tourism lauded by UNESCO and international
development banks outweighs its environmental and social effects (see review in Crick
1989).

In the shadow of a mega cruise ship carrying potential consumers, a quick drive
through neighboring Bannerman Town reveals a dearth of economic opportunities,
symbolized by the end of the copper lines at the access road to Princess Cays: the utilities
were not funded to be extended further south at the time of the Princess Cays
Figure 9: Vendor booths outside of Princess Cays, South Eleuthera. (Photo credit: Elizabeth Chilton 2011)

Figure 10: Security Gate, Princess Cays, South Eleuthera. (Photo credit: Elizabeth Chilton 2011)
Figure 11: Map of Eleuthera with inset of southern tip. Orange star is Princess Cays and yellow star represents approximate location of the original Bannerman Town (now marked as north of Princess Cays). Note cruise ships anchored off shore. (Images compiled and edited by author from Google Earth and Google Maps)
development. Ruins of houses abandoned within the last generation dot the landscape, and a shrinking population struggles to maintain their generational titles to their settlement’s land. Once the most bustling port on Eleuthera, today, one informant claims that Bannerman Town is officially abandoned and only has succeeded to maintain its settlement through a bureaucratic accident when road crews erected the Bannerman Town settlement sign too far north in neighboring Millars (effectively wiping Millars off the map). Amid the impoverishment, it is no surprise that the siren’s call of tourism development is tempting despite any negative social or environmental impacts, or even amid the evidence of uneven economic growth.

The resort model of Princess Cays follows the widespread success of all-inclusive tourism destinations developed since the late 1970s, and which has grown to become the most successful sector in the industry (Pattullo 2005:95–96; Wood 2000, 2006). The all-inclusive operates much like a cruise ship at sea: importing goods and services that are served within the gates, and therefore generating revenue within the resort, which enables

16 Land title in the Bahamas differs fundamentally from American property law. The Bahamian government holds title to 70% of the 100,000 square miles of land spread over 700 islands and cays (Drosdoff 2005). Some if not most private land is owned under generational title, which is handed down, without freehold (i.e. fee simple) title or documentation, within families and may be transferred among and between families through ad hoc titles and contracts (Drosdoff 2005). These titles can be challenging to defend and affect many Family Island residents who often leave their ancestral land for urban centers (Gibbs 2010). Further complicating matters, Bahamian property boundaries are naturally unstable due to the archipelago’s marine environment and climate. As of 2005, the IADB approved a $3.5 million loan to fund the creation of the nation’s first central land registry on the two most populous islands of New Providence and Grand Bahama and a comprehensive national land policy to assist with central land planning and administration (Drosdoff 2005).
the resort to control the flow of money (and people) back into the local sector.\textsuperscript{17} In the Bahamas, very little tourism revenue flows back to the local market: in 1994 a senior tourism official suggested that leakage (i.e. the loss of foreign exchange to taxes, imports, profits, and wages) was as high as 90\%, meaning for every dollar earned in the tourism market, 90 cents went offshore to foreign interests (Pattullo 2005:52). Statistics compiled by the Caribbean Tourism Organization from 2002 confirmed that the Bahamas suffers the highest leakage among Caribbean nations at 85\% (Karagiannis and Witter 2004:139). Considering that tourism accounts for 60–70\% of The Bahamas’ GNP and 50–60\% of its labor force, the high rate of leakage technically qualifies Bahamian tourism as an \textit{offshore} activity (United States Department of State Bureau of Public Affairs 2012; Karagiannis and Witter 2004:150). While guarded and gated compounds lend the impression that tourism operates as an exclusive enclave \textit{within} a state, the economic reality is that Bahamian tourism operates as a parasitic foreign market \textit{upon} a dependent state. The market quickly grows larger than its host country, which hemorrhages potential revenue while suffering the contextual/place-based environmental and social effects.

The growth of tourism in the Bahamas and its reliance on foreign imports has been simultaneous with a decrease in domestic exports, a move originally intended to shift the country away from its colonial economic structures (Crick 1989:319). This is especially apparent on Eleuthera, which used to be an agricultural breadbasket in the

\textsuperscript{17} Historically, cruise ships, like the Titanic, were novel forms of transportation; however, the modern cruise ship (1966–present) is now a floating paradise of consumption that minimizes the desire for offshore attractions and returns passengers to their dock of departure (Ritzer 1999:18–19; Weaver 2005). Thus, onshore and offshore tourism business models appear to be converging on the goal of all-inclusive “containment” as discussed by Weaver (2005).
Bahamas and a thriving exporter of canned pineapples at the turn of the twentieth century (Bounds 1972). Agricultural production declined in the Bahamas following the nationalization of the sector after independence in the 1970s and the mandated destruction of all citrus crops on Abaco in 2005 following a devastating citrus canker outbreak (a loss of $60 million annual GDP) (Citro Source 2005). Today, agriculture and fisheries account for 1.2% of GDP, an underdeveloped market that holds potential for establishing linkages with the tourism market and decreasing dependency upon foreign foodstuffs (United States Department of State Bureau of Public Affairs 2012; Karagiannis and Witter 2004).

Ruins of grain silos and community packing plants across the island speak of a time, not too long ago, when subsistence and industrial agriculture employed Eleutherans. Contemporary informants within the industry complain that the younger generation prefers to look toward urban markets for employment, citing the stigma attached to farming as the work of slaves. Much like in rural communities across America (e.g. Hadley, Massachusetts), the outflow of the younger, local labor force on the Bahamian Family Islands is supplemented with an inflow of lower paid and socially marginalized workers such as Haitian immigrants.18 Although the agricultural and fishery sectors could be developed to mitigate leakage of tourism revenue, there is a lack of capacity and historical social stigma among local populations and points of distribution to exploit this opportunity and a xenophobic attitude toward migrants who could fill a labor gap.

18 The inflow of illegal Haitian immigrants who squat on “undeveloped” land on Bahamian Family Islands such as Eleuthera has partially fueled the development of new legislation such as the 2010 Land Adjudication Bill, which enables Bahamians who hold generational title to land to more easily defend their right to title in the face of illegal squatting (Gibbs 2010).
Most recently, rumors of large agricultural development projects primarily backed by China have aroused fears that the pattern of Chinese investment seen on the urban islands of New Providence and Grand Bahama will spread to the rural Family Islands (Nicolls 2010; Smith 2010). For instance, the $2.6 billion Baha Mar project, advertised as the Bahamian “New Riviera,” on Cable Beach is funded by the state-owned Chinese Export-Import Bank (Baha Mar 2012; Todd 2012). But, instead of creating new jobs and demand for supplies within the local market, the China State Construction Engineering Corporation has imported thousands of Chinese laborers to build the 900+ acre complex (Todd 2012). Therefore, when China recently announced investment plans on rural Abaco, local residents grew fearful of a large inflow of Chinese peasants with pundits (e.g. Smith 2010) drawing parallels to Chinese agricultural development initiatives in Africa where imported workers cultivate valuable arable land (see Rotberg 2008). Such a development model represents yet another undesirable system of economic “containment” and local revenue leakage.

On Eleuthera, local residents see the need for economic development but are wary of the established patterns of tourism development and the emerging model of Chinese investment. The material culture of tourism’s short term boom and bust cycles is readily apparent across the island: from the ruins of the Rat Pack era Potlatch and Castaway Clubs to the more recently abandoned Club Med, the stalled Sky Beach resort with its “moonscape” limestone environment, and the Arnold Palmer golf course where the untended fairways offer golfers a rough lie at best. Such ruins stand testament to the insidious “tourism area life cycle,” in which the planned or natural obsolescence of particular resorts gives way to newer resort areas and more luxurious facilities
Furthermore, the complex history of colonial power relations eerily haunts modern development efforts across the Caribbean region—the postcolonial era of Chinese development is yet one more chapter in the foreign extraction of resources and revenue using an imported and socially marginalized labor force (Pattullo 2005; Rotberg 2008). Locals want and need jobs but are cautious of the mounting evidence of the negative impacts of tourism and other foreign development projects on local economies, environments, and social relations (Karagiannis and Witter 2004; Kempadoo 1999; Pattullo 2005). Eleutheran informants repeatedly told my UMass colleagues and me they didn’t want to become another Nassau (i.e. an urban, mass tourism, “spring breaker” market), but struggled to articulate what a preferable mode of tourism would look like on their island.

**Challenges in New Tourism Models**

**Social Science Criticisms of Mass Tourism**

This is how the islands from the shame of necessity sell themselves; this is the seasonal erosion of their identity, that high-pitched repetition of the same images of service that cannot distinguish one island from the other, with a future of polluted marinas, land deals negotiated by ministers, and all of this conducted to the music of Happy Hour and the rictus of a smile….All of the Antilles, every island, is an effort of memory; every mind, every racial biography culminating in amnesia and fog. (Walcott 1992)

The alienating effects of the mass tourism industry in host communities as well as its role in placating the alienating symptoms of modernity as experienced by tourists are well-documented and critiqued within three broad frameworks in social scientific literature: political economy, representation and ideology, and social process (Crick 1989). Contemporary political economic treatments of Caribbean tourism tend toward neocolonial critiques that compare the power structures and economic consequences of
international tourism to colonial plantation societies (e.g. Davis 1978; Harrison 2001; Kadt 1979; Mowforth 2009; Pattullo 2005). Such critiques contextualize statistics such as the Bahamas’ high revenue leakage rates in terms of the structure of tourism under global capitalism wherein neither host economies nor their consumers profit, but foreign and local elites who, much like colonial plantation owners, are typically removed from the frontline of social and material exchanges within the market (Britton 1982; Cornwell and Stoddard 2001; Crick 1989). Furthermore, these researchers cite the lack of national capacity among postcolonial countries to adequately cope with the central planning and policy issues of tourism including property and water rights and environmental and cultural resource conservation (e.g. Mathieson and Wall 1982). These sources document the structures of economic and political inequalities that continue to plague international tourism in postcolonial nations such as the Bahamas and argue that mass tourism has not lived up to the lofty ambitions of postwar intergovernmental and development agencies.

Sociologists, anthropologists, and other cultural theorists have engaged with representations and ideologies produced and reproduced within tourism, including critiques of the conspicuous consumption of tourists (Turner and Ash 1975; Urry 1990), the limits to educational benefits of tourism (Brameld 1977), and the myths constructed through tourism that serve to further alienate tourists from hosts and hosts from their own identities (Barthes 1972; Baudrillard 1983; Crang and Travlou 2009; MacCannell 1999; Minea and Borghi 2009; Pi-Sunyer 1989; Urry 1990). Studies in this vein that concentrate on the Caribbean and the Bahamas in particular explore how the region’s colonial past forms the basis of a marketable, exotic pastiche of a timeless fantasy world for tourists rather than the contemporary lived realities (or historical experiences) of host
communities (Palmer 1994; Saunders 2003; Strachan 2002). Such discourses serve to further entrench racism, inhibit cross-cultural exchange, and hinder the presentation of diverse (and realistic) cultural and place identities (Cornwell and Stoddard 2001; Montero 2011; Palmer 1994; Saunders 2003).

Finally, studies that focus on tourism and its social and cultural impacts critique how cultural traditions are commoditized through tourism (Crick 1989; Stronza 2001), thus potentially contributing to their erosion (Crystal 1989; Greenwood 1989; MacCannell 1999), involution (De Jong 2007; McKeen 1989; Swain 1989), or preservation (Brown 1984). Critiques emerging from within the cultural heritage field analyze the unintended consequences of international cultural heritage promotion programs such as the World Heritage List, which ostensibly promote cultural heritage distinction and protection (Cleere 2011; Di Giovine 2009; Labadi 2005). Other sources explore impacts on land tenure, cultural understandings of the natural environment, and ethics concerning resource conservation (Davis 1997; Honey 2008; Mansperger 1995; West 2006; West et al. 2006). However, Stronza (2001) contends that such studies suffer from a myopic focus on impacts at the local, host community scale to the detriment of understanding social impacts upon tourists and their origin communities. More nuanced research is emerging on the effects of tourism among increasingly transnational populations (Coles and Timothy 2004; Kelner 2010), including the Caribbean diaspora (Scher 2007; Stephenson 2004), and transnational second home owners (Hall and Müller 2004).
Alternative Tourism Models

The above review is just a representative sampling of the plentiful and still accumulating critiques of mass international tourism, critiques that have informed experiments in alternative tourism models during recent decades. Two leading alternative models: ecotourism and heritage tourism are briefly described here, followed by the more general “community tourism” model. Such alternative models envision tourism as a means for securing sustainable economies, environments, and cultures and typically prioritize local community participation. Alternative tourism models are now commonly integrated into sustainable development initiatives such as the United Nations World Tourism Organization’s Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty (ST-EP) initiative launched in 2002 (United Nations World Trade Organization 2012). The operationalization of alternative tourism models faces a number of challenges and are now the focus of what could be considered a “second wave” critique in tourism studies (e.g. Apostolopoulos 2002; Burns and Novelli 2008; Richards and Hall 2000; Richards and Wilson 2007; Singh et al. 2002; Williams 2004) and associated publications (e.g. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, and Journal of Ecotourism).

Selling the Adventure of Wilderness: Ecotourism

Ecotourism has emerged amid the context of a growing awareness of ecological and environmental issues since the late 1960s and is currently a thriving industry (Fennell 1999; Wight 2001). The term refers to tourism that features natural resources as the basis of leisure activities as well as a model for integrating the conservation of natural resources into the historically extractive tourism market (Fennell 1999). Although wilderness has long attracted tourists (e.g. Brown 1997), a distinction is typically made
that ecotourism includes some form of environmental education and “low impact” ethic alongside the promise of adventure and recreation (Fennell 1999). Local people and interests figure into many ecotourism models as stakeholders in local economic and environmental issues, with rural ecosystems affected more than urban environments. However, like popular labels such as “organic,” “natural,” and “green,” there is no single standard for identifying or assessing ecotourism.

Similarly, there is no single profile for the ecotourist, who is presumed to differ from the “typical” mass tourist by a desire to move beyond the pleasure resort and directly engage with the natural environment in a benign way. Because the definition of ecotourism is slippery and is used to refer to a wide range of nature-oriented tourism, identifying ecotourists and their characteristics and motivations are challenging. Anglophone ecotourists may represent a higher income bracket; however, Wight (2001:40) complicates this by presenting variation in ecotourism activities across classes, especially among American ecotourists. For example, higher incomes correlate to sailing and scuba diving while lower incomes correlate to camping, preferences that evoke Bourdieu’s study (1984) of how such preferences are culturally mediated and signal social capital. Generally, statistics are consistent in identifying ecotourists with at least some college-level education (Wight 2001:40), which may explain the presumed correlation with higher income levels. Furthermore, ecotourists generally spend more money on their trips than mass market tourists (including comparisons made at single destinations) but also demand higher value from destinations (Wight 2001:45). These “higher class” (both in terms of income and social standing) tourists are more attractive to
many destination communities and service providers than the stereotypical mass market tourist.

Although ecotourism promotes a sustainable ethos, reviews have been mixed about whether it engenders more sustainable relations on the ground. Honey (2008) presents several case studies wherein ecotourism offers welcome economic opportunity to residents in or near nature preserves or presents a more profitable and less environmentally damaging path than other extractive industries such as mining. However, she also notes that ecotourism doesn’t necessarily build capacity at the local level for the active management or participation in the trade and is often carried out in nations that lack comprehensive policies for regulating environmental conservation and planning (Honey 2008:445–446). Furthermore, ecotourism maintains its private enterprise imperative to produce profit with no guarantee of improvement in leakage rates from the domestic economy (let alone “fair” distribution of income at the local level). Finally, Butcher (2008) suggests that an overemphasis upon local community participation in ecotourism has not empowered more political agency in the environmental and economic arenas but rather has contributed to the erosion of associated political institutions at the national level.

Ecotourism is making inroads on the Bahamian Family Island of Eleuthera, which is advertised as undeveloped and boasts beaches, coral reefs, natural limestone formations, and underground and underwater caves. For example, the recently opened Leon Levy Nature Preserve in Central Eleuthera, privately funded by the Leon Levy Foundation and operated by the Bahamas National Trust, is the first national park on the island and is designed as a research center and ecotourist attraction. The fragile marine
ecosystem of the Bahamas is an attraction to ecotourists but not necessarily resilient to increased visitation (no matter how lightly one treads). Thus, the Bahamas has strengthened its environmental policies in response to the United Nation’s Agenda 21 (1992), the international sustainable development mandate associated with the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (United Nations Conference on Environment and Development 1992) and the Millennium Development Goals. Major environmental legislation has been introduced in the past 20 years, as well as mandatory environmental impact assessments for development, a national coordinating body to assist with conservation and development issues, and a national action plan (SENES Consultants Limited 2005) to comprehensively manage and mitigate development impacts on biodiversity, land use, and nonrenewable resources (United Nations 1998).

**Selling Culture and Place: Heritage Tourism**

A second, fast-growing sector of the alternative tourism industry is heritage tourism, which includes cultural and creative tourism. In heritage tourism, local cultural identities and spirit of place are marketed and developed into visitor experiences (Dicks 2004; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Robinson and Smith 2006; Timothy and Nyaupane 2009). Although the resources of the authorized heritage discourse (Smith 2006) have often figured prominently in tourism such as in the nineteenth century Grand Tour, today’s heritage tourism includes such traditional attractions as well as a range of tangible and intangible resources of vernacular cultures around the world. Timothy and Nyaupane (2009) identify several major, non-mutually exclusive types of heritage tourism: religious (e.g. pilgrimages to sacred sites), diasporic (e.g. descendant communities returning to ancestral or associated lands), living (e.g. tourists visiting
“intact” folk communities in rural villages or exploring culinary or craft traditions in urban and rural areas), built (e.g. visiting a historic urban center), and archaeological. Thus, heritage tourism covers a lot of ground and appeals to a range of tourists, although the stereotypical heritage tourist mirrors the ecotourist: white, middle class, educated, and willing to spend more money (Robinson and Smith 2006:5). Like its environmental cousin (i.e. ecotourism), contemporary heritage tourism is based within the sustainable development model and promotes “pro-poor” planning, community participation, and a heritage conservation ethos.¹⁹

Whereas ecotourism relies upon the physical environment to create tourism experiences, heritage tourism, in commodifying cultural resources has more leeway in the creative construction of its attraction. Furthermore, the changing conceptualization of heritage as contemporary social practice has led to a slow emergence of conceptualizing cultural resources as reproducible rather than non-renewable/non-replaceable (Ashworth 2002; Richards and Wilson 2007). Although cultural “authenticity” is a main attraction to heritage tourists, the commoditization of heritage resources is a complex, transformative process that may have little to do with host communities’ contemporary uses of the past and which may reflect the limits of tourists’ willingness to experience others’ cultural values (Ashworth 2002; Dicks 2004; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; MacCannell 1999; Robinson and Smith 2006; Timothy and Nyaupane 2009; Urry 1990). For instance, Ashworth (2002) presents three case studies in which the commoditization of cultural identity proves transformative for host cultures to the extent that tourism becomes

¹⁹ Examples of this can be accessed via the World Bank’s Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Resources website (2011).
enmeshed with local heritage practice—for better and worse. Comaroff and Comaroff (2009) detail the ways in which an “identity economy” grants marginalized groups opportunity to transform their alienation from majority society into a means to generate revenue (e.g. Ashworth’s [2002] example of Newfoundland translating its folksy “backwardsness” into an attraction for tourists nostalgic for yesteryear). However, such practice may come at a high cost of further entrenching stereotypes, inequalities, social exclusion, and poverty (Ashworth 2002; Comaroff and Comaroff 2009).

In the Caribbean, heritage tourism offers an alternative (or at least an addition) to the mass tourist attractions of sun, sand, and sea. However, in that the region’s colonial history features morally reprehensible acts such as the massacre of Indigenous peoples, the enslavement of Africans, and the indenturing of East Indians—vestiges of which are embedded in present power relations and cultural geographies—heritage tourism in the Caribbean is a tricky business to say the least. Archaeological sites such as slave plantations and historically satirical cultural spectacles such as Carnival hold potential as “sites of conscience” (Sevcenko 2010) that offer cross-cultural opportunities to engage with universal moral issues. However, they also may be transformed into venues for reproducing colonial power relations in postcolonial contexts (Cornwell and Stoddard 2001). For instance, sex tourism across the region capitalizes on particular cultural values, stereotypes, and colonial histories and may be considered a form of “backroom” [bedroom] heritage tourism (Gmelch 2003; Kempadoo 1999; Scher 2011). Scher (2011) argues that heritage tourism in the Caribbean serves neoliberal governmentality: a decentralized nation-building in which citizens “perform” certain state-legitimated and market-driven identities to the detriment of creative capacity. Although promoted as local
and unique, heritage tourism has the paradoxical propensity to globalize and standardize cultural practices.

Heritage tourism is of particular interest in the Bahamas with efforts ranging from Coca-Cola’s “Love My Bahamas” campaign to beautify downtown Nassau (making it “friendlier” to tourists [Boal 2010]) to the development of Clifton Heritage National Park where recent Miss Universe contestants “walked in the footsteps of the Lucayan, the Loyalists and Enslaved Africans” (Clifton Heritage Authority 2010). The latter hosts the last publicly accessible plantation site on New Providence, which was preserved following a grassroots movement that eventually aided the opposition party in regaining control of Parliament and passing the Clifton Heritage Authority Act in 2004 (Pateman 2011). Although the Bahamas passed an antiquities act in 1998, it does not carry heavy penalties (relative to major tourism development projects), protect underwater resources, nor provide adequate funding for preservation activities across the archipelago. However, the antiquities act has aided the centralization of a heritage site inventory for planning and protection purposes and expanded government interest in the development and promotion of heritage resources for tourism (Pateman 2011).

**Selling for Ourselves: Community Tourism**

Community tourism emphasizes local participation, values, and benefits in tourism development regardless of whether the tourism “product” is focused on the local environment, heritage, or neither. Case studies and critiques of community tourism unsurprisingly focus on the challenges of working with communities: challenges shared in ecotourism and heritage tourism models. These challenges include recognizing communities as heterogeneous entities (rather than the presumed homogeneity often
attributed to “the local community”) with differing and changeable power structures that
effect membership, authority, and decision-making (Boyd and Singh 2002; Butcher 2008;
Hall 2002). While “community” is used to semantically signal a progressive or friendlier
form of development, communities are political entities that are not inherently
benevolent, nor are community members’ political experiences within the community
identical or mutually beneficial (Butcher 2008; Creed 2006b; Hall 2002; Joseph 2002).
Thus, tourism development has the likely potential to affect community members
differentially along existing relations of power.

More biting critiques of community tourism accuse the rhetoric as tokenistic,
effective public relations, or a sham “cover” for first world hegemony in developing
nations (Butcher 2008; Mowforth and Munt 1997). In other development projects,
community participation is a practical, instrumental tactic to efficiently and economically
complete construction (Butcher 2008; Hall 2002). Butcher (2008) criticizes the popular
tourism development discourse among non-governmental organizations that promote
social cohesion as masking an underlying shared ideology of neoliberalism that runs
counter to the NGOs’ intended radical agendas. For instance, by focusing exclusively on
local communities (and at the local political scale), citizens are deterred from intervening
or participating in state or federal institutions, further diminishing their capacity. Thus,
the pervasive usage of loaded terms such as “sustainable,” “local,” “participatory,”
“democratic,” and “social cohesion” should be critically assessed in terms of their
operationalization at multiple scales.

Such criticism should not negate community-based approaches to development
but should inform them. Because tourism development has the potential to impact
economies, environments, and societies at a number of levels, participation should be at multiple scales, including national, regional, and local, and should include multiple sectors, such as government, professional, and lay. Successful community tourism models will require a combination of top-down and bottom-up political interventions. Participation implies an onus on the actor to engage with a development project; however, for some, this onus may be too burdensome as it requires a commitment of time, energy, and perhaps money. Furthermore, participation is constrained by issues of access and education. All of these factors point to the importance of building capacity across multiple scales and sectors to support meaningful and fairly distributed participation.

**Tourists as Stakeholders**

Much emphasis is placed upon the rights of host communities in alternative tourism models; however, what of the rights and stakes of tourists? The Manila Declaration on World Tourism (United Nations World Tourism Organization 1980) expands the 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights statement that all humans should enjoy rest and leisure time and be free to travel. In particular, the Manila Declaration underscores the belief that tourism can be a tool for enacting world peace in that it promotes international cooperation and moral education for participants. Acknowledging the interests and ethical responsibilities of tourists and integrating their stakes into ongoing community-engaged tourism development initiatives can expand the beneficial potential of such development—moving beyond economic and internal social dynamics to cross-cultural relations that more fully achieve the “shared” component of shared heritage ethics.
Community Capacity Building for Shared Heritage Development

One Eleuthera Initiative

It was a proposed development project on Lighthouse Beach at the southern tip of Eleuthera that broke the proverbial camel’s back in 2009. After observing the boom and bust cycle of failed, halted, or shrinking resorts on the island, including Club Med, Cotton Bay, Potlatch Club, Arnold Palmer’s Beach Front Inn, Cape Eleuthera, Sky Beach, Whale Point Club, and the recent (2008) failing of the Lehman Brothers backed Rose Island project just northeast of Eleuthera, residents were ready to take action when the government approved plans for a massive, foreign-investor backed development on Lighthouse Beach. The site is home to a unique ecosystem and range of archaeological resources and is an important cultural landscape for contemporary South Eleutherans. The proposed development project attracted a range of advocates: from local residents concerned about issues of public access and economic stimulus to environmental and heritage conservationists, who formed Friends of Lighthouse, a concerned citizens’ group. Friends of Lighthouse then hired Michael Singer Studio to assess potential impacts and alternative development models for South Eleuthera that would protect the cultural landscape of Lighthouse Beach. The resulting report, “A Shared Vision for South Eleuthera,” (Michael Singer Studio South 2010) outlined a plan for sustainable development on the southern end of the island, identifying a range of current resources and planning priorities, including building capacity in the cultural, agricultural, and environmental infrastructure as well as improving networks among the dispersed settlements on the island.
Seeing the need to expand the vision of the Singer Report to the whole island, Shaun Ingraham and Michele Johnson formed the One Eleuthera Foundation (OEF), a nonprofit community development organization to organize, promote, and fund planning and capacity building for sustainable development across the island. The foundation formally organized in 2012 and focuses on economic development that enhances the island’s cultural and natural assets, including branding Eleuthera as an eco- and heritage tourism destination (Ingraham and Johnson 2011). OEF is member driven, engaging the existing community development organizations, heritage advocacy groups, and educational institutions scattered across the island as well as remote partners who share a stake in Eleuthera’s future. OEF recognizes the existence of a diverse array of human, cultural, and natural resources across the island that could benefit from a collaborative network organized around unifying sustainable development principles. As such, OEF serves as a possible model for shared [cultural and natural] heritage initiatives in other places confronting the challenges of conventional tourism development noted above.

The Potential of ICT: The One Eleuthera Web Portal

I was introduced to OEF through my research assistantship at the UMass Center for Heritage and Society (CHS) when the center was contacted by Shaun Ingraham in October 2010. Ingraham was seeking collaborations with academic institutions that could provide information and tools for heritage conservation and development programs on Eleuthera. I accompanied Elizabeth Chilton and Neil Silberman on an initial assessment of heritage assets and potential for collaboration with OEF in 2011. In our report we proposed three actions to lay the groundwork for a partnership between OEF and CHS guided by a strategic vision of community-based elicitation and management of heritage
Our first proposed action was the creation of a web-based information system to provide a digital analog to OEF’s local initiatives. This information system would be the conduit and repository for additional CHS-led projects on the island, including an assessment of vernacular architecture and landscape undertaken in 2012, and a study abroad program currently being planned.

My vision extended beyond a simple website; I saw a need for an online collaborative space to serve the goals of capacity building: the creative enhancement and transformative interfacing of available resources, meaningful projects, and committed communities (Senteni and Johari 2006). I proposed the One Eleuthera Web Portal as an information and communication technology (ICT) to support community articulation around sustainable heritage development planning and capacity building and outlined three design goals:

1. Public presentation and education: To provide the coalition and its member organizations with an intuitive and cohesive interface to present material for public interpretation without having to create their own website or learn HTML.

2. Public promotion and community stakeholder engagement: To allow client organization, community stakeholders, and the "general public" to access content and engage with each other.

3. Fundraising and community mobilization: To coordinate constituent data, run online fundraising campaigns, accept online donations, manage events, send mass emails, and manage grants made to OEF members.

**Networking Dispersed Stakeholders**

ICT’s most obvious potential lies in its ability to quickly and cheaply communicate information across vast physical and social networks. One Eleuthera’s
stakeholders are widely dispersed, including residents in local settlements, diasporic workers and students in Nassau or further abroad, government officials on the island and in Nassau, vacation home owners who spend part of the year on island, members of US-based academic institutions who conduct field schools on island, tourists from around the globe, heritage advocacy NGOs with initiatives in the Caribbean, and potential investors in tourism development on the island. By providing centralized access to information across such a diverse and dispersed group, the web portal can generate a sense of openness and complement the metanarrative of One Eleuthera: that a cohesive community exists (Alakeson et al. 2003). Furthermore, ICT enables a global conversation—the web portal is meant to move beyond top-down publication of information to incorporate bottom-up and lateral online dialogue, including diverse voices and creating a sense of inclusion (Alakeson et al. 2003).

Reaching dispersed stakeholders via online networks depends upon their access to digital tools. Such access cuts unevenly across political and class lines and is known as the “digital divide.” Rural and impoverished areas have less physical access to technology while disabled people and internet “illiterates” (e.g. in the U.S. this disproportionately includes Latinos, senior citizens, and adults without high school education) are hindered by issues of interface access and proficiency (Alakeson et al. 2003; Zickuhr and Smith 2012). According to statistics compiled by the United Nations’s International Telecommunications Union (2010), 43% of Bahamians and 74% of Americans used the internet. However, mobile penetration flows in the opposite direction: 125% in the Bahamas compared to 89.86% in the United States (in other words, many Bahamians have more than one mobile device).
Stakeholders in countries such as the U.S. that enjoy deep broadband penetration will have easier access to a web-based system. However, the deep mobile penetration in the Bahamas suggests that digital technologies such as short message service (SMS, aka “text messaging”) could bridge the physical network divide. Additionally, websites should be optimized for mobile devices when possible (e.g. fitting smaller screen displays, limiting data transfers such as large images, and providing an easily-navigable main menu). Reaching individuals who are marginalized on the basis of disability, proficiency, or disinterest will require more than adding a technical protocol. These populations should be reached through other modes of communication while working to extend access to those who are interested as an OEF project. Such initiatives are already in process by OEF members such as the South Eleuthera Mission, Rotary Club of Eleuthera, and Island Journeys.

ICTs enable information proliferation, which can lead to a glut of information and make it difficult to filter relevant data or identify meaningful information. While many can relate to the explosion in junk email and internet-based advertising, unintended consequences of information proliferation include the breakdown of trusting relationships. For instance, the access to online medical information including professional, corporate, and lay websites, has contributed to the erosion of patient trust in doctors (Alakeson et al. 2003:62–63). On the other hand, the ability to access consumer reviews on sites like Angie’s List, Tripadvisor, or Yelp can not only provide useful information, but build trust among consumers and accountability among providers.

A main challenge for the One Eleuthera Web Portal is to generate meaningful content for and by OEF stakeholders. My design objective was to remove as many
barriers as possible for potential content authors and to teach the teachers (i.e. provide training that trickles down among stakeholders). This includes implementing “what you see is what you get” (WYSIWYG) tools, which make it easier for non-technical experts to publish content without knowing how to write hypertext markup language (HTML), the basic source code which web browsers interpret for display. In addition, online information media currently used by OEF stakeholders can be identified so that web portal data can be “pushed” or “pulled” to maximize coverage and inclusion (e.g. pushing event announcements to a Twitter feed or pulling comments from a Facebook wall).

**Maintaining Linkages to Place across Space**

ICT usage is popular among transnational and diasporic populations to maintain ties to home and to identify and reproduce ethnic communities in their adopted home nations (Adams and Ghose 2003; Brinkerhoff 2009; Graham and Khosravi 2002; Valentine 2006). Adams and Ghose (2003:416) use the metaphor of “bridgespace” to explain the role that ICT plays in collapsing time and space to bridge the gap between one’s present and past: “[Bridgespace] is a set of connections between here and there, in both a geographical and a cultural sense, like a rail yard or an airport” (emphasis in original). The infrastructure of ICT supports two way communication across the bridge, which enables both conservation (i.e. the preservation of an ideal, essentialized cultural identity) and innovation (i.e. the transformative incorporation of other cultural elements) (Adams and Ghose 2003). Thus, the One Eleuthera Web Portal is an important tool to maintain the stakeholder status of diasporic Eleutherans, including workers and students. Because many of these people hope to return to Eleuthera later in life, incorporating their values and voices into OEF-based conversations about Eleuthera’s future ensures the
relevance of planning activities to future populations. Additionally, bridgespace is a
useful metaphor for understanding the potential of the web portal to include tourists and
vacation homeowners in maintaining a link to Eleuthera and deepening their ties to the
island.

**Enabling Empathy-based Ethics**

The value of coexistence promoted in shared heritage ethics relies upon empathy;
that is, the significance of heritage as a means to instill hope and ontological security
among modern humans should be empathetically recognized and inform ethical practices.
Christie (Alakeson et al. 2003:38–40) summarizes four areas in which ICT can enable
empathy: the expansion of open forums for debate and knowledge exchange, the ability
to simulate alternative representations of reality to explore shared problems (e.g. climate
change) or imagine utopias, the creation of digital tools for conflict resolution and
scenario planning, and the ability to “virtually” meet (e.g. using online video
conferencing) and overcome previous barriers of geographical access. Communication
frameworks that enable feedback loops can generate empathy across common interests
and accountability to other community members (Alakeson et al. 2003). Thus, the One
Eleuthera Web Portal should offer stakeholders an opportunity to provide “peer review”
on OEF initiatives and incentivize organizational members to creatively plan mutually
beneficial projects. Furthermore, the engagement of those stakeholders who are not seen
as community insiders such as tourists, vacation homeowners, and American academic
partners can engender more trusting relationships and ethical behavior that are consistent
with the idealistic goals of community tourism and sustainable development. And
creating empathy implies a reciprocal relationship; the goal should be to appreciate ways
in which we are all tourists and all natives somewhere and to someone (and to have such understanding inform actions both on Eleuthera and away).

Although early critiques equated the disembodied nature of online communication with impersonality and inauthenticity that would serve to further alienate modern subjects, more recent research reviewed and contributed by Valentine (2006) suggests otherwise. Rather, such researchers frame ICT as a communicative environment that provides a context for a wide range of human interactions (Adams and Ghose 2003; Valentine 2006). For instance, the immediacy of email means we can give kneejerk responses that we may regret later; on the other hand, because we aren’t engaged in a physically immediate conversation with the recipient, we can also choose to reflect upon our response before engaging. The One Eleuthera Web Portal complements those relationships that OEF builds on the ground; its online environment should be moderated in the same spirit of building community and sharing experiences.

**Mobilizing Obligation**

The One Eleuthera Web Portal is designed to help build community through networking dispersed stakeholders, maintaining ties to place, and creating space for empathy. Such community building should lead to mobilizing a sense of shared obligation to community interests among stakeholders. That is, the web portal is a conduit for community action, providing ways that stakeholders can “get involved” with OEF and its initiatives. For instance, volunteer opportunities, events, and membership drives provide points of access to OEF and its member organizations and mobilize human resources among the broader OEF stakeholder base.
Additionally, fostering financial support through charitable giving and patronage helps to expand OEF’s resource base, which is then distributed as grants to OEF member organizations and OEF collaborative initiatives. The web portal can provide both a mechanism to solicit and process financial support and a dependable source of feedback to donors on the projects they have funded to show the material and social effects of their gifts. Currently, the philanthropic economy on Eleuthera is quite strong but based on limited sources. Thus there is considerable competitiveness for the support of donors among the island’s many nonprofit organizations and government agencies. Coordinating development activities in terms of scheduling fundraising campaigns and collaborating on mutually beneficial projects can help to ease the sometimes disruptive competition amongst organizations that share similar goals and maximize the value of donors’ gifts. However, many organizations tend to keep their patrons’ identities quiet and some patrons also wish to remain anonymous to other charities. Thus, despite its potential for coordination, OEF could be seen by some as pursuing a monopoly on the island’s philanthropy market. ICT can assist with some of these issues but not all.

**Information Architecture of the One Eleuthera Web Portal**

In this section I outline the information architecture of the web portal, which refers to an information system’s structural design, organizational and navigation systems, and usability features (Morville and Rosenfeld 2008). I also refer to my work designing the web portal’s graphic identity and configuring its software environment. My approach to information system development is shaped by my anthropological training; that is, I approach my “clients” as an ethnographer would, recognizing that their knowledge domain is a mixture of explicitly defined information (e.g. their
organization’s mission statement), implicit ontologies that participants take for granted (e.g. office jargon), and habitual performances (e.g. workflows). I favor an iterative and adaptive workflow that is informed by the organization’s needs and feedback throughout the development process. Ideally, the client becomes a collaborator in the workflow as we refine the organization’s mission and information system’s goals (described above). The following sections will describe particular construction stages of the portal that were informed by a shared heritage perspective and reflect system requirements for similar ICT: (1) articulation of user personas and needs; (2) design of the site’s information structure; (3) development of the graphic identity for the user interface; (4) software development; (5) user training; and (6) project launch. Although presented sequentially, my workflow was a bit more organic, roughly following a two-phased, iterative cycle (Figure 12) of discovery (i.e. stakeholder consultation to elicit needs), design, implementation, and review.

Following consultations with OEF and their stakeholders regarding the needs of their users, I began planning the web portal by crafting a set of user personas and associated needs. User personas are fictional characters that represent certain segments and interests of an online community and are used to enable empathetic (i.e. user-based) development among teams of collaborators to more efficiently cope with the challenge that a system’s knowledge domain is incompletely known (or ultimately unknowable) until it is used. That is, an optimal software project cannot be wholly pre-planned and should anticipate change and adaptation to end users’ needs as expressed throughout (and after) the development process.

---

20 My preference is consistent with recent developments in software development and project management philosophies including the “bazaar” (Eric Steven Raymond 2000) and “agile” (Beedle et al. 2001) models, which emphasize bottom-up, incremental development among teams of collaborators to more efficiently cope with the challenge that a system’s knowledge domain is incompletely known (or ultimately unknowable) until it is used. That is, an optimal software project cannot be wholly pre-planned and should anticipate change and adaptation to end users’ needs as expressed throughout (and after) the development process.
Figure 12: OE Web Portal Iterative Development Work Cycle in Two Phases

User Personas and Needs

design, while simplifying and organizing stakeholders’ requirements (Castro et al. 2008; Dayton 2003). Following consultations with OEF and their stakeholders regarding the needs of their users, I began planning the web portal by crafting a set of user personas and associated needs. User personas are fictional characters that represent certain segments and interests of an online community and are used to enable empathetic (i.e. user-based) design, while simplifying and organizing stakeholders’ requirements (Castro et al. 2008; Dayton 2003). Information architects use personas much like how anthropologists craft the characters that people their ethnographies: they are based on real people yet are generalized in ways that aid in the compelling and clear communication of otherwise complex contexts of human experience. Personas necessarily collapse variation
in user preference and behavior and are representative of essential user types rather than descriptions of actual users. Following unstructured interviews and workshops with OEF staff and stakeholders, I created the following hypothetical user personas to guide my design decisions.

Table 1: User Personas for the One Eleuthera Web Portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Renee   | OEF Staff | Renee is married, middle aged and wears multiple hats. She works as a part time OEF staff member and juggles a few other jobs as well. She has two cell phones and checks her email frequently. She knows how to use a word processor but doesn’t use the computer for much else besides internet access and correspondence. She is often asked to report immediately on data such as event registrations or donor pledges. She is not interested in writing a lot of content for a website and prefers to work outside of the office and with people in the community. She shines at organizing events and getting people involved. However, she often overcommits and is frazzled. She doesn’t feel she has the time to sit down and really learn a piece of software comprehensively and draws upon her colleagues for help when she forgets how to do something. | • Publish content about OEF quickly and easily  
• Track donor information  
• Organize events and manage mailing lists  
• Moderate all content to verify substance and vision  
• Maintain history of email correspondence  
• Work in tandem with other staff members who work remotely  
• Manage the collaborative projects OEF is funding  
• Access training resources |
| Sheila  | OEF Member | Sheila is married, middle aged, and wears multiple hats. She spends much of her time working for a nonprofit organization that is focused on community wellness. She is a Rotarian and is involved in many volunteer activities in her settlement. She is focused on building a strong donor base for her organization while delivering services to her stakeholders. She believes in the One Eleuthera message but is unsure what membership will mean for the organization. She does not want to share her donor data, | • Easily publish a profile of her organization, including the organization’s logo  
• Link to current online content her organization publishes  
• Connect with a larger user base to |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>OEF Offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Darryl   | Local resident              | Darryl is middle aged and runs his own business out of his home. Income can be unsteady, but he is well connected in his social network and can access opportunities when necessary. He is savvy and resourceful. His family has generational property on the island and he has several family members in Nassau, some with government connections. He attends all of his settlement’s homecomings and serves on the homecoming committee, often helping with the bar. He enjoys socializing and helps his family and friends, but doesn’t volunteer beyond his settlement’s circle. The OEF message sounds good but isn’t sure what it offers him. | • Learn more about how OEF can benefit him.  
• Learn about events where he can socialize and have fun.  
• Find a low stakes/low effort way of supporting OEF if he finds it worthwhile – perhaps helping with a future event. |
| Mary     | Vacation home owner         | Mary is a senior citizen “snow bird,” who flies south to Eleuthera in the winter and spends the summer and fall on Long Island, New York. She is a patron of the arts, often spending the evening in Manhattan to attend the theatre, opera, or gallery openings. She worked in PR for many years. She and her husband have been visiting Eleuthera for 30 years now and feel like it’s their second home. She has a tight-knit social group of other second homeowners on the island, and she enjoys chatting with them about gardening, theatre, books, and benign US political banter at their informal dinner parties. She gives money to the local library on Eleuthera and attends the library’s fundraising events. She | • Learn about what her community’s needs are.  
• Find other venues on the island where her pet interests (i.e. the arts) are being supported.  
• Find events where she would feel welcome to attend.  
• Learn about projects in her area of interest where her money could have a tangible impact.  
• See how her |
also gives money to a handful of U.S.-based charitable organizations. She likes that she can see her money get put to good use at the library on Eleuthera—her money seems to go a bit further down here. She is very fond of the local Eleutherans and thinks they’re very “friendly,” but she doesn’t have many Bahamian friends. She is supportive of social causes that help the island’s people but does not want to see the island change from the quiet, undeveloped “paradise” she values.

Kendrick, College student abroad

Kendrick is a college student on New Providence studying software engineering. He is in his final year of school and is looking forward to finding a job. Most of his family is back on Eleuthera, but he has an aunt and uncle in Nassau and plenty of friends. He returns to Eleuthera for holidays and big events and misses home. Although he would consider taking a job on Eleuthera, most of the work is in Nassau right now, so he expects to stay in New Providence. He aspires to make a good salary and enjoy the finer things in life. He’d like to return to Eleuthera one day but doesn’t know where the next years will take him and is really focused on making money and making the most of his 20s.

• Stay connected to what’s going on on the island, including learning about big social events planned at holiday times.
• Learn about human resource opportunities on the island.
• Connect with other Eleutherans who are on New Providence and may offer economic opportunities for him.

Mark & Maya, Tourists

Mark and Maya are in their early 30s and live in Chicago. They have done a bit of traveling after college, including hiking in the rain forests of Costa Rica and whale watching in Alaska. They are interested in a Caribbean vacation but want to get off the beaten track. Mark scuba dives and Maya enjoys museums. They don’t want to be around spring breakers, but they also want a bit of a social atmosphere and to get a taste of an “authentic” Bahamas. They’re not sure what Eleuthera has to offer and have been leaning toward Andros because it’s so undeveloped. However, Maya is interested in a more culturally immersive experience where she can meet local people and perhaps volunteer with a community organization.

• Learn about what the island offers for eco and heritage tourism.
• Learn about volunteer opportunities for eco and heritage tourists.
• See pictures of people and places on the island.
Figure 13: One Eleuthera Web Portal Site Architecture
Information Structure

As illustrated in Figure 13, the One Eleuthera Web Portal has three main structural levels. Level 1 contains the public face of the website and would be what users such as Darryl, Kendrick, Mary, and Mark and Maya would use to gain access to relevant information. Such content has been divided into four streams: informational (i.e. more static content about OEF and Eleuthera in general), action-oriented (i.e. how to get involved or support OEF), news (i.e. more dynamic content about OEF), and social media (i.e. content pushed or pulled via external digital media such as cell phones or Twitter). Level 1 should look and act like a professional website but its content will need to be published by non-expert users such as Renee. Level 3 contains the back office tools for OEF staff to manage community development data. Because OEF doesn’t have a single office that houses all staff members, the tools should support a dispersed network of staff who need place-independent access and to know what they have each been working on (i.e. the tool should support self/meta-documentation of the workflow).

Finally, Level 2 sits between 1 and 3 and utilizes features from both levels to form communities of practice that would include users such as Sheila, Darryl, Kendrick, and Mary. I have identified two main content streams: member groups (i.e. organizations that have become OEF members, pledge to support OEF, and gain access to OEF benefits such as presence on the web portal) and project groups (i.e. collaborative development initiatives funded by OEF that bring together tangible resources, OEF members, and volunteers). Member groups and project groups each have their own landing pages, blog, and followers (i.e. people who express an interest in receiving content updates). To incentivize OEF members to collaborate on meaningful projects, project groups have
access to more features, such as private and public forums as well as the ability to plug in to Level 3 features such as event management and fundraising campaigns. Project group forums can facilitate stakeholder feedback on project planning and implementation.

Figure 14 illustrates the site map for the web portal, which defines the navigational structure for accessing particular content nodes. To read the flow chart, begin in the top left corner at the home page. There are three content groups accessed directly via the home page. The blue box at the top represents forms, feeds, and social media that users access to connect with OEF; for instance, from the home page, users should be able to (in one click) contact OEF, signup for a newsletter, or find OEF on Facebook. The aqua box directly beneath the home page represents featured content that takes up prime real estate on the home page (above the fold/scroll); that is, dynamic content that OEF wants to direct users’ attention to most. I’ve given four hypothetical content nodes to illustrate its utility such as profiling a featured member, project, upcoming event, or promoting a recent news item. To the right of the aqua box is a light green box that represents primary navigational links or what should appear in a main menu on the home page. These are meant to be exclusive categories of content that direct users to all content within the site, represented to the right in the main content box.

Some content, such as blog articles, are meant to be automatically pushed to external media such as OEF’s RSS, Facebook, and Twitter feeds. Some Level 3 content could be pushed via SMS to mobile phones including event and volunteer announcements. Other mobile-phone related content could include matrix barcode integration (e.g. QR codes) with the web portal at heritage sites or even geo-referencing content to appear when a user is in the physical vicinity of a relevant site. The site should
Figure 14: One Eleuthera Web Portal Site Map
also support user-driven content syndication (i.e. “Share this” links) via email and popular social media outlets.

**Graphic Identity and User Interface**

The One Eleuthera Web Portal needed a graphic identity that matched OEF’s mission. As a community development organization, I advised that its identity should be friendly, accessible, fresh, inspiring, hopeful, and professional. I also advised that the aesthetic evoke the cultural and place identity of Eleuthera. I wanted the design to reflect that One Eleuthera is composed of a wide range of organizations located across the entire island, in Nassau, and in the U.S. The site needed to instill confidence in the creative mission that from many we form one community with a common interest.

I began with peer market research, identifying several model websites in terms of aesthetic and their coherence in design and mission. These websites included large private foundations such as Ford Foundation (http://www.fordfoundation.org/), Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (http://www.gatesfoundation.org), and W.K. Kellogg Foundation (http://www.wkkf.org/); smaller religious, community, or cultural organizations such as R.U.4.Children (http://www.ru4children.org/), Sower of Seeds (http://www.sowerofseeds.org/), Chapeltown Development Trust (http://chapeltowndt.org.uk/), Housing Works (http://www.housingworks.org/), Help your Habitat (http://www.helpyourhabitat.org/), and Mission First (http://www.missionfirst.org/home); the Caribbean-oriented foundation 1Love (http://www.1love.org/); the multidisciplinary “collaboratory” of HASTAC (http://hastac.org/); and the heritage promotional site of Duchy Originals (http://www.duchyoriginals.com/). In studying and sketching these websites, I identified
common elements that make up a visual lexicon for community-oriented websites so that I could aesthetically situate the One Eleuthera web portal within the sector but also distinguish it from other sites.

Figure 15: One Eleuthera Web Portal Home Page Wireframe.

I sketched four sets of possible wireframes of the home page and landing page designs. Wireframes are simplified schematics of a page layout and help to map the essential content identified in your architecture and site map without getting bogged
down in graphical design choices. I chose the best of the four to digitize (Figure 15) using Adobe Illustrator on a standard 960 pixel wide grid system of 12 columns (Smith 2011), which would guide my full color mockups (Figure 16).

Figure 16: One Eleuthera Web Portal Home Page Mockup.
I created my mockups using Adobe Photoshop and followed an iterative process with two rounds of design review of the home page, landing page, member profile, and project profile pages with the director of OEF, Shaun Ingraham. I refined my wireframe to organize content in a more efficient and pleasing manner. I defined a color palette drawn from photographs Elizabeth Chilton and Neil Silberman took during field trips to Eleuthera as part of the Center for Heritage & Society and OEF partnership projects. The page background and header and footer bars are meant to represent the ombré effect of the sky and sea meeting on the horizon (Figure 17). The orange is the complementary color to turquoise, a combination I observed while on the island (Figure 18) and which also evokes an energetic and creative feeling of joy. I chose modern and clean sans-serif fonts with high readability and a roundness that lent a friendly and accessible feel.

Figure 17: Sky and sea ombré inspiration from Eleuthera. (Photo credit Elizabeth Chilton 2011)
I designed the feature content as a dynamic slide show with four slides that automatically rotate but can also be activated by the slide button on the left of the slide image. The slide image contains a link to the featured content node. This arrangement keeps the featured content “above the fold” without pushing the rest of the content too far down the screen. The rest of the content identified on the site map was arranged on the grid system.

Finally, I integrated Google Map features into the design with the intention that each member and project group be geo-coded so that users such as Darryl, Mary, and Mark and Maya could find resources and venues across the island and so that OEF
member organizations could advertise where they are located in relation to other resources. I entitled the map “Explore Eleuthera” to invite users to click on the map.

**Software Development**

I organized software development into two phases according to OEF’s priorities: Phase 1 included Level 1, Level 3, and the public facing and geo-referencing for Level 2; Phase 2 included the complete build out of Level 2 (to follow further community testing and assessment after Phase 1). I developed the site using the content management system (CMS), Drupal 7 on a LAMP stack (Linux operating system, Apache 2 web server, MySQL database, and PHP language). Drupal is an open source CMS with a thriving user base and developer community; according to its website, as of May 2012, “826,008 people in 228 countries* speaking 181 languages power Drupal” \(^{21}\) (Buytaert 2012). Drupal is a framework for website development: it offers a graphical user interface and an application programming interface (API) that developers can use to build compatible “modules” to add site features and implement graphical “themes” to brand their site and arrange content according to their own specification. Website content, termed “nodes” in the Drupal world is stored in a backend database. Thus, the API is separate from the content, unlike in “static” HTML where the website content is integrated with the markup language (Figure 19). This enables the use of a graphical user interface (Figure 20) to edit website content as rich text (like in a word processor), while the API dynamically processes the content into web browser-accessible HTML. Additionally, it enables web

\(^{21}\) The unusually high country count is attributed to the Drupal community’s respect for the self-identification by Fourth World peoples and populations in disputed territories of their country.
developers to design new features without impacting the website content. All website code was maintained and documented using the Git version control system.

Figure 19: Directly editing website content in HTML.

Figure 20: Editing website content in Drupal 7.
Modules are the building blocks for adding features to a Drupal site. As open source software with a thriving community of practice, Drupal’s website offers over 10,000 community-contributed modules, many of which are actively maintained by collaborative groups of volunteers. I developed the One Eleuthera Web Portal using a suite of over 70 modules, which I configured to work together to achieve the proposed architecture.

While I can’t discuss every module, I mention two sets of modules that comprise the basis of our community engagement and mobilization strategy. First, I used the Organic Groups suite of modules to build the Level 2 architecture, which enables each OEF member and project to have its own “site within a site” and supports a bottom-up, on the fly (i.e. “organic”) identification of group membership and content publication. In other words, an OEF member organization such as CHS should have its own set of collaboration and communication tools that they can easily administer and add users to without being a system-wide administrator for the entire web portal. Likewise, their settings, tools, content, and users wouldn’t interfere with other members’ settings. For example, each member organization could have its own blog, discussion board, mailing list, chat room, or wiki. Individual users such as Sheila can be granted group administrator status to moderate these activities while users such as Kendrick and Mary could subscribe to an organic group to gain access to the group’s specific tools. The multidisciplinary online “collaboratory” of HASTAC (www.hastac.org) uses Organic Groups in much the same way to build collaborative communities of practice around thematic topics. This implements Sheila’s (i.e. OEF member users) needs while delivering focused content of value to users like Darryl, Kendrick, and Mary and inviting...
them to follow and participate in Level 2 content. Additionally, the voluntary membership into organic groups respects the many interests that comprise the OEF community and avoids an information glut of publishing all content to all individuals. However, such structure can entrench special interest communities at the detriment to building cross-group, common interests. While digital tools can offer some antidote, such as suggested content links that can bridge groups, the responsibility to provide creative linkages between the member organizations falls to humans: that is, the OEF staff and project leaders. I suggest that OEF staff craft content for Level 1 of the portal that highlights and promotes such linkages. Additionally, project groups (discussed above) are meant to build such bridges by providing space for members to collaborate on practical applications to accomplish common interests (e.g. a heritage conservation trail project involves multiple member organizations who would be party to the project group).

Second, I used CiviCRM (http://civicrm.org/), which is an open source constituent relationship management system (CRM), to build the Level 3 features. CiviCRM is popular among non-profits and public-private partnerships oriented toward civil society engagement. CiviCRM allows OEF staff users like Renee to manage events, organize fundraising campaigns, maintain archival histories of correspondence with donors and volunteers, send mass emails, accept online donations, and generate development statistics (e.g. LYBUNT/SYBUNT reports). As open source software, it doesn’t carry the burden of annual license fees like commercial CRMs, and because it is web-based, data are stored “in the cloud,” meaning they are available from any computer or mobile device with a broadband connection. Thus, OEF staff aren’t tied to a physical computer terminal to access OEF constituent data, nor are they passing around copies of
Microsoft Excel spreadsheets with sensitive donor data. Finally, CiviCRM is self-documenting, which means that it archives transaction-based (i.e. time-coded) actions such as email correspondence and content edits and supports task management. Used effectively, such an architecture enables Renee to assign a particular task like following up with a particular donor to a fellow staff member, who can log in, see the task on his dashboard, read the history of correspondence between Renee and the donor (without logging into Renee’s personal email account) and follow up with the donor via email or phone.

Finally, I integrated Google Analytics in the web portal so that OEF can track its site statistics such as visitor demographics, page visits and pathways, and search contexts. Such statistics informed a self-assessment I conducted at the conclusion of Phase 1 development in April 2012 to inform strategic recommendations for Phase 2 development.

**User Training**

I trained a core group of OEF staff over two weeks while on site in Eleuthera. I spent one week conducting general workshops on Level 1 and Level 3 content publication and data management with five participants. I then spent one week intensively training a new local webmaster who took responsibility for administering content publication and providing local support to OEF staff and members. Phase 2 training, to commence summer–fall 2012, will include training workshops among OEF members in Level 2 features and more intensive training with the webmaster to hand over all upper-level administration for which I have been responsible (e.g. site backups, security updates, feature enhancements, theme revisions, and bug fixing).
Project Launch

The One Eleuthera Foundation and its Web Portal (http://www.oneeleuthera.org) publicly launched Earth Day weekend, April 20-22, 2012, amid a number of events co-sponsored by The Nature Conservancy, the Bahamas National Trust, and a number of OEF member organizations. The event represented a framework for capacity building across multiple sectors, including national policymakers and administrators, non-governmental advocacy organizations including local community development groups, vacation homeowners who patronize community and heritage development causes, and local residents seeking sustainable economic development. The event was covered by local and Nassau-based newspapers and radio stations and received wide publicity throughout the Bahamas. Its opening served as a first step in the widening shared initiatives of the One Eleuthera Foundation.

Conclusion

The Web Portal is designed to serve as a conduit for learning about the events and the collaborative initiatives in progress at the time of launch, including a conservation and heritage trail that traverses the entire island and incorporates many of the resources identified by Michael Singer Studio South (2010) and the Center for Heritage & Society (Chilton et al. 2011) as well as OEF member organizations.

The web portal serves as a platform to create a “community of practice” (Wenger et al. 2002) committed to a common interest in sustainable economic development and guided by my theorization of shared heritage ethics, which emphasizes an empathetic understanding of the instrumental effects of the social process of heritage in instilling hope and security in an imaginable future. As such, it incorporates design principles that
are user-centered and “agile,” recognizing that community is in process and that content and attendant feature needs will change over time as the community grows and adapts to its conditions. It creates public and private spaces across a dispersed network of stakeholders to access meaningful information and provide feedback on active initiatives, enabling dialogue and accountability. It also serves practical purposes, streamlining staff members’ tasks and helping them to focus on work beyond the computer monitor.

Finally, the web portal fosters different levels of participation for stakeholders across multiple sectors and at multiple scales, allowing stakeholders to claim and name a stake rather than prescribing it. In that sense it is a possible tool to begin to address the core problems of the traditionally dominant cultural tourism paradigms.

The OEF Web Portal also addresses the challenges of alternative tourism development models by assisting OEF’s mission to build linkages across the niche “markets” representing nature (e.g. ecotourism), culture (e.g. heritage tourism, historic preservation), and community (e.g. education, public health wellness, entrepreneurs).

Furthermore, it links stakeholders across sectors, including public administration, private business, non-governmental community organizations, and the citizenry. And it expands the boundaries of community by identifying the many, synchronous scales at which community and heritage are practiced, including local residents, vacation homeowners, and members of the Family Island diaspora. Mobilizing community through ICT is more than publishing a website or e-newsletter: it requires interfacing the range of available physical and human resources to create meaningful collaborative projects and ethical responsibilities based in shared interests. ICT can aid the development of shared heritage by networking dispersed stakeholders, maintaining intangible linkages to places and their
inhabitants, enabling empathy-based ethics, and mobilizing obligations to common interests. As such, ICT can be a constructive and practical tool for complementing, extending, and enhancing shared heritage development efforts on the ground.
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